

## 1

## INTRODUCTION

Nearly a century ago, Rudolf Bultmann described two basic problems that beset the study of the Fourth Gospel: (1) the place of the Gospel in the development of early Christianity and (2) its central idea.<sup>1</sup> Simply put, from what conceptual, social, and historical situation does the Gospel of John emerge? And how can we characterize the central theological claim of the Gospel? Whether stated or not, these two questions – the historical and the theological – and their corresponding answers are bound up with all exegesis of John.<sup>2</sup> The present study will propose an approach to the Fourth Gospel that sheds light on both problems: The Gospel of John ought to be read as a narrative argument about how Israel might embrace its future. The Gospel consistently demonstrates how Israel’s worship of God and obedience to God find their fulfillment through Jesus Christ. John’s concern for the future of Israel means that it is incorrect to view John as interested in *replacing* or *superseding* Judaism. It is incorrect to read John as a document that looks back on a decisive break with Judaism. Rather, John seeks to demonstrate the fundamental continuity that runs toward Jesus through the Scripture and history of Israel, and through the practices and convictions of first-century Judaism. John claims that this Scripture and history, those practices and convictions, find their home in Jesus and the people who believe in him. Nearly half a century ago, Nils Dahl called this a “peculiar” continuity.<sup>3</sup> He was surely right, about both

<sup>1</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, “Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums,” *ZNW* 24 (1925): 100–146 (see esp. 100–102).

<sup>2</sup> See John Ashton, *The Interpretation of John*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 7–25. My categorization of Bultmann’s two questions as “historical” and “theological” is indebted to Ashton.

<sup>3</sup> Nils Dahl, “The Johannine Church and History,” in *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*, ed. Nils Dahl (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), 119.

2 *The Gospel of John and the Future of Israel*

the continuity and its peculiarity. Be that as it may, the Gospel of John presents its reader with a theological vision for the way in which Israel might move into its future in continuity with its past. Reading the Gospel from this perspective sheds light on the historical context of the Gospel and its theological center.<sup>4</sup>

The burden of this entire study is to make this case. But before presenting this reading, a few clarifications are in order: First, while John is obviously a narrative, the statement that John is a *narrative argument* is not as clear. The claim of this study is that the theological vision of the Gospel of John derives from and speaks into a set of historical and theological concerns that were present within Second Temple Judaism. To read John historically is to read it within a particular “context of expectation,” one that is alert to the question of how the Jewish tradition can live in fidelity to its past and anticipation of its future. In formal terms, the Gospel is a narrative that works within the generic conventions of its day, but it is implicitly an argument for a particular (and in its context, an alternative) understanding of Jesus’ significance vis-à-vis the Jewish tradition.<sup>5</sup> We will consider this in much more detail in the pages that follow. A second clarification to make is that to state that John’s narrative is also an argument does not mean to deny that John is also (and primarily) a gospel – good news. It is to claim, however, that a

<sup>4</sup> The methodological implications of the text’s theological coherence and historical context, as well as the complex theological and historical developments that preceded the final form, are considered in M. C. de Boer, “Historical Criticism, Narrative Criticism, and the Gospel of John,” *JSNT* 47 (1992): 35–48. My aim to read John as a *historically situated argument* attempts to build on de Boer’s criticisms and proposals without accepting that a full reconstruction of the redaction history of the Gospel is a prerequisite to an account of its coherence. Similarly, see Jörn-Michael Schröder, *Das eschatologische Israel im Johannesevangelium: Eine Untersuchung der johanneischen Israel-Konzeption in Joh 2–4 and Joh 6* (NET 3; Tübingen/Basel: A. Franke Verlag, 2003), 26–28.

