

The Love and Hatred of Jesus and Johannine Sectarianism

FERNANDO F. SEGOVIA

Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53233

A NUMBER OF recent exegetical studies on the different levels of the Johannine tradition¹ have adopted the position that the community behind that tradition was consistently “sectarian” in nature.² For example, W. Meeks has argued that the community was composed of a “small group of believers isolated over against ‘the world’ that belongs intrinsically to ‘the things below.’”³ Similarly, D. Moody Smith sees the community as possessing “a sense of exclusiveness, a sharp delineation of the community from the world.”⁴ R. Alan Culpepper speaks of it as an “embattled brotherhood” that with time “withdrew further from the world and clung to the teachings and new commandments of its Lord.”⁵ Finally, J. Bogart presents it as “being both

¹ By “Johannine tradition” I mean the Gospel, with its postulated literary layers, and 1-2-3 John. The Book of Revelation plays no part at all in these recent studies.

² The main criterion for such a judgment differs from author to author. In general, however, a “sectarian” attitude is said to include a world-negating position.

³ “The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism,” *JBL* 91 (1972) 68. Meeks’ main criterion is the development of a unique language or set of symbols that reinforce and sharpen the exclusivistic outlook of the community.

⁴ “Johannine Christianity: Some Reflections on Its Character and Delineation,” *NTS* 21 (1974-75) 224. The main criterion here is the visible hostility of the community toward the world.

⁵ *The Johannine School* (SBLDS 26; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975) 287. Culpepper’s main objective in this work is to see whether the Johannine community classifies as an ancient “school.” Nevertheless, Culpepper admits the possibility that the Johannine “school” may also have been a “sect,” where the latter term is understood as emphasizing “devotion to a person or teachings of a founder or its adherence to a set of principles” (259).

peculiar in doctrine vis-à-vis the rest of the church, and defensive and alienated vis-à-vis the world around it."⁶

In the present study I should like to examine the use and understanding of the love for and hatred of Jesus that other parties exhibit in the Fourth Gospel in order to see whether that relationship of love and hatred confirms and illuminates further the proposed sectarian nature of the community.⁷ However, before beginning such a redaction-critical study, there are certain methodological problems that must be raised and precautions that must be taken.

First of all, given the general scholarly consensus that chap. 21 constitutes a later addition to the Fourth Gospel by another hand, all examples of these relationships from this chapter should be left out of consideration.⁸ Likewise, it is advisable from a methodological point of view to leave all examples of either relationship from chaps. 15-17; out of consideration. A growing number of exegetes have assigned these chapters to one or more later hands on both theological and literary grounds.⁹

As a result of these two methodological steps, one may find in the rest of

⁶ *Orthodox and Heretical Perfectionism in the Johannine Community as Evident in the First Epistle of John* (SBLDS 33; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977) 138. Bogart adds to the usual element of hostility toward the world that of distinctiveness vis-à-vis the rest of the church. The main criterion adopted is the idea of perfectionism, both spiritual and ethical, found in the community.

The element of uniqueness vis-à-vis the rest of the church is adopted by two other recent studies as the main criterion for rejecting the sectarian nature of the community: O. Cullmann, *The Johannine Circle* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976); R. E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple. The Life, Loves, Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist, 1979). It should be pointed out, however, that in other aspects of the community's life and thought Brown sees much that he would characterize as sectarian (see, e.g., pp. 60-62, 88-91).

⁷ I have undertaken elsewhere a complete study of all the relationships of love present not only in the Fourth Gospel, but also in I John. See F. F. Segovia, 'Ἀγάπη/Ἀγαπᾶν in I John and the Fourth Gospel (Dissertation; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1978; accepted for publication in SBLDS).

⁸ See, e.g., D. Moody Smith, "Johannine Christianity," 235.

⁹ See, e.g., G. Richter, "Die Fusswaschung Joh 13:1-20," *MTZ* 16 (1965) 13-26, and "Die Deutung des Kreuzestodes Jesu in der Leidensgeschichte des Johannesevangeliums (Jo 13-19)," *BibLeb* 9 (1968) 21-36; H. Thyen, "Johannes 13 und die 'kirchliche Redaktion' des vierten Evangeliums," *Tradition und Glaube: Festgabe für K. G. Kuhn* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 343-56; J. Becker, "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu im Johannesevangelium," *ZNW* 61 (1970) 215-46; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium* (3 vols.; HTKNT 4; Freiburg: Herder, 1965-75), 3. 101-6, 140-43. My own work follows this line of interpretation (see n. 7 above).

