

TEO, ISSN 2247-4382
85 (4), pp. 132-146, 2020

Deepening Christ Tradition through Remembrance, according to the Fourth Gospel

Adrian MURG

Adrian MURG

Hilarion V. Felea Faculty of Orthodox Theology, Arad, Romania

Email: adrian.murg@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper explores the specific Johannine meaning of remembrance. St. John does not use the vocabulary of tradition, but uses other means to convey the idea of tradition. One of them is the concept of remembrance, which appears in some key passages. The most obvious are the Temple Incident in chapter 2 and the Triumphal Entry in chapter 12. Here we find the picture of a two-stage revelation: the time of the earthly Jesus and the time of post-Easter remembrance. Remembrance, though, is not mere recollection but a complex combination of eye-witness, faith, Scripture and guidance of the Spirit. These two epoques are not to be seen in a hierarchical manner. The Spirit does not bring new revelations, but a more profound understanding of the meaning of the earthly Jesus.

Keywords

Fourth Gospel, remembrance, Tradition, Spirit, Temple Incident, Triumphal Entry

I. Introduction

According to Danièle Hervieu-Léger¹, religion is to be seen as a chain of memory, that is, a form of collective memory and imagination based on the sanctity of tradition. What is specific to religious activity is that it

¹ Danièle HERVIEU-LÉGER, *Religion as a Chain of Memory*, trans. from French by Simon Lee, Polity Press, 2000, p. 4

Deepening Christ Tradition through Remembrance, according to the Fourth Gospel

is wholly directed to the production, management and distribution of the particular form of believing which draws its legitimacy from reference to a tradition² which is to be understood as the authorised version of a religious community collective memory³. All religions “have at their base the essentially *normative* character of religious memory”⁴.

In regard to memory or remembering St. John the Evangelist offers us some very precious teachings. It is true that the passages which concern the role of memory in John are few; some recent articles though have rightly drawn our attention to its importance⁵. It is our intention in this article to explore the memory theme by relating it to the specific teaching of the Fourth Gospel on the Paraclete Spirit. For Johannine theology, the concept of testimony is most fundamental⁶ and constitutes the background

² D. HERVIEU-LÉGER, *Religion as a Chain of Memory*, p. 101.

³ D. HERVIEU-LÉGER, *Religion as a Chain of Memory*, p. 97.

⁴ D. HERVIEU-LÉGER, *Religion as a Chain of Memory*, p. 124.

⁵ Peter STUHLMACHER, “Spiritual Remembering: John 14:26”, in: Graham N. STANTON, Bruce W. LONGENECKER, Stephen C. BARTON (eds.), *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 2004, pp. 55-68; Larry W. HURTADO, “Remembering and Revelation: The Historic and Glorified Jesus in the Gospel of John”, in: D. B. CAPES, A. D. DECONICK, H. K. BOND, T. A. MILLER (eds.), *Israel’s God and Rebecca’s Children: Christology and Community in Early Judaism and Christianity, Essays in Honor of Larry W. Hurtado and Alan F. Segal*, Baylor University Press, Waco, 2007, pp. 195-213; Jean ZUMSTEIN, “Mémoire, histoire et fiction dans la littérature johannique”, in: *New Testament Studies* (2019) 65, pp. 123-138, Tom THATCHER, *Why John Wrote a Gospel. Jesus-Memory-History*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, Kentucky, 2006; Xavier LÉON-DUFOUR, “Le Deux Mémoires du chrétien”, in: Daniel MARGUERAT, Jean ZUMSTEIN (eds.), *La mémoire et le temps: Mélanges offerts à Pierre Bonnard*, Labor et Fides, Genève, 1991, pp. 143-151; Jean ZUMSTEIN, “Mémoire et relecture pascale dans l’évangile selon Jean”, in: Daniel MARGUERAT, Jean ZUMSTEIN (eds.), *La mémoire et le temps: Mélanges offerts à Pierre Bonnard*, pp. 153-170.

