

John 15:18–16:4a: A First Addition to the Original Farewell Discourse?

FERNANDO F. SEGOVIA

Marquette University
Milwaukee, WI 53233

IN HIS COMMENTARY on the Fourth Gospel published in 1972, S. Schulz, when faced with that ever-recurring problem concerning the present structure and composition of Jesus' farewell discourse in the Gospel (13:31–17:26) and the number of proposed solutions, adopted two fundamental exegetical positions: (1) the present form of the discourse, he argued, contains "eine kaum lösbare Schwierigkeit"; (2) the resolution of that difficulty, and thus the need for an explanation concerning the present sequence of the text, he continued, does not belong "zu den dringend zu lösenden Problemen johanneischer Forschung."¹

The first position is by no means new in the history of Johannine scholarship. The difficulty in question has to do with Jesus' declarations of 14:30-31. In v. 30, Jesus tells his disciples that he "will no longer talk much with them," while in v. 31c he gives them the following command, "Arise, let us depart from here!" These are clear and strong indications that the farewell discourse that began with 13:31 is now coming to an end. Yet, it is precisely at this point that Jesus unexpectedly launches into a new discourse which, if taken as a unity, is far more extensive than the first one.

The difficulty is further compounded by the fact that the beginning of chap. 18 picks up very well exactly where 14:31c leaves off, both sequentially

¹ *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972) 177. It should be pointed out that Schulz himself does opt for a variation of the transpositional solution. See n. 14 below.

and contextually. From the point of view of context, the narrative returns to the theme of Judas' betrayal of 13:30, which in effect signalled the beginning of the first discourse. Similarly, from the point of view of sequence, Jesus' command of 14:31c is easily and smoothly continued by the statement of 18:1 concerning Jesus' movements.²

As a result, given the concluding character of 14:30-31 and the obvious connection between chap. 18 and 13:31-14:31, Johannine scholars have generally considered these latter verses to be a clearly delineated unit and, at the same time, have attempted to provide a satisfactory explanation of the present position in the Gospel of the intervening chapters, i.e., chaps. 15-17. The explanations have been varied indeed; however, dissenting from Schulz' second exegetical position, I would argue that the search for such an explanation remains not only a desideratum of Johannine scholarship, but also one of its most important and pressing tasks, since it may in the end—as I believe it does—shed a great deal of light on the later history of the Johannine community.

I should like to begin this study of a section within the problematic chaps. 15-17 with an overview of the different types of explanations given in the exegetical literature for the present position of these chapters. Previous research had led me to identify four such basic types, which I proceeded to call the historicizing, transpositional, softening, and redactional solutions.³ Further research now shows that very definite and recurring sub-types are to be found within each of these four basic types.⁴ In what follows, therefore, I shall present the exegetical overview in terms of these four types and their respective sub-types and then proceed to locate and justify my own approach to these chapters and to 15:18-16:4a in particular within this taxonomy.

By far the oldest and most frequently encountered of the four basic types of explanations is the one that I call the historicizing approach. Its proponents emphasize above all the historicity of the sequence of events and words in question as they stand in the present text. Three sub-types may be readily identified, all of which attempt to account for the obvious break of

² Although the statements of 14:30-31 do in effect constitute the major difficulty of the present discourse, there are others as well. For the best summaries of these other difficulties, see J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1928) I. xx-xxiii; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (2 vols.; AB 29, 29A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966-70) 2. 582-83; J. Painter, "The Farewell Discourses and the History of Johannine Christianity," *NTS* 27 (1980-81) 527-31.

³ F. F. Segovia, *Love Relationships in the Johannine Tradition: Agapē/Agapan in I John and in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS 58; Chico: Scholars, 1982) 82-86.

⁴ There is a very real need, I believe, for a thorough chronological and critical history of the literature concerning this problem, and this remains one of the author's future projects.

14:31c: (1) Jesus did not leave the room, but he did get up from the table and continued the discourse in the same room;⁵ (2) Jesus did leave the room and continued the discourse as he walked through the streets of Jerusalem;⁶ (3) Jesus did leave the room, but stopped and continued the discourse at the Temple.⁷

In recent times, this approach to the problem has found very few adherents and is almost universally considered to be quite outdated. There is no question that the rise of form and redaction criticisms as the dominant methodologies in biblical studies have spelled its doom. In addition, it may be said that the historicizing solution, which accepted chaps. 15–17 as a unified composition, never really explained satisfactorily the present form and structure of these chapters.

There were two very strong reactions against the historicizing approach beginning at the turn of the century. One of these is what I call the transpositional solution. Against the presupposition of historicity, its proponents argue that the present sequence of the discourse is not the original one and that therefore it is the task of exegesis to reconstruct, by means of rearrangements of the text, that now lost original sequence. Historicity thus yields to logical sequence as the primary emphasis.

Four basic sub-types may be outlined: (1) Chapters 15–16, but not 17, are rearranged. The chapters are then variously placed: after 12:44–50,⁸ 13:20,⁹ 13:31a,¹⁰ 13:32a,¹¹ 13:35.¹² (2) All three chapters are transposed. Again, they are variously placed: elsewhere in the same order;¹³ elsewhere

⁵ See, e.g., J Knabenbauer, *Commentarius in quatuor s evangelia Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Pars IV Evangelium secundum Joannem* (Paris Lethielleux, 1898), B Weiss, *Das Johannes-Evangelium* (MeyerK 2, 2d ed rev, Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1902)

⁶ See, e.g., J Corluy, *Commentarius in evangelium s Joannis in usum praelectionum* (Ghent Poelman, 1878), T Calmes, *L'Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Paris Lecoffre, 1904)

⁷ See, e.g., B F Westcott, *The Gospel according to St John* (London James Clarke & Co., 1880), H B Swete, *The Last Discourse of Jesus and Prayer of Our Lord A Study of St John xiv-xvii* (London Macmillan, 1913)

⁸ See, e.g., J Huby, *Le discours de Jésus après la cène* (VS, 2d ed rev, Paris Beauchesne, 1942)

⁹ See, e.g., B W Bacon, "The Displacement of John xiv," *JBL* 13 (1894) 64–76

¹⁰ See, e.g., F Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Literatur des Urchristentums* (2 vols, Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1893–96)

¹¹ See, e.g., F W Lewis, *Disarrangements in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge University Press, 1910)

¹² See, e.g., H H Wendt, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1900), G H C MacGregor, *The Gospel of John* (MNTC, New York Harper & Bros., 1928)

¹³ See, e.g., F Spitta, *Das Johannesevangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu* (Göttingen Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910)

with chap. 17 preceding 15–16;¹⁴ completely broken up.¹⁵ (3) Chapter 14 is transposed along with 15–17.¹⁶ (4) 14:25–31 alone are rearranged.¹⁷

This approach was widely used in the early decades of the century and has been revived occasionally in more recent times. Most of the dissatisfaction concerning this approach, a dissatisfaction that I share completely, can be traced to two fundamental criticisms: (1) such massive rearrangements create in the end as many new literary problems as there had been prior to the reordering procedure;¹⁸ (2) no satisfactory explanation has been forthcoming as to how an originally better text became a much poorer one.¹⁹

Before describing the second reaction to the historicizing approach, viz., the redactional solution, I should like to turn to what I call the softening solution. The main claim of its proponents is that the seemingly concluding statements of 14:30–31 are not in the least problematic, if one understands them correctly. Thus, historicity and logical sequence yield to proper interpretation of Johannine thought and style as the main emphasis.

