THE GLORIFICATION OF THE SON OF MAN

AN ANALYSIS OF JOHN 13:31-32

Peter Ensor

Summary

The article examines the textual, exegetical and historical questions surrounding John 13:31-32. Accepting the Nestle-Aland text as it stands, the article argues that Jesus is represented as saying, at least in part, that through his return to the Father by way of the cross his divine qualities would be revealed, that he would thereby fulfil the role of the 'one like a son of man' of Daniel 7:13-14, and that God's own divine qualities would also thereby be revealed. These motifs, it is argued, may be traced back to the historical Jesus and may even have been expressed in the context of the Last Supper, where John places them.

1. Introduction

The words attributed to Jesus in John 13:31-32 are found at a critical moment in the narrative of John's Gospel.¹ Jesus is sharing his last meal with his disciples prior to his death (13:1-4). He has washed his disciples' feet (13:5-20), and has prophesied that one of his disciples would betray him (13:21-26). After receiving the morsel from Jesus, Judas goes out into the night (13:27-30), thus setting in motion those events which will lead to the arrest, trials, condemnation, and crucifixion of Jesus. It is at this juncture that, in John's record, Jesus speaks those words which begin the so-called 'farewell discourse', and which form the subject of this study: 'Now is the Son of Man glorified, and in

¹ 'John' will be used in this article, as is conventional, without prejudice to the question of authorship.

him God is glorified; if God is glorified in him, God will also glorify him in himself, and glorify him at once' (13:31-32).²

Despite their apparent simplicity, these words raise an unusually large number of questions, which continue to perplex the minds of interpreters. There are, first, the textual questions surrounding the opening clause of verse 32 and the reading of αὐτῷ in its second occurrence there. Then, secondly, there are the exegetical questions: (1) What event is being referred to in verse 31 (which includes the question of the meaning of νῦν and the significance of the aorist tense of the verb ἐδοξάσθη)? (2) What does the verb δοξάζω mean in this context? (3) What is the significance of the use of the title 'Son of Man' as used here? (4) How are we to understand the passive ἐδοξάσθη when God is the subject? (5) What is the precise meaning of the preposition ἐν at the end of verse 31? (6) What event is referred to by the future verbs in verse 32 (which includes the question of the meaning of the word εὐθύς)? Is it the same event or different from the event referred to in verse 31? (7) Who is referred to by the pronoun αὐτῷ in its second occurrence in verse 32 (if this is the correct reading), and (8) What does the phrase ἐν αὐτῷ mean in this context? Finally, there is the wider question of what connection this saying has with the historical Jesus.

All these questions have been answered differently in modern scholarship, producing a whole array of possible understandings of this text. In the light of this diversity of interpretation, we are justified in taking a fresh look at these problematical verses in the hope of gaining a new clarity as to their meaning.

2. The Textual Questions

2.1 *The Opening Clause of Verse 32*

The first clause of verse 32 is bracketed in the twenty-seventh edition of the Nestle-Aland text, a sign of its precarious position within the text at this point. The manuscript evidence alone would favour their exclusion, since the words are missing in some important early witnesses (including p⁶⁶, **ℵ***, B, C*, D, L, W), but that is the only strong argument which can be produced in favour of their exclusion.

² All translations in this article are taken from the RSV, 2nd edn.

This is hardly a case of dittography,³ since we would have to imagine that a scribe deliberately added the word εἰ to the text in the knowledge that it was not in his original.

In favour of the retention of the clause, we need to note that it accords entirely with John's style, which frequently employs conditional clauses,⁴ and small repetitions as stepping stones to a further development in thought.⁵ In addition, the omission of the clause can easily be accounted for as a likely case of accidental haplography through parablepsis, or homoioteleuton.⁶ This argument should probably be counted as decisive, and the clause retained, as it is by the majority of modern scholars.⁷

2.2 The Second Occurrence of αὐτῷ in Verse 32

Here the weight of manuscript evidence (including p⁶⁶, $\aleph^{*2}$, and B) favours the reading αὐτῷ as against the alternative reading ἐαυτῷ (read by $\aleph^1$, A, D, L, W, Θ, and Ψ). In addition, it is thought more likely on the grounds of parallelism with the preceding two clauses, both of which contain ἐν αὐτῷ. Thus, despite Westcott's advocacy for ἐαυτῷ,⁸ the reading αὐτῷ is commonly accepted today as original.

There has been a further debate as to whether the word αὐτῷ should carry a rough breathing in our modern texts,⁹ but this question poses no

³ Regarded as possible, though not decisive, by C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: SPCK, 1955): 376.

⁴ Cf. 3:12; 4:10; 5:46-47; 7:23; 8:19, 39, 42, 46; 9:41; 10:35, 37-38; 13:14, 17, 32; 14:2, 7, 11, 28; 15:18-24, 22, 24; 18:8, 23, 36.

⁵ Cf. R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971, ET): 523.

⁶ So B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd edition, London/New York: UBS, 1975): 242.

⁷ Including G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco: Word, 1987): 242; J. H. Bernard, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1928): 2.525; R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, Vol. 2 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970): 2.606; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester: IVP, 1991): 483 n. 1; E. Haenchen, *John 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of John Chs. 7-21* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984): 2.117; Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (London: Oliphants, 1972): 462; R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, Vol. 3 (Tonbridge Wells: Burns and Oates, 1983): 3.50; and W. Thüsing, *Die Erhöhung und Verrherrlichung Jesus im Johannesevangelium* (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1970): 235; in addition to Bultmann and Metzger; and as against Barrett, *John*, 376; A. J. B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964): 180 n. 1; and B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: J. Clarke, 1958): 196.

⁸ Westcott, *John*, 197.

⁹ So Barrett, *John*, 376; but B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary*, 242, 616 n. 3; and Schnackenburg, *John*, 3.52, 407 n. 10 argue that in Hellenistic Greek the unaspirated αὐτῷ can have a reflexive meaning.

exegetical dilemma since all are agreed that, whatever its breathing, the word should be taken as a reflexive pronoun.

We therefore accept the Nestle-Aland text as it stands, and turn to the exegetical questions associated with this saying.

3. The Exegetical Questions

3.1 *The Event Referred to in Verse 31*

In verse 31 Jesus says ‘Now is the Son of Man glorified, and in him God is glorified.’ We need to enquire what event is being referred to, giving special attention to the word ‘now’ (νῦν), the tense of the verb ‘is glorified’ (aorist), and the total context in which these words occur.

3.1.1 The Word ‘Now’

The word νῦν, in Johannine usage, is not as precise as it may seem. For example, while in the vast majority of its occurrences it refers to the present time,¹⁰ in 21:10 it is used with the aorist tense to refer to a genuinely past event (‘the fish that you have just (νῦν) caught’), in 11:8 with the imperfect tense to refer to a genuinely past event (‘The Jews were but now (νῦν) seeking to stone you’), and in 12:31 (in its second occurrence) with the future tense to refer to a genuinely future event (‘Now (νῦν) shall the ruler of this world be cast out’). So it appears that we should withhold judgement concerning the genuine tense of the event referred to in verse 31 until we have looked at the other indicators mentioned above.