⁶ The centrality of the testimony theme is signalled, among others, by: Thomas W. SIMPSON, “Testimony in John’s Gospel. The Puzzle of 5:31 and 8:14”, in: *Tyndale Bulletin* 65.1 (2014), pp. 103-108; Johannes BEUTLER, *Martyria traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Zeugnisthema bei Johannes*, J. Knecht Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1972, p. 365; Robert H. STRACHAN, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment*, SCM Press, London, 1941, p. 173; Theo PREISS, *Life in Christ*, SCM Press, London, 1954, p. 15; Rudolf BULTMANN, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, Basil Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, 1971, pp. 48-49; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel According to St. John*, vol. 1, Burns and Oates Publishing, London, 1968, p. 251; Leon MORRIS, *The Gospel According to John*, Marshall, Morgan and Scott Publishing,

on which we must study the meaning of memory. Indeed, according to the conclusion of the Gospel written by the leaders of the community who edited it and seek to disseminate it, the text is based on the testimony of the Beloved Disciple (21, 24), present at the foot of the cross (19, 35), the first to believe in the resurrection (20, 8). This testimony is only the human echo of a more fundamental testimony, that which the Father gives to his Son (5, 31.37) and that which, at present, is given by the Spirit of truth (15, 26; cf. 1 Jn 5, 6).

This testimony took the form of a writing in which, despite obvious peculiarities, we find the genre “gospel”, inaugurated by the text of Mark, a genre characterized among other things by the insertion of teaching within a biographical framework. Whatever the importance of the farewell speeches, which are characterized by the exclusivity of a didactic form almost disconnected from the historical moment in which the teaching is given, the Fourth Gospel can in no way be assimilated to revelatory speeches (Offenbarungsreden) of Gnostic type or to hymns such as the Odes of Solomon⁷. With more direct reference to the literary nature of the Gospel of John, we note in particular that, although this Gospel is readily distinguishable from any of the Synoptics in various specific matters - such as: order of events, selection of material, vocabulary, characters, and key themes - nevertheless, this distinctive account can be likened to the Synoptics in emphatically placing Jesus in a historically specific setting, and with lots of “local color”⁸. To underscore the point, although the Fourth Gospel is very well known for its uniquely explicit presentation of an exalted view of Jesus, the text in its own way also emphatically identifies the incarnate Logos and the risen/glorified “Lord” fully with reference to the historical Jesus⁹.

London, 1971, p. 89; John PAINTER, *John: Witness and Theologian*, SPCK, London, 1975, pp. 90-91; C. K. BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*, The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1978, p. 159; Paul RICOEUR, *Essays on Biblical Interpretation*, SPCK, London, 1981, p. 136; J. RAMSEY MICHAELS, *The Gospel of John*, Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans Publishing, Michigan, 2010, p. 60.

⁷ Jean ZUMSTEIN, “Mémoire et relecture pascale dans l’évangile selon Jean”, p. 153 sq.

⁸ As is known, especially among Johannine scholars, the classic study of this is C. H. DODD, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

⁹ Note, e.g., how the risen Jesus who appears to the disciples in 20, 19-29 is acclaimed also as “my Lord and my God” by Thomas in 20, 28.

Deepening Christ Tradition through Remembrance, according to the Fourth Gospel

The author's concern, however, was obviously not that of the typical modern "historical Jesus" scholars¹⁰. He was not aiming to *separate* or even to distinguish the historical figure from the glorified recipient of Christian devotion, or to offer what can be made of Jesus historically apart from what he became in Christian faith. Instead, the author's emphasis was on the direct *identity* and *continuity* between the earthly and the risen Jesus. The author's reason for giving his account of the ministry of Jesus was entirely *theological*, not to serve some academic modern interest in historical exactitude, but to shape and nurture the faith of the intended readers¹¹.

II. The vocabulary of memory

While the Old Testament as a whole gives a considerable place to remembrance (root *zkr*)¹², the New Testament offers few explicit references, preferring the vocabulary of tradition. John, however, does not speak of tradition as such. He mentions instead the act of remembrance, not many times but in key passages whose scope goes far beyond their immediate context. Let us first give an overall picture.

Mimneskomai: this verb comes up three times in the stereotypical form: "the disciples remembered" (2, 17.22, 12, 16).

Mnemeuo: apart from one profane use (16, 21), twice Jesus invites his disciples to remember His word (15, 20; 16, 4). In the same context we note the insistence on the need to keep (*terein*) the command of Jesus (8, 51.52.55; 14, 15.21-24; 15, 10; 17, 6).

¹⁰ See, e.g., the balanced and discerning discussion by Marianne MEYER THOMPSON, "The Historical Jesus and the Johannine Christ", in: R. Alan CULPEPPER and C. Clifton BLACK (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, Westminster John Knox Press, Louisville, 1996, pp. 21-42.

¹¹ Larry HURTADO, "Remembering and Revelation...", p. 196.

