

**I AM**

**LESSON THREE**

**COMMENTARY**

# COMMENTARY NOTES

## JOHN 10:7-18

### D. A. Carson, In the *Pillar Commentary*, explains how Jesus is the Good Shepherd:

The fuller explanation in these verses cannot easily be accommodated as long as we think of vv. 1-5 as a cohesive narrative parable, and the verses before us as mere explanation of them. Now Jesus is not the shepherd who goes through the gate; rather, he is the gate (v. 7). Before, the shepherd led the sheep out of the fold; now he leads them in and out (v. 9). Hired hands are introduced (v. 12), along with sheep from other sheep pens (v. 16), and the death of the shepherd (v. 15). The tensions are largely alleviated when we recognize that the expansions in these verses are not predicated on a single, narrative parable, but are further metaphorical uses of the three dominant features of the shepherding language introduced in vv. 1-5—*viz.* the gate, which generates further metaphorical expansion in vv. 7-10; the shepherd, whose parallels with Jesus are further elucidated in vv. 11-18; and the notion of his own sheep, further expanded in vv. 26-30. This last section is placed a little further on in the chapter because it admirably explains the Jews' unbelief of Jesus' messianic claims. In short, John 10 makes sense as it stands, as long as we do not approach it with false expectations of a formally coherent *narrative*.

**10:7-8.** Both here and in v. 9, Jesus claims, *I am the gate* (cf. Additional Note). (On the 'I am' formula with a predicate, cf. notes on 6:35; on the asseveration *I tell you the truth*, cf. notes on 1:51; 10:1.) In vv. 1-5, Jesus the shepherd enters the sheep pen through the gate; here, he is the gate. Even if we allow for the various sources that demonstrate that some Near-Eastern shepherds slept in the gateway of their own sheep pens, keeping marauders out and sheep in (cf. Beasley-Murray, p. 169), the tensions are not entirely alleviated. For although such background allows the reader to link the gate and the shepherd, the framework is still quite different from vv. 1-5, where a watchman presides at the gate, sanctioning the entrance of the shepherd, and several flocks are assumed to be in the fold. Here, the watchman has disappeared, and the only flock in the enclosure belongs to the shepherd who serves as the gate. In short, this is not an explanation of vv. 1-5, so much as an expansion of some of the metaphors found in those verses.

Some scholars suppose that in v. 7 Jesus is the gate *to* the sheep, deciding which putative shepherd may gain access to the sheep, while in v. 9 he becomes the gate *for* the sheep, allowing them ready entrance and egress. (The Greek is ambiguous.) The distinction is too clever; it assumes a continuation of the watchman motif from v. 3, even though that metaphor has been left behind. Verse 8 does not sanction a continuation of the motif. Rather, the earlier contrast between the shepherd and the thieves and robbers (vv. 1-5) is now slightly transformed into a contrast between the gate (which may also be the shepherd) and the thieves and robbers: *i.e.* the latter come with selfish motives and brutal tactics to ravage the flock, while the former serves as a symbol of security and plenty (cf. vv. 9-10). The ensuing verses suggest that *All who ever came before me* excludes from the indictment such leaders as Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah and others who heard God's voice in former times, and who served him faithfully in the terms of the covenant to which they had sworn allegiance. Nevertheless, the expression surely hints at more than despotic local leaders who care more for their own gain than for the sheep in their care (cf. 'thieves and robbers' in v. 8). It sounds, rather, as if reference is being made to messianic pretenders who promise the people freedom but who lead them into war, suffering and slavery. The freedom Jesus wins for his people (cf. notes on 8:34) will be achieved not by sword and shield, but by a cross. If large crowds are taken up with the pretenders, the real sheep do not listen to them (cf. v. 5).

