ABIDING WORDS

Society of Biblical Literature

Resources for Biblical Study

Tom Thatcher, New Testament Editor

Number 81

ABIDING WORDS

PERSPECTIVES ON THE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

Edited by

Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard

SBL Press
Atlanta

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Abiding words : the use of scripture in the Gospel of John / edited by Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard.

p. cm. — (Resources for biblical study ; number 81)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-62837-094-2 (hardcover binding : acid-free paper) — ISBN 978-1-62837-093-5 (paper binding : acid-free paper) — ISBN 978-1-62837-095-9 (electronic format)

1. Bible. John—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 2. Bible. Old Testament—Quotations in the New Testament. 3. Bible. John—Relation to the Old Testament. I. Myers, Alicia D., editor. II. Schuchard, Bruce G. (Bruce Gordon), editor.

BS2615.52.A25 2015

226.5'06—dc23 2015004297

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper conforming to ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994 standards for paper permanence.

Contents

Acknowledgments

The beginnings of this book stretch back to a meeting of the Johannine Literature Steering Committee during the Society of Biblical Literature annual meeting in San Francisco in 2011 with the suggestion of then member Mary Coloe. Mary had been recently impressed with the doctoral work of fellow Australian Johannine scholar Ruth Sheridan, and upon hearing that Alicia Myers's doctoral research focused on this topic from a different angle, she thought it was high time to get an update in the field. Mary's insight prompted a well-attended and stimulating session, "John and Scripture," at the 2012 SBL annual meeting in Chicago, which featured the work of Jaime Clark-Soles and Bruce G. Schuchard, as well as that of Ruth and Alicia. The positive response we received, as well as the knowledge of additional recent monographs published on our topic, soon prompted us to work toward a collection of essays with the four presentations from Chicago as our starting point. In addition to these four papers, we solicited contributions from other scholars—both those whose work in this area has been well-established and those just entering the field with recently published doctoral work. The present collection, therefore, represents a well-rounded glimpse at current scholarship in the area of the Fourth Gospel's employment of Scripture, offering work from diverse perspectives that aims both to introduce new readers and update seasoned ones to past and current approaches, as well as fuel continued conversations on the subject.

With so many moving parts in this collection, there are plenty of thanks to be shared. First and foremost, we would like to thank Mary Coloe and the rest of the Johannine Literature Steering Committee for sponsoring the session in 2012 that formed the foundation of this project. Thank you to all those who participated and attended, offering thought-provoking work and comments for continued refinement and energy for the ideas presented. A special thank-you to Tom Thatcher, who not only helped to organize the 2012 session but also encouraged us to

pursue publication of this collection and invited us to consider the SBL Resources for Biblical Study series. We found in this series a perfect fit for the aims of our project as well as an able and accessible editor whose helpful advice and counsel guided this volume to completion. Bob Buller and Leigh Andersen at SBL Press have also provided quick responses and dealt deftly with potential problems, providing solutions and handling the behind-the-scenes mechanics to make this book a success. In addition to SBL Press, E. J. Brill graciously granted permission for the reprinting of portions of Jaime Clark-Soles's *Scripture Cannot Be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003) so that her valuable work on the sociological aspects of scriptural appeals could be included. No collection can be compiled, however, without the willingness of talented participants who offer their time and skills to create insightful essays. Thank you all for participating in this volume, for contributing your thoughts and allowing us the great privilege of bringing all of our work together.

I (Alicia) would also like to thank Bruce Schuchard for his partnership in this endeavor. It was a delight to work with Bruce, whose energy for the project as well as attention to detail and patience, first with a sudden illness in my family, and second with my move to a new institution in the midst of this project, kept things on track. Thank you, also, to my colleagues at United Theological Seminary in Dayton, Ohio, for providing support for the beginnings of this project and to those at Campbell University Divinity School in Buies Creek, North Carolina, for assistance as it comes to print. Finally, thank you to my family—especially to my husband, Scott, and our son, Keaton—for your encouragement of my work even in the midst of much more challenging, and significant, events. And thank you, Jesus, that we can all be here to hold the finished product together.

I (Bruce) am also thankful for the opportunity to have worked with Alicia. More hands—better yet, more eyes—made both the load lighter and the work much more enjoyable and efficient, as each of us supported and spot-checked the efforts of the other in bringing this project to fruition. I have enjoyed very much the opportunity to become acquainted and to work with Alicia, whose own recent contributions to the study of the employment of Scripture in John I have admired greatly. To be sure, it has been a great pleasure to work and to become acquainted with all of the contributors to this project. I have found the engagement to be most stimulating. Thanks are due to my graduate assistant Kevin Armbrust for

his help with the construction of this book's bibliography, its author and subject index, and its list of abbreviations, and to family, colleagues, and others here at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri, without whose support my work on this project would not have been possible. It is the hope of this book's editors that its collection of essays will be of benefit to researchers both old at and new to the ongoing study of the use of the Old in the New.