Four basic sub-types may be discerned in the literature: (1) The words in question do not in fact refer to a physical departure, but rather possess a more spiritual meaning.²⁰ (2) The words are an example of a Johannine literary technique. This technique is then variously interpreted: it is meant to signify the closure of a stage in a progressive instruction of the disciples;²¹ it is an example of Johannine misunderstanding;²² it forms part of an overall intricate structure for the whole Gospel.²³ (3) The words presuppose and point to a rereading of the Synoptic Gospels. This rereading may then be

¹⁴ See, e.g., S. Schulz, *Evangelium nach Johannes*.

¹⁵ See, e.g., R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971).

¹⁶ See, e.g., W. J. Peter Boyd, "The Ascension according to St. John: Chapters 14–17 not Pre-Passion but Post-Resurrection," *Theology* 70 (1967) 207–11.

¹⁷ See, e.g., B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1924).

¹⁸ G. H. C. MacGregor's concluding statement (*Gospel*, 282) is very instructive in this regard: "Nevertheless, any rearrangement still leaves its difficulties."

¹⁹ On this point, see particularly D. M. Smith, *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory* (New Haven: Yale University, 1965) 239.

²⁰ See, e.g., C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1953). The words are taken to refer to an acceptance by Jesus of his coming destiny, to the spiritual journey that he must undertake to meet the ruler of this world.

²¹ See, e.g., L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971).

²² See, e.g., H. Zimmermann, "Struktur und Aussageabsicht der johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Jo 13–17)," *BibLeb* 8 (1967) 279–90.

²³ See, e.g., D. Deeks, "The Structure of the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 15 (1968–69) 107–29.

interpreted as a spiritualization of Mark 14:42²⁴ or as a deliberate association of the truth of the Gospel with the death and return of Jesus.²⁵ (4) The words represent a later addition (one of many) to the Gospel based on the Synoptic Gospels.²⁶

Of the four types of explanation, this is by far the least frequently encountered and also the most recent in origin. Indeed, most of its proponents deliberately disassociate themselves from both the redactional and transpositional solutions. To a certain extent, therefore, the softening approach may be seen as a reaction to both of these solutions. However, the approach has failed to gain many adherents because, in effect, it fails to address the many other difficulties posed by the present form of the discourse. Thus, while it does attempt to come to terms with the major problem, it neglects all the other problems, e.g., the structure and composition of chaps. 15–17. The criticism is a valid one.

I have already alluded above to the second major reaction to the historicizing approach, i.e., the redactional solution. I have decided to consider it at this point so that it can serve as an introduction to the immediate task of this study, since it is the approach to which I subscribe and that I shall follow here as well. Like the transpositional approach, the redactional solution was widely used in the earliest decades of the century; however, unlike its counterpart, it has steadily gained more and more adherents among Johannine exegetes. Indeed, it is fair to say that it has carried the day in recent and contemporary Johannine scholarship.

The basic claim of its proponents is that there was only one farewell discourse (13:31–14:31) in the original draft or edition of the Gospel and that, consequently, chaps. 15–17—some would not see chap. 17 as intrusive, but most do—were added to the Gospel narrative at a later time. Thus, 14:30–31 do mean exactly what they say, and the literary problems are a direct result of subsequent additions. Two basic subtypes may be discerned: the chapters constitute either one discourse or a collection of several originally independent discourses. In the first case, three possibilities may be observed: one discourse written and added by the evangelist;²⁷ written by the

²⁴ See, e.g., E. C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel* (2d ed. rev. by F. N. Davey, London: Faber and Faber, 1947).

²⁵ See, e.g., J. Marsh, *The Gospel of Saint John* (Pelican New Testament Commentaries, Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1968).

²⁶ See, e.g., P. Corssen, "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu in dem vierten Evangelium," *ZNW* 8 (1907) 125–42. An editor who did not find anything from the Synoptic account and yet interpreted this account to be saying the same thing added these words.

²⁷ See, e.g., A. Loisy, *Le quatrième évangile* (Paris: A. Picard et fils, 1903), A. Durand, *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (VS 4, 2d ed. rev. by J. Huby, Paris: Beauchesne, 1938), G. M. Behler, *Les paroles d'adieux du Seigneur* (S. Jean 13–17) (LD 27, Paris: Cerf, 1960).

evangelist, added by someone else;²⁸ written and added by someone else.²⁹ In the second case, there are four possibilities: several discourses written and added by the evangelist;³⁰ written by the evangelist, added by someone else;³¹ written by the evangelist and/or other Johannine writers (prior to the composition of the Gospel), added by someone else;³² written and added by someone else (different authors at different times).³³

A closer examination of the literature in question shows three significant developments: (1) a growing tendency, beginning around 1950, to see these chapters as a collection of discourses rather than as one literary unit; (2) an emphasis, beginning with the 1960s, on the role of a redactor(s) in the addition of these chapters; (3) a further emphasis, also beginning with the 1960s, on the role of the redactor(s) as the author of these chapters.

I fully agree with the first development: only a theory of multiple discourses should be considered viable. The single addition theory ultimately falls prey to a fundamental literary objection which has also been levelled at both the historicizing and the softening approaches: the uncritical acceptance of chaps. 15–17 (or, as some would have it, 15–16) as a literary unity. Even a cursory reading of these chapters reveals the complex nature of their structure and composition. Thus, if the redactional approach is to offer a satisfactory solution to the problems of the farewell discourse, there is no question that it must be carried out along the lines of several discourses.

²⁸ See, e.g., A. Loisy, *Le quatrième évangile: Les épîtres dites de Jean* (2d ed. rev.; Paris: E. Nourry, 1921); H. Strathmann, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951).

²⁹ See, e.g., J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: Reimer, 1908); G. Richter, "Die Fusswaschung Joh 13:1-20," *MTZ* 16 (1965) 13-26; "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.

³⁰ See, e.g., M.-J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Jean* (EB; 3d ed. rev.; Paris: Gabalda, 1927): 15:1-17; 15:18-16:4a; 16:4b-33. W. Wilkens, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums* (Biel: Evangelischer-V., Zollikon, 1958): 15:1-8, 9-17; 15:18-16:4a; 16:4b-15, 16-24, 25-33; 17. B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (New Century Bible; London: Oliphants, 1972): 15:1-17; 15:18-25/16:1-3; 16:16-22.