**10:9-10.** Barrett (pp. 371-373) provides an impressive list of 'gate' expressions in Jewish, Christian and Hellenistic sources. But the lavishness of the list defeats its purpose. All that is demonstrated is that 'gate' is a common metaphor in various religions. What significance it has in any particular passage must be determined by the contextual and conceptual parameters of the text at hand. Here, the idea is not that Jesus the shepherd draws out his own flock from a rather mixed fold (vv. 1-5), but that Jesus the gate is the sole means by which the sheep may enter the safety of the fold (v. 9a) or the luxurious forage of the pasture (v. 9b). The thought is akin to 14:6: 'I am the way and the truth

# COMMENTARY NOTES

and the life. No-one comes to the Father except through me.’ While the thief comes *only to steal and kill and destroy*, Jesus comes *that they may have life, and have it to the full*. This is a proverbial way of insisting that there is only one means of receiving eternal life (the Synoptics might have preferred to speak of entering the kingdom, although entering into life is also attested there), only one source of knowledge of God, only one fount of spiritual nourishment, only one basis for spiritual security—Jesus alone. The world still seeks its humanistic, political saviours—its Hitlers, its Stalins, its Maos, its Pol Pots—and only too late does it learn that they blatantly confiscate personal property (they come ‘only to steal’), ruthlessly trample human life under foot (they come ‘only ... to kill’), and contemptuously savage all that is valuable (they come ‘only ... to destroy’). ‘Jesus is right. It is not the Christian doctrine of heaven that is the myth, but the humanist dream of utopia.’

Within the metaphorical world, *life ... to the full* suggests fat, contented, flourishing sheep, not terrorized by brigands; outside the narrative world, it means that the life Jesus’ true disciples enjoy is not to be construed as more time to fill (merely ‘everlasting’ life), but life at its scarcely imagined best, life to be lived. It is tempting to see here an allusion to Psalm 118:20, ‘This is the gate of the Lord through which the righteous may enter.’ Certainly the subsequent verses (118:22–24) are happily applied to Christ elsewhere in the New Testament (Mt. 21:42; 2 Pet. 2:7).

**10:11.** As vv. 7–10 depict Jesus as the gate for the sheep, so vv. 11–18, picking up on another expression from vv. 1–5, portray Jesus as the shepherd—indeed, the ‘good’ (*kalos*) shepherd. Many people in the industrialized West (though not Australians!) are inclined to think of shepherds as sentimental beings, perhaps somewhat effeminate, with their arms full of cuddly lambs, and the English adjective ‘good’ does nothing to dissuade us from these misconceptions. But the shepherd’s job was tiring, manly and sometimes dangerous. The word *kalos* suggests perhaps nobility or worth: the noble shepherd or the worthy shepherd (though Lindars’ ‘ideal shepherd’, p. 361, reaches a bit beyond the semantic range of the word). Elsewhere Jesus is said to be the *true* light, the *true* vine, the *true* manna, and so forth, always with reference to a temporal and perhaps failed type. The expression serves to identify him as the *genuine* antitype, with roots in eternity. Here, however, Jesus is not contrasting himself with temporal types, successful or otherwise, but with hired hands who have no real attachment to the sheep. Over against their deep self-interest, he is the noble shepherd. On the ‘I am’ formula with a predicate, cf. notes on 6:35; on the Old Testament background, cf. the notes on vv. 1–2; there may also be a self-conscious allusion to the worthless shepherd of Zechariah 11:17. The numerous parallels drawn from Hellenistic and gnostic sources (cf. especially Bauer, pp. 143–144) belong to a quite different world, and are possible only because they too draw from the universals of first-century experience.

Within the metaphorical world, that *the good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep* means no more than that he is prepared to do so. He is willing to risk his life for the sheep, perhaps by beating back a marauding bear (cf. 1 Sa. 17:34–36). But the death of shepherds for such reasons must have been fairly rare, and even then it would never be the *intention* of the shepherd to die. That would leave his flock entirely exposed. But by the strong language Jesus uses, he points beyond the metaphorical world to himself. He does not merely risk his life, he lays it down, in line with the Father’s will (vv. 17, 18). Far from being accidental, Jesus’ death is precisely what qualifies him to be the good shepherd—a point presupposed in Hebrews 13:20, which acknowledges Jesus to be ‘that great Shepherd of the sheep’. And by his death, far from exposing his flock to further ravages, he draws them to himself (12:32).