A recent monograph on the love terminology in the Fourth Gospel fails to adopt this methodological precaution: M. Lattke, *Einheit im Wort: Die spezifische Bedeutung von ἀγάπη ἀγαπᾶν, und φιλεῖν im Johannesevangelium* (SANT 41; Munich: Kösel, 1975).

the Gospel seven instances of love for Jesus, five direct (8:42; 14:15, 21a, 23a, 28) and two indirect (3:19; 12:43), all using the verb ἀγαπᾶν; one example of the negation of such love, i.e., the verb ἀγαπᾶν with the negative particle (14:24a); and two instances of hatred toward Jesus, one direct (7:7), one indirect (3:20), both employing the verb μισεῖν. In all, therefore, there are ten references to be considered. Since five of these are to be found in the farewell discourse of the Gospel (14:15, 21a, 23a, 24a, 28), I propose to take that discourse as the point of departure for this study. Then, I shall turn to the evidence from chaps. 1-4 (3:19, 20) and chaps. 5-12 (7:7; 8:42; 12:43).

I. Love for Jesus in the Farewell Discourse

I begin with an analysis of the structure of the discourse and then proceed to examine the references to the love for Jesus on the part of the disciples in the light of that structure.

1. Structure of Jn. 13:31-14:31.

If one leaves chaps. 15-17 out of consideration, then 13:31-14:31 constitute the farewell discourse of Jesus to his disciples—the discourse begins immediately after Judas leaves the company of the disciples at Jesus' request (13:27-30) and concludes with the statement of 14:31c, "Arise, let us depart from here."¹⁰ Within this discourse I believe that three major sections may be discerned: an introduction, consisting of 13:31-38; a main body, encompassing 14:1-26; a conclusion, consisting of 14:27-31.

The introduction begins with a comment on the imminent glorification of the Son, thus anticipating the hour of Jesus' death and departure from this world (13:31-32). In view of this departure, Jesus tells the disciples that they cannot follow him at this time (13:33). This saying then gives way to a dialogue with Peter, consisting of two question-and-answer cycles and focusing on the theme of "departing" (ὑπάγειν, 13:36-38).¹¹ That the introduction ends with v. 38 may be seen from the switch to the second person plural beginning with 14:1—from now on Jesus addresses the disciples as a body—and from the

¹⁰ The unexpected continuation of the discourse has been a *crux* in Johannine scholarship, especially when 18:1-2 connect quite well with the end of the discourse in 14:31. A very recent way of explaining this *crux* has been to look upon these chapters as originally independent discourses that have been added to the original farewell discourse by later hands; see n. 9 above.

¹¹ I have deliberately omitted 13:34-35. Not only do the verses interrupt the theme of ὑπάγειν, but their thematic concern—the promulgation of the love command—is quite different from that of its context; as such, the verses should be considered a later addition. Thus, e.g., J. Becker, "Die Abschiedsreden," 220; G. Richter, "Die Deutung," 30; H. Thyen, "Johannes 13," 354; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 3, 59-61.

inclusio formed by the repetition of the command of 14:1 in 14:27c.¹² This *inclusio* signals as well the beginning of the concluding section with 14:27, a division which is confirmed by the extension of the peace-greeting to the disciples in that same verse. The conclusion comes to an end with the command of 14:31c.¹³

The function of these two sections is immediately ascertainable. The introduction places the entire discourse within the perspective of Jesus' departure and begins to address the situation of the disciples after that departure. The conclusion brings together both overarching and subordinate themes from the main body of the discourse and points forward to the resumption of the narrative in chap. 18.¹⁴

This delineation of the introduction and the conclusion yields a main body clearly delineated by the above noted *inclusio* and consisting of 14:1-26. The structure of this main body has been customarily divided into two subsections: vv. 1-14, concentrating on the theme of faith, and vv. 15-26, on that of love.¹⁵ Although I would agree with a division after v. 14, I would hesitate to make faith and love the overarching themes of the two subsections. Rather, I agree with J. Becker's position that the overarching themes are Jesus' departure and return: vv. 1-3 introduce the two themes in the main body, while vv. 4-17 and 18-26 develop them sequentially.¹⁶

¹² In 14:27 the command, "Let not your hearts be troubled," is amplified by the addition, "nor let them be afraid" (μηδὲ δειλιάτω).

The introductory character of these verses has been widely noted: R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB 29, 29a; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966-70), 2. 608-9; R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 3. 53-63; C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), 403-4; J. Becker, "Die Abschiedsreden," 219-20; A. Wikenhauser, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (2d ed.; RNT 4; Regensburg: Pustet, 1957) 260-61.

¹³ The concluding character of these verses is also espoused by many, e.g., J. Becker, "Die Abschiedsreden," 227-28; A. Wikenhauser, *Evangelium*, 280-83; C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 403-6. Others (e.g., R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 3. 63-65) prefer 14:25 as the beginning of the conclusion primarily on the basis of the formula, "These things I have said to you"; however, both the *inclusio* and the peace-wish militate against this position.

¹⁴ Thus, for example, 14:28a recalls 14:2-3—Jesus' departure and return; 14:28b recalls both the love of Jesus (14:15, 21, 23, 24) and Jesus' relationship to the Father (14:6-11); 14:30 recalls 13:33; 14:19, 25—the theme of "a little while" and related declarations; 14:27 and 31 recall the motif of 14:15, 19, 22—the role of "the world."