³¹ See, e.g., R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium. I. Teil: Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1-4* (HTKNT 4; 2d ed. rev.; Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1967): 15:1-16:4a; 16:4b-33; 17.

³² See, e.g., R. E. Brown, *Gospel*: 15:1-17; 15:18-16:4a; 16:4b-33; 17.

³³ See, e.g., J. Becker, "Die Abschiedsreden Jesu im Johannesevangelium," *ZNW* 61 (1970) 215-46: 15:1-17; 15:18-16:15; 16:16-33; 17. R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium. III Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 13-21* (HTKNT 4; Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1975): same as above (see n. 31), but with changed attribution.

Such an approach, however, raises new questions in Johannine scholarship: Can the discourses be clearly delineated and differentiated from one another? Can the questions of *Sitz im Leben* and authorship be satisfactorily resolved? Can the present position of these discourses in the Gospel be adequately explained?

Previous research has already led me to answer these questions with respect to 15:1-17 and, in so doing, to agree with the other two exegetical developments mentioned above. Thus, I have argued that John 15:1-17 can be clearly delineated as an originally independent discourse, that this discourse presupposes and reflects a *Sitz im Leben* parallel to that of 1 John, and that its addition to and present position in the Gospel represent a further tactic in the attack of the "orthodox" Johannine Christians against the "deviant" members of the community.³⁴ (Furthermore, I have also attributed to the same hand the composition and addition of 13:1b-3, 12-20³⁵ as well as 13:34-35.³⁶)

In what follows, I should like to answer the same questions with respect to what I consider to be the second originally independent discourse within these chapters, viz., 15:18-16:4a. I shall proceed as follows: (1) a delineation of the unit in question; (2) the literary structure of that unit; (3) an exegetical analysis of the unit according to this structure; (4) the *Sitz im Leben* and other conclusions.

I. 15:18-16:4a as a Literary Unit

The beginning of the second unit or discourse in chaps. 15-17 is directly determined by one's delineation of the first discourse. In outlining that first discourse, I argued on behalf of 15:17 as its conclusion on the following grounds: (1) the verses in question (15:1-17) present a clear and discernible structure: vv. 1-8 introduce the figure of the vine and the branches, while vv. 9-17 develop it further in terms of the theme of love; (2) the exposition of this theme is not continued at all after 15:18; (3) the theme of hatred, which becomes the dominant theme after 15:18, is not anticipated at all in the preceding verses.

I should now like to add a fourth argument. In 15:1-17 the focus of the discourse rests entirely on the relationship between Jesus and his disciples. Jesus' role vis-à-vis the Father provides an example for the disciples' role

³⁴ F. F. Segovia, *Relationships*, 97-121, 129-31; "The Theology and Provenance of John 15:1-17," *JBL* 101 (1982) 115-28.

³⁵ F. F. Segovia, "John 13:1-20, The Footwashing in the Johannine Tradition," *ZNW* 73 (1982) 31-51.

³⁶ F. F. Segovia, *Relationships*, 121-25, 129-31.

vis-à-vis Jesus. (Part of this latter role includes, to be sure, the relationship among the disciples themselves.) However, with 15:18 an entirely new focus predominates in the discourse: a new character is introduced, viz., "the world," and attention is now drawn to the attitude of that "world" toward both Jesus and his disciples. This argument from content confirms the position summarized above: 15:17 does represent the end of a unit; 15:18, the beginning of a new one.

If the beginning of the second discourse is to be located at 15:18, 16:4a represents its conclusion. Several arguments may be offered on behalf of this demarcation: (1) the opposition from and persecution by "the world" find their climax and concretization in 16:1-4a; (2) with 16:1-4a the theme of persecution comes to an abrupt halt; (3) 16:4a presents an expression ("These things I have said to you") which is used elsewhere in the discourse as a concluding formula, e.g., 16:33; (4) the development of the figure of the Paraclete in 16:4b-15 is quite independent of the Paraclete saying of 15:26-27; (5) that same development is also quite independent of the theme of hatred so dominant in 15:18-16:4a. In conclusion, I believe that 16:4a brings to an end a unit that begins with 15:18 and that this unit constitutes an originally independent discourse.³⁷

II. Literary Structure of 15:18-16:4a

This second originally independent discourse presents, in my opinion, a fourfold structure centered around the dominant theme of the hatred of "the world."³⁸ A clear progression of thought may be outlined. The first subsection encompasses 15:18-20 and introduces the theme of hatred: "the

³⁷ The self-contained nature of these verses has been accepted by many exegetes regardless of their approaches to the problems of chaps. 15-17. Among the proponents of the redactional solution, see, e.g., M.-J. Lagrange, *Evangile*, 398; W. Wilkens, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 153; B. Lindars, *Gospel*, 468 (minus 15:26-27); R. E. Brown, *Gospel*, 2, 691-95. R. Schnackenburg (*Johannesevangelium*, 3, 103-5) would see 15:18-16:4a as a major sub-unit of the larger unit comprising 15:1-16:4a.

A major exception in this regard is J. Becker ("Abschiedsreden," 238-39), who proposes 16:15 as the conclusion to this second unit. Becker argues that 16:4b-15 do belong with 15:18-16:4a because the Paraclete is presented in 16:8-11 as the accuser of the hostile world described in 15:18-16:4a. However, that accusation of the Paraclete against "the world" contained in 16:8-11 does not include the issue of the persecution of the disciples developed in 15:18-16:4a; with 16:4a the theme of persecution comes to an end.

³⁸ Thus, e.g., R. Bultmann, *Gospel*, 550-51; R. E. Brown, *Gospel*, 2, 695. Brown, however, does take v. 21 with the first subsection.

Some prefer a threefold structure consisting of 15:18-25, 26-27, and 16:1-4a. Thus, e.g., M.-J. Lagrange, *Evangile*, 409-17; J. Wellhausen, *Evangelium*, 70-71. However, I believe that a division of vv. 18-25 is proper and necessary. A twofold structure can only be obtained by

world” hates the disciples as much as it hated Jesus. The second subsection comprises vv. 21-25 and develops the theme of Jesus’ claim and the sin that results from a rejection of that claim. In effect, the subsection presents the rejection of Jesus’ claim as the fundamental reason for the hatred described in vv. 18-20. Verses 26-27 constitute the third subsection. The verses offer a word of comfort to those who are hated: the Paraclete will be with you. The final subsection, 16:1-4a, concludes the discourse with a warning concerning specific actions, i.e., concrete examples of hatred, that will be taken against the disciples.