3.1.2 The Tense of the Verb ‘Is Glorified’

The aorist tense of ἐδοξάσθη is again not precise in its time reference. As S. E. Porter has shown, the aorist tense in Greek, even in the indicative, can refer to the past, present or future, and can even be omnitemporal and atemporal.¹¹ In this particular context, it is frequ-

¹⁰ Either when used with the present tense, as in 4:18, 23; 5:25; 6:42; 8:11, 40; 9:21, 41; 13:36; 15:22; 16:22, 29; 18:36; or with the aorist imperative, as in 2:8; or with the perfect tense, as in 8:52; 11:22; 12:27; 14:29; 15:24; 16:30; and 17:7, where, as usual with the perfect, we should see a reference to the present arising out of a past event. Other uses of νῦν in John, at 12:31; 16:5; 17:5, 13 appear to refer to the same event as 13:31 and carry the same ambiguity. See 3.1.3 below.

¹¹ S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1989): 75-76, 233.

ently regarded as being ‘proleptic’ or ‘prophetic’, referring to a future event as so certain that it is regarded as already having happened,¹² or as reflecting the time of the author himself at the end of the first century, as he looks back on a past event.¹³ But in itself it is ambiguous. We need more guidance from the total context in which it appears before we can arrive at a decision in this matter.

3.1.3 The Johannine Context

It is the Johannine context which provides the clues we need. Here a number of texts point towards the understanding that the word ἐδοξάσθη refers to the entire complex of events, considered as one, which includes Jesus’ death, resurrection, and ascension, and may be summed up as ‘Jesus’ return to the Father by way of the cross’.

To establish this point, we need only look at (1) those texts in which Jesus’ final glory is referred to (7:39; 12:16, 23; 13:31-32; 17:1, 5), (2) those texts in which Jesus’ ‘hour’ is referred to (2:4; 7:30; 8:20; 12:23, 27; 13:1; 17:1), and (3) those texts in which the word ‘now’ is used at the climax of Jesus’ ministry (12:31; 13:31; 16:5; 17:5, 13). If we allow these texts to interpret one another within the context of John’s Gospel, a clear picture emerges. Jesus is approaching his death, and he knows it. The ‘hour’ which is anticipated at 2:4, 7:30 and 8:20 arrives at 12:23; 13:1; 17:1. It is the hour of his death (12:27 – why else would his ‘soul be troubled’ in the context of 12:24?). It is also the hour of his ‘departure out of this world to the Father’ (13:1). In a word, it is the hour of his ‘glorification’ (12:23; 17:1), following which the Spirit would be given (7:39) and the disciples would remember the Scriptures and see their relevance to Jesus (12:16). The ‘now’ of his ‘glorification’ (13:31; 17:5), which is also the ‘now’ of his going to the Father (16:5; 17:13), is in addition the ‘now’ when the world will be judged and the world’s ruler cast out (12:31). The ‘hour’ of Jesus’ departure to the Father, which is the ‘now’ of his ‘glorification’, thus includes *both* his death *and* his subsequent exaltation to the Father’s presence to

¹² So, e.g. Bernard, *John*, 2.524; D. B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996): 564.

¹³ The understanding of, e.g. Barrett, *John*, 375-76; Brown, *John*, 2.585, 610; and A. T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to St. John* (London: Continuum, 2005): 386. The suggestion of J. N. Sanders and B. A. Mastin, *A Commentary on the Gospel According to John* (London: A. & C. Black, 1968): 315 n. 4, that the aorist here could be ‘timeless’ sits uneasily with the particle νῦν, which does seem to refer to a particular event, whenever it is thought to have happened.

enjoy the glory he had with the Father before the world was made (17:5). Both aspects of this climactic ‘glorification’ are encapsulated in the word ὑψόω, which alludes both to the ‘lifting up’ of Jesus on the cross (3:14; 12:33), and his being exalted thereafter (implied in 8:28; 12:32).¹⁴

In the light of the total Johannine context, therefore, we should interpret 13:31 to refer to the entire complex of events, considered as one, which include Jesus’ death, resurrection and ascension. Jesus’ ‘glorification’ (whereby the Father also is glorified) refers to his return to the Father by way of the cross. We should therefore question alternative views, such as that of Godet, who sees the aorist as referring to some past event from Jesus’ standpoint in the narrative;¹⁵ or that of Lenski, who sees it as referring to Judas’ act of betrayal;¹⁶ or that of Bultmann and others, who see it as referring to the completion of Jesus’ earthly work on the cross, but not to what followed.¹⁷ Rather, it refers *both* to Jesus’ suffering on the cross *and also* his subsequent exaltation rolled into one.¹⁸

3.2 The Meaning of the Verb δοξάζω in Verse 31

Having decided what the verb δοξάζω refers to in verse 31, we now need to determine what it connotes, and what this connotation contributes to our understanding of the climax of Jesus’ ministry as John presents it. Our quest is made all the more important when we consider that: (1) the verb occurs no less than five times in this brief saying; (2) it is the only verb used at all in it; and (3) there is a strong likelihood that, for all the changes in subject, tense and voice in the varying

¹⁴ Ὑψόω is defined by B. Abbott-Smith, *A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1937): 465, as (1) ‘lift’ or ‘raise up’, then metaphorically as (2) ‘exalt’, ‘uplift’. Bultmann, *John*, 432 n. 2, goes so far as to say that the verb ὑψόω used here is actually a synonym for δοξάζω in John. While the latter has a different connotation, as we shall see in 3.2 below, we may certainly agree that it refers to the same complex of events.

¹⁵ F. L. Godet, *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (3rd ed.; Michigan: Zondervan, 1893): 264.

¹⁶ R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. John’s Gospel* (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1942): 956.

¹⁷ Bultmann, *John*, 523; cf. Haenchen, *John*, 2.117; C. S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 Vols (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrikson Publishers, 2003): 2.920; F. J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical, 1998): 385; W. Thüsing, *Johannesevangelium*, 235, 241.

¹⁸ For particularly clear expressions of this view, see Beasley-Murray, *John*, 246; and Brown, *John*, 2.610.

occurrences of this verb in these two verses, there is some fundamental meaning which binds them all together.

