sciendo

Perichoresis
Volume 22. Issue 2 (2024): 46-67
DOI: 10.2478/perc-2024-0015

THEOLOGICAL AFFINITIES BETWEEN THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE BOOK OF REVELATION

ANDREAS J. KÖSTENBERGER*

Palm Beach Atlantic University

ABSTRACT: The focus of this study is on the exploration of theological affinities between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation. While I personally hold to the apostolic authorship of both writings by John, the son of Zebedee — admittedly a minority view in contemporary Johannine scholarship—the specific identity of the author will not be of primary concern here. Rather, my focus will be on the plausibility (or lack thereof) of common authorship, whether by the apostle or another writer. If it can be shown that the differences in outlook between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation may be accounted for by different subject matter, genres, and circumstances addressed, an important objection against the common authorship of the two documents will be removed.

KEY WORDS: Forth Gospel, Revelation, relationship, futuristic

It is impossible to deny that the Fourth Gospel and Revelation cover different subject matter and are written in a different genre. But does that necessarily mean they were written by different authors? Recent scholarship is all but united in its contention that the worldviews underlying these two writings are irreconcilable, requiring authorship by two different individuals or groups (if community authorship is a realistic possibility). However, as I will seek to show in this essay, there is every reason to believe that the same individual likely penned both writings if one considers the remarkable theological affinities that unite both documents.

Proposals regarding the Fourth Gospel-Revelation Relationship

The common authorship of the Fourth Gospel and Revelation is often rejected due to their respective eschatologies. E. S. Fiorenza (1985:107) spoke for many when she

* Dr. Andreas J. Köstenberger (PhD in New Testament, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1993) is Research Professor of Biblical Studies at Palm Beach Atlantic University, Theologian in Residence at Fellowship Raleigh, and Co-founder of Biblical Foundations. Dr. Köstenberger is a leading evangelical scholar who has published over sixty books. A full list of his publications can be found on his website, https://biblicalfoundations.org. E-mail: akostenberger@gmail.com.

© EMANUEL UNIVERSITY *of* ORADEA

maintained years ago that the Gospel and the Apocalypse "represent opposite eschatological options." She stood in the tradition of the Tübingen School which asserted that because of differences in theology, the Fourth Gospel and Revelation could not have been written by the same author. R. Bultmann (1951:165–83; 1969:165–83; 1971:155–57, 164–67, *et passim*) and C. H. Dodd (1953:147, 209, 395–96, 405–6), likewise, both contended that the Gospel's eschatology is realized while Revelation's is futuristic. R. Brown (1966:cxix, cxxi) was more cautious by arguing for a tension between the two respective eschatologies. The emergence of the Johannine school or community hypothesis toward the latter half of the twentieth century did little to resolve the perceived gulf between these documents by positing several levels of redaction in their composition (R. Brown 1979; Cullmann 1975; Culpepper 1975; Martyn 2003; Smith 1975:222–48).

In describing the Fourth Gospel-Revelation relationship, scholars have set forth various proposals (cf. Fiorenza 1985:88). The first, traditional solution, affirming common authorship, acknowledges theological differences but contends that the perspectives reflected in these writings are complementary rather than mutually exclusive and that *differences in subject matter, genre, and circumstances addressed* account adequately for differences in presentation. This view represented a broad patristic consensus that, with inevitable exceptions, has held until fairly recent times.

The second option suggests that an interval between the two writings may account for *the community's change of eschatological and other views*. Thus J. Weiss (1904:146–64) proposed that Revelation was written early and the Fourth Gospel late and that the latter's present-oriented outlook overcame the apocalyptic eschatology of the former. Weiss suggested that a second edition of Revelation was published during the reign of Domitian with additional polemic against the imperial cult. Later, after Revelation's apocalyptic had failed to materialize, someone issued a second edition of the Fourth Gospel; the realized eschatological perspective of the Gospel had won out over Revelation's apocalypticism. C. K. Barrett (1978:133–34), likewise, suggested that Revelation was written first. He believed that the Apocalypse was compiled by John's followers who later also wrote the Gospel. Similarly, M.-É. Boismard (1962:185–211) considered apocalyptic to be the earliest notion in Johannine thought and realized eschatology the more mature approach.

The third approach explains the theological differences on the basis of *multiple amanuenses or hands in the composition of these two documents*. Fiorenza's solution is broadly representative of this view. She believed that the author of Revelation had access to the Johannine school but was himself a member of an early Christian "prophetic-apocalyptic community" (1985:101, 107). In good Hegelian dialectic fashion, she saw the literary and theological evolution of Revelation unfold against the back-

drop of an eclectic process of cross-fertilization between the Johannine and prophetic-apocalyptic communities, and perhaps other communities as well.

A fourth view was advocated by C. F. D. Moule (1970:155–60), who held that the present-future tension represented a shift of emphasis from an individual perspective to a collective one.

Aim of This Study

In what follows, I will suggest that the first proposal—common authorship, but differences in subject matter, genre, and circumstances addressed—accounts for most, if not all, of the varying perspectives between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation. This makes the second option, a time lapse between the writings, unnecessary. The third solution, multiple amanuenses, seems to be unnecessary as well, for while such a phenomenon may account for differences between New Testament books such as 1 and 2 Peter, it seems less likely that different secretaries, redactors, or translators account for differences between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation, as I will seek to demonstrate below. The fourth option, a shift in theological emphasis, is unnecessary as well if the first proposal turns out to be valid.

The focus of this study, as mentioned, is on the exploration of theological affinities between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation. While I personally hold to the apostolic authorship of both writings by John, the son of Zebedee (Köstenberger 2009:72–79; 2021:10–23)—admittedly a minority view in contemporary Johannine scholarship—the specific identity of the author will not be of primary concern here. Rather, my focus will be on the plausibility (or lack thereof) of common authorship, whether by the apostle or another writer. If it can be shown that the differences in outlook between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation may be accounted for by different subject matter, genres, and circumstances addressed, an important objection against the common authorship of the two documents will be removed (for a survey of the theological contribution of Revelation, see Köstenberger 2020:217–66).

