This paper seeks to interpret the Gospel of John in light of new innovations: utilizing the prologue to interpret the body of the gospel, seeking a theological background for Jesus’ ἐγώ εἰμί statements, and viewing Jesus’ farewell discourses in light of liberation theology. John 14:1-14 challenges us to look beyond our present circumstances to the God that does not change, by presenting a discourse on the unity of the Triune God who is incarnate in Jesus Christ. By seeking to ground this passage in its literary context, the significance of the tribulation that Jesus and his disciples are currently experiencing clearly becomes the primary lens that proper interpretation and application of John 14:1-14 must proceed through.

I would assume it might be considered unwise to start an exegetical paper with lyrics from a song not many people know by a band that people thought stopped making music ten years ago; however, starting an exegetical paper in the middle of a dialogue is also potentially unwise, but personally I blame whatever scribe or scholar provided the modern chapter divisions. “Do not let your hearts be troubled.” Well, okay Jesus, but I just started reading this chapter here, so why shouldn’t I let my heart be troubled. Well, effectively, because Jesus in the preceding chapter has been telling his disciples that he’s been watching the skies, and there is a storm up ahead, and in this storm there will be many casualties – for even Peter will fall away, yet there is hope. Starting with the almost enigmatic statement in verse 1, Jesus lays out a way for us, as believers, to bravely face the storm saying, “Hello Hurricane, you’re not enough. Hello Hurricane… I’ve got my doors and windows boarded up. All your dead end fury is not enough, You can’t silence my love.”
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asked by the disciples, and brought to a climax in the proclamation that the one who believes in me will do works greater than these (v. 12).

As we begin to look at the text, the literary background and genre of the text must be established in order for the passage to be properly understood. John 14 sits in what is known as the Book of Glory in the Gospel of John, a division noted by scholars as the focus of the story shifts from the performing of miracles in the first 12 chapters to the glorification of the Son on the cross. As we look closer, we see that this passage sits in the middle of the first of two farewell discourses. As Köstenberger notes, the actual farewell discourse genre presented in John does not neatly fit the assumed genre of Second Temple farewells. Thus, the true genre of the Johannine farewells may not be fashioned off of the surrounding Second Temple material, but rather off of “patriarchal blessings and Moses’ final words in Deuteronomy.”

This, however, will not be good enough as one of the most important differences is brought out heavily in 14:1-14, namely the fact that Jesus’ farewell is not portrayed as final, rather only a temporary preparation for the 3 days that Jesus spends in the grave. Thus, I propose for the purpose of studying 14:1-14 simply understanding it as a dialogue between teacher and student. This understanding allows for the natural flow from topic to topic to be fully seen as question begets a deeper revelation of previous truths. Furthermore, due to the structure of the Gospel of John as a whole, the prologue (1:1-18) and the purpose statement (20:31) will frequently be utilized to inform our understanding of the text. With a basis for understanding the passage, we now turn to the text.

_John 14:1-3 – Threatened with Resurrection_

1 Do not let your hearts be troubled; you [already] believe in God, believe also in me. 2 In my Father’s house are many rooms, otherwise, would I have told you that I am going to prepare a place for you? 3 And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you to myself, so that where I am, also you will be.

Beginning in v. 1 we have a simple exhortation to not allow our hearts to be troubled, even by the very troubling news Jesus has just revealed to the disciples. In chapter 13 we have what Köstenberger describes as “the cleansing” of the disciples. This is both literal – as Jesus washes the feet of the disciples – and metaphorical – as he sends Judas off to commit his betrayal, and he foretells Peter’s abandonment in spite of the protest that he is willing to go with Jesus unto death. In light of this, how could one’s heart not be troubled? Yet, Jesus’ answer is elegantly simple, “you already believe in God, believe also in me.” This statement introduces the motif of the essential unity and radical equality of the Father and the Jesus, shown through its chiasmic structure centering on the conjunction.

Here, however, a problem is reached in the fact that the form of the imperative and that of the indicative, πιστεύετε, is identical. The debate as to what is intended here stretches back centuries to the Church Fathers, many of whom differ in opinion. I here follow Welch who argues, “If we accept the imperative… we must assume that the disciples had slipped back very far indeed, for the Jew who believed the testimony of the law and prophets, yet who was in ignorance of the revelation of Christ, would still “believe God.”