III. Exegetical Analysis of 15:18-16:4a

1. *The Hatred of the World (15:18-20)*. As mentioned above, the role of the first subsection is to introduce the dominant theme of the discourse, viz., the hatred of “the world.” An introductory conditional sentence (v. 18) provides a warning to the effect that the fate of the disciples will be no different than that of Jesus. The warning is then developed in vv. 19-20 as follows: the former verse develops the protasis, i.e., hatred toward the believers, by providing the rationale for that hatred; the latter verse develops the apodosis, i.e., the patterning of this hatred after the hatred toward Jesus, by recalling a saying of Jesus and applying it to the situation of the disciples.

In what follows, I should like to comment on the following points: (a) the theme of hatred in the introductory condition; (b) the stark differentiation between “the world” and the disciples in the expansion of the protasis; (c) the theme of persecution in the development of the apodosis.

a. With regard to the theme of hatred in v. 18, it should be pointed out that of the twelve occurrences of the verb in the Gospel, seven are to be found in this discourse. Of the other five examples, three are immediately relevant, viz., 3:20 and 7:7(bis).³⁹ Two of these (3:20 and 7:7b) speak of hatred toward Jesus—hatred toward the disciples is not mentioned outside

means of the excision of certain verses from this unit. Thus, e.g., B Lindars (*Gospel*, 493-98) proposes 15:18-25 and 16:1-4a, leaving out vv. 26-27, while R Schnackenburg (*Johannesevangelium*, 3:105-6) proposes 15:18-25 and 15:26-16:1, leaving out 16:2-4a. However, I believe that the discourse is a unity as it stands.

³⁹ John 12:25 is a Synoptic-like saying that concerns itself with the individual’s relationship to his or her own life (love/hatred) and the consequences of that relationship (destruction/salvation). John 17:14 is excluded on methodological grounds: it forms part of those chapters that have been added to the original farewell discourse of the Gospel and that must be examined unit by unit. Suffice it to say at this point that the verse is very close indeed to 15:18-20: “the world” hates Jesus’ disciples because they, like Jesus, are not of “the world,” and they are not of “the world” because they have accepted Jesus’ claim.

of this discourse—and define that hatred in terms of unbelief, i.e., the rejection of Jesus' claim. The third (7:7a) specifies that such hatred was not directed at Jesus' brethren precisely because they did not believe in him.

John 3:20 forms part of a discourse of Jesus (3:11-21) which is located within the larger Nicodemus unit of 3:1-21.⁴⁰ Within the discourse, vv. 16-21 constitute a subsection whose main theme is the judgment that results upon the sending of the Son by the Father into the world: those who believe in him are said to escape judgment; those who do not are presented as already condemned. In 3:19-21 this theme is presented by means of the contrast "light/darkness": when "the light" (= the Son) came into the world, those who "do evil" (= who do not believe in him) hated it and did not come to it. Thus, John 3:20 clearly equates hatred toward Jesus with a refusal to accept his claim.

John 7:7, on the other hand, forms part of that narrative that deals with Jesus' withdrawal to Galilee as a safe haven because of the violent reaction to his claim in Jerusalem (7:1-9). When asked by his brethren to go back to Judea and show himself to "the world," Jesus responds that "the world," whose deeds are evil, hates him because he testifies against it. This hatred can only be understood in the context of 5:16-18: Jesus' claim was rejected in Jerusalem.⁴¹ By way of contrast, Jesus further responds that this same "world" does not hate them. The aside of v. 5 provides the reason for this exclusion: his brethren do not believe in him. Indeed, one can only conclude, given their unbelief, that they are part of this "world" and share in its hatred toward Jesus.

b. Although there are no other instances of hatred toward Jesus' disciples in the Gospel, one does find clear references elsewhere to a strong differentiation between "the world" and the disciples paralleling that of 15:19. This differentiation may be seen, first of all, in the use of the theme, "being chosen," in 6:70⁴² and, secondly, in the explicit contrast between the disciples and "the world" in the original farewell discourse of 13:31-14:31.

⁴⁰ This section is generally accepted as a literary unit. See, e.g., J. Becker, "J3, 1-21 als Reflex johanneischer Schuldiskussion," *Das Wort und die Wörter: Festschrift G. Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Balz und S. Schulz; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973) 85.

⁴¹ Regardless of one's position on the present location of chap. 6 in the Gospel, it is clear that chaps. 5 and 7 belong together contextually. See, e.g., J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (2d ed. rev.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1979) 64-81.

⁴² The verb, ἐκλέγομαι, may also be found in John 13:18 and 15:16 (2). All three examples, however, form part of sections that I have already assigned to the *Sitz im Leben* of 1 John (13:1b-3, 12-20; 15:1-17); see nn. 34, 35 above. Both of these sections define discipleship in terms that go beyond an acceptance of Jesus' claim concerning himself. Thus, the marks of discipleship and "being chosen" now become, as in 1 John, correct belief and correct praxis.

The differentiation is strong but implicit in 6:70. The verse forms part of 6:67-71, the confession of the Twelve in Galilee after the multitudes that had been following Jesus break with him (v. 66). After the confession, Jesus refers to the Twelve as those whom he has chosen (although allowance is made for Judas' betrayal). The Twelve are thus clearly contrasted with and set apart from the multitudes who could not accept his claim. A much stronger differentiation may be found in Jesus' farewell discourse to his disciples. Within the main body of the discourse,⁴³ certain promises dealing with Jesus' return and coalescing around the figure of the Paraclete (14:16-17a, 21b, 23b, 25-26) are made to the disciples as those who believe and are explicitly denied to the unbelieving "world" (14:17bc, 18-20, 22, 27). Thus, what is implicit in the designation of 6:70 becomes explicit in 14:15-26.

c. In 15:20, the expansion of the apodosis of 15:18, a saying of Jesus to the effect that the disciple is no greater than his master is recalled⁴⁴ and given concrete application both from a negative and a positive point of view: just as Jesus was persecuted, so too can the disciples expect persecution; just as Jesus' claim was accepted by some, so too can the disciples expect some acceptance. Within the discourse, it is the theme of persecution that predominates, continuing in effect that of hatred from v. 18 and anticipating the conclusion of 16:1-4a.