¹² "Israel is told to remember the entire law God has commanded them. They are told to remember the covenants and to remember how God has judged and has been merciful. Above all, they are to remember God as God remembers them in steadfast love. And often, they do remember. They remember in times of trouble and affliction. They remember as they seek understanding and a way to live. They remember in the midst of judgment, and they remember while in bondage. They remember in order to interpret what is going on in the world and what it means, and they remember in giving thanks and praise." (Craig DYKSTRA, "Memory and Truth", in: *Theology Today* Vol. 44, [July 1987] 2, p. 159).

Hypomimnesko: this verb is used only once, in a crucial passage for our thesis (14, 26) with the Paraclete for subject¹³.

On the other hand, we note the absence of the verb *anamimnesko* and of the substantive *anamnesis*, which holds great importance for Paul and Luke in the context of the Last Supper: “Do this in remembrance of me” (1 Cor 11, 24; Lk 22, 19). In the Gospel of John, in the place of the institution words we find Jesus washing the feet of His apostles. In a very suggestive article, X. Léon-Dufour drew a parallel between the command to act according to the example of the Master (13, 15) and the command to celebrate the Eucharist in memory of Him. In conclusion, he showed the complementary character of these two “memories”: “In John we see the direction towards which the Eucharistic practice tends, namely the love which can go even to death, according to the very action of Jesus who was faithful to God to the point of giving his life for us. If the Eucharist makes the Church, the example of the washing of the feet remains, in John’s view, the founding act by which the Church is constituted”¹⁴.

In text next part of this study we shall examine some episodes in which St. John speaks explicitly of memory.

III. Expulsion of the merchants from the Temple

The account of the expulsion of the merchants from the Temple offers a privileged case for the comparison between John and the Synoptics. The event can only be the same, situated by the Synoptics during the last week

¹³ For a more thorough examination of St. John’s memory vocabulary, see Larry HURTADO, “Remembering and Revelation...”, pp. 207-210. He sums up his analysis thus: “In the Gospel of John we have several instances where verbs for «to remind» and «to remember» are used with a technical meaning, indeed a meaning that seems peculiar to John. I propose that the author chose these terms and invested them with this technical meaning precisely to express his dialectical view of the Spirit-Paraclete’s revelatory work. On the one hand, this work consists in a significantly fuller measure of truth than was disclosed during Jesus’ earthly ministry. On the other hand, the author insists, this fuller revelation will simply be all about Jesus, pointing back to him with the aim of showing forth his true/full glory, and his full participation with «the Father» (esp. 16:14-15). That is, the new revelations from the Spirit-Paraclete simply bring forth a fuller disclosure of what was true of Jesus all along, and what his earthly activities actually portended”. (p. 210).

¹⁴ X. LÉON-DUFOUR, “Les Deux Mémoires...”, p. 151.

Deepening Christ Tradition through Remembrance, according to the Fourth Gospel

of Jesus' life, and by John during a first trip to Jerusalem, at the beginning of his public ministry. In the Fourth Gospel two episodes are closely associated: the actual expulsion of the sellers (2, 13-17), and the question of the Jews on the authority of Jesus for such an intervention (2, 18-22), while in Mark as in Matthew, the account of the expulsion (Mk 11, 15-19) is followed by the observation that the fig tree is withered (11, 20 sq.) and it is only the next day that the authority of Jesus is questioned by the high priests, scribes and elders (11, 27-33). By omitting the story of the dried fig tree, Luke (19, 45-20, 8) presents the same sequence as John.

By placing this story immediately after the prototype sign performed at Cana, John puts it into special relief. The overabundance of wine, instead of water intended for the purification of the Jews, evoked the incomparable superiority of the New Covenant and the fullness of Messianic joy¹⁵. By repeating twice the list of animals needed for sacrifices, which Jesus drives out with a whip of cords, John suggests that this scene signifies the end of the Temple sacrificial system, be it prescribed by Moses. The declaration of Jesus corresponds in meaning to that found in the Synoptics, but does not include direct references either to Is 56, 7 or to Jer 7, 11.

On the other hand, in one of these parentheses so characteristic to his work, the evangelist adds: "His disciples remembered that it has been written: «Zeal for your house will consume (*kataphagetai*) me»" (v. 17). According to v. 22, the time of remembrance is that of the post-Easter period. We shall come back to this. The quote itself is taken from one of the Psalms of individual lamentation or righteous sufferer, applied by common tradition to the Passion of Christ. However, John is the only one to quote verse 10 with a characteristic variation: the future (*kataphagetai*) instead of the aorist (*kataphagen*)¹⁶. The term itself *zelos*, frequent in the Old Testament, is found only here in John. It designates passionate ardor in

¹⁵ Jesus' first sign, turning water into wine tacitly implied that the old system which the Jews had become accustomed to is now being replaced by a better system – Jesus Christ, the Messiah (D. A. CARSON, *The Gospel According to John*, Inter-Varsity Press, Leicester, England, 1991, p. 174). This theme of replacement will then repeat itself in similar fashion in the Cleansing of the Temple passage (John 2, 13-22).