When the emphasis on the καί is seen and translated emphatically as “also,” along with the indicative to imperatival switch, the statement of Jesus can be fully appreciated as a demand for an equivalent faith in God and himself. If this is the solution to the trouble of our hearts, the only logical question is why? What is it about faith in Jesus that will give us peace, regardless of our ἔρροι? (v. 7)

The answer is provided in v. 2, “my Father’s house has many rooms… and if I go and prepare a place for
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you, I will come again and receive you to myself, so that where I am, you will be also.” To the disciples, talk like this is utter foolishness, and as will be seen shortly, they do not comprehend the dimension that Jesus is speaking in. Much earlier in the story, Jesus calls the temple in Jerusalem “my Father’s house” (2:16); which, depending on the understanding of the chronology of John when combined with the Synoptic account, could have even been earlier the same week. However, Jesus had just revealed to the disciples what he had said to the Jews earlier while speaking in the temple courts (8:21), “where I am going, you cannot come” (13:33). Thus, the temple must not be in view here. As readers who have the whole gospel in mind, it is clear that this is a reference to the resurrected life, when we will be received into (παραλήμψομαι) heaven. Here in v. 3, John utilizes a third class conditional sentence, one that carries the weight of something that has uncertain fulfillment, but is still likely. Yet, here Jesus uses a futuristic present and a simple future verb here, thus indicating simply grammatically “a more probable future occurrence.” Theologically speaking, however, considering that it is someone who is equal with God (1:1-2, 14:1), it should be taken as a guaranteed fulfillment of the protasis because of the certain fulfillment of the apodosis. This grounds the exhortation to not let our hearts be troubled, for the future promise of our resurrection is guaranteed through the action of Christ on the cross.

This understanding is most clearly articulated by many of the Church Fathers, who were not willing to understand the preparation of Jesus as literal preparation of a place for us in heaven, but rather understood it as referencing the preparation of the ὀδὸς by which we might get to heaven. Although this does provide valuable insights into the text, keeping an eye on the greater literary context of the passage being some form of farewell discourse, and understanding the clear vantage point of the text as constantly looking forward towards what is coming on the cross, it should be noted that the dual repetition of ἔτοιμας τοπός should not be confused with a preparation of the way. Rather, the image of τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ πατρός μου μοναὶ πολλαὶ εἶσον is most reminiscent of the ancient world practice of a ma building a house on to his father’s estate when he is ready to take a wife. Thus, here it may very well be a presentation of Jesus preparing a place for his bride, the Church. It becomes more interesting when it is realized that the word μονή is only used one other time in the NT, in 14:23 as Jesus and the Father are said to make their dwelling (μονῆν) in and with the one who loves Jesus and keeps his commandment. In Revelation 21:22 John does not see a temple in the New Jerusalem, but rather the Father and the Son are (ἐστίν) the temple – my Father’s house in John – and all who believe in Jesus are given a place in this New Jerusalem as the collective bride of Christ. Therefore, although it is clear that Jesus is preparing a way for his bride to come to him through his cross, the marital metaphor of v. 2-3 should not be discounted as it offers a new insight into the love that Jesus has for his own.

This promised resurrection should not primarily be taken as a free pass to comfortably sit around and wait for death, as many modern Americans seem to believe. The very nature of the resurrection is that it can only be seen or grasped by faith, thus in the moments where this is our greatest ally, it is also our most powerful foe. Emmanuel Katongole develops this utterly contradictory understanding of the promised resurrection through the use of a poem by Julia Esquivel. “There is something here with us which doesn’t let us sleep, which doesn’t let us rest, which doesn’t stop pounding deep inside… What keeps us from sleeping is that they have threatened us with Resurrection.” To an American, one cannot be threatened with resurrection, for resurrection is a joyous and momentous occasion, especially to many of us who have not experienced death in a personal way. For myself, death is but an abstract reality, touching people that I know only through multiple degrees of separation, and in this sense, resurrection is as abstract and meaningless as death is.