<sup>5</sup> Frank Kermode (*The Genesis of Secrecy: On the Interpretation of Narrative* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979], 162–163) describes genre as “a context of expectation . . . a set of fore-understandings exterior to a text which enable us to follow that text.” This study proposes that the context/fore-understanding necessary to read John well is not only generic (John as a *bios*, novel, etc.) but also the urgent historical and theological questions facing John’s Jewish tradition. As an “argument,” I mean that the narrative of John is, as a whole, a kind of *reason* or *proof* that supports a particular proposition. (On this, see *OED*, *ad loc.*) The description of John as a narrative argument can be coordinated with many other approaches to the genre of the Fourth Gospel; see, e.g., the essays in Kasper Bro Larsen, ed., *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic*, SANt 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015).

theological vision for the future of Israel is basic to the good news of John. To miss John's vision for Israel is to miss something significant about the Gospel. Third, the meaning of the terms "*Ioudaioi*," "Jewish," and "Israel" requires clarification.<sup>6</sup> I will show in this study how a theological frame of reference for these terms must be added to their oft-noted sociological frames of reference. For now, it will suffice to note that in this study *Ioudaioi*, "Israel," and "Judaism" are not used allegorically.<sup>7</sup> Fourth, John's vision for the future of Israel correlates with the Gospel's critical stance toward the *Ioudaioi*. John is arguing not only *for* a particular vision of the future of Israel but also *against* a competing vision for the future of Israel. The positive argument and the negative argument belong together. Many studies falter when they reduce or underplay one side of the argument – as if John is primarily positive and only minimally critical, or vice versa.

My aim is to demonstrate John's commitment to the future of Israel as a theme that runs through the entire Gospel. This thesis draws on several streams of scholarship, and it has been anticipated by a number of studies of John. The streams that contribute to this reading include those that shed light on what C. K. Barrett aptly named "Johannine Judaism."<sup>8</sup> These include the significant studies of Wayne Meeks,<sup>9</sup> J. Louis Martyn,<sup>10</sup> Raymond Brown,<sup>11</sup> Klaus

<sup>6</sup> In this study, the transliterated "*Ioudaioi*" will refer to the group that is commonly referred to as "the Jews" (oftentimes including quotation marks) in other studies of the Fourth Gospel. It is my hope that the transliteration preserves some of the historical distance that is vital to reading John as a historically situated narrative argument.

<sup>7</sup> They are not allegorical in the way that is often attributed to Bultmann, where "*Jews/Ioudaioi*" = the unbelieving world. (Bultmann is more nuanced than this common summary of his position. See Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* [trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971], 86–87, esp. 87n2).

<sup>8</sup> C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel of John and Judaism*, 1st American ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 19.

<sup>9</sup> Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, NovTSup 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1967); "The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism," *JBL* 91.1 (1972): 44–72; "Am I a Jew? – Johannine Christianity and Judaism," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Morton Smith (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

<sup>10</sup> J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*, 3rd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003).

<sup>11</sup> Raymond Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978).

4      *The Gospel of John and the Future of Israel*

Wengst,<sup>12</sup> and John Ashton.<sup>13</sup> Focused studies on the Gospel of John that have attempted to sustain similar ideas in their exegesis include the works of Stephen Motyer,<sup>14</sup> Andreas Köstenberger,<sup>15</sup> and John Dennis.<sup>16</sup> Daniel Boyarin's important contributions to New Testament studies in general and Johannine scholarship in particular open up space for the thesis I will pursue.<sup>17</sup>

In order to set up a reading of the Fourth Gospel that can appreciate its vision for the future of Israel, this introduction proceeds in four steps: (1) a brief sketch of recent scholarship on this topic and a clarification of my approach in light of prior studies; (2) a review of the diversity of Second Temple Judaism, with particular attention to the theologically significant ways that Jewish groups could narrate their identity vis-à-vis "Israel"; (3) a conceptual account of this diversity – here we will turn from a historical mode to a philosophical mode in order to gain perspective about how Jewish writers, including the Fourth Evangelist, could understand the distance between their present way of life and their future as the restored and re-gathered people of God; and (4) a review of the *Ioudaioi* in the Gospel and how John's characterization of them informs the Gospel's vision for the future of Israel.

<sup>12</sup> Klaus Wengst, *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus: der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu seiner Interpretation* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981).