Even an author such as Fiorenza (1985:93), who strongly contended for different authors, acknowledged the presence of numerous theological and linguistic affinities between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation. In addition, Fiorenza observed the lack of extensive exegetical investigations of such theological interconnections. While she registered this observation almost forty years ago, I would argue that even since then, critical scholarship has largely assumed different authors while conservatives have often simply asserted common authorship rather than arguing for it by presenting cogent evidence in favor of such a view. While space does not permit the kind of comprehensive study Fiorenza called for, I will aim to provide a survey of some of the most significant theological affinities between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation in order to demonstrate the plausibility of common authorship. Building on Fiorenza's

material, I will first provide a synopsis of her discussion and then supplement and, where necessary, correct her findings.

Contact Points between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation

What, then, are contact points between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation? Fiorenza (1985:93–101) begins her discussion of linguistic and theological affinities between these two documents by showing that these writings *share only eight words in common* that are found nowhere else in the New Testament. Unfortunately, however, she omits terms these two writings have in common with one another *as well as* with other New Testament books; yet while not shared exclusively, these words still constitute important common terminology.

Fiorenza proceeds to note that the two writings also *use different expressions for the same words*, citing terms found in the Gospel but not in Revelation and vice versa. She concludes that Revelation has more in common with the Pauline than the Johannine tradition. The problem here is that Fiorenza neglects to mention that the Pauline corpus is larger than the Fourth Gospel, so that a mere quantitative comparison of common vocabulary between Paul and Revelation on the one hand and the Fourth Gospel and Revelation on the other is hardly conclusive and in fact misleading.

Common Material	Differences in Terminology	Fourth Gospel Only	Revelation Only
arnion (lamb)	*arnion* vs. *amnos* (lamb)	*alētheia* (truth)	*adikein* (to do wrong)
Ebraisti (in Hebrew)	*idou* vs. *ide* (look, behold)	*alēthēs* (true)	*aparchē* (first-fruits)
exekentein (to pierce)	*Ierousalēm* vs. *Ierosolyma* (Jerusalem)	*zōē, aiōnios* (eternal life)	*basileis tēs gēs* (kings of the earth)
kykleuein (to surround)	*pseudēs* vs. *pseustēs* (lie)	*idios* (own)	*douloi* (slaves)
opsis (face)		*kosmos* (world)	*ekklēsia* (church)
porphyrous (purple)		*menein en* (to remain in)	*hagioi* (saints)
skēnoun (to dwell)		*pisteuein* (to believe)	*hypomonē* (endurance)
phoinix (palm tree)		*skotia/skotos* (darkness)	*mystērion* (mystery)

Common Material	Differences in Terminology	Fourth Gospel Only	Revelation Only
			oikoumenē (world)
			pantokratōr (Almighty)
			prōtotokos (firstborn)
			thlipsis (affliction)
			thronos (throne)

Using Revelation as her starting point, Fiorenza identifies as most significant contact points between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation the Christological titles *arnion* (28x in Revelation; cf. John 1:29, 36) and *logos* (Rev 19:13; cf. John 1:1, 14), the eschatological metaphors of shepherding and living water (Rev 7:17; 21:6; 22:1, 17; cf. John 4:14; 6:35; 7:37–38), the motif of God's dwelling with his people (Rev 7:15; 21:3; cf. John 1:14), and references to the absence of the temple (Rev 21:22; cf. John 2:19, 21; 4:20–26). In every instance, Fiorenza (1985:93–101) finds that there are significant dissimilarities in the way these terms are used. We will return to this observation below. Suffice it to say at this point of our investigation that Fiorenza's conclusion seems premature. While the differences are real, there is underlying common ground which allows for the notion of common authorship to stand if allowance is made for different subject matter, genres, and circumstances addressed.

Matters Related to Genre

We first turn to matters related to genre, including the obvious difference in literary genre between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation, their respective occasions for writing, and various elements of complementarity. I have addressed the genre of the Fourth Gospel in a previous publication (Köstenberger 2012:435–62). Broadly speaking, the Fourth Gospel, like the Synoptics, represents an exemplar of *bios*, Greco-Roman biography, which in dramatic form sets forth the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus along a salvation-historical continuum, connecting it to God's previous acts in history. By contrast, Revelation can be characterized as a prophetic-apocalyptic epistle (Ladd 1958:192–200; see the brief summary in Köstenberger 2020:217–22). Apocalyptic, for its part, can be simply (and for our purposes adequately) defined as "a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another, supernatural world" (Collins 2016:5).

Genre Differences

What, then, are we to make of the difference in genre between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation? Does this difference necessarily rule out common authorship? I believe such a conclusion would be premature in view of significant theological affinities uniting these two documents. While focusing on differences in vocabulary, Fiorenza regrettably neglects important similarities such as the prominence of the number seven in both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation. The Fourth Gospel contains seven messianic signs of Jesus (Köstenberger 2021), seven "I am" statements made by Jesus (John 6:35–48; 8:12=9:5; 10:9, 11–14; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1–5), and seven witnesses to Jesus (Moses and the Scriptures, John the Baptist, Jesus's works, God the Father, the Holy Spirit, Jesus's followers, and the fourth evangelist); Revelation includes seven seals (Rev 6:1–17; 8:1–5), trumpets (Rev 8:6–9:21; 11:15–19), and bowls (Rev 16:1–21). Most likely, the number seven represented the notion of perfection and completion in Johannine thought (as it does elsewhere). Fiorenza also makes little of the genre-related differences between the two writings that can be accounted for within the hypothesis of common authorship. Specifically, Fiorenza does not seriously consider the possibility that one and the same author could use different words to convey varying subject matter or that a given author may use the same word in multiple ways depending on their respective communicative purposes.

An example from the realm of musical composition will illustrate this point. Comparing Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart's two compositions, *The Magic Flute* and his *Requiem*, both written in the last year of his life (1791), may lead one to the conclusion that one and the same individual could never have written both works if one employed presuppositions prevalent in modern critical biblical scholarship. After all, there are many conspicuous, undeniable differences in mood, chord progression, and overall outlook that characterize these works. However, different genres, in Mozart's case those of comic opera and death mass, are more than sufficient to account for the composer's use of varying compositional techniques and motifs. What is more, in this case common authorship is a fact of history, which should caution modern scholars against undue dogmatism of what an ancient author could or could not have done.

