

πάντες (*pantes*) as “all men” (ASV, RSV, NASB, NIV). While the gender of the pronoun is masculine, it is collective and includes people of both genders.

A TN Grk “Jesus answered him.”

B TN Or “I will die willingly for you.”

C TN Or “Will you die willingly for me?”

D TN Grk “Truly, truly, I say to you.”

E SN The same verb

is used to describe Jesus’ own state in John 11:33; 12:27, and 13:21. Jesus is looking ahead to the events of the evening and the next day, his arrest, trials, crucifixion, and death, which will cause his disciples extreme emotional distress.

F TN Or “Believe in God.” The translation of the two uses of πιστεύετε (*pisteuete*) is difficult. Both may be either indicative or imperative, and as L. Morris points out (*John* [NICNT], 637), this results in a bewildering variety of possibilities.

To complicate matters further, the first may be understood as a question: “Do you believe in God? Believe also in me.” Morris argues against the KJV translation which renders the first πιστεύετε as indicative and the second as imperative on the grounds that for the writer of the Fourth Gospel, faith in Jesus is inseparable from faith in God. But this is precisely the point that Jesus is addressing in context. He is about to undergo rejection by his own people as their Messiah. The disciples’ faith in him as Messiah and Lord would be cast into extreme doubt by these events, which the author makes clear were not at this time foreseen by the disciples. After the resurrection it is this identification between Jesus and the Father which needs to be reaffirmed (cf. John 20:24–29). Thus it seems best to take the first πιστεύετε as indicative and the second as imperative, producing the translation “You believe in God; believe also in me.”

G TN Many interpreters have associated μοναί (*monai*) with an Aramaic word that can refer to a stopping place or resting place for a traveler on a journey. This is similar to one of the meanings the word can have in secular Greek (Pausanias 10.31.7). Origen understood the use here to refer to stations on the road to God. This may well have been the understanding of the Latin translators who translated μονή (*monē*) by *mansio*, a stopping place. The English translation “mansions” can be traced back to Tyndale, but in Middle English the word simply meant “a dwelling place” (not necessarily large or imposing) with no connotation of being temporary. The interpretation put forward by Origen would have been well suited to Gnosticism, where the soul in its ascent passes through stages during which it is gradually purified of all that is material and therefore evil. It is much more likely that the word μονή should be related to its cognate verb μένω (*menō*), which is frequently used in the Fourth

³⁶ Simon Peter said to him, “Lord, where are you going?” Jesus replied,^A “Where I am going, you cannot follow me now, but you will follow later.”³⁷ Peter said to him, “Lord, why can’t I follow you now? I will lay down my life for you!”^B ³⁸ Jesus answered, “Will you lay down your life for me?^C I tell you the solemn truth,^D the rooster will not crow until you have denied me three times!

Jesus’ Parting Words to His Disciples

14 “Do not let your hearts be distressed.^E You believe in God;^F believe also in me.² There are many dwelling places^G in my Father’s house.^H Otherwise, I would have told you, because^I I am going away to make

Gospel to refer to the permanence of relationship between Jesus and the Father and/or Jesus and the believer. Thus the idea of a permanent dwelling place, rather than a temporary stopping place, would be in view. Luther’s translation of μοναί by *Wohnungen* is very accurate here, as it has the connotation of a permanent residence.

H SN Most interpreters have understood the reference to *my Father’s house* as a reference to heaven, and the *dwelling places* (μονή, *monē*) as the permanent residences of believers there. This seems consistent with the vocabulary and the context, where in v. 3 Jesus speaks of coming again to take the disciples to himself. However, the phrase in *my Father’s house* was used previously in the Fourth Gospel in 2:16 to refer to the temple in Jerusalem. The author in 2:19–22 then reinterpreted the temple as Jesus’ body, which was to be destroyed in death and then rebuilt in resurrection after three days. Even more suggestive is the statement by Jesus in 8:35, “Now the slave does not remain (μένω, *menō*) in the household forever, but the son remains (μένω) forever.” If in the imagery of the Fourth Gospel the phrase in *my Father’s house* is ultimately a reference to Jesus’ body, the relationship of μονή to μένω suggests the permanent relationship of the believer to Jesus and the Father as an adopted son who remains in the household forever. In this case the “dwelling place” is “in” Jesus himself, where he is, whether in heaven or on earth. The statement in v. 3, “I will come again and receive you to myself,” then refers not just to the parousia, but also to Jesus’ postresurrection return to the disciples in his glorified state, when by virtue of his death on their behalf they may enter into union with him and with the Father as adopted sons. Needless to say, this bears numerous similarities to Pauline theology, especially the concepts of adoption as sons and being “in Christ” which are prominent in passages like Eph 1. It is also important to note, however, the emphasis in the Fourth Gospel itself on the present reality of eternal life (John 5:24; 7:38–39, etc.) and the possibility of worshiping the Father “in the Spirit and in truth” (John 4:21–24) in the present age. There is a sense in which it is possible to say that the future reality is present now. See further J. McCaffrey, *The House With Many Rooms* (AnBib 114).

I TC A number of significant MSS (ϕ^{66c} NA B C* D K L W Ψ f¹³ 33 565 579 892 al lat)

have δτι (*hoti*) here, while the majority lack it (ϕ^{66c} C² E M). Should the δτι be included or omitted? The external evidence is significantly stronger for the longer reading. Most Alexandrian and Western MSS favor inclusion (It is a little unusual for the Alexandrian to favor the longer reading), while most Byzantine MSS favor omission (again,

a little unusual). However, the reading of ϕ^{66c}, which aligns with the Byzantine, needs to be given some value. At the same time, the scribe of this papyrus was known for freely omitting and adding words, and the fact that the ms was corrected discounts its testimony here. But because the shorter reading is out of character for the Byzantine text, the shorter reading (omitting the δτι) may well be authentic. Internally, the question comes down to whether the shorter reading is more difficult or not. And here, it loses the battle, for it seems to be a clarifying omission (so TCGNT 206). R. E. Brown is certainly right when he states: “all in all, the translation without δτι makes the best sense” (*John* [AB], 2:620). But this tacitly argues for the authenticity of the word. Thus, on both external and internal grounds, the δτι should be regarded as authentic.

TN If the δτι (*hoti*) is included (see tc above), there are no less than four possible translations for this sentence: The sentence could be either a question or a statement, and in addition the δτι could either indicate content or be causal. How does one determine the best translation? (1) A question here should probably be ruled out because it would imply a previous statement by Jesus that either there are many dwelling places in his Father’s house (if the δτι is causal) or he was going off to make a place ready for them (if the δτι indicates content). There is no indication anywhere in the Fourth Gospel that Jesus had made such statements prior to this time. So understanding the sentence as a statement is the best option. (2) A statement with δτι indicating content is understandable but contradictory. If there were no dwelling places, Jesus would have told them that he was going off to make dwelling places. But the following verse makes clear that Jesus’ departure is not hypothetical but real—he is really going away. So understanding the δτι with a causal nuance is the best option. (3) A statement with a causal δτι can be understood two ways: (a) “Otherwise I would have told you” is a parenthetical statement, and the δτι clause goes with the preceding “There are many dwelling places in my Father’s house.” This would be fairly awkward syntactically, however; it would be much more natural for the δτι clause to modify what directly preceded it. (b) “Otherwise I would have told you” is explained by Jesus’ statement that he is going to make ready a place.