Abbreviations

ℵ	Codex Sinaiticus (ca. fourth century CE)
Γ	Codex Tischendorfianus IV, Uncial 036 (ca. tenth century CE)
Θ	Codex Coridethianus, Uncial 038 (ca. ninth–tenth century CE)
Ψ	Codex Ψ, Uncial 044 (ca. ninth–tenth century CE)
AB	Anchor Bible
ABR	*Australian Biblical Review*
ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture
Adv. Jud.	John Chrysostom *Adversus Judaeos* homilies
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
AJS	*American Journal of Sociology*
Anab.	Arrian, *Anabasis of Alexander*
AnBib	Analecta biblica
ANS	Ancient Narrative Supplements
Ant.	Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*
Apoc. Ab.	Apocalypse of Abraham
ARS	*Annual Review of Sociology*
As. Mos.	Assumption of Moses
ASLL	Anglo-Saxon Language and Literature
ASMAR	Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance
ASR	*American Sociological Review*
B	Codex Vaticanus (ca. fourth century CE)
b. Sanh.	Babylonian Talmud, tractate Sanhedrin
2 Bar.	2 Baruch (Syriac Apocalypse)
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BCAW	Blackwell Companion to the Ancient World

BECNT	Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
Bell. Cat.	Sallust, *Bellum catalinae*
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BDB	Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BIMW	The Bible in the Modern World
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BO	Berit Olam
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BTNT	Biblical Theology of the New Testament
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCS	Classical Culture and Society
CD	*Damascus Document* (Dead Sea Scroll)
CE	Cultural Exegesis
1 Clem.	*1 Clement*
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
Comm. Jo.	Origen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*
ConC	Concordia Commentary
CSMC	*Critical Studies in Mass Communication*
CSML	Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature
De or.	Cicero, *De oratore*
DRev	*Downside Review*
EBib	Études bibliques
ECIL	Early Christianity and Its Literature
Enc	*Encounter*
Epist.	Jerome, *Epistles*
EvangR	Evangelical Ressourcement
ESCO	European Studies on Christian Origins
ESEC	Emory Studies in Early Christianity
EUS	European University Studies
FG	Fourth Gospel

FGrHist	*Fragments of Greek History*
HB	Hebrew Bible
HBT	*Horizons in Biblical Theology*
Hom. Jo.	John Chrysostom, *Homilies on John*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
IECOT	International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament
Il.	Homer, *Iliad*
Inst.	Quintillian, *Institutes of Oratory*
Int	*Interpretation*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBT	*Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JPSTC	Jewish Publication Society Torah Commentary
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement
Jub.	Book of Jubilees
J.W.	Josephus, *Jewish War*
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar)
KNNE	Kontext und Normen neutestamentlicher Ethik
KTAH	Key Themes in Ancient History
L	Codex Regius (ca. eighth century CE)
LASBF	*Liber annuus Studii biblici franciscani*
LBS	Linguistic Bible Studies
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
Leg.	Plato, *Laws*
Legat.	Philo, *Legatio ad Gaius* (*On the Embassy to Gaius*)
Liv. Pro.	Lives of the Prophets
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Scott, Jones Lexicon
LXX	Septuagint
m. Naz.	Mishnah, tractate Nazir
m. Šabb.	Mishnah, tractate Shabbat

Mart. Ascen. Isa.	Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah
Matrix	Matrix: The Bible in Mediterranean Context
MatT	Material Texts
MNS	Mnemosyne Supplements
Mos.	Philo, *Life of Moses*
MT	Masoretic Text
NCB	New Century Bible
NCBC	New Collegeville Bible Commentary
NCI	New Critical Idiom
NETS	New English Translation of the Septuagint
NGC	*New German Critique*
Nic. eth.	Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NT	New Testament
NTC	New Testament Commentary
NTL	New Testament Library
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTR	New Testament Readings
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTSI	The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel
NTTSD	New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents
NVBS	New Voices in Biblical Studies
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology
OG	Old Greek
OT	*Oral Tradition*
OT	Old Testament
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	Old Testament Studies
P^{66}	*Papyrus* 66, Papyrus Bodmer II (ca. 200 CE)
P^{75}	*Papyrus* 75, Papyrus Bodmer XV (ca. 175–225 CE)
PBM	Paternoster Biblical Monographs
PCNT	Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament
PNTC	Pillar New Testament Commentary
Poet.	Aristotle, *Poetics*