¹⁵ Thus, e.g., R. E. Brown, *Gospel*, 2. 623-24, 642-43; R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John—A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 603-12; A. Wikenhauser, *Evangelium*, 261-63, 268.

¹⁶ J. Becker, "Die Abschiedsreden," 219-23. An examination of the terms used for Jesus' departure and return in 1-26 confirms Becker's position: 1. vv. 1-3 have the verb "to depart" (πορεύομαι) twice and the verb "to come" (ἔρχομαι) once; 2. vv. 4-17 contain one example of πορεύομαι and two of the synonymous verb, "to go away" (ὑπάγειν); 3. vv. 18-26 have ἔρχομαι twice. Thus, a clear division of presentation can be discerned within vv. 1-26.

My only disagreement with J. Becker in this regard concerns his proposed division between vv. 17 and 18; I believe that such a division belongs after v. 14.¹⁷ Several arguments may be advanced on behalf of this latter proposal. First of all, the subsection on Jesus' return would be marked off by an *inclusio*: vv. 15-17 and 25-26 have references to the Paraclete. Secondly, the addition of vv. 15-17 to vv. 18-26 would place the former verses within the theme of Jesus' return. This is, I believe, a correct interpretation of the Paraclete sayings. Finally, such an addition preserves a threefold series of three subordinate themes which governs the subsection:¹⁸

A. Sequence I —	14:15	The Love of Jesus
	14:16-17a	Reward
	14:17b-c	Opposition between "the world" and the disciples
B. Sequence II —	14:18-20	Opposition
	14:21a	The Love of Jesus
	14:21b	Reward
C. Sequence III —	14:22	Opposition
	14:23a	The Love of Jesus
	14:23b	Reward
	14:24a	No Love of Jesus
	14:25-26	Reward

In conclusion, therefore, it may be said that the main body of the discourse consists of three subsections: vv. 1-3 present the main themes of departure and return; vv. 4-15 develop the theme of departure; vv. 16-26, that of return. Further, these last two subsections also contain subordinate themes.

2. *Love for Jesus in 13:31-14:31.*

If one locates the references to the love of Jesus within the proposed structure of the discourse, it may be seen that four of these references (14:15, 21a, 23a, 24a) are found within the main body (14:1-26), while the fifth (14:28) forms part of the conclusion (14:27-31). Further, all the references in the main body stand within the overarching theme of Jesus' return (14:15-26) and constitute a major subordinate theme of that subsection: it is the love of Jesus that merits certain specific rewards—all connected with Jesus' return—and

¹⁷ Becker's position (*ibid.*, 226) rests on the first occurrence of the verb ἔρχομαι in v. 18 since v. 3. However, the inclusion of vv. 15-17 within that same subsection does not disturb the distribution of the terms for Jesus' departure and return at all.

¹⁸ In the first sequence, the opposition theme follows the other two; in the second and third, it precedes the other two. The third and final sequence is expanded by the negation of 14:23a in 14:24a and a repetition of the promised reward to the disciples in 14:25-26.

separates the disciples from “the world.”¹⁹ I should like to turn, first of all, to the various formulations of the love of Jesus in the main body and then to the final occurrence within the conclusion.

a. 14:15-26. Although all four references present both grammatical²⁰ and terminological variations,²¹ one does not get the impression from the text that these variations convey theological implications; rather, all four formulations seem to provide synonymous definitions of what love for Jesus entails. Such love is defined in terms of “keeping” (τηρεῖν or ἔχειν) Jesus’ “commands” (ἐντολαί) or “word(s)” (λόγος/οι). Although the definitions are rather terse, some light may be shed on them from evidence or indications outside as well as inside the farewell discourse. I turn to the former first, i.e., a consideration of the usage of either ἔχειν or τηρεῖν with either λόγος /οι or ἐντολαί in the rest of the Gospel.

First of all, it should be noted that, although the combination τὰς ἐντολάς τηρεῖν does not occur elsewhere in the Gospel—excluding those sections which have been termed methodologically unsound for this study, the expression τὸν λόγον τηρεῖν is found in the acrimonious debate between Jesus and the Jews of John 8. Toward the end of the exchange (8:48-59), the expression is used three times: twice with regard to the Jews (vv. 51-52); once with respect to Jesus (v. 55).²² It is the former use that is of interest here.

In 8:51, after having been accused by the Jews of being possessed by a demon, Jesus declares that “unless someone keeps his word” (ἐὰν τις τὸν ἔμὸν λόγον τηρήσῃ), that person will not possess eternal life. From the flow of the debate, it is quite clear that Jesus’ λόγος has to do with his origin and identity (8:14, 18-19, 25-27, 28-29). It is also quite clear from the other occurrences of λόγος in chap. 8 (vv. 31, 37, 43) that the Jews do not and cannot accept this

¹⁹ 14:24a simply negates the positive statement of 14:23a. The author then adds a reiteration of the promises made in order to round off the subsection.