The classical meanings of δοξάζω included, first, ‘think, imagine, suppose, entertain/form/hold an opinion’, and, secondly, ‘magnify, extol; (passive) be distinguished, held in honour, magnified’.¹⁹ In the New Testament, as in the LXX, the first meaning does not appear at all, but the second does; for example, at Matthew 5:16; Mark 2:12; Romans 15:6; 1 Peter 2:12.²⁰ Alongside this usage, a new meaning appears, stemming from the fact that the LXX translators often decided to use this verb to translate various parts of the Hebrew verb כָּבַד (even as they often used the noun δόξα to translate כְּבוֹד). This brought the verb into contact with the concept of the glory of God in the Old Testament, which means the revealed splendour, majesty, radiance, honour, or power of God (according to context), and gave it the meaning of ‘clothe with (divine) splendour’, or ‘cause to share in (the divine) splendour’, as, for example, in Romans 8:30; 2 Corinthians 3:10; and 1 Peter 1:8.²¹ In John’s Gospel, however, the only persons who are ‘glorified’ are God and Christ.²² Because, in their case, ‘glory’ was already theirs from before the creation of the world (17:5), their ‘glorification’ is not a matter of acquiring something they never had, but rather of manifesting something that is inherently theirs. As Cremer puts it (referring to Christ), in his glorification ‘his innate glory is brought to light, is made manifest’.²³

This connotation can be seen in all the Johannine references to ‘glorification’,²⁴ including those which refer to Christ. Divine glory

¹⁹ H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940, 9th ed.): 444.

²⁰ Abbott-Smith, *Greek Lexicon*: 121.

²¹ Abbott-Smith, *Greek Lexicon*, 121. Cf. also W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957): 203. J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1930): 169, find a close parallel to this usage in the magical papyri, which they translate ‘adorn with lustre’.

²² It is true that Jesus says in 17:22 that he had given to the disciples the glory which the Father had given to him, and that he prays in 17:24 that they might be with him where he is and see that glory for themselves; but nowhere are they, or anyone or anything else, said to be ‘glorified’ in John’s Gospel.

²³ As H. Cremer, *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek* (4th edition, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1895): 210, puts it.

²⁴ 7:39; 8:54 bis; 11:4; 12:16, 23, 28 bis; 13:31 bis, 32 ter; 14:13; 15:8; 16:14; 17.1 bis, 4, 5, 10; 21:19.

was his from before the creation of the world (17:5), given by the Father because of his love for him (17:24). His glory was seen by Isaiah (12:41), and by some of those who witnessed his earthly ministry (1:14). During this ministry, there were certain moments when this glory shone through his humanity, and was seen by those who had eyes of faith – as at Cana in Galilee, where Jesus worked his first miracle (2:11), and at the raising of Lazarus (11:4). All such moments were possible because of Jesus' unbroken fellowship with his Father, who 'glorified' him during his earthly ministry (8:54). The disciples also 'glorified' him (17:10), and after the climactic 'glorification' of Jesus in his death, resurrection and ascension (7:39; 12:16, 23; 13:31; 17:1, 5), Jesus was glorified by the Holy Spirit (16:14). In each case, the 'glorification' of Jesus included in some way the revelation of that divine splendour which was always his as God (1:1, 18; 20:28), but which was to some extent hidden from view during his earthly life.²⁵

We may therefore question those interpretations of δοξάζω in John's Gospel which obscure this aspect of its meaning.²⁶ In 13:31, when we read 'Now is the Son of Man glorified, and in him God is glorified', we are to understand, at least in part, that, by returning to the Father by way of the cross, Jesus' divine qualities would in some way be revealed, and that in the process God's own divine qualities would shine forth.

3.3 The Significance of the Use of the Title 'Son of Man' in Verse 31

We now need to consider the way in which Jesus is represented as referring to himself in this saying. Has John simply inserted the title here without thought to its context?²⁷ Or has he done so simply as a way of

²⁵ W. Thüsing, *Johannesevangelium*, 235, refers to the 'Offenbarungscharakter' (revelatory character) of the glorification of the Father and the Son in John's Gospel.

²⁶ Such as that of the *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*, eds H. Balz and G. Schneider (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990): 1.348, which defines the LXX-influenced meaning of δοξάζω in the New Testament simply as 'give (passive: 'receive') a share in the divine glory', which does not fit the Johannine Christ, let alone God; or that of *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, ed. C. Brown (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976): 2.46, which interprets the meaning of δοξάζω in John 13:31-32 as 'make the glory of God or of the Son effective'.

²⁷ The view of E. D. Freed, 'The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 86 (1967): 402-09, who thinks that John's Gospel has no separate Son of Man Christology, and that the title is distributed indiscriminately throughout the Gospel, as are other titles, simply out of John's love of variation.

referring to Jesus humanity?²⁸ Or is there an allusion here to the vision of the enthronement of ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel 7:13-14?²⁹

In defending the last view here, we need not deny that other influences have been at work as well in John’s unique presentation of the figure of the Son of Man. For example, there is a clear allusion to Genesis 28:12 at John 1:51, and to Numbers 21:4-9 at John 3:14. There are also possible allusions to Proverbs 30:3-4 at John 3:13, and to Isaiah 52:13 in the use of the verbs ὑποῦν and δοξάζεσθαι in connection with the sufferings and death of Jesus. Synoptic ‘Son of Man’ passion predictions may also lie behind the ‘Son of Man’ passion predictions in John,³⁰ and wisdom and eucharistic traditions may lie behind the Son of Man sayings at 6:27 and 53. All that is being affirmed here is that Daniel 7:13-14 is *one* of the background texts which have had an influence on the Johannine Son of Man sayings, and 13:31-32 in particular.

Before we look at the evidence from within John’s Gospel itself, it is worth reflecting that the influence of Daniel 7:13-14 on John’s Son of Man sayings is antecedently likely in any case in view of his evident contact with the tradition which lies behind the Synoptic Gospels. This is not to say that that he is necessarily dependent on the Synoptic Gospels in a literary sense (a question over which there is no scholarly unanimity); nor is it to say that his view of Jesus as the Son of Man coincides exactly with those of the Synoptic Gospels (which is clearly not the case); but in view of the facts that (1) there are obvious contacts between John and the Synoptic tradition,³¹ and (2) there are undisputed allusions to Daniel 7:13-14 in some of the Synoptic Son of Man sayings,³² we should be open to the possibility that John’s Gospel also shows signs of the influence of the Danielic vision of ‘one like a son of man’.

²⁸ The position of D. R. A. Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990): 79-111.

²⁹ Since the demise of Bultmann’s theory of reliance on a gnostic redeemer myth (for which see especially Schnackenburg, *John*, 1.529-42), these are the main alternatives currently on offer.

³⁰ Cf. B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man* (London: SPCK, 1983): 145-55, especially 155.

³¹ In the case of the Son of Man sayings themselves, one remarkable common feature is the fact that only Jesus uses the phrase with reference to himself. John 12:34 is hardly an exception.

³² E.g. Mark 13:26//Matt. 24:30//Luke 21:27; Mark 14:62//Matt. 26:64//Luke 22:69. We are not at this point concerned with the much-debated question of the authenticity of these sayings.