Prob.	Aristotle, *Problems*
Prog.	*Progymnasmata*
Pss. Sol.	Psalms of Solomon
Q	Codex Guelferbytanus B, Uncial 026 (ca. fifth century CE)
1QH	*Hymns of Thanksgiving* (Dead Sea Scroll)
1QS	*Community Rule* (Dead Sea Scroll)
RB	*Revue biblique*
Rep.	Plato, *Republic*
Rhet.	Aristotle, *Rhetoric*
Rhet. Alex.	Pseudo-Aristotle, *Rhetoric to Alexander*
Rhet. Her.	Pseudo-Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*
SAGN	Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative
SBAB	Stuttgarter biblischer Aufsatzbände
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLRBS	Society of Biblical Literature Resources for Biblical Study
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
SHS	Scripture and Hermeneutics Series
SI	*Sociological Inquiry*
Sir	Sirach, Ben Sira, Ecclesiasticus
SJ	Studia judaica
SNTI	Studies in New Testament Interpretation
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
Soph.	Plato, *Sophist*
SP	Sacra Pagina
Spec.	Philo, *De specialibus legibus* (*On the Special Laws*)
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
SR	Studies in Religion
SRR	Studies in Rhetoric and Religion
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
STI	Studies in Theological Interpretation
T. Ab.	Testament of Abraham
T. Isa.	Testament of Isaiah
T. Levi	Testament of Levi
T. Mos.	Testament of Moses

TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
Tg. Frg.	Fragmentary Targum
Tg. Onq.	Targum Onquelos
Tg. Ps.-J.	Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Theat.	Plato, *Theatetus*
Tim.	Plato, *Timeaus*
Top.	Cicero, *Topica*
TS	Texts and Studies
W	Washington Codex (ca. fifth–seventh century CE)
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WGRW	Writings of the Greco-Roman World
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
y. Ta'an.	Jerusalem Talmud, tractate Ta'anit
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Abiding Words: An Introduction to Perspectives on John's Use of Scripture

Alicia D. Myers

As with numerous other New Testament writings, Israel's Scriptures form the foundation on which the narrative of the Gospel of John is written. Ushered in with the opening verses of the prologue, Scripture appears throughout the Gospel and is even identified as one of the "witnesses" for Jesus's defense (5:31–47), showing up in explicit quotations along with a number of varyingly transparent allusions and references. Indeed, so crucial is Scripture to the Gospel's plot that the narrator winds the sequence of events tightly to the Jewish festival calendar whose own roots stretch into Israel's scriptural past.[1] Yet it is also the Fourth Gospel that is frequently accused of anti-Jewish language, if not explicit sentiment, in its presentation of "the Jews." With this mixed relationship with Israel's history—the incorporation of Scripture as a pillar of support for its presentation of Jesus alongside a sustained conflict with the religious leaders of that very scriptural tradition—John's use of Scripture has drawn the attention of a number of scholars.[2] Such persistent attention, however, makes entering into the conversation and deciphering the various voices a challenge. In an attempt to clarify the dialogue and offer possible avenues forward, the

1. See Michael A. Daise, *Feasts in John: Jewish Festivals and Jesus' "Hour" in the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 2/229 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); Dorit Felsch, *Die Feste im Johannesevangelium: Jüdische Tradition und christologische Deutung*, WUNT 2/308 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011).

2. Due to continued attention to this area of research, the Johannine Literature section of the SBL sponsored a session on this topic, hosted at the annual meeting in Chicago in 2012. This session provides the impetus for the present collection, which also incorporates additional papers from the annual SBL meeting in Baltimore from 2013 as well as independently solicited contributions.

present volume provides an overview of past research before featuring a collection of essays that showcase some current approaches to studying the use of Scripture in the Gospel of John.

1. Israel's Scriptures in John's Gospel: An Overview of Past Scholarship

When approaching the Fourth Gospel's use of Scripture, scholars are in agreement that, like other New Testament writings, the Gospel demonstrates a Christocentric hermeneutic. Scripture quotations, allusions, and echoes provide support for the Gospel's presentation of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God (20:30–31).[3] According to J. Louis Martyn, however, the reverse of this statement is also true: namely, that belief in Jesus supports interpretation of Scripture in the manner that the Fourth Gospel epitomizes.[4] Martyn's statement highlights the tension in which the Gospel's employment of Scripture exists. Scripture testifies to Jesus's identity as understood by the Gospel, thereby adding an authoritative voice to its presentation; nevertheless, the persuasiveness of this testimony depends largely on one's predisposition to the Gospel's perspective. Indeed, that the same Scripture passages, images, and figures could be interpreted to oppose the Gospel's views is highlighted in the debates that flair up when Jesus's interpretations of Scripture come into conflict with those of religious leaders and crowds during his ministry (e.g., 7:14–53; 8:12–59).