The words ‘for (*hyper*) the sheep’ suggest sacrifice. The preposition, itself ambiguous, in John always occurs in a sacrificial context, whether referring to the death of Jesus (6:51; 10:11, 15; 11:50ff.; 17:19; 18:14), of Peter (13:37–38), or of a man prepared to die for his friend (15:13). In no case does this suggest a death with merely exemplary significance; in each case the death envisaged is on behalf of someone else. The shepherd does not die for his sheep to serve as an example, throwing himself off a cliff in a grotesque and futile display while bellowing, ‘See how much I love you!’ No, the assumption is that the sheep are in mortal danger; that in their defence the shepherd loses his life; that by his death they are saved. That, and that alone, is what makes him *the good shepherd*. He carries a cross,

# COMMENTARY NOTES

not plastic explosives or an Uzi sub-machine-gun. Moreover, Jesus' death is here presented as a sacrifice peculiarly directed to the redemption of *his sheep*, whether of this (Jewish) sheep pen or of others (v. 16). This emphasis on the *intentionality* of Jesus' sacrifice is itself grounded on Jesus' peculiar intimacy with his sheep, an intimacy whose proper analogy is the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son (vv. 14-15 and notes there).

**10:12-13.** Thieves and robbers (vv. 1, 8) are obviously wicked; the hired hand is not wicked, simply more committed to his own well-being than to the well-being of the sheep. When care for the flock is neither too arduous nor too dangerous, he is willing to work and receive his pay; but *when he sees the wolf coming*, when there is danger to his own skin, he retires forthwith and abandons the sheep to their devices. This cannot be surprising: the man *is a hired hand and cares nothing for the sheep*. It is uncertain whether or not the hired hand refers to certain religious leaders who perform their duty well enough in normal times, always provided they are paid, but who never display personal care for the sheep in times of danger, occupied as they are with their own safety and advancement. It may be that the hired hand is primarily a foil to emphasize what is characteristic about the good shepherd (in the next verses).

**10:14-15.** The repetition of *I am the good shepherd* (cf. notes on v. 11) not only lays emphasis on the sacrificial theme already introduced and about to be enlarged upon (vv. 15, 17, 18), but signals to the reader that what immediately follows, the theme of the mutual knowledge of the shepherd and the sheep (vv. 14, 15), is also of great importance. This mutual recognition, or better, mutual knowledge, is clearly experiential, and is analogous to the mutual knowledge of the Father and the Son (v. 15). That the shepherd knows his sheep, and the sheep know their shepherd, is presupposed by vv. 3-4; this mutual knowledge is precisely what ensures that they follow their shepherd, and only him. But the intimacy of this relationship is mirrored on the intimacy between the Father and the Son (cf. also notes on 15:9-11); indeed, the intimacy of the sheep/shepherd relationship is *grounded upon* the intimacy between the Father and the Son (cf. notes on 17:21; cf. also Mt. 11:27). However clearly this Gospel portrays Jesus as the Saviour of the world (4:42), the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world (1:29, 36), it insists no less emphatically that Jesus has a peculiar relation with those the Father has given him (6:37ff.), with those he has chosen out of the world (15:16, 19). So here: Jesus' death is peculiarly for his sheep, just as we elsewhere read that 'Christ loved the church and gave himself up for her' (Eph. 5:25).

Because of the clarity of the later passages (15:9-11; 17:21), not to mention the theme of sacrifice in this passage ('I lay down my life for the sheep' is repeated in v. 15), the intimacy envisaged here cannot legitimately be confused with the Hellenistic mysticism of the magical papyri, still less with the vagaries of the modern 'new age' movement. John envisages no *identification* between God and the believer; 'man is not deified but delivered' (Barrett, p. 376).

**10:16.** *I have other sheep* is tied to the previous two verses by the assumption that, however many sheep Jesus has, they are known to Jesus and ultimately respond to his voice. At the same time, this verse refers back to vv. 1-5. There the sheep pen represents Judaism. Jesus calls his own sheep out of that fold, thereby constituting his own flock; the sheep that remain in that pen are, presumably, the unbelieving Jews. If Jesus has *other sheep that are not of this sheep pen*, the reference must be to Gentiles. When he calls them, they, too, will respond to his voice, *and there shall be one flock and one shepherd* (cf. Additional Note). Thus, salvation which is 'from the Jews' (4:22) must first be announced to the Jews, but opens to enlist Gentiles as well (cf. Rom. 1:16). Jesus' death was not only 'for the Jewish nation' but also 'for the scattered children of God, to bring them together and make them one' (11:51-52). This is the fulfillment of messianic prophecy, and the ground of the Gentile mission. Indeed, if it is Jesus himself who must gather these sheep from other pens, it is assumed that it is Jesus himself who is operative in the Gentile mission (cf. the closing words of Mt. 28:18-20). The vision of unity in the words *one flock and one shepherd* not only prepares the reader for the dominant theme of ch. 17, but receives major treatment in other New Testament books (e.g., 1 Cor. 12; 2 Cor. 5:14-21; Gal. 3:28; Eph. 2:11-22; 4:3-6).