Traces of this Danielic vision are in fact found by most commentators in the Johannine texts, for two main reasons. First, the Johannine Son of Man is clearly a *heavenly* man. Nathanael is promised a vision of heaven, in which he will see ‘the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man’ (1:51). The Son of Man is he who ‘descended from heaven’ (3:13), and who will ‘ascend to where he was before’ (6:62). He will be ‘lifted up’ (3:14; 8:28; 12:32), as a result of which his divine identity will become apparent (8:28), he will draw ‘all men’ to himself (12:32), and will give eternal life to those who believe in him (3:14; cf. 6:27, 53-54). In the light of this understanding of the origin, status and function of the Son of Man in John, which is consistently presented throughout the Gospel, it is unlikely that John peppered his narrative with references to the ‘Son of Man’ without regard for their contexts, or that he used the title simply to convey the idea that Jesus was just an ordinary man. It is much more likely that there is some connection with the ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel’s vision, who comes before God ‘with the clouds of heaven’ and is given ‘authority, glory and sovereign power’, such that his dominion is ‘everlasting’ (Daniel 7:13-14).³³

Secondly, the Johannine Son of Man is a man of *authority*. In 5:27 he has ‘authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man’. With this we may link 17:2, which follows a reference to the glorification of Jesus in 17:1 and asserts that Jesus has authority ‘over all flesh, to give eternal life’ to all whom the Father gives him. Thus, Jesus has authority to determine the ultimate destiny of all people. This clearly resonates with the authority given to the ‘Son of Man’ of Daniel 7:13-14, especially as the phrase υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου in John 5:27 is anarthrous, just as it is in the Greek versions of Daniel 7:13.³⁴ We may also note that the ‘Son of Man’ saying in 12:23 (cf. v. 34) is spoken in the context of the ‘Greeks’ request to see Jesus (vv. 20-22). The thrust of the passage is that the ‘glorification’ of Jesus as Son of Man is a necessary prerequisite for the Gentile mission – the drawing of ‘all

³³ Cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 131; Brown, *John*, 1.299; Carson, *John*, 164; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1.393-94. The Son of Man figure in 1 Enoch also has points of contact with the Johannine conception, but the date of 1 Enoch is uncertain.

³⁴ Cf. Barrett, *John*, 218; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 77; Brown, *John*, 1.215, 220; Carson, *John*, 257, 259. Even Lindars, who in his book *Jesus Son of Man* retreats somewhat from his earlier identification of the Johannine Son of Man with the Danielic figure in his commentary, still accepts the allusion to Dan. 7:13-14 in John 5:27 in this later work, 155.

men' to himself (v. 32)³⁵ – which resonates with the theme of the universal acknowledgement and dominion of the 'one like a son of man' following the bestowal of glory on him in Daniel 7:13-14.³⁶

In the light of this background, when Jesus says 'Now the Son of Man is glorified' in John 13:31, it is likely that there is an allusion to the fulfilment of the Danielic vision, especially if, as we have seen, the 'glorification' of the Johannine Son of Man includes not only his death on the cross but also his subsequent exaltation and return to the Father. This allusion is confirmed by the use of the word 'glorify', which corresponds to the 'glory' (כִּדְּוּר) which is given to the 'one like a son of man' in Daniel 7:14,³⁷ and the divine passive 'glorified', which identifies God as the giver of the glory, again as in Daniel 7:14.³⁸ We may speculate why John extended the idea of glory to include the cross. Perhaps he was influenced by Isaiah 52:13, as suggested above, or more generally by a synthesis of the figures of the Son of Man in Daniel and the Isaianic Servant of the Lord in the early Christian tradition. Or possibly he saw the idea of suffering in Daniel 7 itself, where the 'saints of the Most High', whom the 'one like a son of man' in some sense represents, suffer at the hands of the 'horn' before they are vindicated by 'the Ancient of Days' (Dan. 7:21-22, 25-27), and took the creative step of seeing their (and Jesus') 'glory' in their righteous suffering as well as in their subsequent vindication. Or, finally, John was perhaps influenced by his own reflections on some of Jesus' own teaching.³⁹ Whichever is the case, it seems highly likely that Daniel 7:13-14 forms at least part of the background for the 'glorification' of Jesus in John 13:31 (and therefore v. 32 also).

We therefore conclude these exegetical comments on John 13:31a by saying that Jesus is represented as saying here that, by returning to

³⁵ Cf. Barrett, *John*, 352; Brown, *John*, 1.475; Bultmann, *John*, 424; Schnackenburg, *John*, 2.382.

³⁶ The two themes are brought together in Matt. 28:18-20, where the claim to authority is followed by Jesus' commission to his disciples to evangelise the world.

³⁷ The fact that the Greek versions of Dan. 7:13-14 do not use the word δόξα or its cognates does not undermine this point: as I argued in my *Jesus and His 'Works': the Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1996): 58-83, it is quite likely that John was familiar with the Hebrew text of the OT and was influenced by it; in any case, the *motif* of glory is clearly present even in the Greek versions.

³⁸ The Danielic background for John 13:31-32 is mentioned explicitly by Barrett, *John*, 375, and Carson, *John*, 482.

³⁹ See further Section 4.4 below.

the Father by way of the cross, not only would his divine qualities revealed, but also that he would begin to fulfil the role of the ‘one like a son of man’ delineated in Daniel 7:13-14.

3.4 *The Final Clause of Verse 31: ἔδοξάσθη with God as Subject*

Traditionally, the word ἔδοξάσθη has been regarded as a true passive, but G. B. Caird has argued that it should be taken as an intransitive passive, and the clause translated: ‘God has revealed his glory in him’.⁴⁰

Certainly, Caird has succeeded in showing that the word could theoretically have this meaning. In the LXX the passive form of the verb δοξάζω is used to translate verbs which have an intransitive sense, including the niph'al of the verb כָּבַד, and analogies exist for the intransitive use of other verbs in the passive voice. But that does not necessarily mean that ἔδοξάσθη in John 13:31b must be an intransitive rather than a true passive. In fact, in view of the immediate context – in which ἔδοξάσθη is clearly a true passive in verse 31a, with God as the implied agent (a point confirmed by the statements in v. 32b and c, where God is the subject of the active δοξάσει) – the presumption must be that it is also a true passive in verse 31b, unless there are signs to the contrary. For Caird such a sign exists in the word ἐν, which he believes must be taken in a locative, rather than an instrumental sense. However, if this preposition should be taken in a predominantly instrumental sense, as argued below in 3:5, then this argument falls to the ground.

I conclude then that ἔδοξάσθη in verse 31b should be taken as a true passive, and translated ‘God is glorified in him’.

3.5 *The Meaning of the Preposition ἐν at the End of Verse 31*

The preposition ἐν is used three times in our saying: once in the final clause of verse 31; again when this clause is repeated in a conditional form at the beginning of verse 32; and a third time in the second clause of verse 32. In each case it is followed by αὐτῷ (though, as we have seen, it may carry a rough breathing in this third instance).⁴¹ In the circumstances, it is antecedently likely that the preposition bears the

⁴⁰ G. B. Caird, ‘The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics’, *NTS* 15 (1968-69): 265-77. His view is accepted by Lindars, *John*, 462, but resisted by Brown, *John*, 2.606; Carson, *John*, 482; and Schnackenburg, *John*, 3.51.