<sup>13</sup> John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

<sup>14</sup> Stephen Motyer, *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and the Jews* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1997); "The Fourth Gospel and the Salvation of Israel: An Appeal for a New Start," in *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*, ed. R. Bieringer et al. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 83–100.

<sup>15</sup> Andreas Köstenberger, "The Destruction of the Second Temple and the Composition of the Fourth Gospel," in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*, WUNT 2/219, ed. John Lierman (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 69–108.

<sup>16</sup> John A. Dennis, *Jesus' Death and the Gathering of True Israel: The Johannine Appropriation of Restoration Theology in the Light of John 11.47-52*, WUNT 2/217 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006).

<sup>17</sup> Daniel Boyarin, "The Gospel of the Memra: Jewish Binitarianism and the Prologue to John," *HTR* 94.3 (2001): 243–284; "The IOUDAIOI in John and the Prehistory of 'Judaism,'" in *Pauline Conversations in Context: Essays in Honor of Calvin J. Roetzel*, JSNTSup, ed. Janice Capel Anderson, Philip Sellew, and Claudia Setzer (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 216–239; "What Kind of Jew Is the Evangelist?" in *Those Outside: Noncanonical Readings of the Canonical Gospels*, ed. George Aichele and Richard Walsh (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 109–153.

### Locating This Study on the Map of Johannine Scholarship

The question of the relationship between John and Judaism has dominated much of twentieth- and early twenty-first-century scholarship on the Gospel, but there are only a few studies of John's vision for the future of Israel. Three recent, sustained arguments for such a reading can be found in the works of Stephen Motyer, John Dennis, and Jörn-Michael Schröder. Motyer argues for a reading of John that rejects the specific historical background that many scholars have assumed in order to make sense of John (i.e., the alienation of the Johannine community following expulsion from the synagogue/Jewish life by the Jamnian authorities). Instead of finding meaning in a murky history, Motyer attends to the "points of sensitivity" that any reader can find in the text of John.<sup>18</sup> For Motyer, these include the temple, the festivals, and the interpretation of Torah. The evangelist engages these central symbols of Jewish identity as a means of engaging his readers. When John is read with these points of sensitivity in mind, and within the tumultuous world of Judaism just after the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, interpreters are equipped to understand John as an appeal for fellow Jews to recognize how the symbols of Jewish life that were threatened by the crisis of the temple's destruction might be maintained in Jesus.<sup>19</sup>

There is much to affirm in Motyer's reading, particularly his interest in understanding the whole narrative of John and its particular emphases within the historical context of post-70 Judaism – a context about which nearly all ancient and modern interpreters of the Fourth Gospel agree. But at a number of points Motyer's interpretation requires critique as well as further application. First, Motyer's reading of the Gospel essentially ends at John 8:59 due to his focus on understanding the polemic of John 8 (esp. v. 44, "... your father the devil") within the framework of his wider thesis. (For Motyer, John 8 is part of a prophetic critique of John's coreligionists.)<sup>20</sup> Readers can infer how the whole Gospel might come under Motyer's thesis, but this is left largely undone.

<sup>18</sup> Motyer's language about "points of sensitivity" is from James D. G. Dunn, "Let John Be John," in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*, WUNT 1/28, ed. Peter Stuhlmacher (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 309–339.

<sup>19</sup> See Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, 214.

<sup>20</sup> See Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, 141–159. Motyer's proposal that John's polemic is best understood as "prophetic" and *therefore* has a missionary purpose is strained. On the role of prophetic critique to circumscribe a community, see Marianne

6 *The Gospel of John and the Future of Israel*

Second, Motyer argues that the purpose of John is to serve as a missionary document for Jews.<sup>21</sup> Klaus Wengst, among others, has rightly shown that this is unlikely: the Gospel presupposes a knowledge of the basic Christian narrative (e.g., the evangelist takes for granted knowledge of the Twelve in 6:67, and Mary as the one who had anointed Jesus in 11:2); it assumes fundamental theological ideas (e.g., what it means to “abide” in Jesus, 6:56 et passim); and it tells the story of Jesus with devices of misunderstanding and irony that suggest an audience already converted to faith in Jesus.<sup>22</sup> Limited though it is, the glimpse of the Johannine community that we encounter in the epistles of 1, 2, and 3 John offers one important set of witnesses for the reception and use of the Fourth Gospel within a community that engages the core ideas of the Gospel *not* primarily in their outreach to unbelievers but in the task of understanding the significance of Jesus for the common life they share.<sup>23</sup> The evangelist would likely rejoice if nonbelievers came to faith through his gospel, but we have no reason to think of John as a kind of late first-century missionary tract.<sup>24</sup>