# COMMENTARY NOTES

**10:17.** Jesus has just set out the relationship between the Father and the Son as the analogue of the relationship between the sheep and the shepherd. But the relationship between the Father and the Son is more fundamental than that. The love of the Father for the Son, and the love of the Son for the Father, are logically prior to the love of God for the world, and the basis that makes salvation possible (cf. notes on 3:35; 5:20; 8:29; 14:31). If Jesus has just mentioned the unique intimacy he enjoys with his Father, he is now at pains to elucidate *why* the Father loves him. It is not that the Father withholds his love until Jesus agrees to give up his life on the cross and rise again. Rather, the love of the Father for the Son is eternally linked with the unqualified obedience of the Son to the Father, his utter dependence upon him, culminating in this greatest act of obedience now just before him: willingness to bear the shame and ignominy of Golgotha, the isolation and rejection of death, the sin and curse reserved for the Lamb of God.

The last clause of the verse should probably be read as a purpose clause: Jesus lays down his life *in order to* take it up again. Jesus' sacrificial death was not an end in itself, and his resurrection an afterthought. His death was with the resurrection in view. He died in order to rise, and by his rising to proceed toward his ultimate glorification (12:23; 17:5) and the pouring out of the Spirit (7:37–39) so that others, too, might live.

**10:18.** In one sense, of course, Jesus' enemies conspired against him and killed him. But if that is all that can be said, it is unclear how his death could be construed as anything more heroic than a martyr's commitment—certainly not a God-ordained sacrifice whose moral significance is bound up with the willingness of the sacrifice to submit to God's will. The early Christians, understanding these issues well, simultaneously reproached the official executioners, and confidently prayed, 'They did what your power and will had decided beforehand should happen' (Acts 4:27–28). So here: not only Jesus' disciples before the cross, but any who are interested in becoming Christians after the event, must understand that looking at the crucifixion from God's perspective assures us that no part of it took place outside God's plan. How could the most significant event in redemptive history be construed in any other way?

However these difficult questions are weighed (cf. Carson), Jesus' point is that the sacrificial death of the shepherd, when it occurs, must not be taken as an accident of fate or merely as a tragedy perpetrated by misguided men, but as the Father's plan. Part of the Son's obedience to that plan is his consummate awareness that he lays down his life of his own accord. The authority he has received from his Father sanctions not only this, but his own resurrection. So at one are the Father and the Son in this plan that, 'When, in rising from the dead, Jesus takes up his life again, nothing occurs other than that the Father glorifies him' (Schnackenburg, 2. 302).

Nevertheless, though the Father and Son are at one, it is the oneness of command and obedience: *This command I received from my Father* (cf. notes on 5:16ff). The theme of Jesus' obedience is already well established; the language of command is common from here on in John (and in 1 Jn. and 2 Jn. as well), whether the commands of the Father to the Son (10:18; 12:49–50; 14:31; 15:10), or of the Son to his disciples (13:34; 14:15, 21; 15:10, 12, 14, 17). Cf. especially the notes on 15:9–11.<sup>1</sup>

## JOHN 10:7–18

**Colin Kruse, in the *Tyndale New Testament Commentary*, notes John's change of setting to the open courtyard and what it means for Jesus's "I am" statements:**

The setting of this passage is different from that of 10:1–6. There it was the village setting: the courtyards and narrow streets on to which they opened. Here the setting is the open country into which the shepherd led the sheep for grazing, and where in the summer months shepherd and sheep might spend the night. Overnight the sheep were placed in roughly constructed round stone-walled enclosures. The top of the dry-stone wall was covered with thorns to keep out wild animals. Inside the

<sup>1</sup>D. A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary (Leicester, England; Grand Rapids, MI: Inter-Varsity Press; W.B. Eerdmans, 1991), 383–389.

# COMMENTARY NOTES

enclosure the sheep were safe so long as the entrance was secured by the shepherd. He slept across the entrance as there was no door and no doorkeeper.