²⁰ For example, 14:15 employs a simple conditional sentence. 14:23a also employs a condition, but introduces the indefinite pronoun τις and a corresponding change to the third person singular forms of the verbs in question. 14:21a eliminates the condition and employs instead the participial form of the verb. 14:24a also follows this usage, except for the elimination of the copulative verb and the conversion of the second participial form into an active form of the verb. 14:23a also reverses the order of the other three.

²¹ Thus 14:21a has the verb “to have” (ἔχειν) in addition to the verb “to keep” (τηρεῖν), which appears by itself in 14:15, with the plural “commands” (ἐντολαί). 14:23a changes the plural “commands” of 14:15 and 21a to a singular “word” (λόγος), while 14:24a employs the plural of this latter term, i.e., λόγοι.

²² The exchange begins in 8:12 with an “I am” saying of Jesus and focuses on the contrast between Abraham and Jesus in 8:31. This contrast pervades the rest of the debate (vv. 37, 39, 40, 53, 56, 57, 58). The contrast is usually divided into three subsections; see, e.g., R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 2. 238: 8:30-36, 37-47, 48-59.

λόγος. Further, since Jesus alone knows the Father (v. 55), the Jews show that they have another Father when they reject Jesus (v. 44).

Secondly, the combination τὰς ἐντολὰς ἔχειν is likewise not found elsewhere in the Gospel; however, the expression τὸν λόγον ἔχειν is used in 5:38.²³ Following J. L. Martyn's arrangement of the material at this point,²⁴ I see chap. 5 as consisting of a traditional healing story (vv. 1-9b), a dramatic expansion of that story (vv. 9c-15), and a homily addressed to the Jews by Jesus (vv. 19-47).

In v. 38, within the body of the sermon, Jesus tells the Jews that they do not have the word of God abiding in them (καὶ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα), precisely because they do not believe in him. Therefore, it is quite clear once again that the acknowledgment and acceptance of the identity and origin of Jesus constitute the λόγος of the Father which is revealed by Jesus (e.g., vv. 19-24, 26-27, 30, 36-37). Furthermore, as in chap. 8, this λόγος constitutes eternal life (e.g., vv. 24a, 40).

These two instances of τὸν λόγον τηρεῖν and τὸν λόγον ἔχειν clearly indicate that the λόγος theme focuses on the person of Jesus, his origin and identity.²⁵ The acceptance or keeping of Jesus' λόγος means belief in him (5:38; 8:24), while rejection—attributed directly to the Jews in both cases—entails the loss of eternal life as well as the absence of any knowledge of the Father.

Yet another variation of this type of formula may be found in the discourse of Jesus of 12:44-50; this particular variation uses the plural τὰ ῥήματα for Jesus' "words" in combination with the verb φυλάσσειν, "to keep" or "to observe": v. 37, "If someone hears my words and does not keep them, . . ."²⁶ In the context of the discourse, Jesus' words refer very clearly to his origin and identity: the acceptance or keeping of these words means belief in

²³ Although the precise combination τὸν λόγον ἔχειν does not appear in John 14, I consider the union of these two terms in 5:38 to be synonymous with the different variations of chap. 14. The absence of a fast and rigid formula in the latter chapter as well as the occurrence of these two terms—even if not in combination—in 14:21a, 23a, and 24a justify this step.

²⁴ J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (2d ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1978), 68-73, 123.

²⁵ Leaving aside the variations from all the sections that have been termed methodologically unsound for this study, this is the meaning of λόγος elsewhere in the Gospel as well, e.g., 1:1(3), 14; 4:41; 12:48. The term ἐντολή conveys exactly the same meaning elsewhere as well, e.g., 12:49-50.

²⁶ I say "variation" because the plural form τὰ ῥήματα is used interchangeably with ὁ λόγος in the Gospel; see, e.g., 14:10, 24a and 12:44-50. On the problematic position of this discourse in the Gospel, see R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 2. 513-14; R. E. Brown, *Gospel*, 1. 490; C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 381-82; A. Wikenhauser, *Evangelium*, 240.

him (vv. 44-45); rejection, on the other hand, entails the loss of eternal life (v. 50), rejection of the Father (v. 44), and judgment by that word (v. 48).²⁷

On the basis of these findings, one may conclude that the formulations of the love for Jesus of 14:15-26 may be defined in terms of belief in Jesus. In other words, love for Jesus means believing in his role, acknowledging his origin with the Father, and recognizing that he has been sent by the Father.²⁸ The same conclusion may be reached from the perspective of the farewell discourse itself.