However, the presence of the theme of acceptance is important in determining the meaning of that of persecution. Since both are presented as contrary alternatives, it is clear that persecution entails a rejection of Jesus' claim concerning himself. By implication, it is also clear that the meaning of

⁴³ I see the structure of the discourse as follows 13 31-38 provide an introduction, 14 1-26 constitute the main body, 14 27-31 provide the conclusion The main body may be further subdivided as follows vv 1-3 present the controlling themes of departure and return, vv 4-14 develop the theme of departure, vv 15-26, that of return The promises made to the believers in 14 15-26 follow upon a definition of love for Jesus as belief in him See F F Segovia, *Relationships*, 136-45, "The Love and Hatred of Jesus in Johannine Sectarianism," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 260-62

⁴⁴ In the present arrangement of the Gospel, the saying recalled is that of 13 16 However, given the thesis of this study, viz , that the addition of 15 18-16 4a preceded that of 15 1-17 (and consequently that of 13 1b-3, 12-20, since both are assigned to the *Sitz im Leben* of I John), I conclude that at the time of the addition there was no such previous reference in the Gospel John 15 20 would have been one of several sayings of Jesus recalled in the Gospel which do not appear elsewhere in the narrative, e g , 6 36, 10 25, 11 40, 12 34, 14 2 Indeed, it is easy to explain the incorporation of 13 16 in the later addition as a deliberate attempt to establish links with the rest of the narrative I should like to point out in this regard the different interpretations that the saying receives in 13 12-20, the saying refers to the duty of the disciples *to do for one another* what Jesus did for them, in 15 18-16 4a, it refers to the fact that the same kinds of things that were done to Jesus *will be done to them*

hatred in v. 18 should be read in terms of a rejection of Jesus' claim, thus paralleling the two examples from 3:20 and 7:7.

The theme of persecution appears only once elsewhere in the Gospel (5:16), and, as in the case of the theme of hatred, it concerns Jesus alone. The verse forms part of the conclusion to the dramatic exchange between Jesus and the Jews following the healing of vv. 1-9.⁴⁵ Verse 16 presents the persecution as a direct result of Jesus' violation of the sabbath, while v. 18 amplifies that persecution to include a plot on Jesus' life because of the claim that he has made. Thus, as in the case of 15:20, persecution—including the plot on Jesus' life—entails rejection or unbelief.

2. *The Reason for the World's Hatred (15:21-25)*. The appearance of the theme of acceptance in 15:20 as a contrary alternative to that of persecution and ultimately that of hatred as well provides a link with and a transition to the second subsection. This subsection proceeds to develop the theme of hatred, which does appear explicitly in vv. 23 and 25, from the point of view of Jesus' claim vis-à-vis the Father, detailing the presentation and rejection of that claim as well as the resulting consequences. In effect, the subsection provides the fundamental reason for the world's hatred by making explicit what was implicit in vv. 18-20: the rejection of the claim and the hatred of Jesus represent two sides of the same coin; hatred and unbelief are two ways of describing the same reaction.

A clear structure may be discerned. Jesus' claim is given twice, in vv. 21 and 23, although from different perspectives. In each case, the claim is followed by a series of three parallel elements: (a) the protasis of a contrary-to-fact condition focusing on Jesus' revelation (vv. 22a, 24a); (b) the apodosis, which gives the consequences of a rejection of that revelation: sin (vv. 22b, 24b); (c) a description of the present status of those who reject it (vv. 22c, 24c). This double cycle of parallel elements concludes in v. 25 with an observation to the effect that the hatred of Jesus represents the fulfillment of a scriptural text (Ps 35:19; 69:4). I should like to comment on the following two points: (a) the meaning of "sin" and (b) the implications of the conclusion of v. 25.

(a) In his commentary on the Gospel, R. Bultmann states that "sin" in this passage refers not to immoral behavior of any kind, but rather to unbelief.⁴⁶ I am in complete agreement with this assessment. In both cycles of the

⁴⁵ On the presuppositions and nature of this dramatic exchange, see J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology*, 64-73.

⁴⁶ *Gospel*, 551. This interpretation of sin as the rejection of Jesus' claim, as unbelief, may be found elsewhere in the Gospel as well, e.g., 8:21-30. Indeed, a recent study by J. Bogart (*Orthodox and Heretical Perfectionism in the Johannine Community as Evident in the First*

subsection, immediately following the presentation of Jesus' claim, the rejection of that claim is said to constitute "sin": the first cycle describes that revelation in terms of Jesus' λαλεῖν; the second, in terms of his ἔργα. In this regard, the second cycle is particularly important. In the description which constitutes the fourth element of the cycle (v. 24c), the themes of sin and hatred are related at a fundamental level: both refer to the rejection of Jesus' claim, i.e., unbelief is sin and also hatred.

(b) Up to this point, the discourse has spoken of the hatred of "the world" toward both Jesus and his disciples; of the differentiation that develops between the disciples and "the world"; of the persecution that both Jesus and the disciples endure from "them" ("the world" understood); and of the sin that "they" (again, "the world" understood) incur in rejecting Jesus' claim. The conclusion of this second subsection (v. 25) begins to reveal quite clearly the identity of the term "the world": in claiming that the hatred previously described constitutes a fulfillment of a saying from *their* law (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν), the verse clearly lets it be known that it is the Jews who represent the source of opposition and who constitute the primary representatives of "the world."

3. *The Disciples and the Paraclete (15:26-27)*. Regardless of the respective literary theories adopted with regard to chaps. 15-17, many Johannine scholars have argued that vv. 26-27 do not belong in their present context and should be seen as a later addition.⁴⁷ Such a position seems *prima facie* to have much to commend itself; the verses do appear to be rather loosely tied to what precedes and follows.⁴⁸ However, I believe that the verses do belong, indeed, in their present context⁴⁹ and constitute, in effect, a prophetic word of comfort in the midst of woes, a promise of assistance to the beleaguered

Epistle of John [SBLDS 33, Missoula Scholars, 1977] 51-61) has shown that this meaning is the primary, if not the exclusive, meaning to be found in the Gospel

⁴⁷ See, e.g., J. Wellhausen, *Evangelium*, 70, F. Spitta, *Johannesevangelium*, 314, W. Bauer, "Johannes," *Die Evangelien* (HNT 2, 2 vols., Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1919), 2:147, H. Windisch, "Die fünf johanneischen Parakletensprüche," *Festgabe für Adolf Julicher* (ed. R. Bultmann and H. von Soden, Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1927) 112, 117, W. Wilkens, *Entstehungsgeschichte*, 153, J. Becker, "Abschiedsreden," 237, B. Lindars, *Gospel*, 486

⁴⁸ First of all, the verses occur quite unexpectedly during the development of the theme of hatred. John 16:1-4a connects easily with vv. 18-20 and 21-25: the hatred of "the world" introduced in vv. 18-20 would be followed by the reason for and definition of that hatred in vv. 21-25 and would then conclude with concrete examples in 16:1-4a. Secondly, the concluding warnings of vv. 1 and 4a—"These things I have said to you"—clearly do not refer at all to vv. 26-27, only to vv. 18-20 and 21-25

⁴⁹ Likewise, e.g., M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile*, 412-13, H. Strathmann, *Evangelium*, 222, R. Bultmann, *Gospel*, 552, n. 1, R. E. Brown, *Gospel*, 2:691-95, R. Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, 3:134-38

disciples. The verses may be divided as follows: (a) v. 26ab states the basic promise of the Paraclete, tracing the latter's origin and background; (b) v. 26c defines its function; (c) v. 27 establishes its relationship to the disciples by defining the latter's function in terms of the Paraclete's own function. I shall limit my remarks to these last two elements.