**7.** Because they did not understand, *Therefore Jesus said again, 'I tell you the truth, I am the gate for the sheep.'* This is the third of seven 'I am' sayings with predicates in the Fourth Gospel (6:35, 48, 51; 8:12; 10:7, 9; 10:11, 14; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1, 5). It is introduced with the solemn formula 'I tell you the truth' (*amen amen lego hymin*) to emphasize the importance of what is said. The word translated 'gate' is again *thyra*, meaning 'door'. Jesus portrayed himself as the shepherd who makes himself the 'door' to the enclosure to protect the sheep.

**8.** Jesus continued, *All who ever came before me were thieves and robbers.* There may be an allusion here to OT passages like Jeremiah 23:1–8 and Ezekiel 34, in which the prophets pronounced judgment upon the shepherds of Israel for their failure to care for the people. Jesus may have had in mind messianic pretenders (cf. Matt. 24:24; Mark 13:22), or more likely 'the Jews', who treated the man born blind so badly. Of such leaders, Jesus says, *the sheep did not listen to them.* The man born blind certainly did not listen to them. Those who belong to Jesus, the true shepherd, do not resonate with voices such as theirs.

**9.** Alluding again to the enclosures built for the sheep, Jesus said, *I am the gate; whoever enters through me will be saved. He will come in and go out, and find pasture.* As the sheep entering the stone enclosure of which the shepherd himself was the door were safe, so too people who believe in Jesus are eternally secure (27–30). As the shepherd led his sheep out to pasture during the day and brought them in at night, so too Jesus provides for those who believe in him.

**10.** Jesus added, *The thief comes only to steal and kill and destroy.* He depicted 'the Jews' as sheep stealers who had no thought for the well-being of the people—they came only 'to kill and destroy'. They were like the wicked shepherds of Israel denounced by Jeremiah and Ezekiel (see commentary on 10:8). Contrasting his own ministry with theirs, Jesus said, *I have come that they may have life, and have it to the full.* The imagery is of a shepherd ensuring that his sheep are well cared for and contented. Jesus, the good shepherd, came into the world so that people might have (eternal) life, and have it to the full. To have eternal life is to know God through Jesus Christ (17:3). To have it to the full could refer either to enjoying the richness of life in relationship with God in the here and now or to resurrection to eternal life at the end of the age (5:24–29), or both.

**11.** For Jesus to bring life to the full to his followers, there was a cost, as he explained: *I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.* This is the fourth of seven 'I am' sayings with predicates in the Fourth Gospel (6:35, 48, 51; 8:12; 10:7, 9; 10:11, 14; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1, 5). The background imagery is still shepherding in the open country. There the shepherd has to lay his own life on the line to protect his sheep from wild animals. Jesus presented himself as a good shepherd who was prepared to do likewise. A shepherd would rarely, if ever, actually die in protection of his sheep (to do so would leave the sheep defenceless). Jesus was extending the imagery beyond its normal limits and pointing forward to the time when he would, in fact, lay down his life for the sake of his people.

**12–13.** There was a big difference between a shepherd from one of the families who owned the sheep and someone outside the family who was just paid to do a job. This is the background to Jesus' next statement: *The hired hand is not the shepherd who owns the sheep. So when he sees the wolf coming, he abandons the sheep and runs away.* The primary motivation of the hired hand is depicted as self-preservation. He flees in the face of danger and deserts his duty to the sheep, with dire results: *Then the wolf attacks the flock and scatters it.* The sheep are left defenceless before the attack and are scattered. Jesus saw the common people of his day as 'sheep without a shepherd' (Matt. 9:36/ Mark 6:34).

The reason why the hired hand flees in the face of danger is further explained, *The man runs away because he is a hired hand and cares nothing for the sheep.* Because the sheep do not belong to the

# COMMENTARY NOTES

hired hand or his family, he does not care for them in the same way as a family member would, and that is why he will desert the sheep and flee. Jesus was referring to the Jewish leaders who were not carrying out their responsibility of care for the people.

**14-15.** Contrasting himself with Jewish leaders who were like hired hands, Jesus said, *I am the good shepherd; I know my sheep and my sheep know me—just as the Father knows me and I know the Father.* Unlike the Jewish leaders who did not ‘know’ the people, Jesus knew his people and they knew him. When Jesus spoke about the Father ‘knowing’ him, he did not mean that he knew about him, or was acquainted with him, but that he enjoyed an intimate personal relationship with him. It is amazing that Jesus said his knowledge of his disciples and their knowledge of him involved a similar intimate personal relationship.