Another significant case in point is John's adaptation of Second Temple genres, whether the Testament genre or apocalyptic (Attridge 2002:17). In the Fourth Gospel, the Farewell Discourse (John 13–17) serves as the functional substitute for the Synoptic Olivet Discourse (Matthew 24; Mark 13; Luke 21:5–36). The final instructions of a patriarch constitute the essence of the Second Temple genre of Testament (e.g., Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs). Patterned after their Genesis counterparts, these writings elaborate on the patriarchs' final instructions with reference to

the present. At the same time, there are differences between these Testaments and the Farewell Discourse. Jesus is not an aging, dying figure; he is anticipating his imminent resurrection. Yet he knows that his time to depart from this world has come.

Unlike the patriarchs who were cast on their deathbed, Jesus actively seizes the opportunity to share his vision with his inner circle. Similar to what Jacob (Israel) did with his twelve sons (Gen 48:11–49:33), Jesus instructs his disciples at the end of his earthly life. While the Fourth Gospel thus resembles the Second Temple genre of Testament, Revelation utilizes the Second Temple genre of apocalypse. While space does not permit a detailed discussion of genre characteristics of apocalypses, such are well documented in the scholarly literature (Collins 1979; 1998; Hellholm 1983). The fact that neither the Fourth Gospel nor Revelation slavishly conforms to these types of writings shows that the author, under divine inspiration, shaped both genres and used them to convey God's message to his people (Attridge 2002:3–21).

Occasions for Writing

Not only were the Fourth Gospel and Revelation written in different genres, the occasions for writing were different as well. Again, however, none of this necessarily rules out common authorship. A comparison of the respective occasions for writing readily reveals the author's need to choose different communicative strategies. The Fourth Gospel was written ultimately to lead unbelieving Jews or proselytes in Asia Minor to faith (John 20:30–31); Revelation is addressed to Christians in the same province (Rev 1:4; 2–3). The purpose of the Gospel is likely indirect evangelism; Revelation's purpose is the provision of comfort and reassurance and the exhortation to persevere (e.g., Rev 3:11). The Gospel highlights the significance of Jesus's first coming; the Apocalypse looks forward to Jesus's return. While in the Fourth Gospel it is primarily Jesus who suffers, and even his suffering is swallowed up in glory and exaltation, in Revelation we see the believing community subjected to intense persecution. Finally, the Gospel's overall message is that (unbelieving) readers must put their faith in Christ for salvation, Revelation's call is for believers to ensure resulting in their ultimate deliverance.

	Fourth Gospel	**Revelation**
Recipients	unbelieving Jews/proselytes in Asia Minor	Christians in Asia Minor
Purpose	indirect evangelism, leading readers to faith	comfort and reassurance, exhortation to persevere
Strategy	significance of Christ's first coming for Jews	significance of second coming for Christians

	Fourth Gospel	Revelation
Setting	little (if any) persecution, suffering	persecution, suffering
Message	believe in Christ for salvation	keep believing for ultimate deliverance

Complementary Features

Real differences in genre and presentation notwithstanding, the Fourth Gospel and Revelation can thus be viewed as complementary rather than standing in conflict with each other. Some of the complementary features of the two documents can be diagrammed as follows.

	Fourth Gospel	Revelation
Jesus	incarnate	glorified
God	immanent	transcendent
Genre	Gospel: good news of salvation	apocalyptic: visions of a new world
Focus	earth	heaven
Tone	quiet, humble	loud, powerful
Message	regeneration prerequisite for kingdom	heavenly worshipping community

In each case, the perspectives, while different, can be shown to be complementary rather than contradictory. In terms of Christology, the Fourth Gospel shows the preexistent Word becoming flesh in Jesus, followed by his earthly ministry, crucifixion, and resurrection; the Apocalypse depicts the return of the glorified Christ. Rather than dichotomize between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, we can see a harmonious sequential relationship in which Jesus is first incarnate and subsequently glorified. In fact, John's Gospel already presents the crucifixion and related events as the glorification of the Son. The Apocalypse then builds on this depiction by showing the triumphant, victorious return of the glorified Son at the end of the age.

In terms of theology, we see respective emphases on God's immanence and transcendence. The Fourth Gospel presents Jesus as the descended and ascending Son of Man who is none other than the lifted-up and exalted Servant of the Lord (John 3:13; 8:28; 12:32). In a countervailing, complementary motion, the Apocalypse presents the glorified, exalted Christ as providing John with a glimpse of heavenly glory, whether in a throne room vision or in a glimpse of the new heavenly city of Jerusalem (Revelation 4; 22).

In terms of genre, John's Gospel sets forth the good news of salvation in Jesus Christ that is to be appropriated by faith resulting in eternal life. The Apocalypse depicts that new life by casting a vision of a new world populated by God, his Christ, and believers. While the Gospel focuses on salvific events on earth, Revelation focuses on salvation's final consummation in heaven. The Gospel urges the necessity of regeneration for entering God's kingdom; Revelation anticipates a worshipping heavenly community. In all these and numerous other ways, the Gospel and the Apocalypse arguably present complementary accounts of successive junctures in salvation history.

Johannine Worldview and Characterization

In the remainder of this essay, I will highlight a variety of commonalities and theological affinities between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation, all of which underscore the plausibility of common authorship. I begin with several factors related to the Johannine worldview and characterization, such as a universal outlook, theodicy, and future-referring statements in the Fourth Gospel cohering with the outlook undergirding Revelation. I will also discuss the author's penchant to discuss theological realities in terms of polar opposites, his use of the Old Testament, and Johannine characterization.

Importance of Worldview

While R. Bultmann and C. H. Dodd, as mentioned, recognized the importance of worldview, they saw Hellenism, whether Gnosticism or Hermetic literature, as the dominant view expressed in the Johannine writings. However, the Qumran documents and the greater availability of Jewish apocalyptic material have demonstrated conclusively that the Fourth Gospel is much more Jewish in nature than Bultmann and Dodd surmised (Köstenberger 2009:ch. 6).

What is more, a close study of the Gospel reveals John's extensive reliance on Old Testament theology, in particular Isaiah, but also Ezekiel and Zechariah, not to mention Moses and the exodus narrative (Köstenberger 2007:415–512; 2022:104–28). In fact, as R. B. Hays (2016) has argued, the entire Johannine narrative builds on antecedent biblical narratives featuring seminal characters such as Abraham and the patriarchs, Moses, and king David.