The first indication to this effect lies, I believe, in 14:1-14, i.e., the subsection on Jesus' departure. Not only is the question of belief one of the main subordinate themes of the section (beginning with v. 10), but there is reason to believe that the pattern, attitude of disciples/reward or promise, found in vv. 15-16, 21 and 23 is grounded in a similar pattern contained in vv. 12-14. Thus, in v. 12a belief in Jesus is followed by the promise of greater works than those of Jesus, because Jesus himself hears the prayers of the believers (vv. 12b-14). Vv. 14:15-16 (as well as vv. 21 and 23) adopt this pattern and develop it further. In so doing, however, they do not add anything to the element of faith; rather, they equate belief in Jesus with love for Jesus.

The second indication is found in 14:24b. After the third definition of the love for Jesus is given in v. 23a and its antithesis in v. 24a, v. 24b specifies clearly the character of the λόγος—and, by implication, the character of all four statements—which lies at the basis of love for Jesus: this λόγος is the revelation of the Father conveyed by Jesus. Thus, once again, carrying out Jesus' λόγος means accepting and acknowledging Jesus' origin and identity (as in vv. 8:48-59 and 5:19-47 above).

Thus, the evidence from within the discourse itself points in exactly the same direction as the evidence from the rest of the Gospel: the love of Jesus—the keeping of his commands, word or words—is nothing other than belief in him.

b. 14:27-31. The final reference to the love for Jesus in the discourse forms part of the conclusion, and, as such, is one of many themes, both overarching and subordinate, recapitulated in this last section. Thus, in 14:28b—immediately following the repetition of the two major themes of the discourse—one finds the theme of love for Jesus associated with that of rejoicing in an unreal condition: “If you loved me, you would have rejoiced (ἐχάρητε ἄν), because I go to the Father.”

²⁷ As in the case of λόγος and ἐντολή, the term ῥήματα also implies elsewhere in the Gospel Jesus' origin and identity, e.g., 3:34; 5:47; 6:63, 68; 8:47; 14:10.

²⁸ Thus, e.g., J. Becker, “Die Abschiedsreden,” 227; M. Lattke, *Einheit im Wort*, 227; S. Schulz, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 187.

The idea of love expressed by this unreal condition is really no different from that of 14:15, 21, 23, viz., faith in Jesus constitutes love for Jesus,²⁹ but the emphasis is now different. Whereas in 14:15-26 the emphasis was on defining the concept, in 14:28 that definition is presupposed and the emphasis is placed instead directly on the themes of departure and return.

The immediate context indicates this shift: on the one hand, 14:27b recalls the distress which befalls the disciples on account of Jesus' impending departure; on the other, 14:28a recalls the fact that the departure will be followed by a return. In view of this assurance of a return, the attitude of distress is hardly the proper one; rather, rejoicing should prevail, since only by going to the Father can the promises of a return be effected.³⁰ Yet, despite this shift in emphasis, it is quite clear that in order to have this correct attitude one must believe that Jesus is going to the Father and has come from the Father, which is precisely the import of the definitions of 14:15, 21a, 23a.

II. Love and Hatred of Jesus in Chaps. 1-4

In the first four chapters of the Gospel, one finds a reference to love for Jesus and a reference to the hatred of Jesus, both indirect in nature and located within the same discourse, 3:11-21. By "indirect" I mean that although neither the name of Jesus nor a christological title is mentioned in the passage, one does find a term that is associated with and symbolic of Jesus elsewhere in the Gospel; in the passage under consideration the term used is "the Light" (τὸ φῶς), which can only refer to Jesus in the light of 3:16b-17 and which is repeatedly used of him in the Gospel (1:4, 5, 7, 8, 9; 8:12; 12:35, 46).

The context for these two references is the encounter between Jesus and Nicodemus of chap. 3. That encounter may be divided into two sections: 1. a dialogue between Jesus and Nicodemus (3:1-10); 2. a discourse of Jesus (3:11-21). Further, with few exceptions,³¹ recent exegesis has regarded 3:1-21 as a literary unit. Thus, the references to love and hatred "of the light" form part of this discourse (3:11-21) within the Nicodemus-unit.

3:19a states that "men' loved darkness more than the light (=Jesus)," because their deeds were evil (ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς). In 3:20 the rejection is phrased in even stronger terms: the one who does evil "hates the light and does not come to it" (μισεῖ τὸ φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται

²⁹ See M. Lattke, *Einheit im Wort*, 236, R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 397

³⁰ The usage of the verb χαίρειν in 20:20, i.e., within the narrative of Jesus' appearance to the disciples, confirms this line of thought. When Jesus returns after his death and imparts the promised spirit as a sign of his permanent return, the attitude of the disciples is precisely one of rejoicing, "And the disciples rejoiced (ἔχαρησαν) when they saw him."

³¹ See, e.g., R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, I 374-77

πρὸς τὸ φῶς). These two statements must be interpreted in the light of 3:16-18, i.e., the sending/coming of the only Son leads to a judgment (κρίσις): some believe in him and possess eternal life (vv. 16b, 18a, 21); others do not and stand judged, lost (v. 18b). Thus, love in 3:19 is also equated with belief: love of the light (= of Jesus) means belief in his origin and identity. The contrary is also true: hatred of the light means unbelief.