¹⁶ On the issue of the change of the tense of the verb in John, see Rudolf SCHNACKENBURG, *The Gospel according to John*, Vol. 1, New York, 1980, p. 347. While Schnackenburg and R. E. Brown (*The Gospel according to John, I-XIII* New York, 1966) see Ps 68/69 as messianic, Barnabas Lindars (*The Gospel of John*, London, NCB, 1972, p. 140) understands it as not messianic but referring to Jesus's suffering.

the service of God, as shown for example by this sentence from Paul: “For I am jealous for you with a godly jealousy” (2 Cor 11, 2). Jesus appears to us so passionate in honoring of his Father that He comes to the point of risking His life. There are some passages where Jesus affirms that he came only to accomplish the will of the Father and that he has no other goal than to glorify Him (for example 12, 28; 17, 4). This passion will lead Him to death. There is a suggestion here that instead of the animals Jesus drove out of the Temple, He, as the true Paschal Lamb, will be the only sacrifice from now on.

In the Synoptics, the Jews question Jesus about His authority (Mk 11, 28 and par.); in John, they ask for a sign as proof for the prophetic mission¹⁷ of the One who arrogates to Himself such power over worship (2, 18). In a way the two presentations correspond, but what follows is profoundly different. According to the Synoptics, Jesus responds with a question on the prophetic authority of the Forerunner and the origin of his baptism. In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus responds with a *logion* on the Temple: “Destroy this temple and, in three days, I will raise it” (2, 19). Because of its obscurity, this *logion* on the Temple has stimulated the perspicuity of the readers and provoked many interpretations, as proved by the multiple forms under which it has been transmitted.

Leaving aside the passage from Acts which reports the accusations made against Stephen on this Temple subject (Acts 6, 14), we limit ourselves to reporting the forms in which the Evangelists transmit it. According to Mark, it is the false witnesses who, before the Sanhedrin, accuse Jesus of having declared: “I will destroy this temple made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands” (Mk 14, 58; cf. 15, 29; Mt 26, 61; 27, 40). According to John, the word on the Temple is authentically spoken by Jesus, but it is not He who destroys the temple, but his adversaries, the imperative “destroy” being a Semitic way of saying: “If you destroy this temple, I will raise it up in three days”.

Rightly, X. Léon-Dufour set out to show how the words of Jesus must be placed against the background of the expectation of the new Temple, maintained since the vision of Ezekiel (40-48) and particularly lively in

¹⁷ Brown points out that “to be in a position to cleanse the temple precincts Jesus had to have public status as a prophet and a numerous following.” (*The Gospel according to John, I-XIII*, p. 117)

Deepening Christ Tradition through Remembrance, according to the Fourth Gospel

apocalyptic circles and in Qumran¹⁸. John, for his part, provides us with his interpretation belonging to the time of post-Easter remembrance: “He spoke of the temple of his body”. In this interpretation we find a typically Johannine idea: while the common tradition attributes the Resurrection to the Father’s power, John is the only one to tell us that Jesus has the power to take back his life (10, 18). The typology of the Temple is also well attested in the Fourth Gospel. At the end of the first chapter, after all the Messianic titles have been displayed, Jesus announces that his disciples will see greater things and presents himself as the point of communication between heaven and earth: “Most assuredly, I say to you, hereafter you shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man” (1, 51)¹⁹. On his return trip to Galilee, Jesus offers a Samaritan woman “living water” (4, 10.14), a Johannine symbol for the Holy Spirit (7, 37-39). He then contrasts worship in Spirit with the Temple worship of Jerusalem and Garizim (4, 20-24), implying that a new and different kind of Temple is being established²⁰. In the farewell speech Jesus urges the disciples to pray to the Father “in his name” (14, 13-14; 15, 26; 16, 23-27). So, from now on his Body will be the proper place for prayer, i.e. the true Temple.