This tension is also reflected in a number of earlier studies on the use of Scripture in the New Testament in general. C. H. Dodd and Barnabas

3. The debate over the purpose of the Gospel of John is well worn. The crux of the debate centers on the text-critical issue in 20:31 concerning the tense of πιστεύω. Is this a present subjunctive, encouraging continuing faith for a believing community, or an aorist subjunctive, suggesting the Gospel means to initiate belief among nonbelievers? For representative viewpoints, see Gordon D. Fee, "On the Text and Meaning of John 20.30–31," in *The Four Gospels 1992*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck et al., BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 3:2193–205; D. A. Carson, "Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20.30–31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 124 (2005): 693–714.

4. J. Louis Martyn, "Listening to John and Paul on the Subject of Gospel and Scripture," *WW* 12 (1992): 73. In this way, then, Scripture does not function as a "proof" in a strict sense because it does not convince anyone to have faith, but only to reinforce the faith they already possess. Such a reading necessarily endorses a particular purpose for the Gospel: it is meant to encourage those who already believe.

Lindars understood the Christocentric hermeneutic of the New Testament as indicative of the foundational role of scriptural interpretation for early believers. For Dodd, small collections of texts acted as the "substructure" for New Testament theology, undergirding the canonical authors' communication of the kerygma.[5] Building on Dodd's work, Lindars focuses on the apologetic function of this substructure, which showcased how Jesus fulfilled messianic expectations.[6] Thus Richard Longenecker argued that the earliest believers interpreted Scripture in such a way that Jesus exemplified the Jewish belief that the meaning of the Torah would be made plain through the Messiah.[7]

Yet not all scholars are convinced that this exercise was as seamless as a cursory reading of Dodd, Lindars, and others might suggest. While agreeing with the Christocentric nature of New Testament hermeneutics, Donald Juel emphasizes the catechetical role of scriptural interpretation alongside any external apologetic functions it served. Juel writes: "Christian interpretation of the Scriptures arose from the recognition that Jesus was the expected Messiah *and* that he did not fit the picture."[8] In other words, "messianic exegesis" had to explain the scandal of the cross and the reality of the resurrection as events entirely unanticipated by Israel's scriptural narratives. Thus expectations during the New Testament era may have been that the Messiah should make the Torah plain, but early believers were faced with the reality that Jesus's life, death, and resurrection were not easily explained by contemporaneous understandings of Scripture. Hence, New Testament authors had to explain *how* Scripture related to Jesus as Messiah. Moreover, the Christocentric readings of Scripture helped early believers to "clarify the implications of faith in Jesus for one's relationship with Israel's God and with the world."[9] Juel's comments rightly

5. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1953), 110.

6. Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961), 18.

7. Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 79 (see further 77–79). In addition to a Christocentric hermeneutic, Longenecker highlights the pneumatological interpretation of Scripture by New Testament authors (p. xxxi). The role of the Holy Spirit in remembrance is particularly significant for interpreting the Fourth Gospel's use of Scripture.

8. Donald H. Juel, *Messianic Exegesis: Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 26 (emphasis original).

9. Ibid., 2.

highlight the fact that the "apologetic" function of scriptural interpretation among early believers is two-sided, helping to support the claims of believers both for outsiders and, *or even primarily*, for believers themselves.

Agreeing on the Christocentric nature of scriptural interpretation in the New Testament, then, does not result in a "disappointingly commonplace" discussion.[10] Rather, this consensus only forms the foundation on which scholars build. Debates surface concerning which Scripture texts are referenced, how such references are incorporated into their surrounding context, and especially on the possible implications of their incorporation. Studies on the Fourth Gospel's use of Scripture reflect these areas of concern as well. In what follows, I will offer an overview of past scholarship on the use of Scripture in John's Gospel by dividing past research into three main areas of study, those that focus on (1) the sources of John's references to Scripture; (2) the method of John's incorporation of these references; and (3) the sociological, theological, and rhetorical functions of the references. While such categories inevitably run the risk of oversimplification, they will aid in our understanding of the major contributions on John's use of Scripture in the past, setting the stage for the present collection of essays, which showcases current and continuing methods of analyzing John's employment of these sacred traditions.