III. Love and Hatred of Jesus in Chaps. 5-12

In the chapters that focus almost exclusively on the debates with and discourses against the Jews, one finds a direct reference to the hatred of Jesus (7:7) and two references to love for Jesus, one direct (8:42), one indirect (12:43).

1. 7:1-9

At the beginning of chap. 7, the reader is told that Jesus is in Galilee because the Jews of Judea were seeking to kill him (7:1). The context for this reference is chap. 5: the healing of the cripple on the sabbath and Jesus' statement concerning his close relationship to God cause a violent reaction among the Jews (5:18).³² In 7:1-7, Jesus' brothers, who see his signs but do not believe in him, dare him to go to Judea on the coming Feast of Tabernacles and show himself to "the world."

It is in Jesus' response to this request that one finds the reference to the hatred of him (7:8): "the world" hates him because he testifies to the fact that its works are evil; therefore, he cannot go up to the feast, because his "time" has not yet come. Against the background of chap. 5, the hatred of the world for him can only mean the refusal of the Jews to accept his claims, i.e., unbelief, as well as the corresponding desire to kill him.³³

2. 8:31-59.

While at the feast in Jerusalem, Jesus has a long and acrimonious exchange with the Jews in chap. 8. Beginning with 8:31 the debate focuses on the contrast between Abraham and Jesus.³⁴ The reference to the love for Jesus is found in what I take to be the second subsection in the development of this

³² See J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology*, 73-81. All of chap. 6 takes place in Galilee as well.

³³ This is why he cannot go up to the feast, because "his time," i.e., the hour of Jesus' death, resurrection, and return to the Father, has not yet come. His death cannot be accomplished yet. See R. E. Brown, *Gospel*, 1. 305-9. Nevertheless, Jesus does go in secret to the feast, where the Jews are still looking for him (7:10-13).

³⁴ See above, n. 22.

contrast, i.e., 8:37-47. The theme of this subsection is the contrast between the alleged father of the Jews—a claim made in 8:33 and repeated in 8:39—and their real father, i.e., Abraham and the devil.

It has already been stated above, in the examination of the phrase τὸν λόγον τηρεῖν, that in the exchange of chap. 8 Jesus' λόγος means his identity and origin and that the Jews cannot and do not accept this λόγος. In the second subsection of that exchange, one also finds the argument that a true child of Abraham would not seek to kill Jesus (vv. 37-40), but rather love Jesus (v. 42), precisely because of who he is and where he comes from, his identity and his origin (ἡγαπατε ἄν ἐμέ, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἤκω). Once again, belief in Jesus means loving Jesus, and that love or belief is contrasted with the desire to kill him.

3. 12:36b-43.

At the end of chap. 12, one finds a discourse of Jesus which is occasioned by the coming of "some Greeks" (Ἕλληνές τινες) to see him (12:20-21). The discourse comes to an end in 12:36a, and then 12:36b-43 provide a succinct summary of Jesus' ministry to the Jews. It is within this summary that the last reference to the love of Jesus is found. As in the case of 3:19-20, that reference is indirect in nature, i.e., a term symbolic of Jesus elsewhere in the Gospel is used rather than the name of Jesus or a christological title. In this case, the term is "glory" (ἡ δόξα), which can only refer to Jesus in the context of v. 41³⁵ and which is used repeatedly of him elsewhere (1:24; 2:11; 5:44).

In vv. 42-43 the evangelist acknowledges that some Jews, even from the ranks of the authorities, believed in Jesus, but did not confess him openly, because they were afraid of being banned from the synagogue.³⁶ The judgment passed on this attitude is severe: such people in effect "loved 'the opinion' of men more than 'the glory' of God (= Jesus)": ἠγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢπερ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. From the point of view of the evangelist, such belief is no different from the unbelief of others (vv. 37-41). Furthermore, such belief, like unbelief, is really a failure to love Jesus.

This reference, therefore, confirms the very close association of belief in Jesus and love for Jesus and indeed may be said to go a step further: true belief, and true love, has to be expressed openly, regardless of the consequences.

³⁵ In this verse it is said that the prophet Isaiah beheld the glory of Jesus (εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ) and wrote about it. The reference here is most probably to the targumic tradition of the temple vision of Isaiah 6. On this point, see R. Bultmann (*The Gospel of John*, 453) and R. E. Brown (*Gospel*, I, 486-87).

³⁶ For similar, yet differing, roles of this group in the Johannine community, see J. L. Martyn, *The Gospel of John in Christian History: Essays for Interpreters* (New York: Paulist, 1978) 107-22; R. E. Brown, *The Community*, 71-73.