Third, it will be helpful to note a conceptual problem in Motyer’s argument: in pursuing a reading that recognizes John’s particular emphases, Motyer argues against J. Louis Martyn’s proposal that a conflict with nascent rabbinic Judaism is also important for understanding the Fourth Gospel. Thus, he asks interpreters to accept a

Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015), 194; Andrew Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000), 179–180.

<sup>21</sup> See esp. Motyer, 211–220. Here Motyer follows Karl Bornhäuser, *Das Johannesevangelium: Eine Missionsschrift für Israel* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928).

<sup>22</sup> On this point, see Klaus Wengst, *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus: Der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu Seiner Interpretation* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981), 34–36; Meeks, “Man from Heaven,” 70. Francis Moloney, “Who Is ‘the Reader’ in/of the Fourth Gospel,” *ABR* 40 (1992): 20–33; Richard Bauckham, “John for Readers of Mark,” in *The Gospel for All Christians*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 147–171.

<sup>23</sup> On the relationship of the Gospel to the Epistles, I agree with Raymond Brown that the Epistles correct possible misreadings of the Gospel. On these points, see Brown, *Community of the Beloved Disciple*, 93–144 (esp. 93–109); *An Introduction to the New Testament*, ABRL (Doubleday: New York, 1997), 383–405.

<sup>24</sup> I read John 20:31 as an expression of the Evangelist’s goal to build up the faith of his readers regarding how Jesus is, in fact, the Messiah, the Son of God. The difficult critical decisions about this text are best deferred to arguments about the nature of the whole Gospel – what kind of narrative is it? – and thus there is an important way that this entire study is an argument for how to understand this particular verse. On this question, see Maloney, “The Gospel of John and Evangelization,” in Francis J. Maloney, *The Gospel of John: Text and Context*, BIS 72 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 3–19.

false dichotomy: either a relationship of conflict between John and the Jews (Martyn et al.) or John's constructive vision for Jewish worship finding its fulfillment in Jesus (Motyer). Motyer's thesis and historical reconstruction cannot balance John's particular emphases on temple, worship, and Scripture with the sustained criticism of the *Ioudaioi* in the Fourth Gospel and the possible historical scenario that would make sense of it. Thus, he asks his readers to follow him in denying the conflict with Judaism that Martyn described. While there are reasons to be cautious in adopting and deploying Martyn's thesis, readers should not need to make a decision between John's "points of sensitivity" on the one hand and the specific historical conflicts that would fit in post-70 Judaism on the other.

John Dennis's study of restoration theology in the Fourth Gospel interprets John 11:47–52 within the broad context of first-century Jewish restoration theology. Dennis argues that the ingathering of the scattered children of God spoken of in 11:52 denotes the scattered people of Israel.<sup>25</sup> Thus, the Gospel of John presents Jesus' death as fulfilling Israel's expectation for the people to be gathered by God in the last days. The plight of Israel is brought to an end by Jesus' death for (ὑπέρ) the nation.<sup>26</sup> After showing how the specific concerns of a restored nation and place of worship fit within Second Temple and post-70 Judaism,<sup>27</sup> Dennis surveys the Fourth Gospel's presentation of Jesus as, among others, the new temple (1:14; 2:13–22), the one who gathers the scattered people lest they perish (6:11–14), the shepherd of Israel prophesied in Ezek 34–37 (John 10:1–18), and the one who defeats the devil, the cosmic foe who leads astray the people of Israel (12:31; cf. 8:44).<sup>28</sup> John 11:47–52 is the crystallization of John's understanding of Jesus' death: he dies on behalf of the nation in order to bring about Israel's eschatological restoration.