⁴¹ See n. 9 above.

same meaning in each case. It is obviously important that we should define as closely as we can what that meaning is.

Liddell and Scott give four principle uses of the preposition ἐν: (1) to denote place; (2) to denote state, condition, or position; (3) to denote instrument, means, or manner; and (4) to denote time.⁴² The same uses are broadly found in the New Testament as in classical Greek.⁴³

As far as our text is concerned, only two of these uses are likely: the locative and the instrumental. Many commentators think that in each occurrence of the preposition ἐν in 13:31-32, it should be translated 'in' and understood in a locative sense.⁴⁴ However, Bultmann takes it in the instrumental sense,⁴⁵ and Brown believes that it is ambiguous and carries both local and instrumental meanings at the same time.⁴⁶ So, once again, we encounter a divergence of opinion.

In the light of what has already been said about the fundamental meaning of the verb δοξάζω as including the idea of revelation in John, a predominantly instrumental meaning would seem to be a preferable way of understanding the use of ἐν in these cases. If the thought that God and the 'Son of Man' are 'glorified' includes the thought that they are revealed for who they are, then to say that they are 'glorified in' one another surely implies that the revelation is made to others *through* one another as medial agents.

This conclusion is resisted by Caird on two grounds: first, that the moment at which the glory spoken here was appreciated lay beyond that designated by the 'now' of verse 31; and secondly, that John does not use ἐν of personal agency elsewhere.⁴⁷ However, both these points can be countered.

As we have already argued, the 'now' of verse 31 includes the resurrection and ascension of Jesus as well as his death, and therefore includes the time of revelation to the disciples. On Easter Day they 'saw the Lord' and 'were glad' (20:20). Thomas, a week later, confes-

⁴² Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 551-52

⁴³ Abbott-Smith, *Greek Lexicon*, 150-51

⁴⁴ E.g. Barrett, *John*, 376; G. B. Caird, 'Glory of God', 265-277; Carson, *John*, 483; Lindars, *John*, 462; Schnackenburg, *John*, 3.51; Westcott, *John*, 197.

⁴⁵ Bultmann, *John*, 523 n.7.

⁴⁶ Brown, *John*, 2.606, reflecting the ambiguity of the Hebrew preposition בְּ. This general approach has the support of A. Oepke in *TDNT*, 2.538, who writes of the use of ἐν with the personal dative: 'The spatial sense is always the starting point, but we have to ask how far there is an intermingling with other senses, especially the instrumental.'

⁴⁷ Caird, 'Glory of God', 270-71

sed Jesus as 'Lord and God' (20:28). The glory of God made known through Christ was seen within the period of time designated by the 'now' of 13:31. Even if the 'now' of verse 31 is confined to the death of Christ, we may still say that the glory of God made known through Christ was (in theory) visible to the eyes of faith.

As for the comment that *ἐν* is not used of personal agency in John's Gospel, we may cite the following counter-examples:

He who does what is true comes to the light, that it may be clearly seen that his deeds have been wrought in (*ἐν*) God. (3:21)

John is speaking about those who are destined for salvation and who already experience God's prevenient grace prior to their 'coming to the light'. Their deeds are thus 'wrought in God'. It is difficult not to see a reference to personal agency here. As Carson puts it (citing Westcott in support): 'All that has been ... done "through God" – "in union with Him, and therefore by His power"''.⁴⁸

Whatever you ask in my name, I will do it, that the Father may be glorified in (*ἐν*) the Son. (14:13)

The natural way to take these words is that the Father will be glorified whenever prayers offered in the name of his Son are granted, and therefore will be glorified through his Son. Many commentators see this verse as an illustration of the way in which Jesus throughout his life sought to glorify the Father.⁴⁹ But if the Son glorifies the Father, then the Father is glorified by or through the Son – which is precisely what is being affirmed here in 14:13.

All mine are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in (*ἐν*) them. (17:10)

In this 'high priestly' prayer for his disciples, Jesus says that he has been (perfect tense) and still is glorified 'in' the disciples. As Bultmann notes (citing Schlatter): 'It is in the disciples that one can see what Jesus is'.⁵⁰ But if this is so, then the glory of Jesus is being revealed through the disciples. Even C. K. Barrett is here forced to acknowledge that perhaps *ἐν* is being used instrumentally here as well as locatively,

⁴⁸ Carson, *John*, 208; cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 44: 'his acts are performed through God'.

⁴⁹ Barrett, *John*, 384; Brown, *John*, 2.636; Bultmann, *John*, 611; Carson, *John*, 497; Schnackenburg, *John*, 3.72.

⁵⁰ Bultmann, *John*, 501.

since, as 17:11 shows, Jesus ‘will be glorified by their faithful fulfilment of their mission’.⁵¹

We may conclude, then, that John can and does use ἐν in an instrumental sense to denote personal medial agency,⁵² and that this usage fits the context of 13:31-32, and particularly the idea of revelation implicit in the word δοξάζω. However much the locative idea may linger in the background, the instrumental meaning is likelier as the predominant meaning of the preposition. We therefore understand the final clause of verse 31 to mean that (in and) through Jesus’ glorification God’s own glory is revealed.

3.6 *The Event Referred to by the Future Verbs in Verse 32*

We now come to verse 32. The opening clause repeats the last clause of verse 31, except that it is made into a conditional clause and prefixed with εἰ. The significance of this εἰ will be taken into account in what follows. The clause is succeeded by the final words of our text: ‘God will also glorify him in himself and glorify him at once.’ We will devote special attention to the phrase ἐν αὐτῷ in 3:7 below. Our main focus in this section will be on the future tenses of these clauses and the word εὐθύς (translated ‘at once’).

At first sight, the futures of verse 32 appear to refer to a ‘glorification’ of Jesus which follows the ‘glorification’ of Jesus (and God) in verse 31. After all, the future tense normally differs from the aorist tense in its time-reference, and εὐθύς normally refers to the future (even if the imminent future),⁵³ whereas νῦν normally refers to the present.⁵⁴ Moreover, the clauses in question appear parallel to the thought of 17:5, which seems to refer not to the cross at all, but exclusively to the future, heavenly exaltation of Jesus.

Accordingly, some commentators have sought to make a distinction between the event referred to in verse 31 and that referred to in verse 32. Barrett, Higgins, Lindars, and Thüsing, for example, are among those who, under the influence of 17:5, see verse 31 as principally referring to the cross, but verse 32 as referring to Jesus’ exaltation to

⁵¹ Barrett, *John*, 423.