IV. Summary and *Sitz im Leben*

This examination of the references to the love and hatred of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel has yielded rather consistent results: the relationship is always defined or presented in terms of belief in Jesus and his claims, or its opposite, unbelief. Thus, to love Jesus means to believe in him. This is true not only of the definitions of such love given in the farewell discourse, but also of all the other scattered references in chaps. 1-12. Given this evidence, one must now raise the question of the *Sitz im Leben* implied by the use and meaning of this relationship of love and hatred in the Gospel. This question, in turn, will lead directly into the further problem of sectarianism in the Johannine community.

I should like to approach both of these questions using, once again, the farewell discourse as the point of departure. In that discourse, there are three main indications that the Johannine community has been and is engaged in a serious dispute with another group:

1. First of all, in the third sequence of subordinate themes of 14:15-26, one finds an antithesis of the definitions of the love for Jesus: if such love means the execution of his "word," i.e., belief in him, then the lack of such love is clearly the failure to execute his "words," i.e., a refusal to believe in him. Thus, there are some who believe and some who do not, and the two groups are being explicitly differentiated from one another.

2. Secondly, in all three sequences the theme of the love for Jesus is accompanied by that of the opposition that exists between "the world" and those who do love him. In the first sequence (14:15-17), those who believe are promised the gift of another Paraclete, but "the world" will not receive or see or know him.³⁷ In the second sequence (14:18-21), those who believe are assured of Jesus' return—a return that is described in 14:21b—but "the world" will never see him again.³⁸ In the third sequence (14:22-26), those who believe are once again assured that they will see Jesus—a vision which is described in 14:23b—but "the world" will never receive such a revelation.³⁹ Thus, every-

³⁷ What distinguishes the disciples from "the world" is not only the love for Jesus that they show, but also the promises which are made to them and which are predicated upon that love. The promises describe the overarching theme of Jesus' return and coalesce around the figure of the Paraclete. See R. E. Brown, *Gospel*, 2. 643.

³⁸ The promises of this second sequence include two other relationships of love: he who loves Jesus will be loved by the Father—this promise is repeated again in the third sequence—and Jesus himself will love and manifest himself to that person. The nature of Jesus' love and return should be interpreted in terms of his role vis-à-vis the Paraclete in vv. 16-17: it is he who asks the Father to send the Paraclete.

³⁹ The promises of this sequence include a reiteration of the Father's love for the disciples, the return of Jesus and the Father, and their abiding in the one who believes. The nature of the Father's love and return should also be interpreted in terms of the Paraclete: he it is who, at Jesus' request, sends the Paraclete (14:16-17).

thing that is promised to those who love (= believe) is denied to those who do not. The explicit differentiation of point 1 above is expanded by means of the term, "the world" (ὁ κόσμος): the consequences of such a differentiation are made explicit.

3. Finally, in 13:33, within the introduction to the discourse, the disciples are placed on the same level as the Jews: they cannot follow Jesus; the separation must take place. However, beginning with v. 36, this parallelism ceases, and the contrast between the two groups becomes starker and starker: the disciples will see Jesus again, but the Jews will not (see 14:19; 7:33-36). Thus, the differentiation of points 1 and 2 above becomes more specific now: those who do not love Jesus, who do not keep his words (= who do not believe in him), those who constitute "the world," are the Jews of 13:33.⁴⁰

This differentiation between those who love Jesus and those who do not (= hate) and the further specification that the latter are to be seen as the Jews is confirmed by a look at the other examples of this relationship in the Gospel. Thus, e.g., in 7:1-9 the hatred of the world for Jesus is a direct reference to the unbelief of the Jews as well as to their attempts to kill him; similarly, in 8:31-59 it is the Jews who, because of their unbelief and their attempts to kill Jesus, are said not to love him; in 12:36b-43 those who loved "the opinion" of men more than "the glory" of God (= Jesus) are identified as rulers of the Jews who would not confess him openly out of fear.⁴¹

Thus, the immediate contexts of these references to love for or hatred of Jesus indicate that this relationship is being used to identify and differentiate from one another two distinct groups—the disciples of Jesus and the Jews—as well as to show that these two groups have been engaged in a bitter and violent dispute with one another, e.g., open love for Jesus entails expulsion from the synagogue (12:36b-43); failure to love Jesus or hatred of Jesus results in attempts to seize and kill him (7:1-9 and 8:31-59).

⁴⁰ In his most recent work, R. E. Brown (*The Community*, 63-66) argues that the category "the world" is a term that is wider than that of "the Jews." The reason given is that "the world" includes not only the rejection by the Jews, but also a similar, though later, rejection by the Gentiles. However, in the farewell discourse as well as in 7:1-9, the category "the world" is, in my opinion, presented as being synonymous with that of "the Jews." My problem with the wider interpretation of the term "the world" proposed by Brown is that whereas the rejection of the Jews receives a lengthy exposition, the rejection by the Gentiles is hardly mentioned at all in the Gospel. In this respect, I agree with Martyn (*The Gospel of John*, 120-21) when he states that "the history of the Johannine community from its origin through the period of its life in which the Fourth Gospel was composed forms to no small extent a chapter in the history of *Jewish Christianity*" (Italics his.)