There are several ways in which my focus on *the future of Israel* differs from Dennis's argument about Jesus' *gathering the true Israel*. First, although the implications of his findings move in many directions, Dennis's major contribution is to clarify how Jesus'

<sup>25</sup> In John 11:52, Jesus death is ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ διεσκορπισμένα συναγάγη εἰς ἕν. On the relevant Scriptural context for such "scattering," see Deut 30:1–5; Neh 1:8; Ps 106:26–27; Jer 9:16; 10:21; 23:1–4; Ezek 5:10; 11:16; 12:15; 20:23; 20:24; 28:25; 29:13; Dan 9:7; Zech 1:21; Sir 48:15, and esp. Isa 56:8.

<sup>26</sup> Dennis, *Jesus' Death and the Gathering of True Israel*, cf. esp. 46.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 80–116.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* See, respectively, *ibid.*, 136–177, 188–200, 200–201, 205–209.

8 *The Gospel of John and the Future of Israel*

death functions in John from within a Jewish frame of reference, specifically how Jesus' death brings about the long-anticipated restoration of the people of God.<sup>29</sup> Dennis's study demonstrates the significance of Jesus' death by examining various motifs and images in the Gospel and in contemporary literature and then locating those motifs within the broader framework of Jewish restoration theology. The present study aims to show how a particular interest in eschatological fulfillment runs through nearly every pericope in the Gospel. To put the differences most sharply, where Dennis's driving interest is restoration theology, mine is Christology, focusing on John's portrayal of Jesus as the one who fulfills the hopes of Israel. To be sure, some aspects of John's depiction of Jesus derive from restoration theology, but not all. Moreover, this study will attend in a more sustained way than Dennis's to the presence of polemic in John's Gospel – how the Gospel both casts a vision for Israel's future in Jesus and rejects alternative proposals. Thus, I hope to demonstrate how several pressing questions lie behind the Gospel's presentation of Jesus: How can Israel faithfully live into its future? Around what (or whom) should it organize its life? I propose that John is an argument for a particular answer to these questions. The difference, then, is that I am trying to locate the whole narrative of John within a broad hermeneutical context. The question is not: *What do we understand when we understand Jesus's death as "for the nation" (11:52)?* – although the answer is critical, and the motifs, images, and expectations of contemporary Jewish literature are indispensable. The question for this study aims at the broader narrative: *What do we understand when we understand the Gospel according to John?*<sup>30</sup>

Jörn-Michael Schröder's *Das eschatologische Israel im Johannesevangelium* argues that in the Gospel of John Jesus establishes the eschatological people of God in continuity and discontinuity with the Jewish and Old Testament tradition.<sup>31</sup> In John, the vision for this newly established eschatological Israel informs both the salvation-historical message of the Gospel and illuminates the contextual

<sup>29</sup> Against Bultmann et al., see Dennis, 13–14, 351–353.

<sup>30</sup> There may of course be multiple ways of answering this question. My contention is that a historically and theologically rooted reading of John will lead to the conclusion that the future of Israel is one such thing that readers are meant to understand.

<sup>31</sup> Jörn-Michael Schröder, *Das eschatologische Israel im Johannesevangelium: Eine Untersuchung der johanneischen Israel-Konzeption in Joh 2–4 and Joh 6*, NET 3 (Tübingen/Basel: A. Franke Verlag, 2003).



strategy of the Gospel as it serves a community in conflict with its local religious community. Schröder demonstrates his thesis by studying every pericope in John 2–4 and 6, and then reading the imagery of these pericopae against the eschatological expectations of the Old Testament and, especially, within the Fourth Gospel’s own eschatologically loaded terminology. The aim of the project is striking similar to my own: to demonstrate that John’s eschatological vision stands in strong continuity with the traditions of Scripture and expectation that were long nurtured within Judaism, and that John also breaks with those traditions in order to characterize Jesus as the one who fulfills the hopes of Israel.<sup>32</sup>