Not only the Fourth Gospel, but also the Apocalypse reflects a Jewish worldview that stands in continuity with the Old Testament storyline and prophetic-apocalyptic. Unfortunately, the customary characterization of the Fourth Gospel as realized in its eschatology over against Revelation's future-oriented outlook has often been used illegitimately to drive a wedge between these two writings and to rule out common authorship. I will return to this matter shortly.

Universal Outlook and Theodicy

Both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation are universal in outlook (Beale 1988:327–29). In the Fourth Gospel, the foundational assertion is that "God so loved *the world*" (John 3:16), not merely the Jewish people (Köstenberger 2011:141–59). Also, Jesus speaks of "other sheep which are not of this fold" that "shall become one flock with one shepherd" (John 10:16; cf. Ezek 34:23; Köstenberger 2002:67–96). Jesus sends his disciples into the world (John 17:18; 20:21) and prays for "those who believe in me through their word" (17:20). In all its Jewishness, the Fourth Gospel is a work with a pervasive universal concern. The fact that an alleged sect such as the Johannine community could be so missions-minded is rarely explained by advocates of a radical form of the Johannine community hypothesis (Köstenberger 1998:ch. 5).

The focus of Revelation, on the other hand, in accordance with apocalyptic literature in general, is on the community's need for comfort and reassurance in times of intense suffering and persecution. All wrongs will be made right, those who presently exercise coercive power will be overturned, and the community will be delivered from all its enemies. What is more, what unites the Fourth Gospel and Revelation is the underlying purpose of *theodicy* (the justification of God's righteous purposes and judgment). In the Gospel, the author asserts that Jesus's rejection by the Jewish nation fulfilled Old Testament prophecy (John 12:37–41; cf. Isa 6:9–10; 53:1). In Revelation, the author, at great length, depicts the world's stubborn refusal to repent and the rightness of God's judgment (Revelation 6–16). In keeping with the varying needs of his readers, the author chose the most appropriate available genre for conveying the respective messages. Both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation have their place in the salvation-historical continuum in their respective emphases on the significance of Jesus's first and second coming.

Future-Referring Statements in the Fourth Gospel

In view of the realized eschatology of the Fourth Gospel, one might surmise that any expectation of future end-time events is absent. However, this is demonstrably not the case, as the following comments will conclusively demonstrate. We will briefly survey references to resurrection on the last day and Jesus's statement to his disciples that he will prepare a place for them.

Resurrection on the Last Day

I already mentioned the customary depiction of the Fourth Gospel as exhibiting a realized eschatology in contrast to Revelation's futuristic outlook. However, while doubtless focusing on the present reality of salvation in Christ and its attendant benefits such as abundant life in the here and now (e.g., John 10:10), the Fourth Gospel also contains several references to the future resurrection on the last day (John 5:28,

29; 6:39, 40, 44, 54; 11:25, 26; 12:48). Critical scholars such as Bultmann (1955:39; 1971:261) have attributed these future-referring passages in John's Gospel to later redactors. But if the eschatological perspectives of the Fourth Gospel and Revelation are understood to be complementary rather than contradictory, there is no need for such a hypothesis. Rather, these kinds of passages in the Fourth Gospel bear witness to the author's awareness of Jesus's own differentiation between his first and second comings. Why would it not be possible that the author at the same time affirms the present-day implications of Jesus's first coming while also holding fast to his expectation of Jesus's return at the end of time? This is, in fact, what we find in the Fourth Gospel, once long-discarded redaction-critical theories such as Bultmann's are set aside in favor of a reading of the coherent Johannine narrative.

Jesus's Preparation of a Place

Another remarkable future-referring passage in the Fourth Gospel is Jesus's statement to his disciples prior to the crucifixion that he will go and prepare a place for them (John 14:2–3). In commenting on this passage, Dodd (1953:405) maintained that Jesus used apocalyptic language to describe symbolically the transcendent character of the kingdom of God. Bultmann, as mentioned, relegated futuristic statements in the Fourth Gospel to an ecclesiastical redactor, viewing passages such as John 14:2–3 to be "symbolic pictures" of existential encounters with God (1955:42). Yet there is no need for such symbolic or redaction-critical construals. What Käsemann (1968) calls the "docetic Christ" of the Fourth Gospel is more plausibly viewed as an expression of an outlook that is more akin to Revelation than even the Synoptics. At his first coming, Jesus announced his imminent departure by telling his followers he would go and prepare their heavenly dwelling; in Revelation, the seer is given a glimpse at what these heavenly dwelling will look like (Revelation 21–22).

Polar Opposites

The Fourth Gospel and Revelation also share a common style of casting matters in terms of polar opposites (Köstenberger 2009:282–92). In the Fourth Gospel, the contrast is between followers of Jesus and unbelievers; in Revelation, it is between those who bear God's seal and those who bear the mark of the beast (Revelation 7; 13). Appropriate worship is another important theme in both writings. The Fourth Gospel features Jesus's statement that God seeks worshippers who worship him in spirit and truth (John 4:23); in Revelation, the antithesis is between worshippers of God and worshippers of Satan and the beast (Revelation 4–5; 12–15; Bauckham 1993a:118–49).

The main difference between the characterization of heavenly and earthly realities in polar opposites in the Fourth Gospel and Revelation is that the former casts matters in the form of historical narrative while the latter uses apocalyptic, symbolic language and imagery. Yet even in the Fourth Gospel we see John's use of representative characters and *double entendre*, which shows that earthly surface meaning often masks a deeper spiritual significance (Köstenberger 2009:130–67). Thus, to give but one striking example, the account of the healing of a man born blind turns out to be an acted-out parable on human blindness (John 9:39–41). The Fourth Gospel, like Revelation, frequently employs symbolism, another common feature.

Use of the Old Testament

No one can legitimately deny that there are differences in the way the Fourth Gospel and Revelation use the Old Testament (Beale 1988:318–36). The Fourth Gospel contains a number of explicit quotations, many of which are found in the passion narrative which the Fourth Gospel largely shares in common with the Synoptics (Köstenberger 2007:415–19), while Revelation deals almost exclusively with Old Testament allusions. At the same time, however, the Fourth Gospel, too, uses the Old Testament allusively (see the long list of Johannine allusions in Köstenberger 2007:419–21).