In the light of the hatred and persecution that will mark the attitude of "the world" to the disciples, two basic and interdependent promises are made to the latter. First of all, v. 26 states that the Paraclete will be sent to the disciples (πέμψω ὑμῖν) in order to "witness concerning Jesus" (ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει ἐπεὶ ἐμοῦ).⁵⁰ Secondly, v. 27 declares that the disciples themselves will witness (καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε).⁵¹ The two promises are not unrelated: the witness of the disciples is clearly grounded on that of the Paraclete; the witness of the Paraclete will sustain and mold that of the disciples in the difficult times ahead.

The combination of themes having to do with the disciples (differentiation from "the world"/the promise of the Paraclete) that the presence of this subsection creates in its context appears very prominently in the farewell discourse of 13:31–14:31.⁵² As I have already mentioned above, the main body of the discourse contains certain promises concerning Jesus' return which are made to the believers and denied to "the world." These promises coalesce around the figure of the Paraclete: in 14:16–17a, the first promise, the role of the Paraclete is defined as abiding with the disciples forever; in 14:25–26, the final promise, that role is further detailed as teaching the disciples all things (ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα) and recalling for them all that Jesus said (ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν).

Two further similarities may be noted: not only is the promise of the Paraclete offered therein, given Jesus' impending departure, as a word of comfort to the believers, but the role assigned to the Paraclete parallels that of 15:26–27.⁵³ One may conclude, therefore, that this subsection is intimately

⁵⁰ The basic function of the Paraclete is also presupposed, I believe, by its designation as "the spirit of truth." The Paraclete not only continues Jesus' task of μαρτυρία (e.g., 5:30–37a; 8:12–20), but the content of that witness continues to be Jesus' claim vis-à-vis the Father, viz., "truth."

⁵¹ This witnessing function of the disciples has already been anticipated in the contrary alternatives of v. 20; vv. 26–27 explicitly ground and explain the origin and nature of this function. To the extent that the disciples accept and witness to Jesus' claim under the power of the Paraclete, the opposition of "the world" to that claim is reinforced and reiterated. Thus, as the claim continues to be presented, its proponents continue to be rejected (vv. 18–20). It is because of their own acceptance of and witness to Jesus' claim that the disciples are not of "the world" (15:19) and are drastically differentiated from that "world" (6:70; 14:15–26).

⁵² See n. 43 above.

⁵³ Although the specific theme of "witnessing" is not to be found in 14:15–26 and the

connected to its context both from the point of view of structure and of content and that the combination of themes it creates in that context may be found already in the original farewell discourse of the Gospel.

4. *Concrete Examples of Hatred (16:1-4a)*. The concluding subsection of 16:1-4a has two basic functions in the discourse: to summarize the contents of the previous subsections (especially vv. 18-20 and 21-25) and to bring to a climax the dominant theme of hatred. A clear structure may once again be discerned. First of all, vv. 1 and 4a form an *inclusio* both from the point of view of style and of content. Stylistically, both verses begin with the same introductory formula, viz., "These things I have said to you" (ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν). In addition, both verses constitute prophetic warnings alerting the disciples to the coming situation.⁵⁴ Secondly, vv. 2-3 provide a concrete description of this coming situation as well as a rationale for it.

The task of summarizing is performed by the introductory formulas of vv. 1 and 4a as well as by the rationale of v. 3. The demonstrative pronoun (ταῦτα) recalls the hatred and persecution of vv. 18-20 and 21-25, i.e., the rejection of Jesus' claim vis-à-vis the Father. Verse 2, then, brings to a climax the theme of hatred by describing specific ways in which hatred toward the disciples will be carried out: the hatred of "the world" will be manifested in terms of expulsions from the synagogues (ἀποσυναγωγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς) and attempts to kill the disciples (πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνειας ὑμᾶς). Both of these procedures may be found elsewhere in the Gospel.⁵⁵

First of all, the procedure of expulsion from the synagogue may also be found in 9:22 (see vv. 24-34) and 12:42. The action is clearly presented as a sanction carried out against those members of the synagogues that openly confess Jesus as the Messiah. Secondly, the possibility of the death penalty applies only to Jesus in the Gospel, never to the disciples. It is encountered for the first time in chap. 5, where it is associated with the rejection of Jesus' claim (v. 18), and is successfully carried out in the passion narrative of the

themes of "teaching" and "recalling" are not present as such in 15 26-27, both descriptions of the Paraclete's function assert fundamentally the same thing: the Paraclete will be with the disciples to continue to present Jesus' claim to "the world." Thus, the saying of 15 26-27 basically reiterates the function of the Paraclete specified in the promises of 14 15-26.

⁵⁴ The warnings are conveyed by means of the ἵνα-clauses that follow the introductory formulas. In v. 1, the warning is phrased in terms of "stumbling" (μὴ σκανδαλισθῆτε), in v. 4a, in terms of recalling these predictions during the times of persecution (ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα αὐτῶν μνημονεύετε αὐτῶν).

⁵⁵ J. L. Martyn (*History and Theology*, 39-40, 67) sees the verse as containing *in nuce* what the evangelist attempts to portray dramatically in chaps. 5 to 10 of the Gospel. The step described in 16 2a would be presented in dramatic form in chap. 9, that of 16 2b, in chaps. 5 and 7.

Gospel. Thus, one finds in the Gospel narrative not only references to the actions specified in 16:2, but also an explicit association of these actions with the rejection of Jesus' claim which parallels that of 16:3.⁵⁶

Finally, it should be pointed out that this concluding subsection further confirms a position taken above with regard to the concrete identity of "the world" that is responsible for such actions. The reference to "their" law in the second subsection clearly pointed to the Jews as the primary representatives of "the world." Similarly, the actions described in 16:2—and, above all, that of expulsion from the synagogue—can only be understood in the context of such an identification, viz., "the world" means quite concretely the Jews.

IV. *Sitz im Leben*; Conclusions

In the introduction to this study, I observed that the adoption of the multiple discourses theory within the redactional approach raises new questions in Johannine scholarship. I should now like to turn to these questions in the light of the preceding analysis of 15:18–16:4a: (1) Can this clearly delineated, originally independent discourse be assigned to a specific context or *Sitz im Leben*? (2) Can its addition to and present position in the Gospel be satisfactorily explained? (3) Can its authorship be in any way determined?