1.1. The Sources of John's Scripture References

As mentioned above, studies on Scripture in the Fourth Gospel have mirrored approaches prevalent among those studying the use of Scripture in the New Testament as a whole. Initially such study primarily reflected historical concerns; that is, what does John's use of Scripture reveal about the Gospel's historicity or its own historical location? The works of Dodd and Lindars fit into this category insofar as both scholars sought to explain the historical use of scriptural interpretation in the early church. Indeed, both Dodd and Lindars agree that the characteristically Christocentric hermeneutics of early believers began with Jesus himself before it was developed by later New Testament authors, of whom Paul, John, and the author of Hebrews are considered the most creative.[11] Other scholars continued Dodd and Lindars's work by examining the form of the quotations. Such

10. Ibid., 1.

11. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 110; Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 88.

studies, like other source, form, and redaction-critical studies, sought to identify the sources used by New Testament authors as well as any changes made to them. By identifying these elements, interpreters hoped to hone in on the specific theological positions made by various New Testament authors, including John. When the quotations disagreed sharply with any known source material, scholars were left to explain such discrepancies. For J. R. Harris and Dodd, the differences were the result of New Testament authors using early *testimonia*, which were lists of ready-made scriptural prooftexts for the nascent Christian movement.[12] Those less convinced of the existence of such collections suggested faulty memories or intentional crafting of traditions to fit the theological perspectives of various authors and their communities.[13]

Among Johannine interpreters, the work of Alexander Faure, Edwin Freed, Günter Reim, and Maarten J. J. Menken typify these historical-critical approaches.[14] Focusing largely on the most explicit quotations in the Fourth Gospel, these scholars seek to demonstrate the evangelist's employment of one or more sources in the construction of his own quotations. The most often agreed-on quotations and references include John 1:23; 2:17; 6:31, 45; 10:34; 12:13, 15, 38, 40; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28, 36, 37. In addition to studying these quotations, Reim explores a number of scriptural allusions in his attempt to construct the general Old Testament

12. J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–20); Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 23–60. See also the recent histories of Harris's *testimonia* proposal in Martin C. Abl, *"And Scripture Cannot Be Broken": The Form and Function of the Early Christian* Testimonia *Collections*, NovTSup 96 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 7–69; and Alessandro Falcetta, "The Testimony Research of James Rendel Harris," *NovT* 45 (2003): 280–99.

13. Charles Goodwin, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" *JBL* 73 (1954): 61–75, for example, argues that John must have had a faulty memory since his quotations vary so much from known written traditions. Such an interpretation, however, assumes the priority of written sources in the construction of the Gospel rather than oral communication.

14. Alexander Faure, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im 4. Evanglium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese," *ZNW* 21 (1922): 99–121; Edwin D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*, NovTSup 6 (Leiden: Brill, 1965); Günter Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevageliums*, SNTSMS 22 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, CBET 15 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996).

background for the Gospel.[15] Faure, Freed, and Menken also tackle the often-debated "quotation" in John 7:38, which, while introduced with a quotation formula, nevertheless does not conform to any known scriptural passage.[16] Faure includes this reference as a result of his particular interest in the introduction of scriptural quotations that will be mentioned below. Menken leaves John 7:37–38 for the end of his collection of essays because his reconstruction of the form of this quotation relies on conclusions drawn from other analyses. Menken also excludes quotations that are identical to the LXX in form or are what he considers "theological" or "juridical" propositions rather than legitimate quotations (cf. 7:42; 8:17; 12:34).[17] Freed explores the standard quotations along with most of the texts that Menken omits as well as 17:12, another highly debated quotation, which Freed suggests is an adaptation of Prov 24:22a LXX.[18]

For Faure, the analysis of John's explicit citations has the potential to uncover pre-Gospel sources employed by the Fourth Gospel, thereby contributing to theories of its composition. Highlighting the switch to fulfillment language in the passion narrative, Faure suggests that the Gospel includes at least two layers of source material redacted by a later editor: the first, in which Scripture is incorporated as unintroduced "prooftexts"; and the second, in which Scripture is actualized in the person and words of Jesus.[19] Although Faure's thesis concerning John's sources has not convinced many, his attention to the switch in introductory formulae in the later chapters of John's narrative is regularly noted.

Instead of focusing on the introductory formulae of the explicit citations, Freed, Reim, and Menken center their attention on deciphering the sources behind the individual citations themselves. The sources suggested by these authors vary greatly depending on the quotation considered. Freed finds room for influence from the LXX, extant portions of the Masoretic Text (MT), several targumic traditions, and corresponding excerpts

15. Reim, *Studien*, 1–188.

16. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations*, 21–38; Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 187–203 (cf. 18).

17. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 14–15.

18. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations*, 96–98.

19. Faure, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate," 101–2. According to Faure, such "actualization" is reflected most clearly in John 18:32 but also surfaces in John 17:12; 8:28; and 3:14.

from the Dead Sea Scrolls.[20] Reim is more restricted in his interpretation, arguing instead that John's use of Scripture was dependent largely on Deutero-Isaiah and other early Christian traditions.[21] Menken repeats the source- and redaction-critical approaches of Freed and Reim, but insists predominantly on the use of the LXX by John, although he leaves room for infrequent influence from Hebrew sources.[22] Menken's investigation centers on uncovering the reasons for John's apparent editorial activity with his sources. For Menken, the differences between the citations and textual traditions expose not a faulty memory on the part of the evangelist, but intentional changes made to highlight unique aspects of Johannine theology, especially its Christology. While concerned with historical elements, these scholars, especially Menken, demonstrate a concerted interest in the theological motivations for John's employment and reshaping of Israel's scriptural traditions mirroring the practices of contemporaneous redaction critical approaches.