Also, the Fourth Gospel and Revelation share a reference to Zech 12:10, declaring that people will "look on the one they pierced" (John 19:37; Rev 1:7). In the Fourth Gospel, the reference is to the crucified Jesus; in Revelation, the depiction is applied to Christ's glorious return. Again, none of this is to deny that there are differences in the use of the Old Testament in both writings, but this is likely a function of their different genre—the Gospel representing historical narrative, Revelation apocalyptic dealing with evocative images and visions—rather than indications of differing authorship.

Characterization of Satan

Both books also share the characterization of Satan as the key antagonist to Jesus. Significantly, both books use the terms *Satanas* (John 13:27; Rev 2:9, 13 [2x], 24; 3:9; 12:9; 20:2, 7) and *diabolos* (John 8:44; 13:2; Rev 2:10; 12:9, 12; 20:2, 10; cf. John 13:2: *beblēkotos* and Rev 20:10: *eblēthē*). The Fourth Gospel depicts Satan, the "ruler of this world" (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11), as entering Judas to betray Jesus, triggering the crucifixion (John 13:2, 27; Köstenberger 2009:281); in Revelation, Satan is similarly cast as the primary foe, futilely seeking to thwart God's salvific purposes and symbolically depicted as a "great red dragon" (Rev 12:3) who loses the final battle and is thrown into a fiery lake in eternal judgment (Rev 20:7–10).

Jesus's statement in the Fourth Gospel upon the arrival of his "hour," "Now is the judgment of this world; now will the ruler of this world be cast out" (John 12:31), is

best interpreted as proleptically anticipating Satan's final judgment, which is all but sealed when Jesus gives his life on the cross in accordance with God's salvific purposes. Far from dividing the two documents, the depiction of the cross as the place of Satan's judgment which is ultimately realized at Jesus's return exhibits tremendous internal coherence between these writings and can be accommodated by the notion of common authorship, once rigid dichotomies are eschewed.

Theological Affinities

Having noted some common ground between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation in the areas of Johannine worldview and characterization, we now move on to theological affinities with regard to Christological titles and common terminology such as "witness," "glory," and other shared vocabulary or conceptual affinities. Note that I am not arguing here that the use of a given word or concept is necessarily the same in the Fourth Gospel and Revelation in every respect; there will be differences, but at the same time there is an underlying coherence that makes the notion of common authorship more plausible than is often presumed.

Christological Titles

The two most conspicuous Christological titles shared between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation are "Word of God" and "lamb of God." We will briefly discuss these in turn.

Word of God

Both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation depict Jesus as the Word. The notion of the preexistent divine Word, descending from heaven and accomplishing God's work on earth, and then ascending again to eternal glory, seems to have Isa 55:10–11 as its likely theological antecedent: "For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and do not return there without watering the earth, …, so shall my word be which goes forth from my mouth; it shall not return to me empty, without accomplishing what I desire, and without succeeding in the matter for which I sent it" (Parker 1988:35).

Against this backdrop, Fourth Gospel refers to Jesus as "the Word" (*logos*) that became flesh and dwelt among God's people (John 1:1, 14). Similarly, Revelation depicts the return of Christ as the coming of "The Word of God" (Rev 19:13). The references to Jesus as the bread of life, living water, and life itself in the Fourth Gospel may likewise represent elaborations of the *logos* theme taken from Isa 55:10–11, in addition to drawing on creation and exodus motifs. Christ's preexistence is also affirmed in Revelation where Christ is called "the beginning of the creation of God" (Rev 3:14; Loader 1978:525–54).

Lamb of God

As briefly noted above, the Fourth Gospel and Revelation use slightly different terms when referring to Jesus as the "lamb of God" (*amnos* [John 1:29, 36] and *arnion* [Rev 5:6, 8, 12, 13 *et passim*], respectively; though see *arnion* in John 21:15). That said, it is not accurate to say, as Fiorenza does, that the theologies of the "lamb of God" in these two documents are essentially different or even incompatible. Far from dividing the two documents, the term "lamb of God" rather provides an important bridge between the two.

The "lamb that was slain" in fulfillment of Old Testament symbolism (John 1:29, 36) is none other than the risen, glorified lion of Judah, the root of David who has overcome in order to serve as God's agent in bringing this world to judgment (Rev 19:9). As Bauckham (1993b:62) observes, "It is because Christians owed salvation to Jesus Christ that he was worshipped." There is thus an integral connection between the sacrificial lamb referenced in the Gospel and the lamb worshipped in Revelation.

Common Terminology

The Fourth Gospel and Revelation share several important semantic domains and clusters of motifs. Among these are "witness," "glory," the Spirit, mystery and revelation, God's dwelling with his people, and the notion of "seeing God." Again, we will briefly discuss each of these in turn.

Witness

In the Farewell Discourse, Jesus tells his disciples that they are in but not of the world (John 17:11, 14, 16). He predicts future persecution and stresses the importance of faithful witness to him (John 15:18–16:4). The semantic domain of "witness" and its various cognates is shared by the Fourth Gospel, the Johannine epistles, and Revelation. The verb *martyreō* ("to witness") occurs thirty-three times in the Fourth Gospel, ten times in the Johannine epistles, and four times in Revelation. Though this word is also found in Acts, Paul's writings, and Hebrews, it does not occur at all in the other General Epistles and is found only once each in Matthew and Luke.

The term *martyria* ("testimony") occurs over fifteen times in the Fourth Gospel, five times in the Johannine epistles, and nine times in Revelation. It is also found three times in Mark and once each in Luke, Acts, 1 Timothy, and Titus. At the same time, the term *martyrion* ("witness") occurs neither in the Fourth Gospel nor in the Johannine epistles and only once in Revelation (Rev 15:5), while it is used more frequently in other New Testament writings. Lastly, the term *martys* ("witness") occurs mostly in Acts in accordance with its subject matter but is also found five times in Revelation (Rev 1:5; 2:3; 3:14; 11:3; 17:6).

While the term "witness" takes on the meaning "martyr" in Revelation, there is clear overlap and continuity in the use of the *mart-* word group in both writings. Rather than reflect the church-synagogue conflict at the end of the first century AD as J. L. Martyn proposed, "witness" terminology in the Fourth Gospel attests to the fact that Jesus, even during his earthly mission, expressed a concern for his followers' faithful future witness. About half a century later, the glorified Christ communicated to John in visions his renewed concern for the church's witness to him, now that his predictions regarding his disciples' intense persecution had come true.