1. Since I have already committed myself, given my position on the provenance of John 15:1–17, to the fourth sub-type within the multiple discourses theory, I should like to approach the question of the *Sitz im Leben* of this second originally independent discourse by means of a critical dialogue with the other Johannine exegetes within this sub-type, viz., J. Becker and R. Schnackenburg.⁵⁷ Both Becker and Schnackenburg consider 15:18–16:4a to be a part of larger literary units or discourses (15:18–16:15 and 15:1–16:4a respectively) which they remove from the context presupposed by and reflected in the Fourth Gospel and assign to that of 1 John.⁵⁸ As a result, 15:18–16:4a is also associated with and assigned to this latter context.

However, in the light of the preceding analysis, I believe that this discourse can and should be understood entirely from the perspective of the situation presupposed by and reflected in the Gospel. Several decisive arguments may be offered on behalf of this position.

First of all, as in the case of the Gospel (3:20 and 7:7), the hatred of "the world" is explicitly presented in terms of unbelief or the rejection of Jesus'

⁵⁶ For historical reconstructions of the background to both of these procedures, see J. L. Martyn, *History and Theology*, 37–62, 75–89.

⁵⁷ See n. 33 above.

⁵⁸ J. Becker, "Abschiedsreden," 236–41; R. Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, 3. 100–8, 140–43.

claim by “the world” (15:21-25). Similarly, the persecution forthcoming from “the world” is, as in the case of the Gospel (5:20), ultimately based on the refusal to believe in Jesus (15:20).

Secondly, further paralleling the usage of the Gospel (e.g., 13:33/14:15-26), the discourse presents the Jews as the primary representatives of “the world”; the scriptural reference of 15:25 and the concrete examples of hatred from 16:2 make this identification quite clear. Thirdly, the specific forms of hatred described in 16:2 provide the immediate background for large sections of the Gospel narrative (chaps. 5; 7; 9; 19:17-37). Fourthly, the stark differentiation between believers and “the world”—where the latter term refers to the Jews—observed in 15:19, 26-27, is also very prominent throughout the Gospel (e.g., 6:66-71; 14:15-26). Finally, the specific promise and function of the Paraclete detailed in 15:26-27 basically parallel those of 14:15-26 (16-17a, 25-26).

Thus, I believe that the discourse reflects and presupposes a context of bitter confrontation between a Christian community and a parent synagogue(s) from which the former’s present members have been forced to separate because of their belief in Jesus. In addition, one gathers from 16:1-4a that the process of enforced separation is still in effect and that even those who have already separated find themselves in serious, indeed mortal, danger. Such a situation is very similar to that delineated for the Gospel as a whole by recent Johannine scholarship.⁵⁹ At the same time, it is far removed from the strictly intra-church concerns of 1 John.⁶⁰

The main difficulty with the proposals of J. Becker and R. Schnackenburg, quite apart from their inclusion of this discourse within larger literary units, lies in their respective treatments of 16:1-4a. On the one hand, Becker declares that in the proposed unit (15:18-16:15) “the world” is no longer represented by the Jews; then, when speaking of 16:1-4a, he further states that “the world” nevertheless “auf ‘jüdische’ Weise ihren Hass austobt.”⁶¹

⁵⁹ For this development, see R. Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975) 147-56. By far the most influential figure in this regard has been J. L. Martyn. A concise delineation of this conflict may be found in his “Glances into the History of the Johannine Community,” *The Gospel of John in Christian History: Essays for Interpreters* (New York: Paulist, 1979) 90-121, esp. pp. 107-21. The conflict is situated in a much broader context by R. E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves, and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist, 1979), esp. pp. 58-91.

⁶⁰ Such dominant issues from the Gospel as the complete rejection of Jesus’ claim, the controversy with the synagogue, and the persecution of the community are completely absent from 1 John. A good summary of the intra-church concerns may be found in J. Bogart, *Perfectionism*, 123-36.

⁶¹ “Abschiedsreden,” 239.

Leaving aside the precarious nature of the distinction, one may wonder why hatred would be specifically described in ways which are no longer in effect. Similarly, Schnackenburg removes 16:2-4a from the proposed unit (15:1-16:4a) as a later addition.⁶² Leaving aside the highly questionable merit of such a procedure,⁶³ one may wonder what possible purpose such an addition could serve at such a late stage.

The conclusion is thus inevitable: 15:18-16:4a cannot be divorced from the *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel. Not only does the discourse presuppose and reflect this bitter confrontation that marks most of the Gospel narrative, but it also reflects the same highly sectarian consciousness present in that narrative. The believers are diametrically opposed to "the world": the former are the elect, those who have been called out of "the world" and who alone possess the Paraclete that comes from the Father, the Spirit of truth; the latter are the evil sinners, those from whom all opposition comes and who show thereby their hatred for the Father.

2. Before turning to the question of authorship, I should like to address that of the rationale for the proposed addition. The success of any redactional theory depends ultimately on the reasonableness of the explanation that its proponents can provide for the proposed redaction. Such an explanation should in turn be of value in approaching the issue of authorship. There are two aspects to be considered in any such situation: (a) Why was the addition made at all? (b) Why was it made at this particular point in the narrative?

a. I believe that the first question may be answered satisfactorily both in terms of the contents of the discourse itself and the nature of Jesus' relationship with his disciples in the Gospel narrative as a whole.

First of all, then, the preceding exegetical analysis has shown that all of the major themes of 15:18-16:4a can be found elsewhere in the Gospel narrative. Nevertheless, an important difference in the application of some of these themes may also be noted. In the Gospel, the themes that describe the opposition of "the world" are used almost exclusively with reference to Jesus alone, while in this discourse those same themes are extended or applied to Jesus' disciples as well.⁶⁴ This is certainly the case with the themes of hatred,

⁶² *Johannesevangelium*, 3, 105-6, 138-40. Verse 1 already contains a concluding formula, while vv. 2-4a develop the warning of 15:20-21 by drawing on the concrete experience of the community.

⁶³ Such a proposal breaks up completely the *inclusio* which serves as a summary of and a climax to the entire discourse. Quite aside from this removal, I find it easier to understand Schnackenburg's proposed attribution, given his connection of these verses with 15:1-17, a discourse which I do believe comes from the context of 1 John.

⁶⁴ There is no noticeable shift, however, with respect to those themes that describe the

persecution, and the threat of death; the sole exception is that of expulsions from the synagogues, which is used in the Gospel of characters other than Jesus (9:22; 12:42), though never of the disciples.

Secondly, an examination of Jesus' relationship with his disciples in the Gospel further shows that there is minimal teaching on Jesus' part concerning the believers themselves. The relationship is developed almost exclusively in terms of belief and presents two basic foci: on the one hand, it is clear that the disciples do possess correct belief in Jesus (1:35-51; 2:1-11; 6:66-71; 13:10; 14:1-3, 15-26; 20:19-23); however, it is also clear that such belief cannot be perfect until after the resurrection (2:13-22; 4:31-38; 11:7-16; 12:12-19; 13:1a, 4-11; 14:4-14). What little teaching there is concerning the disciples themselves surfaces only in 14:1-26, when certain promises are made to them (14:12-26).