⁵² As do other New Testament authors, cf. Matt. 9:34, Mark 3:22//Matt. 12:24//Luke 11:15; Acts 17:31; Rom. 3:24; 1 Cor. 6:2; 7:14; Col. 1:16 (first occurrence).

⁵³ Cf. 13:30; 19:34 for εὐθύς, and 5:9; 6:21; 18:27 for the synonymous εὐθέως.

⁵⁴ See Section 3.1.1 above.

pre-temporal glory.⁵⁵ Sanders and Mastin likewise see a difference in the events referred to, only for them verse 31 refers to the foot-washing and verse 32 refers to the cross.

However, the position that two different events are referred to in verse 31-32 is by no means unassailable:

(1) We have already seen that the aorist tense can refer to the future as well as other times, or even no particular time,⁵⁶ and have argued that in fact in verse 31 the aorist does refer to the future from Jesus' point of view, in that it refers to his imminent death, resurrection and ascension.⁵⁷ It could be, then, that the future δοξάσει in verse 32 merely draws out the temporal significance of the aorists of verse 31, which in themselves point to the certainty of coming 'glorification' of the Son of Man.⁵⁸

(2) We have also seen that while the word νῦν normally refers to the present time from the point of view of the speaker, this is not always the case.⁵⁹ The case of 12:31 is particularly instructive, where Jesus uses the word νῦν to refer to a future event when he says: 'Now (νῦν) shall the ruler of this world be cast out.' This statement follows another which uses the same word with the present tense to refer to a simultaneous event in the future: 'Now (νῦν) is the judgement of this world.' Perhaps therefore the νῦν of 13:31 refers to something which is imminent rather than actually present, and the εὐθύς of verse 32 draws this out, even as the future δοξάσει draws out the temporal significance of ἐδόξασθη.

⁵⁵ Barrett, *John*, 376; Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, 180; Lindars, *John*, 462; W. Thüsing, *Johannesevangelium*, 233-39. Brown, *John*, 2.610, takes the same position. He does the same again on 1.476, where he draws a parallel with 12:28. However, this parallel is not convincing, since in this latter verse it is the Father's glory which is in view, and even if it be argued (as is done by Brown) that John is thinking of the Father being glorified through the Son, the word ἐδόξασα in 12:28 may still refer to Jesus' ministry rather than his passion and exaltation, which would be required for the parallel to work. Moreover, Brown's note in 2.610 in any case appears to contradict his note in 2.606, where he says that the εὐθύς of v. 32 includes the passion as well as the resurrection and ascension.

⁵⁶ See Section 3.1.2 above.

⁵⁷ See Section 3.1 as a whole.

⁵⁸ In this connection it is interesting to note that Brown himself, commenting on 14:17 in 2.640, thinks it possible that the future ἔσται emphasises the 'proleptic quality of the two preceding verbs', which is precisely what is being argued here with reference to the future tenses of 13:32.

⁵⁹ See Section 3.1.1 above.

(3) A rough parallel with 17:5 may be acknowledged, but if we accept the position already argued for, that the climactic ‘glorification’ of Jesus in John’s Gospel refers to Jesus’ death, resurrection and ascension, or his going to the Father by way of the cross, seen as *one* event, then we may see this single event being referred to in each of 13:31, 32, and 17:5. The fact that the cross is not explicitly referred to in 17:5 does not mean that it is not presupposed as part of the single process whereby Jesus is ‘glorified’.

Two further considerations may be added to the arguments already adduced to give positive support for the view that 13:32 refers to the same event as 13:31:

(4) It is universally acknowledged within Johannine scholarship that John loves to employ small stylistic variations while seeking to make the same essential point. His change of tenses between verse 31 and verse 32, and his use of εὐθὺς in verse 32 instead of another use of νῦν, cohere perfectly with this tendency.

(5) The view that verse 32 refers to the same event as verse 31 has the advantage of simplicity: it allows us to give all the references to Jesus’ climactic ‘glorification’, listed in section 3.1.3 above, the same reference point. If John had intended to particularise different moments of ‘glorification’ within this single ‘hour’, we would have expected him to make his meaning clearer.

I conclude, therefore, that in verse 32 Jesus is referring, as in verse 31, to the single climactic event of glorification which includes his death, resurrection and ascension.⁶⁰ Jesus is represented as saying, in effect, that if God is (i.e. is about to be) glorified through him (i.e. through his death, resurrection and ascension), then he will glorify him ... immediately (i.e. through his death, resurrection and ascension). The implication is that God will glorify Jesus because he himself will be glorified thereby.

In the paraphrase of verse 32 just given, one clause has been omitted, ‘God will also glorify him in himself.’ It is now time to give our attention to this clause.

⁶⁰ The view of Beasley-Murray, *John*, 246; Carson, *John*, 483, 486-87; and R. Michaels, *John* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989): 239, 241. Bultmann, *John*, 524, sees the two verses as referring to the same event, but for him the event is the cross rather than the whole process which includes the resurrection and ascension as well.

3.7 *The Meaning of the Second Occurrence of the Phrase ἐν αὐτῷ in Verse 32*

We will take together the two questions that were posed above in the introduction on this phrase, namely the identity of the person referred to by the pronoun αὐτῷ, and the meaning of the phrase as a whole.

The vast majority of commentators are agreed that the reference is to God.⁶¹ As Michaels puts it: 'To say that he [God] glorifies the Son in the Son makes no sense.' At least, it is difficult to see what it might mean. We take it, then, that the clause in which this phrase is found means that God will glorify Jesus 'in' God himself.

As far as the word 'in' (ἐν) is concerned, we have already argued that in verse 31 (and by implication verse 32a) the word ἐν should be understood predominantly in an instrumental sense, and may be best translated 'through'. In view of the parallelism of these clauses, it is highly likely, unless there are compelling reasons for taking an alternative view, that the preposition has the same meaning here. Since such compelling reasons are absent, we take the clause to mean that God will glorify Jesus through himself, i.e. by his own power.⁶² This understanding fits in well with the main thrust of verse 32 as a whole, which stresses the immediacy of God's action in bringing about the glorification of Jesus.

We may therefore propose the following interpretation of 13:31-32: by going to the Father by way of the cross, Jesus' divine qualities will be revealed and he will begin to fulfil the role of 'the one like a son of man' as described in Daniel 7:13-14. Moreover, God's own divine qualities will be revealed through him in the event. Because this is so, God will bring it about by his own power, and do so immediately.

⁶¹ Barrett, *John*, 376; Brown, *John*, 2.606; Carson, *John*, 483; Lenski, *Interpretation*, 957; R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1956); Lincoln, *John*, 387; Lindars, *John*, 462; Michaels, *John* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1989): 241; Schnackenburg, *John*, 3.49.

⁶² We therefore follow Bultmann once again at this point, rather than the scholars listed in n. 44 above who understand the preposition locatively in both v. 31 and v. 32, and Michaels, *John*, 239, who understands the preposition in v. 32 to mean 'in relation to himself'.