Glory

Another term that has great significance in both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation is *doxa* ("glory"; Bauckham 2015:43–62; Cook 1984:291–97; Pamment 1983:12–16). The expression occurs nineteen times in the Fourth Gospel (John 1:14 [2]; 2:11; 5:41, 44 [2]; 7:18 [2]; 8:50, 54; 9:24; 11:4, 40; 12:41, 43 [2]; 17:5, 22, 24) and sixteen times in Revelation (Rev 1:6; 4:9, 11; 5:12, 13; 7:12; 11:13; 14:7; 15:8; 16:9; 18:1; 19:1, 7; 21:11, 23, 24, 26). In addition, the verb *doxazō* ("to glorify") occurs twenty-three times in the Fourth Gospel (John 7:39; 8:54 [2]; 11:4; 12:16, 23, 28 [3]; 13:31 [2], 32 [3]; 14:13; 15:8; 16:14; 17:1 [2], 4, 5, 10; 21:19) and twice in Revelation (Rev 15:4; 18:8). Thus "glory" constitutes a major shared theological concept in these two writings.

The Fourth Gospel depicts Jesus's crucifixion, together with his burial and resurrection, as his glorification (John 12:23, 28; cf. 12:32). While the Fourth Gospel shows how Jesus's messianic signs reveal God's glory (e.g., John 2:11; cf. 1:14), the Apocalypse shows the full and final revelation of God's glory in Jesus at his second coming (Rev 1:12–16). As W. R. Cook (1984:296) notes, it is particularly in the doxological passages in Revelation (Rev 7:12; 11:13; 14:7; 15:9; 19:1, 7) that God is shown to bring his eternal purposes to consummation. The same author also points out that, in the Fourth Gospel, the glory of God is seen in Christ's redemptive work, while in Revelation it is demonstrated in the triumph of the kingdom of God.

The Spirit

Both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation significantly feature the Spirit (Allison and Köstenberger 2020:68–79, 188–94; Bauckham 1993a:150–73). In the Fourth Gospel, references to the Spirit crescendo in the second half in the Farewell Discourse (John 14:16–17, 26; 15:26; 16:7, 13; cf. 1:32–33; 3:34; 6:63; 7:39; 20:22). Revelation features four visions given to John "in the Spirit" (Rev 1:10; 4:2; 17:3; 21:10; cf. 19:10; 22:6, 17; Bauckham 1993a:150), presents the letters to the seven churches as messages by the Spirit of God (Rev 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22), and speaks of the sevenfold Spirit (Rev 3:1; 4:5; 5:6), with the number seven doubtless alluding to the perfection of the Holy Spirit.

In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus announces the future revelatory ministry of the Spirit: "He will disclose to you what is to come" (John 16:13). The prominence attributed to the Spirit in the formation and completion of the canon through the apostolic intermediaries, which Jesus anticipated in the Fourth Gospel, reaches its climax in the revelation of the glorified Lord Jesus Christ at his triumphant return at the end of the age, envisioned in Revelation by "the spirit of prophecy" (Rev 19:10; cf. 22:6; Bauckham 1993a:160–62). There is thus an integral connection between the Fourth Gospel's presentation of the Spirit's ministry in conjunction with Jesus's first coming and the Spirit's role in relation to the *parousia* (Jesus's return).

Mystery and Revelation

Revelation is a major theme connecting the Fourth Gospel and Revelation. Even though the term *mystērion* ("mystery," "symbol") occurs only in Revelation (Rev 1:20; 10:7; 17:5, 7), the theological theme of hiddenness and revelation is present in both documents (Beale and Gladd 2014; cf. Carson 2004:393–436). In the Fourth Gospel, the purpose of Jesus's first coming is not only to save people but also to reveal God (John 1:18; 3:16–17; 14:9). The concept of hiddenness and revelation surfaces at the end of the first half of the Fourth Gospel (John 12:36–41).

The revelation of God was an essential prerequisite for the disciples' mission as witnesses to Jesus (John 15:26–27) and as Jesus's emissaries and representatives (John 17:18; 20:21). At his first coming, Jesus revealed God to his followers; they, in turn, were sent out to reveal Jesus to others; and at his second coming, Jesus will be fully revealed in all his glory. The Johannine writings thus present Jesus as hidden from the world but as revealed to those who place their faith in him and who will see him at his triumphant return.

God's Dwelling with His People

The verb *skēnoō* ("to dwell"; lit., "to pitch one's tent") is used in both the Fourth Gospel (John 1:14) and Revelation (Rev 7:15; 12:12; 13:6; 21:3). The shared antecedent is the Old Testament Tabernacle, which served as a visible representation of God's presence amid his people. While Jesus temporarily dwelt among God's people during his earthly sojourn, the new age will be characterized by believers permanently living in God's presence. A salvation-historical reading of these passages provides one with the key to an understanding of the progression in the divine plan, moving from Eden to the Tabernacle, the temple, Jesus, and ultimately heaven. Nothing in the presentation of God's dwelling with God's people in the Fourth Gospel and Revelation requires different authors. Instead, the two documents are to be placed at subsequent junctures along the salvation-historical continuum and sustain remarkable thematic coherence which allows for common authorship.

Seeing God

Both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation include references to seeing God. This is all the more remarkable as in the Old Testament no one is able to see God and live (Exod 33:20). The Fourth Gospel uses such language in John 1:18, 50; 5:37 (cf. Deut 4:12); 6:46; 7:16; 11:40; 12:41, 45 (cf. Isaiah 6); and 14:7, 9 (cf. Exod 34:6). Revelation similarly refers to "seeing God" in passages such as Rev 1:7 and 22:4 (Ladd 1993:682–83). C. Rowland (1984: 498–507) sees these passages in light of the apocalyptic notion of the revelation of divine secrets (more broadly, see Rowland 1982). Consequently, he interprets John 1:51 as referring to Jesus's bearing of divine glory at which even angels long to look (cf. Eph 3:10; 1 Pet 1:12).