Continuing in this vein of study is the past work of two contributors to the present volume: Bruce Schuchard and William Randolph Bynum.[23] Schuchard's 1992 monograph establishes him as a contemporary of Menken, whom he acknowledges as a key influence on his methodology and his interest in the editorial activity of the evangelist.[24] Nevertheless, Schuchard's methodological alignment with Menken does not always result in the same interpretation of John's source material or the theological motivations for John's intentional changes to that material.[25]

20. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations*, 127–30.

21. Reim, *Studien*, 188–90 (cf. 241–46).

22. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations*, 205–6.

23. Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*, SBLDS 133 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Wm. Randolph Bynum, *The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37*, NovTSup 144 (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

24. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, xv.

25. For example, both Menken and Schuchard suggest that the author has purposefully altered the quotation of Isa 40:3 in John 1:23 by suppressing ἑτοιμάσατε and substituting εὐθύνατε rather than εὐθείας ποιεῖτε. Menken suggests that the author has done this because of his disagreement with the Synoptic tradition that John's ministry must end before Jesus can initiate his own (*Old Testament Quotations*, 30–31). In contrast, Schuchard argues that none of the gospels would present such an argument since "Jesus will come whether the way is prepared or not" (*Scripture within Scripture*,

Unlike Menken, Schuchard understands John's primary source material to be what he calls the "Old Greek" (OG) as a more precise designation for the Greek textual traditions available in the first century. Moreover, unlike Menken, Schuchard leaves greater room for the possibility of John citing material from memory in light of the oral culture in which he existed.[26] Yet, like Menken, Schuchard displays confidence in the ability to identify specific changes to citations made by the author of the Gospel and, therefore, in his ability to posit theological emphases that result from such changes. Bynum repeats such optimism in his recent monograph, which focuses in particular on the use of Zechariah in John 19:37. Although specifically concerned with John 19:37, Bynum's research has far-reaching implications concerning the relationship between John and the Dead Sea Scrolls and even leads him to the provocative suggestion that John's consistently careful citation style can be used to support increased confidence in the Gospel's historicity.[27] With Bynum, then, the concern for historicity inherent in the work of Dodd and Lindars is again palpably felt, reflective of an increased integration of John's Gospel in dialogues on reconstructing the "historical" Jesus in recent years.[28]

10). Instead, εὐθύνατε is used as a result of the influence of wisdom traditions, which frequently employ (κατ)ευθύνω with ὁδός (p. 11).

26. Schuchard dialogues with the work of Paul J. Achtemeier ("*Omne verbum sonat*: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity," *JBL* 109 [1990]: 3–27) concerning the importance of oral transmission of traditions over written documents. While acknowledging the importance of Achtemeier's observations, Schuchard is not convinced by his blunt conclusion that searching for the form of citations is "an exercise in futility." Instead, Schuchard maintains that "even if John cited from memory, his citations do, in fact, represent precise and therefore perceptible recollections of a specific textual tradition" (*Scripture within Scripture*, xvi–xvii).

27. Bynum, *Fourth Gospel*, 173.

28. See the publications of the SBL section "John, Jesus, and History" in particular: *Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*, vol. 1 of *John, Jesus, and History*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, SBLSymS 44 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007); and *Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*, vol. 2 of *John, Jesus, and History*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, ECIL 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009).

1.2. The Method of John's Scripture References

In addition to examining citation forms, other studies have focused more on the method of John's scriptural citations: that is, how the evangelist incorporates Scripture into the sequence of the narrative. Such exploration has connections to studies interested in John's citation form and sources since those studies are also often interested in how John incorporates his material, although they are necessarily more focused on individual references.[29] Moreover, scholars studying the method of John's Scripture referencing often utilize the conclusions of those studying citation forms in order to strengthen their claims.[30] Debates center on questions such as, (1) Does the Gospel simply "prooftext" for the sake of its argument, and thus disregard the original context of the quotations, or does it somehow incorporate the larger context from which the quotations come? (2) Does it matter whether or not the Gospel writer intended such quotations and allusions to incorporate the larger context of its scriptural material, if these connections were or can be made by ancient as well as contemporary audiences? And, (3) does the Gospel reflect interpretation practices current in Second Temple Jewish circles or even the larger Greco-Roman milieu and, if so, what does this reveal about the Gospel's origins or rhetorical goals? Studies on deciphering John's hermeneutical method, then, have largely settled into two main areas: first, those interested in discovering the intersection between John and ancient interpretive techniques, both Jewish and Greco-Roman; and, second, those exploring John's use of Scripture under the broad heading of "intertextuality," which can privilege either the original audiences of the Gospel or create fertile fields for contemporary reader-response and ideological readings.