4. The Historical Question

4.1 Introduction

Having elucidated as best we can the meaning of the words attributed to Jesus in John 13:31-32, we turn finally to the question of their relationship with the historical Jesus.

It may seem that there is no connection at all, since the language and style seems so Johannine.⁶³ Yet there is more to be said. We must remember that John, while occasionally transmitting sayings which have all the hallmarks of authenticity (taking that word in a strict sense), also had a tendency of recasting authentic motifs of Jesus' original teaching in new forms, often retaining much of the essence of that original teaching in the process.⁶⁴ We must therefore ask whether there are motifs in John 13:31-32 that correspond with any found in Synoptic sayings, which in turn may reliably be attributed to the historical Jesus. To this question there are some surprisingly positive answers, which may now be unfolded under four headings.

4.2 Jesus' Passion Predictions

Let us begin with the three passion predictions found in the Synoptic tradition in which Jesus foretells his coming death and resurrection and refers to himself as the 'Son of Man' (Mark 8:31//Matt. 16:21//Luke 9:22; Mark 9:31//Matt. 17:22-23//Luke 9:44; and Mark 10:33-34//Matt. 20:18-19//Luke 18:31; cf. also Luke 17:25; 24:6-7, 44-46). Despite the variations between the evangelists, few doubt that there is an authentic core to these sayings, and that the historical Jesus did prophesy in some way of his forthcoming death and subsequent vindication.⁶⁵ If this is so, then there is clear overlap between these

⁶³ The comment of Schnackenburg, *John*, 3.52, is typical of many: 'These ... lines are a typically Johannine logion, composed by the evangelist himself.'

⁶⁴ See P. W. Ensor, *Jesus and His 'Works'*, especially chapters 3, 9, and 10 for an exposition of this theme, with examples.

⁶⁵ Matthew and Luke's reference to the 'third day' may be an *ex eventu* sharpening up of Mark's 'after three days', which itself may be a proverbial expression for 'after a short interval'. As V. Taylor puts it in *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (London and Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1966): 378, 'It is best to infer that He did speak of rising again and exaltation, but in terms less explicit than those of [Mk.] viii.31 and parallel passages.'

predictions and that of John 13:31, when Jesus says, 'Now the Son of Man is glorified.'⁶⁶

4.3 *Jesus as Son of Man*

But did Jesus see himself as fulfilling the role of the 'one like a son of man' as described in Daniel 7:13-14? This is a notoriously difficult question, over which there has been much debate and little agreement in modern scholarship.⁶⁷ Clearly the Synoptic evangelists present him as such (cf. e.g. Mark 13:26//Matt. 24:30//Luke 21:27; Mark 14:62//Matt. 26:64//Luke 22:69), but the authenticity of the Synoptic material is disputed at this point. Nothing said here can settle this question. However, it would be appropriate in this context to throw one particular passage into the balance in favour of the view that Jesus did regard himself as fulfilling this role, not only because it sheds light on this question, but also because it occurs, like John 13:31-32, within the context of the Last Supper narrative. I refer to Luke 22:29-30, where Jesus is reported to have said: 'I confer on you, just as my Father has conferred on me, a kingdom, so that you may eat and drink at my table, and you will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.'

There are considerable grounds for regarding this saying as, to a very high degree, authentic. The parallel with Matthew 19:28 suggests a common basis in Q, yet, in view of the Matthean catchword ἀκολουθεῖν, the Hellenistic παλιγγενεσία, and the possibly redactional 'Son of Man' title itself at this point, the Lukan version seems more original. The reference to God as 'my Father', the use of the word 'kingdom', and reference to 'eating and drinking at my table' (cf. Mark 14:25//Matt. 26:29//Luke 22:18) cohere well with what we know of the historical Jesus, and the authenticity of the final part of verse 30 is supported by the consideration that it is unlikely that a later Christian would have created a saying which suggested that Judas would be sitting on a throne as a judge of Israel. The christological claim implicit in the saying distances it from Jesus' Jewish background, yet at the same time this was not the sort of language the early church used to develop its understanding of Jesus, so the criterion of double

⁶⁶ Lindars argues strongly in *Jesus Son of Man* (see n. 29 above) that these Synoptic passion predictions stand behind John 3:14, which he regards as fundamental to all the other 'Son of Man' sayings in John.

⁶⁷ See D. Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999) for a survey of the literature and a statement of the extent of continuing uncertainties.

dissimilarity is fulfilled. Moreover the language is not particularly Lucan. Thus, the likelihood that this is a genuine saying of Jesus is very high.⁶⁸

The important point to note about this saying is that, even though Jesus does not refer to himself as ‘Son of Man’, there is a strong likelihood that his words reflect a belief that he was fulfilling the role of the ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel 7:13-14, who represents the ‘holy ones of the Most High’ and is given ‘kingship, that all peoples, nations and languages should serve him’, all in a context in which ‘thrones were set in place’ (7:9) alongside that of the ‘Ancient One’, and in which the ‘holy ones of the Most High’ are said to be given ‘judgement’.⁶⁹ C. F. D. Moule finds Luke 22:28-30 ‘irresistibly reminiscent of Daniel 7:9ff.’⁷⁰ Thus, even though Matthew’s reference to the ‘Son of Man’ at this point may be redactional, it may nevertheless draw out the intended meaning of Jesus’ original statement as transmitted by Q.

We have, then, a probably authentic saying of Jesus in the Last Supper narrative of Luke in which Jesus implicitly sees himself as fulfilling the role of the ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel 7:13-14 – precisely the motif which we have discovered in John 13:31-32.

Could it have been said at the Last Supper itself? This is not at all impossible. The saying is a kind of testamentary disposition. In fact, these may have been the final words of Q itself. If so, John 13:31-32 may even contain a faint echo of these words, cast into the Johannine idiom. This possibility is supported by the fact that much of the surrounding material has parallel material, of a sort, in Luke. Thus the teaching about humble service in John 13:12-17 echoes Luke 22:24-27; the prophecy of Judas’ betrayal in John 13:21-30 echoes Luke 22:22-23; the prophecy of Peter’s denial in John 13:36-38 echoes Luke 22:31-34; the exhortation to mutual love in John 13:34-35 may even be an

⁶⁸ For arguments in support of the authenticity of Luke 22:29-30 see especially J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (London: SCM, 1975): 36; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1978): 815; B. Witherington, *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990): 140; G. Theissen and A. Merz assume the saying’s authenticity in *The Historical Jesus* (London: SCM, 1998): 467.

⁶⁹ Dan. 7.22. The MT probably means that judgment was given ‘for’ the saints, but the Hebrew preposition ל can also mean ‘to’ and it was taken thus by the LXX translator, and by the writer of Rev. 20.4, so this meaning could well underlie Luke 22:29-30 also.

⁷⁰ C. F. D. Moule, *The Origin of Christology* (Cambridge: CUP, 1977): 21.

echo of the exhortation directed originally to Peter in Luke 22:32. It is not impossible, therefore, that John 13:31-32 has its roots in something Jesus actually said on the occasion of the Last Supper itself.