For Katongole, and much of the rest of the world,
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however, death is a day-to-day reality, and in light of this he explicates this poem using the stories of martyrs, a reality not at all distant from the disciples in John 14. Speaking on the poem, Katongole notes the fear of the killers not because of the violence or death that they bring, but “because they test our convictions about resurrection…” and that “we fear the innocent victims of the killers… we fear them because they call us to follow them.” Then as he begins to discuss actual stories of martyrs, he hits on the true purpose of this promise of resurrection, the one seen here in John, as a gift from God that defines the telos of the Christian life – resistance in the face of the evil powers of the world. “Without a clear sense of the gift toward which one’s life is directed, resistance can be a form of reckless self-sacrifice or mere expression of radical fundamentalism.” This resistance is most clearly seen in the sacrifice of their life, however the point of the martyr’s story is not to embolden us towards death, but to wake us up to a life fully lived in the daily practices of peacefulness and grace, even mundane repetition of pious attitudes that shape our lives into martyrs who are willingly sacrificed and resurrected for the glory of God on a daily basis. The combination of this promise of resurrection with the subsequent power of the divine self-revelation in v. 4-11 will empower us for the greater works which we are called to in the last section of this passage.

John 14:4-11 – The Self-Revelation of God

“‘And where I am going you know the way.’
5 Thomas said to him, ‘Lord, we do not know where you are going; how are we able to know the way?’
6 Jesus said to him, ‘I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life; no one comes to the Father except through me. 7 If you know me, you also know my Father. And from now on you know him and have seen him.’
8 Philip said to him, ‘Lord, show us the Father, and that will be sufficient for us.’
9 Jesus said to him, ‘After all this time I have spent with you, yet you still do not know me, Philip? The one who has seen me has seen the Father. How do you say, “show us the Father?”
10 Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me? The words, which I have said to you, I do not say from myself, but the Father abides in me doing his works. 11 Believe in me because I am in the Father and the Father is in me; but if this is not enough for you, believe on account of the works themselves.’

If our hope in resurrection is based on Jesus “coming and receiving us to himself,” why is it necessary that we know the way? Furthermore, if Jesus is going to a place where we cannot come (13:33), how could we know the way? Thomas asks this question, illuminating the two-leveled dialogue of Jesus in the Gospel of John, which elucidates the deep irony in the situation that even after such time with Jesus, the disciples are still not fully aware of Jesus’ true nature. Although this is true, I choose to have more sympathy with Thomas as ὁ ὁδός has only appeared once before this dialogue in the gospel of John, used in a quotation of Isaiah by the Baptist declaring his purpose to make straight the way of the Lord. This also gets to a deeper irony in Jesus’ self-description, as it is not man who makes straight the way of the Lord, but the Lord who becomes the Way for man. This statement of ἐγώ εἰμί should not, however, be immediately understood as divine self-revelation in the Deutero-Isaiah tradition as a translation of ani hu, the way that the instance in 8:58 clearly is. Rather, this instance can be understood as divine self-revelation, but not on a grammatical basis, but on the images which Jesus utilizes here, namely life, and truth.

The first instances of life and truth are both found in the prologue and are tightly bound to the divine nature of the λόγος. The first instance
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of ζωή is in 1:4, “in him was life, and this life was the light of mankind.” This follows immediately after the statement describing the λόγος action in creation; nothing was created without him, even life was found in him. Furthermore, Jesus has already proclaimed himself to be Life at the raising of Lazarus (11:25), his fifth ἐγώ εἰμι statement. Further down in the prologue, as the λόγος dwells with us, John describes the incarnate word as “full of grace and truth.” Yet neither of these concepts are new to the reader of John, so although they can help argue a basis for our understanding of this statement to be divine in nature, it is not the focus of this statement. Ball persuasively argues that the nature of the surrounding text requires an emphasis on “the Way” in understanding his statement. The preceding verses not only repeat ὁδός, but the entire dialogue is around where Jesus is going, why he is going there, and finally the way to get there. Furthermore, the sub-clause to the ‘I am’ statement explains in what manner Jesus is the Way, as he is the Way to the Father. Therefore, the initial καί can be taken with epexegetical force, producing a translation reading, “I am the Way that means Truth and Life,” or even “True Life.” Therefore, Jesus “is the way in such a manner as to be at the same time the goal: for he is also ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή: the ἀλήθεια as the revealed reality of God, and the ζωή as the divine reality which bestows life on the believer.” Bultmann further notes that in John the redemption as an event takes place in relation to a personal encounter with the Revealer resulting in an eschatological existence defined by the believer’s present being influenced by the future, thus the way is simultaneously his goal.