The Evangelist’s final remark is the most explicit on the nature and scope of the remembrance: “Therefore, when He had risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that He had said this to them; and they believed

¹⁸ Xavier LÉON-DUFOUR, *Lecture dans l'Évangile selon Jean*, t. 1, Éd. Du Seuil, Paris, 1988, pp. 262-267. “Some parts of the Hebrew Scriptures look forward to a new temple: there is Ezekiel’s vision of the restored temple, with water flowing from it to transform the desert, to which the glory of the LORD returned (Ezek. 40-47); and there is the Melchi-Zedek prophecy in Isaiah 61, which continues with the restored people building up ancient ruins. At the time of this prophecy, the second temple was already rebuilt, and the Third-Isaiah spoke out against the corrupted temple leaders and their cult (Isa. 66.1–4). His prophecy that the one anointed with the Spirit would bring the year of the LORD’s favour and rebuild the ancient ruins may be an early reference to the role of the Messiah replacing the second temple”. (Margaret BARKER, *King of the Jews. Temple Theology in John’s Gospel*, SPCK, 2014, p. 331).

¹⁹ “The Son of Man is here presented as the new Beth-El of Jacob’s dream, who links earth and heaven. This text likely presumes the tradition preserved in Rabbinic circles which identifies Beth-El with the Temple mount in Jerusalem.” (Mark KINSER, “Temple Christology in the Gospel of John”, in: *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers*, Scholars Press, Atlanta, 1998, p. 449.

²⁰ Mark KINSER, “Temple Christology in the Gospel of John”, p. 451.

the Scripture and the word which Jesus had said”(2, 22). We must note the parallelism established between the Scripture (*graphe*) and the word of Jesus, both of which becoming crucial elements in the disciples’ post-Easter efforts to understand the significance of Jesus’ acts and teaching²¹. *Grappe* can mean a specific passage of Scripture, such as verse 11 of Ps 68 (LXX) quoted in verse 17, but it can have a broader meaning to refer to Holy Scripture as a whole. We know that John, in a synthetic vision, often presents combined quotes. Here we can not find a precise quote for the *logion* on the new Temple, but we must appeal to the various texts that evoke the new Temple as illuminated by the Glory of God (Is 60; Ba 5, 1-9), center of pilgrimage for the nations (Is 2, 2-4). “Memory” in the Johannine sense is therefore not a pure phenomenon of repeating events. It is “is a complex combination of witness, recall, faith, and Scripture”²². The destruction of the Jerusalem Temple by Titus in the year 70 could only facilitate this Christic understanding of the Temple. For St. Paul, all the Christians (1 Cor 3,16; 2 Cor 6,16) and even each one of them (1 Cor 6, 19), in virtue of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, deserve to be considered the true Temple. Through the Christological concentration, so characteristic of his Gospel, St. John teaches us to see in Christ the fulfillment of the new Temple promises. As the Prologue already suggested, the *Shekhinah* no longer rests on a stone temple, but on the Logos made flesh (1, 14)²³.

IV. Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem

The account of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem is common to the four evangelists and is situated in the same context, namely the beginning of the Passion Week. Compared to that of the Synoptics, John’s text is characterized by its brevity²⁴.

²¹ “Clearly, the remembering posited in this passage involved more than recollection; it also included a new perception that Jesus’ actions are prefigured in, and interpreted by, scripture, and also a new understanding of Jesus’ pre-resurrection sayings and actions in light of his resurrection.”; Larry W. HURTADO, “Remembering and Revelation...”, p. 208.

²² Tom THATCHER, *Why John Wrote a Gospel...*, p. 24

²³ M. L. COLOE, “Raising the Johannine Temple (Jn 19:19–29)” in: *Australian Biblical Review* (2000) 48, p. 57.

²⁴ There are more differences between John and the Synoptics. Thus, John knows noth-

Deepening Christ Tradition through Remembrance, according to the Fourth Gospel

So the Old Testament quotations serve all the more for emphasizing the kingship of Jesus. The cries of the crowd begin with Hosanna, taken from Ps 117, 25-26 as in the Synoptics²⁵. While Matthew and Mark evoke the kingship of David, John specifies that the One who comes in the name of the Lord is “the king of Israel” (12, 13). In spite of not explicitly mentioning David²⁶, it is clear that John’s version of the entry contains a Davidic atmosphere due to the mention of the “king of Israel”, the palm branches and the ass, which is connected with the prophesy of the Davidic king of Zion in Zech. 9, 9²⁷. In the Gospel of John, we must carefully distinguish between the term “Israel”, which has an eminently positive value (1, 31.50; 3, 10), and the term “Jew”, so often the bearer of negative