The Fourth Gospel portrays unregenerate human beings, even Jesus's closest followers, as incapable of grasping the significance of Jesus's coming. Nathanael's confession preceding John 1:51 must not be understood as reflecting deep insight regarding Jesus's divine origin and nature. Even in John 14:8–12, Jesus's disciples fail to see God in Jesus. The Fourth Gospel thus bears ample testimony to the necessity of the Spirit for a true understanding of the significance of Jesus's coming and of his true identity as God incarnate. While God was still substantially concealed in Jesus during his earthly existence, his glory will be fully revealed at the end of the age. At that time, there will be no more misunderstanding.

Perseverance

Both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation exhibit a concern for the genuineness of faith and the perseverance of believers (Fourth Gospel: *menō*; Revelation: *hypomenō*). Note that these different terms can be seen to reflect the respective concerns of Christ before his crucifixion (Fourth Gospel) and at his final revelation at his return (Revelation). In the circumstances recorded in the Fourth Gospel, the disciples will be without Christ's physical presence. They will need to go through a transition period and adjust to Christ's spiritual presence in their midst by his Spirit (cf. John 14–16). Later, in Revelation, Jesus's concern for the suffering communities of believers is for their endurance until the ultimate victory is secured.

Revelation recites God's promises to those who endure until the end (*nikaō*, "to overcome," is found in Rev 2:7, 11, 17, 26; 3:5, 12, 21; 5:5; 6:2; 11:7; 12:11; 13:7; 15:2; 17:14; 21:7). This echoes similar language in the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine epistles (e.g., John 16:33; 1 John 2:13, 14; 4:4; 5:4, 5), which is all the more remarkable as other occurrences of the term in the New Testament are rare (cf. Luke 11:22; Rom 3:4; 12:21; *hypernikaō* in Rom 8:37). The Fourth Gospel emphasizes that not everyone who "believes" is a true believer, but only those who keep believing (John 2:23–24; 6:60, 66; 8:31–32; 15:1–17; Carson 1982:59–91). Both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation focus on God's sovereign election and predestination (Köstenberg-

er 2009:458–64). Those who harden themselves against Jesus and reject him, reject God. This rejection is their own responsibility, not God's.

Thus the Fourth Gospel and Revelation complement each other. In the Fourth Gospel, those who reject Jesus incur judgment, while those who receive him inherit the right to become God's children (John 1:12). In Revelation, both judgment and entrance into God's kingdom are executed and administered by Jesus. In the Fourth Gospel, no one can come to Jesus unless it is given to him by God (John 6:44). After his glorification, Jesus will draw both believing Jews and Gentiles to himself (John 12:32). Believers are God's gift to Jesus (John 6:35–40; 17:2, 6–12; cf. Ps 2:8). In Revelation, the call to repentance is issued to the seven churches (Rev 2:5, 16, 21, 22; 3:3, 19), but never to the world (Rev 3:20, 21; 16:11; 22:11). The towering image in Revelation is the irresistible sovereignty of God under which people are to seek refuge (Carson 1981).

Conclusion

The Fourth Gospel is compatible with a perspective that focuses all the hopes of Jewish apocalyptic on Jesus. While the Jewish apocalypticist hoped to ascend to heaven in order to catch a glimpse of God's throne and glory, the Fourth Gospel shows that God, in Christ, had come down to earth. In order for people to ascend to God, God first must descend to earth. In Jesus, the apocalypticist's dream, a firsthand knowledge of God, had come true. While people cannot see God directly, they can see God in Jesus. Eternal life is to "know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent" (John 17:3). Thus Jesus can be seen to realize Jewish apocalyptic hopes (Rowland 1984:498). In a sense, the Fourth Gospel therefore represents a reversal of apocalyptic. While in the Second Temple period the apocalypticist sought to find access to the elusive deity, in the Fourth Gospel God is shown to have taken the initiative to visit his people (cf. John 1:9–11; 3:16–17).

The Fourth Gospel does not reflect anti- or non-apocalypticism so much as fulfilled apocalypticism. While this fulfillment is yet partial and preliminary, it is sufficient to validate the authenticity of the person and work of Christ. Jesus's person and work, in turn, form the basis for his disciples' proclamation. John was a privileged man indeed. As a young man, he saw Jesus's temporary, incarnate glory; as an old man, he caught a glimpse of Jesus's permanent, transcendent glory. Joel had prophesied that "your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions" upon the outpouring of God's Spirit in the last days (Joel 2:28). While Stephen, Paul, and Peter all had visions recorded in the book of Acts (Acts 7:55–56; 9:3–6; 10:10–16), it was John who received visions that most typically resemble the kinds of visions prophesied by Joel: apocalyptic visions of a cataclysmic end of the world, of the powerful display of God's judgment, and of the deliverance of God's people.

As I conclude, it is fitting to return to the opening illustration comparing one author writing both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation with Mozart's composition of documents as diverse as *The Magic Flute* and *The Requiem* in the final year of his life. While the analogy holds, I believe there is one important additional aspect in the case of one author writing both the Fourth Gospel and Revelation. At a young age, the author, as he claims in his Gospel, witnessed Jesus's earthly ministry. He was among those who ate the Last Supper and saw the crucified and risen Lord. Half a century later, at the prodding of some of his disciples, he wrote down an account of his experience with the earthly Jesus. A few years later, when exiled to the island of Patmos, the same author had a series of visions, which he also committed to writing. So while the *composition* of these two documents was only a few years apart, the actual *experience* of what is underlying these accounts spans from the 30s to the 90s AD. The outlook and style is that of a mature, seasoned believer; the two writings he produced cover the entire range from seeing Jesus in the flesh as a young man to receiving visions about the glorified, exalted Jesus in glory as a man advanced in years.

Personally, I believe this kind of scenario is every bit as plausible as highly complex critical theories involving multiple schools, amanuenses, or layers of redaction. In fact, there are some similarities between this scenario and the origin of this essay as a seminar paper over thirty years ago in the Revelation seminar at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, taught by the late Grant Osborne, a preeminent Revelation scholar, to whose memory this paper is gratefully dedicated. It has been my purpose in this paper to point to common ground between the Fourth Gospel and Revelation in form of theological affinities that enhance the plausibility of common authorship. While the affinities adduced fall short of conclusive proof, I hope I have shown that the contention that the Gospel and the Apocalypse "represent opposite eschatological options" that could not have been held by one and the same author is premature and that common authorship is a likely, if not probable, option worthy of serious consideration.