Jesus’ declaration of himself as the Way clarifies the epistemological question of Thomas, for if someone knows Jesus, than they know the way to the Father (v. 6), which is further explicated in v. 7; “if you know me, you also know the Father. From now on you know him and have seen him.” Already the dialogue has encountered the motif of knowing (οἶδα), and here the epistemological focus resurfaces, but not on an abstract location or route to it, but on Jesus himself. The shift is seen here from οἶδα to γινώσκω, likely a use of Johannine synonyms and not any intentional difference in the semantic meaning of the words. This can be seen in the manuscriptural evidence as NA 28 decides to err with P66 reading γινώσκετε; however, B, C, and Q, among others, as well as the SBLGNT text read ἂν γνώσετε. The important difference is the inclusion of ἂν and the move into a secondary tense, as this would change the understanding of the text from a first class condition utilizing two indicatives, to a second-class conditional statement. Furthermore, the other textual variant found here also adds ἂν (ἐγνωκείτε ἂν). The likely use of the first class conditional here (as seen in the NA text) is to invite dialogue about the issue rather than to simply lecture on the epistemological nature of Father and Son, thus inviting the next question. The textual variants, however, change the nature of the statement from a rhetorical statement of argument into a statement which should be presumed to be untrue, at least from the viewpoint of the speaker. This would imply that Jesus’ statement about the epistemological relationship between himself and the Father would be untrue in this instance.

On account of the assumption of the first class condition, we should understand the essential nature of the statement in v. 7 to be true. The disciples misunderstand this truth and instead Philip asks for a theophany, yet this is not the understanding
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of the ἑωράκατε αὐτόν, for John does not present a “traditional” theophany, but rather God incarnate in Christ the Son. This has been alluded to since the prologue, the ontological unity of the Father and the Son is beyond human comprehension. Therefore, the λογός has the glory as μονογενοῦς (1:14), works in creation (1:3), has been given authority to judge (5:27), and has been given all things (3:35, 13:3), yet does nothing on his own (5:30), and only does what he sees the Father doing (5:19). As Jesus finishes his initial reply to Philip (v. 9), he asks Philip whether or not he believes that Jesus is in the Father and the Father is in him. Interestingly enough, οὐ precedes the question, which expects a positive answer, thus Jesus – who knows the heart of mankind (2:23-25) – understands that Philip believes the essential unity of the Father and Son, even if not fully understanding it.

After the question a second sense is addressed in our search for knowledge of the Father, hearing. Thus, not only have those who have seen Jesus seen the Father, but also those who have heard Jesus have heard the Father. Köstenberger here argues that this is the fulfillment of the eschatological Prophet of Second Temple Judaism, for the prophet was supposed to be one who would be greater than Moses. “In Deuteronomy 18:18 God says regarding the prophet like Moses, “I will put my words in his mouth, and he will tell them everything I command him.” Therefore, Jesus is not only the promised Messiah, but also the expected prophet, both fulfilled in the one man. Not only does Jesus speak from the authority of another, but he also has the Father abiding in him performing his works. These works should be taken as referencing the miracles, the greatest of which simply being the words that he speaks from the Father to men.

To the Church Fathers, this unity in both word and action held much of the soteriology of the early church at stake, for their savior had to be fully God, thus in Jesus man must really encounter God. The emphasis is placed on the power of this teaching in the use of the imperative πιστεύετε in v. 11,27 thus we must believe in the mutual indwelling of Father and Son. This belief, however, is not discredited if it is founded on the tangible; as opposed to earlier in the gospel where Jesus did not trust those who believed in him on account of his works (2:23-25). In fact, this contradicts the earlier dichotomy of faith through an encounter with the Revealer and the faith that comes through witness of the signs, for the imperative is repeated in v. 11b, “if this is not enough, then believe on account of the works themselves.”28 This belief is the essential unity of the Father and the Son, seen through word and deed; and in this faith is the power to access the heavenly realms through the Way, and into the eternal life found in the Father’s house. This reward, however, is reserved for those who mediate the Revealer of God through their own testimony of their encounter with the Revealer. In the proclaimed word of the witness, the subject of the evangelism must perceive the word of the Revealer himself; “thus we are faced with the strange paradox that the proclamation, without which no man can be brought to Jesus, is itself insignificant” for through the messenger the “second-hand” hearer is able to receive first hand revelation.29

John 14:12-14 – The Greater Work

12 “Truly, truly I say to you, the one who believes in me will do the works, which I do, and he will do even greater things than these, because I am going to the Father; 13 and whatever you ask in my name I will do it, so that the Father is glorified in the Son. 14 If you ask me for anything in my name I will do it.”