29. The interest in individual quotations does not prevent many of these scholars from suggesting aspects of John's hermeneutics; indeed, some studies explore individual quotations as a means to identify John's interpretive tools. For example, from his studies, Dodd concludes that John is not interested in the original context of his quotations, but uses Christian *testimonia* as sources for his prooftexting.

30. For example, Catrin H. Williams ("The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology," in *"As Those Who Are Taught": The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, ed. Claire Matthews McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull, SBLSymS 27 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006], 109–12) notes Menken's findings in her own analysis of the use of Isaiah in the Gospel of John even though her main interest lies in John's shaping of Isaian material, especially the servant material, for his own christological ends.

Turning first to connections between John's use of Scripture and ancient interpretive practices, most attention has been given to discovering John's reflection of Jewish exegetical practices of the first centuries. Thus, beginning with the work of Lindars, those studying John's use of Scripture have often noted a pesher quality to John's quotations, although few go far in fleshing out this characterization.[31] Generally, such a definition is used to explain John's references as prooftexts, but with the addition of finding a precedent for such a practice in a Jewish context. Daniel Patte develops Lindars's observation in more detail and suggests that New Testament use of Scripture is pesher-like with its eschatological focus on fulfillment through the person and work of Jesus as the Messiah. For Patte, pesher becomes a way to understand what he sees as a typological perspective of Second Temple Judaism. Nevertheless, Steven Witmer has recently questioned the association between pesharim and scriptural references in John in particular. In addition to lacking the characteristic line-by-line interpretation of pesharim, Witmer suggests that John's "radically Christocentric hermeneutic" sets it apart from the exegetical technique of Qumran.[32]

Rather than suggesting the specific practice of pesher, many scholars prefer the more general expression of midrash to explain John's scriptural interpretations. Peder Borgen's 1965 study represents the first fully developed attempt to trace the connections between John's use of Scripture in John 6:31–58 and midrashic practices from Second Temple Judaism, especially as demonstrated in the work of Philo of Alexandria.[33] In addition

31. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 265–70. A few examples include Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 49–57; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 80–87; Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 104, SSEJC 3 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 380–95; J. Harold Ellens, "A Christian Pesher: John 1:51," *Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society* 25 (2005): 143–55.

32. Stephen E. Witmer, "Approaches to Scripture in the Fourth Gospel and the Qumran *Pesharim*," *NovT* 48 (2006): 313–28 (esp. 327–28).

33. Peder Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*, NovTSup10 (Leiden, Brill: 1965); Borgen, "John 6: Tradition, Interpretation, and Composition," in *Critical Readings of John 6*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper, BIS 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 95–114; Borgen, "The Scriptures and the Words and Works of Jesus," in *What We Have Heard from the Beginning: The Past, Present, and Future of Johannine Studies*, ed. Tom Thatcher (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2007), 39–58.

to showcasing remarkable similarities, Borgen's analysis supports a Jewish milieu for the Fourth Gospel in contrast to studies arguing for Hellenistic roots, which presented the Gospel of John as a response to gnostic and protognostic groups. Borgen's study has paved the way for later scholars to dig more deeply into Jewish interpretive practices, including exploration of Hillel's middot, as a means to understand the specific techniques behind the Gospel's scriptural appeals.

Most scholars, however, have accepted Jewish exegetical practices as the backdrop for John's scriptural interpretations without precisely defining the techniques used through either discussions of pesher or middot. Aside from brief references, the majority of scholars studying the use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel do not delve deeply into Jewish techniques.[34] This result is in large part because while there is agreement that rabbinic texts offer some information concerning first-century interpretive practices, it is unclear how much they reveal since rabbinic texts were not codified until centuries later. Michael Fishbane attempts to deal with this issue in his work, which traces inner-biblical interpretations across a variety of genres. He notes how established traditions (*traditum*) are transformed into what he calls *traditio* by various authors as a means to contemporize religious practices and reaffirm allegiance to Israel's heritage.[35] Without the confidence to tie down specific techniques, Fishbane instead notes general tendencies meant to "authorize" later "innovations" made by various Jewish groups influenced by their own historical locations and ideologies.[36] No doubt the same impulses are present among the Jewish writers of the New Testament, who seek both to legitimatize and explain their beliefs concerning Jesus of Nazareth by illustrating his relationship with Israel's sacred *traditum*. But without the identification of specific techniques, most scholars are limited to discussing John's midrashic practices as a way of noting his indebtedness to Jewish exegetical traditions. As a result, then, the term *midrash* itself runs the risk of becoming a loose description, providing little more than an assertion of John's Jewish milieu rather than a substantial statement concerning John's interpretive practices.