ing of the two men sent to bring the ass. In the Synoptics Jesus is said to have healed a blind man, or two blind men, in Bethany just before his royal entry (Mark 10, 46–52; Luke 18, 35–43; Matt 20, 29–34). In the Synoptics it is emphasized that the blind men see that Jesus is the “Son of David”. Mark and John use a different word for the ass. In John the disciples do not put garments on the ass. In John’s account it is underlined that people followed Jesus into Jerusalem – Jesus had gained the interest of the Jews because he had previously raised Lazarus from the dead. According to John 12, 19 the whole world had gone over to Jesus. Some scholars consider that these differences between John and the Synoptics may suggest the John knew the story from another, separate source. If so, then our knowledge of Jesus’ entry is based on two different traditions: Mark’s and John’s. In this case the criterion of multiple attestations supports the claim that the story of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem on an ass is grounded in actual history. (See: Juho SANKAMO, “Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem”, in: *Approaching Religion*, (December 2014) Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 25-26.

²⁵ Most probably some kind of a messianic interpretation of Ps. 117 was known during the first century. The Aramaic Targum had translated and interpreted Ps. 117, 25–26 in a way that combines Hosanna and Davidic kingship. According to the Targum Ps. 118 the ‘stone that the builders rejected’ was the son of Jesse, David, whom the priests will now bless from the temple (Targum Ps. 117, 22, 26b); Stephen HULTGREN, “The Incident at the Temple as the Occasion for Jesus’ Death: Meeting Some Objections”, in: Fabian E. UDOH, Susannah HESCHEL, Mark CHANCEY, Gregory TATUM (eds.), *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, University of Notre Dame Press, 2008, pp. 287-288. Cf. Juho SANKAMO, “Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem”, p. 30.

²⁶ “The lack of direct mention of David in John’s version of Jesus’ entrance is not surprising. In general the Gospel of John does not demonstrate interest in the Son-of-David Christology, and thus the Davidic atmosphere even in John’s version of the event is striking”. Juho SANKAMO, “Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem”, p. 31, n. 15.

²⁷ John, P. Meier, “From Elijah-like Prophet to Royal Davidic Messiah”, in: Doris DONNELLY (ed.), *Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land*, New York, Continuum, 2001, pp. 54-55.

values²⁸. Israel, according to an etymology proposed by Philo, and which could well be underlying the text of Jn 1, 47-50, is the one who sees God²⁹. Either way, Israel is the designation of the people to whom God's promises have been addressed. To greet Jesus as the King of Israel is to recognize that - paradoxically, certainly, but very real - the Messianic hope is fulfilled in Him (see Jn 1, 41).

All of the four Evangelist quote in context of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem Zech. 9, 9: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion! Shout, O daughter of Jerusalem! Behold, your King is coming to you; He is just and having salvation. Lowly and riding on a donkey, a colt, the foal of a donkey". It seems that John is particularly interested in Zech. 9-14, because of the significance given to the feast of the Tabernacles as the feast of the universal kingship of YHWH³⁰: "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth. In that day it shall be - «The Lord is one», and His name one" (14, 9). The palms waved by the crowd in Jn 12,13 evoked the ceremony of the Tabernacles day thus suggesting Jesus' universal kingship. The idea is reinforced by the fact that the entry into Jerusalem is immediately followed by the scene of the Greeks asking to see Jesus (12, 22) and by the declaration on the meaning of the elevation on the cross: "And I, if I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all peoples to Myself" (12, 32).

After the quotation from Zech. 9, 9 in v. 15, in the next verse John introduces a crucial remark for the remembrance theme: "His disciples did not understand these things at first; but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things were written about Him and that they had done these things to Him" (Jn 12, 16). The time of remembrance is therefore that of understanding in faith of an event which, at first, could not deliver its true meaning. We need the light of Easter, we need the entry of the Greeks into the Christian community for the full scope of Jesus' kingship to be revealed. A kingship which is not according to the powers of this world (18, 36), but which reveals itself in the testimony given to

²⁸ See R. BIERINGER, D. POLLEFEY, F. VANDECASTEELE-VANNEUVILLE (eds.), *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel*, Westminster John Knox, Louisville, Kentucky, Verenigde Staten, 2001.

²⁹ David T. RUNIA, "Philo, Alexandrian and Jew", in: David T. RUNIA, *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria*, Vantage, Aldershot, 1990, p. 12.

³⁰ Édouard COTHENET, "L'Arrière-Plan vétéro-testamentaire du IV^e Évangile", in: Association Catholique Française pour l'Étude de la Bible, *Origine et postérité de l'Évangile de Jean*, coll. *Lectio divina* 143, Éd. du Cerf, Paris, 1990, pp. 60-66.