⁴¹ The one example that does not explicitly mention the Jews is that of 3:11-21, where "men" are said to love darkness more than "the light" and, indeed, to hate "the light." Nevertheless, one should remember that such "men" stand condemned because of their unbelief and that the discourse is addressed to Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews.

This atmosphere of rejection and persecution by the Jews reflected in these references tends to confirm the general framework postulated for the Gospel by the work of J. L. Martyn.⁴² Working primarily with the narrative section of chaps. 5-11, Martyn finds that the situation of the Johannine community is essentially one of a violent debate with a local synagogue over the issue of belief in Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God and that the synagogue has taken stringent steps to preserve the unity of the community and to stifle the apparently rapid growth of defections—steps which include the excommunication of those members that profess belief in Jesus as well as the trial and execution of those Jewish-Christian preachers who continue to evangelize among the Jews.⁴³

Insofar as love for or hatred of Jesus ultimately means belief in Jesus or unbelief, this relationship of love and hatred confirms the basic nature of the dispute postulated by Martyn, i.e., belief in Jesus as Messiah and Son of God. Similarly, insofar as the context of these references is one of debate with and polemic against the Jews in which open love of Jesus is said to entail expulsion from the synagogue and hatred of Jesus results in attempts to kill him, this relationship confirms the steps taken by the synagogue that Martyn postulates. As such, the references to love and hatred of Jesus presuppose and reflect—at the contemporary level—what seems to have been a very bitter struggle between the Johannine community and its parent synagogue(s).

The proposed context for this relationship of love/hatred immediately raises the question of sectarianism: does such a struggle lead the separated community to see itself as basically alienated from “the world” and as rejecting the values of that world?⁴⁴ The question can only be answered in the affirmative.

⁴² See n. 24 above. Martyn's work has met with considerable success, e.g., D. M. Smith, “Johannine Christianity,” 183-84; R. A. Culpepper, *The Johannine School*, 268 n. 20; W. Meeks, “‘Am I a Jew?’ Johannine Christianity and Judaism,” *Christianity, Judaism and Other Graeco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (4 vols.; ed. Jacob Neusner; SJLA 12; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 1. 183; R. Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975) 149.

⁴³ Martyn, *History and Theology*, 90-100. Martyn's basic presupposition is that the Fourth Gospel operates at all times on two distinct levels of action. The first level is what he terms the *einmalig*, which deals primarily with events in Jesus' life; the focus of this level is thus primarily historical. The second level, on the other hand, concentrates on the contemporary problems of the Johannine church and communicates these problems through the characters of the *einmalig* level. *Ibid.*, 29-30.

⁴⁴ It was pointed out above that most exegetes, if not all, who describe the Johannine community as “sectarian” include a reference to the hostility shown toward “the world,” even though this antagonism may not be the main criterion for such a description. One of the most recent and complete typologies of sects has been provided by the British sociologist of religion, Bryan Wilson, in his *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of*

The first indication that this is the case may be gathered from the example of 7:1-9. While in Galilee, Jesus' brothers ask him to go to Judea and to show his works "to the world." Jesus' response is that "the world" does not hate them, but it does hate him. This "world" means the Jews of Judea who are seeking to kill him, and their "hatred" is precisely their refusal to believe in him.

The second and more important indication is found in the farewell discourse, viz., the theme of the opposition that exists between those who love Jesus and "the world." It is only to the former that the return of Jesus is guaranteed with all that that implies, i.e., the presence of the Paraclete, love by both Jesus and the Father, the abiding of both Jesus and the Father. The "world" can never receive, see or know any of these promises. This "world" is composed of the Jews who refuse to believe in him (14:24) and cannot follow him (13:33).

It is evident, therefore, that the author is employing the relationship of love and hatred of Jesus to a great extent to separate an elect community, the chosen brethren, from an unbelieving "world," the parent synagogue. Further, the relationship is also being used to strengthen the separated and alienated brethren in the midst of a very hostile "world"—Jesus and the Father are with us through the Paraclete—and to deny that "world" any knowledge whatsoever of the Father—Jesus and the Father love and abide with us and *only* with us. Thus, the use and meaning of the relationship of love for and hatred toward Jesus in the Fourth Gospel confirm the recent and frequent opinion that the Gospel is a "sectarian" document and the Johannine community a "sectarian" group.

Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples (New York: Harper & Row, 1973) 9-30. Wilson sees the main criterion for sectarianism precisely as hostility toward "the world"—where the latter term is understood differently by different sectarian groups and types of groups—and elaborates seven different possible responses to "the world" on the part of sects. In this particular study, I do not wish to go into the individual responses and their relationship to the Johannine response; the subject matter under consideration is not broad enough to allow for an educated opinion. I do wish, however, to adopt this alienation from "the world" as the criterion for the attribution of the term "sectarian" to the Johannine group.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.