Jesus reiterated what he had said earlier (11) by saying, *I lay down my life for the sheep.* The imagery is the same: those who shepherd in the open country must be prepared to lay their lives on the line for the sheep. Jesus said he would actually lay down his life for the sake of his sheep (the disciples). It was his love that led him to do this for them (cf. 15:13: ‘Greater love has no-one than this, that he lay down his life for his friends’), and his love made him the ‘good shepherd’.

References to Jesus as ‘the good shepherd’ recall Jeremiah 23:2-4, where God himself promises to gather the scattered people Israel, and Ezekiel 34:11-16, where God promises to look after his sheep, providing them with good pasture, caring for the injured and weak, and shepherding the flock with justice. There are also possibly allusions to Psalm 23, in which God is again depicted as the good shepherd. So Jesus’ claim to be ‘the good shepherd’ was more than a claim to do what the national leaders of his day failed to do. It was also a claim to be one with God the Father, who is ‘the good shepherd’ of his people.

**16.** In the OT God is depicted as the true shepherd of Israel, and Jesus’ own ministry was predominantly to Israel also (see Matt. 15:24; cf. Matt. 10:5-6). However, Jesus widened the role of the good shepherd when he said, *I have other sheep that are not of this sheep pen. I must bring them also.* The word translated ‘sheep pen’ is again *aule*, which means ‘courtyard’. The imagery is of a shepherd who has called sheep from one courtyard to lead them out to pasture, and then says there are sheep from another courtyard for which he has responsibility also. The allusion is to Gentile people, those who are not part of Israel. They too must hear the message of the gospel. Of these Jesus said, *They too will listen to my voice, and there shall be* (lit. ‘they shall become’) *one flock and one shepherd.* Jesus was foreshadowing apostolic times, when his gospel would be taken to non-Jews, to Samaritans and Gentiles, something that would take place through the preaching of his disciples. Then all peoples would hear his voice, believe in him and be incorporated into the body of his disciples. Believers from different races would become ‘one flock’ (a church made up of Jews, Samaritans and Gentiles) led by ‘one shepherd’ (Jesus himself).

**17-18.** In 10:11, 15 Jesus said he would lay down his life for the sheep. In those texts laying down his life was motivated by love for the sheep. In 10:17-18 another aspect of Jesus’ motivation is implied: *The reason my Father loves me is that I lay down my life—only to take it up again.* Here is implied what will be stated explicitly very shortly, that Jesus laid down his life in obedience to his Father, an obedience that drew out again the Father’s love for his Son. In the plan of salvation it was required that the Son lay down his life for his people, but that was not the end of it: he laid down his life ‘only to take it up again’ (lit. ‘in order to take it up again’)—he would rise from the dead. This is one of the few places in the NT where the resurrection of Jesus is attributed to the action of Jesus himself. In most other places it is God who raises Jesus from the dead.

While Jesus’ life, humanly speaking, was taken from him by the actions of evil men, it was not outside his control. He said, *No-one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have authority to lay it down and authority to take it up again. This command I received from my Father.* In his account of the passion the fourth evangelist portrays Jesus, not as a victim of circumstance, but as one who was in control of his destiny. In two places this is particularly clear: (1) in the betrayal and arrest

# COMMENTARY NOTES

scene, when Jesus identified himself to those who came to seize him and they fell backwards to the ground; (2) during the Roman trial, when Pilate said to him, 'Don't you realize I have power either to free you or to crucify you?' (19:10). To this Jesus replied, 'You would have no power over me if it were not given to you from above' (19:11). These incidents show that Jesus was in control of his own destiny. He had the authority to lay down his life and to take it up again, because it was what he had been commanded to do by his Father.<sup>2</sup>

## ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Herman Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*  
David F. Ford, *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary*  
Richard D. Phillips, *John*, Reformed Expository Commentary  
Colin G. Kruse, *John*, Tyndale New Testament Commentary  
Gerald Borchert, *John*, New Application Commentary  
Jey J. Kanagaraj, *John*, New Covenant Commentary Series  
Rodney Whitacre, *John*, IVP New Testament Commentary  
Bruce Milne, *The Message of John*, The Bible Speaks Today  
Grant Osborne, *John*, Cornerstone Bible Commentary  
Barclay Newman and Eugene Nida, *A Handbook on the Gospel of John*, UBSH

---

<sup>2</sup>Colin G. Kruse, *John: An Introduction and Commentary*, vol. 4, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 231-235.