Deepening Christ Tradition through Remembrance, according to the Fourth Gospel

the truth (18, 37); a kingship of mockery for the world who dressed the King in purple robe and crowned Him with thorns (19, 2); a kingship unconsciously proclaimed by Pilate who writes in three languages the *titulus* of condemnation: “Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews” (19, 19); and, finally, a kingship which is fully attained when the One zealous for the Father’s glory cries out “It is finished” and gives his Spirit to the Church represented by Mary and the Beloved Disciple (19, 30)³¹.

V. The role of the Paraclete

In the cases studied so far, the post-Easter remembrance is attributed to the whole group of disciples, without further details. With the Book of Glory appears the specific role of the Beloved Disciple, the one who leans on Jesus’ bosom (13, 23; cf. 1, 18) and therefore receives the Master’s thoughts. More courageous than the others, he will stand at the foot of the cross and, will be the first to believe in the Resurrection by relating the sign of the empty tomb to the Scripture (20, 8 sq.)³². The testimony of this disciple, (19, 35; 21, 24), presumably the author of the Fourth Gospel, is connected in covered words with the Paraclete Spirit³³. The farewell speeches, so typical to the Gospel of John, describe the Paraclete’s work in five *logia* closely related to each other (14, 16-17. 26; 15, 26; 16, 7-11.12-15)³⁴.

Specific to the Gospel of John, the term *parakletos* is so rich in nuances that it is very difficult to render it through a single translation. Originally, the term has a legal value: the *parakletos* is the one who pleads

³¹ See Francis J. MOLONEY, *The Gospel of John*, coll. *Sacra Pagina* 4, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, MN, 1998, pp. 508-509; cf. R. Alan CULPEPPER, *The Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1983, p. 226: “To such true disciples Jesus hands over the Spirit (19:30)”.

³² On the Beloved Disciple, see Paul S. MINEAR, “The Beloved Disciple in the Gospel of John: Some Clues and Conjectures”, in: *Novum Testamentum*, Vol. 19, Fasc. 2 (Apr., 1977), pp. 105-123; Frederick W. BALTZ, *The Mystery of the Beloved Disciple: New Evidence, Complete Answer*, Infinity Publishing, 2010.

³³ Eskil FRANCK, *Revelation Taught: The Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, coll. *Coniectanea biblica: New Testament series* 14, CWK Gleerup, Lund, 1985, pp. 91-95.

³⁴ See George JOHNSTON, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 29-39.

in a court of law³⁵. This meaning is easily found in 1 Jn 2, 1-2: “If anyone sins, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous. And He Himself is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the whole world”. In the New Testament, the verb *parakalein* and the substantive *paraklesis* are often used to designate Christian proclamation, which seeks to actualize the Scripture for listeners and emphasizes the person and mission of Christ³⁶. Let us limit ourselves to evoking two typical cases. The purpose of prophecy, according to 1 Cor 14, 3, is to build up the community, to exhort and encourage it. And, secondly, Rom 15, 4: “whatever things were written before were written for our learning, that we through the patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope”. These associations between the *paraklesis*, prophecy and interpretation of the Scriptures are helpful for understanding this promise relating to the Paraclete: “But the Helper (*parakletos*), the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you (*didaxei*) all things, and bring to your remembrance (*hypomnesei*) all things that I said to you” (14, 26).

Even if one detects a gradation between the five *logia* on the Paraclete, it is convenient to interpret each in relation to the others. Generally, we can thus affirm that all the activities attributed to the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth, (14, 17; 15, 26; 16, 13) are situated in the intellectual order. Let us note the characteristic terms: teach (14, 26); bear witness (15, 26); convince (16, 8); unveil the future (16, 13); lead to the fulness of truth (16, 13). It is worth observing the legal dimension of some of these activities, which fits very well with the origin of the word *parakletos*. Equally important is the parallelism between the actions attributed to the Paraclete and the work of Christ. The Spirit really appears as “another Paraclete”, continuing and internalizing the work of Jesus. He will be with the disciples forever (14,16) making up for the absence of Christ Who has returned to the Father.

³⁵ For a thorough analysis of the term’s etymology and meaning, see David PASTORELLI, *Le Paraclet dans le corpus johannique*, coll. *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* vol. 142, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin / New York, 2006, chap. 2: “Le terme παράκλητος dans la littérature antique. Étude sémantique”, pp. 40-104.

