In John xii 34 an objection is raised by the crowd against a statement of Jesus: δει υψωθηναι τον υιον του ανθρωπου, which leads to the question: who is this mysterious "Son of Man". In the present text of John this question is connected with the clear pronouncement of Jesus καγω δεν υψωθω εκ της γης, but the sequence of thought is extremely obscure. Bultmann 1) therefore, transferred this passage to ch. viii and connected it with verse 28: δεν υψωσητε τον υιον του ανθρωπου, τοτε γνωσεσθε δει εγω ειμι. I wonder why it is put here. Bultmann admits that there is a difficulty, because there is no explicit δει υψωθηναι in viii 28, but he tries to evade it by observing: "von der Erhöhung des Menschensohnes hat er ja gesprochen". It seems to me that xii 34 cannot be an answer to viii 28, because in the latter text we have a direct accusation of Jesus flung against the Jews, while the former has to do with a difficulty of a dogmatic kind. What Jesus has said about the necessity (δει, here as often used in connection with God's plan 2) of the lifting up of the Son of Man, conceived as His passing away 3) conflicts with a saying of the Scriptures about the Messiah. Therefore it seems much more plausible to make a connection with iii 14, as was done by Mc Gregor 4) and Noack 5) : ουτως υψωθηναι δει τον υιον του ανθρωπου.

3) W. Bauer, Das Johannesevangelium, Tübingen 1933, S. 164: "Die Volksmenge versteht die Erhöhung 34 als Entfernung von der Erde argumentiert von da aus gegen den Messiasanspruch Jesu"; on υψωω, see his note on John iii 14.
We have here before us a situation similar to vii 27, vii 41-42, vii 52. In all these instances Jesus' origin is not in accordance with the dogmatic picture of the Messiah current in Jewish circles, partly derived from the Scriptures. xii 34 offers another example of a statement by Jesus which hurts against the accepted teaching about the Messiah. If the conception of the Fourth Gospel as a missionary book for the synagogues of the Diaspore, as put forward in my paper on "the purpose of St. John's Gospel"¹) is right, these features of debates on points of Jewish messianology are an important confirmation of that view. Stumbling-blocks on the way to accepting Jesus as the Messiah (xx 31) which consisted of (seeming) conflicts with accepted doctrine had to be removed.

At the basis of this text lies the identity of the terms „Christ“-Messiah, and „Son of Man“. This is not a special feature of this gospel, but is also found in the Synoptics and certain Jewish groups²). The expression Jesus uses with regard to the future of this „Son of Man“ being in conflict with their doctrine makes the Jews ask, what is meant by this „Son of Man“. Their objection is derived from the „Law“: ἥμεν ἥξονσαμεν εκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ Χριστός μένει εἰς τὸν αἰώνα. Only the last three words are marked both by Nestle and Kilpatrick³) as a direct quotation. But it seems clear from the context that the contrast here lies in the verbs: Jesus speaks of ἀπελθοῦσαι—going away in one form or another ⁴), while the „Law“ speaks of remaining. So at least we must keep in mind this permanent μένων. Another reason for concentrating the attention upon μένων lies in the fact, that, as is brought to light by the concordance, this verb plays a prominent part in the theology of the Gospel.

This doctrine has, as is clearly indicated, a scriptural basis. But which? All modern commentators agree in pointing out that νόμος here is not the Mosaic Law, but Scripture in general, as sometimes in later Jewish writings⁵), and that John offers two more instances, viz. x 34 and xv 25. Let it, however, be noticed that both these

⁴) See the quotation from W. BAUER p. 174, nt. 3.
⁵) See e.g. BAUER ad x 34.