Thus, from the point of view of Jesus' relationship with the disciples, the addition of 15:18-16:4a may be construed as an explicit attempt to provide further teaching concerning the disciples and thus to expand what is given in the Gospel itself. In addition, from the point of view of its contents, the addition of the discourse may further be seen as a deliberate attempt to transfer in a very explicit way the opposition of "the world" from Jesus to his disciples. Indeed, it is this transferral which constitutes the essence of the expansion, of the further teaching.

b. The second question concerns the present position of 15:18-16:4a in the Gospel narrative. This question, however, has to be qualified in the light of previous research. As I have already mentioned above, I believe that 15:1-17 constitutes an originally independent discourse which presupposes and reflects the *Sitz im Leben* of 1 John. The present study has shown that 15:18-16:4a also constitutes an originally independent discourse and that its *Sitz im Leben* parallels that of the Gospel as a whole. I believe, therefore, that the latter addition should be seen as preceding the former; the reverse situation would be impossible to defend. Thus, at one time, 15:18-16:4a was added directly to 13:31-14:31; it was only at a later time that 15:1-17—and other related passages—was also incorporated.

The question then becomes, Why was 15:18-16:4a added to 13:31-14:31? or, Why was the further teaching concerning the disciples added to the original farewell discourse? I believe that this question may be answered satisfactorily both in terms of the role and the contents of this discourse vis-à-vis those of 13:31-14:31.

status of the disciples. Thus, both the theme of complete separation from "the world" and that of the possession of the Paraclete with its very specific function within the community may already be found elsewhere in the Gospel narrative.

First of all, it was pointed out in the preceding section that there is little teaching concerning the disciples themselves in the course of Jesus' relationship with his disciples and that such teaching surfaces only in 14:1-26, i.e., the main body of the original farewell discourse. Given the expansion of this teaching that 15:18-16:4a represents, one can readily see why the discourse was added at this point, viz., the expansion would thus follow immediately upon the sole instance of such teaching in the original Gospel narrative.

Secondly, it was also pointed out above that the teaching concerning the disciples of 13:31-14:31 consists of certain promises made to them as believers which coalesce around the figure of the Paraclete (14:12-26).⁶⁵ The tone of these promises is quite positive throughout. By way of contrast, the expansion of this teaching in 15:18-16:4a consists primarily—the presence of the Paraclete is reiterated—of warnings concerning the coming opposition of “the world” toward them as believers: hatred, persecution, expulsions, killings. The tone of these warnings is quite negative throughout. Given the character of the expansion represented by 15:18-16:4a, one can see why the discourse was added at this point as well, viz., the expansion provides an explicit view of the darker side of belief in Jesus and, as such, balances the more positive side of the earlier discourse. Thus, the expansion would be saying: the Paraclete, yes, but also the hatred of the world.

In conclusion, one may think of the expansion, given its specific location, as a commentary on 14:27: peace, yes, but a peace that includes hatred, persecution, separation, and even death. One may also think of it, in more general terms, as making explicit what is implicit in the Gospel: what happened to Jesus happens to all who accept his claim, i.e., the Gospel is not only a biography of Jesus, but also an autobiography of Jesus' disciples.

3. The third and final question concerns the authorship of this discourse. Within the multiple discourses theory, two different attributions may be found: it is argued that 15:18-16:4a (or the larger unit in which it is placed) was written either by the evangelist or by another hand from the same context as that of 1 John. Given the strong similarities between these verses and the rest of the Gospel narrative, I believe that the latter option is untenable. At the same time, I have doubts concerning the former option.

First of all, from the point of view of content, the discourse does go beyond the rest of the Gospel narrative insofar as it attempts to make very explicit what is already implicit in the Gospel, i.e., the fate of the disciples

⁶⁵ They will perform works similar to and greater than Jesus' own works (vv. 12-14); they will be loved by both Jesus (v. 21b) and the Father (vv. 21b, 23b); Jesus will manifest himself to them (v. 21b); both the Father and Jesus will come and abide in them (v. 23b). Ultimately, all of these promises coalesce around those of the Paraclete who will be sent to them (vv. 16-17a, 25-26).

will be no different than that of Jesus. Such an essentially clarifying addition, it seems to me, points to a hand other than that of the evangelist. Secondly, from the point of view of structure, the discourse follows rather faithfully a pattern of presentation already found within the original farewell discourse (14:15-26).⁶⁶ Again, such a faithful reproduction, it seems to me, points to a hand other than that of the evangelist.

Although, to be sure, the role of the evangelist as the author of these verses cannot be completely ruled out, I would prefer to argue, given the above reservations, in terms of a "school" hypothesis.⁶⁷ Thus, during a very intense period of confrontation with the synagogue, one may posit the following situation: a disciple of the evangelist, a member of the school, decided to provide some encouragement for the beleaguered community by drawing out very clearly certain implications from the community's *Grundschrift*, this task the disciple accomplished by composing a new discourse, no doubt using some traditional material, which he modelled after the original farewell discourse of that *Grundschrift*, finally, he placed this discourse immediately after the latter discourse, 1 e., at that moment in the narrative when Jesus speaks to his disciples concerning their coming situation.

Through this addition the disciple wished to emphasize above all the darker aspects of that situation and to show that such developments had indeed been foreseen by Jesus himself and thus were to be expected and endured. From the perspective of a school hypothesis, such an addition is not surprising at all and, indeed, may be seen as one of several to be found in the present arrangement of the Gospel.⁶⁸ Thus, I believe that the *Grundschrift* gradually became a reservoir for the history and the reflections of this particular early Christian community, 15:18-16:4a is but one example of these later reflections. I further believe that the rigorous application of the redactional theory can solve many of the literary difficulties to be found in the present Gospel narrative and shed a great deal of light on the later development of this most peculiar and influential early Christian tradition.

⁶⁶ That pattern is as follows: a radical differentiation between "the world" and the disciples (15:18-20/14:17bc, 18-20, 22, 27), the grounding of this differentiation on an acceptance of Jesus' claim (15:21-25/14:15, 21, 23a, 24a), the promise of a Paraclete who will continue Jesus' work to those who believe (15:26-27/14:16-17a, 25-26). See F. F. Segovia, "Love and Hatred," 260-62.

⁶⁷ For a very broad concept of the school hypothesis, see R. Alan Culpepper, *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools* (SBLDS 26, Missoula: Scholars, 1975) 261-90. For a narrower concept of the term, with which I am in agreement, see R. E. Brown, *Community*, 99-103.

⁶⁸ See, e.g., 3:31-36, 12:44-50, 21



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.