³⁶ Adrian MURG, “The Paraclete’s Testimony: Hermeneutical, Liturgical and Communal Aspects”, in: Martin TAMCKE, Constantin PREDA, Marian VILD, Daniel MIHOC (eds.), *Scripture’s Interpretation Is More than Making Science, Festschrift in Honor of Fr. Prof. Vasile Mihoc*, coll. *Studien zur Orientalischen Kirchengeschichte* vol. 62, Göttingen: Lit Verlag, 2020, p. 129.

Deepening Christ Tradition through Remembrance, according to the Fourth Gospel

This is the context in which we must explain the close relationship implied in 14, 26 between “teaching” and “remembering”. Up to this point Jesus had been recognized as the Master (1, 38; 3, 2; 11, 28; 13, 13 sq.). The Temple, the place of revelation par excellence (cf. Is 2, 2-4), had been the privileged tribune of His teaching (7, 14.28.35; 8, 20.28; 18, 20). On many occasions Jesus had given as a sign of authenticity His sending by the Father (7, 16) and His total disinterest in honouring Himself (8, 54). Coming from above, He can reveal divine secrets better than Moses (thus 3, 13; 6, 46). In a word, Christ presents himself as the truth (14, 6) and calls for the observance of his commandment(s) as an absolute necessity for salvation (15, 7.10). His words must therefore be remembered (15, 20; 16, 4) as the only guide on the road to life. The repeated use of the verb *terein* goes in the same direction: we must keep the word of revelation to escape death (8, 51 sq.), We must observe (the same verb *terein*) the command of *agape* as the command par excellence of the new covenant (14, 15.21.23.24; 15, 10.20; 17, 6). The revelation of the Word is meant to shape human life according to *agape*, of which Christ Himself is both the principle and the model (13, 34; 15, 9 sq.).

In these conditions, how can the Paraclete also be the Master of truth? If He is to lead in the whole truth (16, 13), isn't his teaching superior to that of the earthly Jesus? We know how Gnosticism embarked on this path. The answer to these difficult questions lies in the good articulation between the teaching given by the Paraclete and the “remembrance” He inspires. To cut short the false interpretations that developed within the Johannine community itself, the epistles of John recall the importance of the teaching given from the beginning (*ap'arches*, 1 Jn 2, 7.13.14.24; 3, 11; 2 Jn 5 sq.)³⁷. We cannot oppose to the time of Christ a time of the Spirit, marked by higher revelations. We must understand how the work of interpretation, which is mentioned explicitly only by John, is carried out in continuity with the teaching based on the tradition Jesus' words and acts. Remembrance in the Johannine sense is not in fact a simple recall of past events, but a penetration to the profound meanings under the guidance of the Old Testament prophecies (cf. 2, 17.22; 12, 16). As O. Cullmann explained, “to understand through the Spirit of Truth that in the reported events all past history is recapitulated and fulfilled and that all that the

³⁷ R. E. Brown, *La Communauté du disciple bien-aimé*, coll. *Lectio Divina* 115, Éd. du Cerf, 1983, pp. 103-156.

future will be its unfolding, that is the consciousness of evangelization of our author”³⁸.

VI. Conclusion

If the vocabulary of tradition is lacking in John, the content of the notion is not absent, but is expressed through different concepts. First, that of the testimony which links the activity of the witnessing Spirit to the testimony of the disciples (15, 26), especially that of the Beloved Disciple. Then, that of remembering in the sense that we have tried to determine. This is how tradition does not appear to be an inactive deposit to be buried in a field, but a gift to be made fruitful for the glory of the One who entrusted it to men. Disciple of John through Polycarp, St. Irenaeus found an unforgettable formula to characterize the true nature of the deposit of faith: “This faith which we have received from the Church, we keep with care, because unceasingly, under the action of the Spirit of God, like a treasure of great value hold in an excellent vessel, it rejuvenates and makes the vessel which contains it rejuvenate” (*Adv. Haer.* III, 24, 1).

³⁸ Oscar CULLMANN, “L’Évangile johannique et l’histoire du salut”, in: Oscar CULLMANN, *Études de théologie biblique*, Neuchâtel, 1968, p. 149. Another ingenious explanation is provided by M.-Al. CHEVALLIER: “If, for Paul, the Spirit actualizes the future, for John, He actualizes the past” (*Souffle de Dieu. Le Saint-Esprit dans le Nouveau Testament*, vol. 2: *Le point théologique*, Beauchesne, Paris, 1990, p. 522).