Bibliography

Allison, G. R., and A. J. Köstenberger. (2020)*The Holy Spirit.* Theology for the People of God. Nashville: B&H Academic.

Attridge, H. W. (2002) "Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 121: 3–21.

Barrett, C. K. *The Gospel according to St. John.* Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, .

Bauckham, R. (1978)*The Climax of Prophecy: Studies in the Book of Revelation.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993a.

Bauckham, R. (2015) *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology.* Grand Rapids: Baker.

Bauckham, R. (1993) *The Theology of the Book of Revelation.* New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beale, G. K. (1988) "The Old Testament in the New Testament: Revelation." Pages 318–36 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars.* Edited by D. A. Carson and H. M. G. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beale, G. K., and B. L. Gladd. (2014) *Hidden but Now Revealed: A Biblical Theology of Mystery.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Boismard, M.-É. (1962) "St. Luc et la rédaction du quatrième évangile." *RB* 69: 185–211.

Brown, R. E. (1966) *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times.* New York: Paulist, 1979.

Brown, R. E. *The Gospel according to John I–XII.* AB 29. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Bultmann, R. (1971) *The Gospel of John.* Westminster: Philadelphia.

Bultmann, R. (1951, 1955) *Theology of the New Testament.* 2 vols. Translated by K. Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Bultmann, R. (1969) "The Eschatology of the Gospel of John." Pages 165–83 in *Faith and Understanding.* New York: Harper & Row.

Carson, D. A. (1981) *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility: Biblical Perspectives in Tension.* Atlanta: John Knox.

Carson, D. A. (1991) *The Gospel according to John.* PNTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Carson, D. A. (2004) "Mystery and Fulfillment: Toward a More Comprehensive Paradigm of Paul's Understanding of the Old and the New." Pages 393–436 in *Justification and Variegated Nomism*, vol. 2: *The Paradoxes of Paul.* Edited by D. A. Carson, P. T. O'Brien, and M. A. Seifrid. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck/Grand Rapids: Baker.

Carson, D. A. (1982) "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel." *TynBul* 33: 59–91.

Collins, J. J., ed. (1979) *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre. Semeia* 14.

Collins, J. J. (2016) *The Apocalyptic Imagination.* 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Cook, W. R. (1984) "The 'Glory' Motif in the Johannine Corpus." *JETS* 27: 291–97.

Cullmann, O. *Der johanneische Kreis. Zum Ursprung des Johannesevangeliums.* Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1975. ET: *The Johannine Circle.* Philadelphia/London: Westminster/SCM.

Culpepper, R. A. (1975) *The Johannine School.* SBLDS 26. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press .

Dodd, C. H. (1953) *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.* London/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fiorenza, E. S. (1985) "The Quest for the Johannine School: The Book of Revelation and the Fourth Gospel." Pages 85–113 in *The Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment.* Philadelphia: Fortress. (1977) "The Quest for the Johannine School: The Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse." *NTS* 23: 402–27.

Hays, R. B. (2016) *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels.* Waco, TX: Baylor University Press .

Hellholm, D., ed. (1983) *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East.* Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck.

Käsemann, E. (1968) *The Testament of Jesus. A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17.* Philadelphia: Fortress.

Köstenberger, A. J. (2020) *Handbook on Hebrews through Revelation*. Handbooks on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Köstenberger, A. J. (1998) *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____. (2021) *Signs of the Messiah: An Introduction to John's Gospel.* Bellingham, WA: Lexham.

_____. *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters: The Word, the Christ, the Son of God.* BTNT. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

_____. (2022) "Exodus in John." Pages 104–28 in *The Exodus in the New Testament.* LNTS. Edited by S. M. Ehorn. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2022.

_____. (2012) "The Genre of the Fourth Gospel and Greco-Roman Literary Conventions." Pages 435–62 in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*, vol. 1: *Early Christianity in Its Hellenistic Context.* Texts and Editions for New Testament Study. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts. Leiden: Brill.

_____. (2002) "Jesus the Good Shepherd Who Will Also Bring Other Sheep (John 10:16): The Old Testament Background of a Familiar Metaphor." *BBR* 12: 67–96.

_____. (2007) "John." Pages 415–512 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament.* Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker.

_____. "John." In *Dictionary of the New Testament Use of the Old Testament.* Edited by G. K. Beale, D. A. Carson, B. L. Gladd, and A. D. Naselli. Grand Rapids: Baker, forthcoming.

_____. (2011) "Lifting Up the Son of Man and God's Love for the World: John 3:16 in Its Historical, Literary, and Theological Contexts." Pages 141–59 in *Understanding the Times: New Testament Studies in the 21st Century: Essays in*

Honor of D. A. Carson on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday. Edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger and Robert W. Yarbrough. Wheaton: Crossway.

_____. (Fall 2021) "The Use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles." *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 64/1: 41–55.

_____. (2023) and G. Goswell. *Biblical Theology: A Canonical, Thematic, and Ethical Approach.* Wheaton: Crossway.

Ladd, G. E. *A* (1993) *Theology of the New Testament.* Rev. ed. Edited by Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

_____. (1958) "Why Not *Prophetic-Apocalyptic*?" *JBL* 76: 192–200.

Loader, W. R. G. (1978) "The Apocalyptic Model of Sonship." *JBL* 97: 525–54.

Martyn, J. L. (2003) *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 3rd ed. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Moule, C. F. D. (1970) "A Neglected Factor in the Interpretation of Johannine Eschatology." Pages 155–60 in *Studies in John presented to Professor Dr J. N. Sevenster on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. NovTSup 24. Edited by W. C. van Unnik et al. Leiden: Brill.

Pamment, M. (1988) "The Meaning of *doxa* in the Fourth Gospel." *ZNW* 74 (1983): 12–16.

Parker, J. "The Incarnational Christology of John." *Criswell Theological Review* 3: 31–48.

Rowland, C. (1982) *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity.* New York: Crossroad.

_____. (1984) "John 1.51, Jewish Apocalyptic and Targumic Tradition." *NTS* 30: 498–507.

Smith, D. M. (1975) "Johannine Christianity: Some Reflections on Its Character and Delineation." *NTS* 21: 222–48.

Weiss, J. (1904) *Die Offenbarung Johannes.* FRLANT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.