Verse 12 serves as a transition from the theme of belief (10-11) to the theme of receiving help from God (13-14). Belief in Jesus will bring to the Christian power from God to perform the same works that Jesus performs, because, by uniting a man
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with Jesus and the Father, belief gives him a share in the power they possess.”30 Regardless of the fact that it simply acts as a transition, this statement is a radical portrayal of the Christian life, one that is empowered and threatened with resurrection. If we have faith in the resurrection of the dead, than we must also have faith in the ability for God to use us in ways beyond our comprehension and our human abilities. What are the ἑπιγλώττοι that Jesus speaks of here? Could they be simply limited to the words, in which Jesus speaks through us so that our revelation mediates an encounter with the Revealer, so that no person is resurrected to life by anyone other the Revealer himself? Possibly this is a reference to the apostles healing people by their shadow in Acts 5:15, or even to miraculous healings reported in Pentecostal churches. The answer most definitely is all of the above, for it is not actually us who work out any of the healing. Augustine writes regarding this, “do not let the servant exalt himself above his Lord or the disciple above his Master. He says that they will do greater works than he does himself, but it is all by his doing such works in or by them, and not as if they did them of themselves.”31

It is because Jesus is going to the Father that those who believe in him are able to do such works, as it is due to his glorification and authority at the right hand of the Father that this promise is fulfilled. Thus, Jesus’ farewell discourse again takes a temporary feel to the departure as Jesus, although leaving soon, will not permanently withdrawal, but rather it is due to this temporary withdrawal for the sake of glorification that he will be able to help his followers on earth.32 It is with this shift to the cause of his disciples’ greater works that naturally draws us to the final section, being help from heaven. As in v. 3, we have a third class conditional statement with a future indicative verb in the apodosis, thus we should understand the condition to have a guaranteed fulfillment. This does not, however, involve magical incantations or a genie bound to the will of the wisher, but rather it is the alignment of our purposes and desires with those of God (1 John 5:14-15) that brings forth the blessings.33 Ambrose says it best in his Tractates on the Gospel of John, “‘In my name.’ That is Christ Jesus. Christ signifies King, Jesus signifies Savior… Therefore whatever we ask for that would hinder our salvation, we do not ask in our Savior’s name, and yet he is our Savior not only when he does what we ask but also when he does not.”34

Especially in a modern world, Ambrose can very easily be seen as an inadequate attempt at theodicy; spinelessly seeking an apologetic for the unanswered prayers of the faithful, and it is here we return to the opening section. The Lord knows that the world is not in our favor, in fact he prophesies our rejection by the world because we are no longer of the world but have been chosen out of it (15:18-19). It is not without reason that the substance behind his exhortation to not let our hearts be troubled was the promise of resurrected life. Resurrection is what Katongole calls “dangerous hope,”35 and with good reason. Dangerous hope is what allowed Chantal Mijawama Sholo of Rwanda to stand united in love instead of allowing the repetition of genocide to occur.36 Dangerous hope is what allowed Christians to go steadfastly to the arena to face certain and excruciating death. Dangerous hope is what compelled Luther to stand in the face of rising pressure and testify to the “new” gospel he had discovered. Yet in all of these cases, the dangerous hope of resurrection cannot stand alone, for there is no resurrection without the Way. And if the Way is not understood to be dwelling in the Father, and the Father empowering his actions and words, than what good would the Way be? Finally, in order to fulfill the calling to live an eschatological existence, knowing the Father through the Son, and doing greater works than these by bringing the Revealer to others in our
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own witnesses of our encounters with him, we are given everything in Christ if only we ask. In asking, our wills are brought into deeper conformity with Christ's and the Father's, bringing us further into security in him. Therefore, as we notice the skies of our lives darkening, turning blood red, we can fall back on the God who exhorts us to live trouble-free lives in the freedom he has provided and sing, “Hello Hurricane, you can't silence my love.”
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