4.4 *Jesus as Glorified through His Death*

We have argued in the exegetical section above that the ‘glorification’ of Jesus in John 13:31-32 refers to his death and exaltation seen as a single event. As has often been pointed out, though Jesus is associated with δόξα (understood as divine glory) in the Synoptic Gospels with reference to his parousia (Mark 8:38//Matt. 16:27//Luke 9:26; Mark 13:26//Matt. 24:30//Luke 21:27; Matt. 25:31), or his future kingdom generally (Mark 10:37; Matt. 19:28; Luke 24:26), or his transfiguration (Luke 9:32), nowhere is this association made with reference to his passion. Attempts have often been made to locate the source of this association, the most frequent being that John has been influenced by the preface to the sufferings of the servant of the Lord in Isaiah 53, which says that he would be ‘exalted and lifted up’ (Isa. 52:13, LXX ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται).⁷¹ This suggestion gains credibility when we remember the fact, already noted, that John uses the verb ὑψώω of the death and exaltation of Jesus as well as the verb δοξάζω.⁷² Moreover, if Jesus saw himself as fulfilling the role of the suffering servant of Isaiah 53, he would no doubt have accepted Isaiah 52:13 as also applying to himself. However, the question remains whether there was anything more in the Jesus tradition which might have encouraged John to view the death of Jesus in this way.

The answer is that there is, and it is found in Mark 10:35-45//Matthew 20:20-28. The story has many signs of authenticity, not least in the fact that it shows up the disciples in a very poor light as selfish status seekers, and also in Jesus’ assertion in Mark 10:40//Matthew 20:23 that it is not for him to assign seats in his kingdom – not the kind of material which would have been created *ex nihilo* by an early Christian in the post-Pentecost period.⁷³ In Mark 10:35-45 James and John ask for special seats in Jesus’ ‘glory’ (Matt. 20:20-28 has their mother asking for special seats for them in his ‘kingdom’). Jesus’ reply

⁷¹ See under 3.3 above.

⁷² See under 3.1.3 and n. 14 above.

⁷³ See Taylor, *Mark*, 439 for 10:35-40. 10:42-44, even if appended here by Mark, is paralleled in Luke 22:24-27, and is likely to contain an authentic core, cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 811.

implies that the road to glory passes through suffering – drinking its cup, and being baptised with its baptism (Mark 10:38-39//Matt. 20:22-23) – and that true greatness lies in the way of humble service (Mark 10:42-45//Matt. 20:25-28//Luke 22:25-27). While it remains true that the concept of glory in this passage is associated with the future exaltation of Jesus, there are grounds for believing that Jesus viewed earthly suffering and earthly service as an essential prelude to the attainment of that glory, and a form of ‘glory’ in their own right as the equivalent in kingdom-of-God terms of the kind of status earthly rulers and other such powerful men seek. Thus, as D. Hill has argued, the Johannine δόξα theme may be a product of John’s reflection on this story.⁷⁴

4.5 *God as Glorified through Jesus*

So far we have seen that the historical Jesus probably foresaw his coming death and vindication, pictured himself as fulfilling the role of the ‘one like a son of man’ in Daniel 7:13-14, and possibly also saw his death as well as his vindication as a form of ‘glorification’. We now note further that he probably believed that through his life and ministry God himself was being glorified.

The evidence for this may be found in the first petition of the Lord’s Prayer, whose authenticity is rarely questioned: ‘Hallowed be your name’ (Matt. 6:9//Luke 11:2). It is generally agreed that God’s name stands for God himself. There is less agreement over whether or not the passive ‘hallowed’ is a ‘divine passive’,⁷⁵ but ultimately it makes little difference. If it is a divine passive, Jesus is praying that God may hallow himself (with the result that people in turn may hallow him); if not, Jesus is praying that God may be hallowed by people (the very fact that this a matter to be prayed for implying that God must take the initiative for this to happen). In both cases, God acts and people respond to his action. The result is that God is hallowed.

⁷⁴ D. Hill, ‘The Request of Zebedee’s Sons and the Johannine ΔΟΞΑ – Theme’ in *NTS* 13 (1966-7): 281-5.

⁷⁵ Cf. W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988): 1.602; J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2003): 546-47; D. A. Hagner, *Matthew 1-13* (Dallas: Word Books, 1993): 148.

The first petition of the Lord's Prayer must be taken in conjunction with the second petition: 'Your kingdom come.' They are in parallel,⁷⁶ and have the same import.⁷⁷ When God's name is 'hallowed', his kingdom will come and vice versa. Each implies the other. Now if Jesus believed that through his life and ministry God's kingdom was already in operation (cf. Matt. 12:28//Luke 11:20), then it follows that he also believed that through his life and ministry God's name (i.e. God himself) was being hallowed. Such a notion overlaps considerably with that of God being glorified, since both imply the revelation of God for who he is – his true self.⁷⁸

The upshot of our argument, then, is that the words 'in him God is glorified' in John 13:31 reflect a motif which may reliably be attributed to Jesus. John 13:32, as explained above, merely adds the thought that God's decision to 'glorify' Jesus immediately, by his own power, through his death and subsequent exaltation, is grounded in the fact that Jesus has indeed been the means by which God himself has been 'glorified'. That God 'glorifies those who glorify him' (1 Sam. 2:30 MT אֲכַבֵּד אֶכְבֹּד, LXX τοὺς δοξάζοντάς με δοξάσω) was a principle which no Jew, including Jesus, would have disputed.

We may see, therefore, that in this apparently Johannine formulation there is a considerable degree of coherence with what we may know of Jesus from other sources. Though the wording and construction reflects John's distinctive style, the essential ideas contained within this saying, as explained above, may well be true to the historical Jesus, and may even have been expressed on the night on which he was betrayed.

⁷⁶ As they are in the Jewish Kaddish prayer, which Jesus would have heard at the end of every synagogue service, and of which they may be an echo: 'Exalted and hallowed be his great name ... may he let his kingdom rule.' The third petition in Matthew's version, 'Your will be done ...', is also in parallel with the first two, but its omission from the Lukan version (Luke 11:2) casts doubt on whether it was original to Jesus' own prayer.

⁷⁷ For Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 148, the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer refer 'essentially to the same salvation-historical reality'.

⁷⁸ Notice, for example, how these verbs are used in parallel in Lev. 10:3: 'I will show myself holy (אֲכַבֵּד) among those who are near me, and before all the people I will be glorified (אֶכְבֹּד).' It is noteworthy in this connection that J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (London: SCM, 1971): 198, interprets the first petition of the Lord's Prayer to refer to 'the coming of the hour when God's *glory* become [sic] visible'. Similarly, Marshall, *Luke*, 457, says that the first petition prays for 'the establishment of God's *glory*' (my italics).