The major differences between Schröder’s work and my own are hermeneutical. First, as will become clear below, I approach the continuity/discontinuity between John and the Jewish tradition as one that is grounded in a more robust account of Judaism as a tradition that, in its various expressions, is sensitive to the question of how its current form (Hasmonean Judaism, Pharisaic Judaism, “common” Judaism, etc.) approximates its ultimate form (the restored Israel). This framing provides a broader historical context for understanding the Gospel of John, one that removes the necessity of reading the Gospel as a text that is generated primarily as a reaction to the exclusion of Johannine Christians from their parent religious group.<sup>33</sup>

Second, Schröder sees John’s commitment to eschatological Israel as so thoroughgoing that it becomes the allegorical key to understanding the narrative. So, in John 2, the mother of Jesus should be understood an ideal “Jew” – one who does not understand Jesus but commits to trusting him.<sup>34</sup> Nicodemus should be seen not as the text presents him – a ruler of the *Ioudaioi*, a Pharisee – but rather as a representative of a late first-century synagogue adherent convinced of Jesus’ signs but unwilling to fully entrust himself to Jesus.<sup>35</sup> Jesus’ walking on the sea in John 6 should be seen as transparent to God’s presence and preservation of his beleaguered eschatological people (following, it seems, Bornkamm’s reading of Matthew

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Schröder, 351–354. <sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 12–17; cf. 316–317.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 42–43 and *passim*.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 83–88. Note that the representative function of Nicodemus is not a problem (he speaks in the first person plural), only the strained profile that Schröder creates.

10      *The Gospel of John and the Future of Israel*

14:22–33).<sup>36</sup> When John writes “it was dark” (6:17), we should read, “there was demonic opposition to the post-Easter church,” because in John 8, 12, and in the letter of 1 John, σκοτία implies an era in or realm of history in which Jesus is not present in the world.<sup>37</sup> Taken individually, each of these proposals is interesting and possible, but taken together they reflect Schröder’s broader hermeneutical approach, which views the eschatological fulfillment of God’s promises to Israel as so thoroughly enclosed within the argument of John that individual terms are often shoehorned to fit his readings.<sup>38</sup> I am interested in pursuing the fulfillment of God’s promises to Israel in the Gospel of John, but I see John making this argument by means of a much deeper engagement with specific traditions and expectations of Scripture and Second Temple Judaism. In other words, while Schröder’s approach is heavily *intratextual* (within John) but requires the re-signification of common terms and a level of reading-in that strikes me as problematic, my approach is weighted toward *intertextuality* – reading John as an engagement with a historically situated set of texts and the arguments that they served.

Finally, Schröder consistently presents John’s vision of the eschatological Israel as one that “transcends” the earthly level for the heavenly. For instance, the *Ioudaioi* and the crowds are left behind as Jesus offers an interpretation of the manna miracle that transcends its original, earthly frame of reference. In their earthly way of thinking, the *Ioudaioi* signify the problem of any religious practice without transcendent reference.<sup>39</sup> The problem here is the idea that in John the eschatology of Jesus is out of reach to the *Ioudaioi* because it transcends what they could think or imagine. This is off point: the gap between Jesus and the *Ioudaioi* is not the ability to think metaphorically or to imagine a transcendent reality (for instance, that God’s word could sustain a person like bread – Deut 8). Rather, the gap between Jesus and the *Ioudaioi* in John is the unwillingness of the *Ioudaioi* to recognize *Jesus* as the one who mediates the transcendent reality that they both affirm. The gap of understanding is specifically Christological. The point of difference is not the ability to think eschatologically. It is the ability/willingness to

<sup>36</sup> Cf. 222. Cf. Bornkamm’s “The Stilling of the Storm in Matthew,” in *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*, ed. G. Bornkamm, G. Barth, and H. J. Held (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963), 52–57.

<sup>37</sup> Schröder, 221–224; cf. 263.

<sup>38</sup> Schröder has a brief discussion of key terms on pp. 321–324.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, 306–307.