34. An exception to this trend is found in Frédéric Manns, "Exégèse Rabbanique et Exégèse Johannique," *RB* 92 (1985): 525–38.

35. Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 409–10.

36. Ibid., 528 (see further 528–42).

A few other scholars have suggested looking to the more developed canon of classical Greco-Roman rhetoric for categories to understand the use of Scripture in New Testament writings.[37] This exploration expands on the broader trend of utilizing ancient rhetorical categories to analyze New Testament writings, particularly discourses and letters, pioneered by George Kennedy.[38] Such studies are particularly popular among interpreters of John's Gospel, with its frequent and lengthy discourses.[39] The blending of Hellenistic and Jewish modes of thought and argumentation necessarily present in the Greco-Roman world indicates the potential for classical rhetoric to provide some language and insight into the ways in which Israel's Scriptures are incorporated into the New Testament. In particular, the close association between several middot—especially *gezera shewa* and *qal-walhomer*—and classical rhetorical techniques has been well established.[40] Since ancient education was rooted in the imitation of past masters (mimesis), it is no surprise that rhetorical manuals and works provide numerous examples of how literature could be integrated into a variety of speeches and writings. Although scholars have noticed that there is little explicit instruction on how to "quote" material, classical handbooks and *progymnasmata*

37. The most thorough development of this approach is in my own recent publication: Alicia D. Myers, *Characterizing Jesus: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Fourth Gospel's Use of Scripture in Its Presentation of Jesus*, LNTS 458 (London: T&T Clark, 2012). However, previous studies have indicated the potential of such an approach. See Dennis L. Stamps, "Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 26–33; Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Gospel of John in Cultural and Historical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009).

38. George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism*, SR (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984).

39. See, for example, Harold W. Attridge, "Argumentation in John 5," in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*, ed. Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker, ESEC 8 (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 188–99; George L. Parsenios, *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif*, WUNT 258 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John*, PCNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011).

40. David Daube, "Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," *HUCA* 22 (1949): 251–59; Saul Liebermann, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transition, Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E–IV Century C.E.*, TS 18 (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), 59–61; Juel, *Messianic Exegesis*, 35–41.

provide a number of examples of quoting and alluding to existing material in ways meant to increase the persuasiveness of one's work.

A far more popular approach to deal with the lack of solid categories from Jewish interpretive practices in the first century, however, is the theory of intertextuality. Aiming to respond in part to the problem of imprecise language and methods from those discussing midrash and typologies, Richard B. Hays turns to contemporary literary theory as a means to add more substance to intertestament exegesis.[41] From its roots in the poststructuralist movement, intertextuality maintains that texts are written in relationship to other texts and, as such, necessarily reverberate with both intended and unintended echoes from other materials. Acknowledging the existence of intertextuality has pushed scholars to explore the relationship between the citations found in John's Gospel and the larger contexts from which they come in Israel's Scriptures. Rather than seeing John's employment of Scripture as prooftexting similar to pesher models, these scholars find support for John's awareness of the larger context from which his quotations and allusions come, adding depth to John's incorporation of Israel's sacred story.[42]

41. Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 11–14. See also Stefan Alkier, "Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts," in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, ed. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008), 3–22; Julia Kristeva, "Word, Dialogue, and Novel," in *The Kristeva Reader*, ed. Toril Moi (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), 34–61. In his most recent contribution, Hays presents John's intertextual awareness as part of a larger hermeneutic that "reads the entirety of the OT as a web of symbols" pointing toward Jesus's life and the life he offers to believers (*Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014], esp. 92).

42. Examples of this type of study include a number full-length monographs, a few of which include Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms*, AGJU 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Andrew C. Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John*, WUNT 2/158 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Gary T. Manning, *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in the Literature of the Second Temple Period*, JSNTSup 270 (London: T&T Clark, 2004); Susan Hylen, *Allusion and Meaning in John 6*, BZNW 137 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005); as well as a number of articles, including Robert L. Brawley, "An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28-29," *JBL* 112 (1993): 427–43; Diana M. Swancutt, "Hungers Assuaged by the Bread of Heaven: 'Eating Jesus' as Isaian Call to Belief: The Confluence of Isaiah 55 and Psalm 78(77) in John 6.22–71," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148, SSEJC 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 218–51.

Catrin Williams's investigations into the Fourth Gospel's use of Isaianic traditions reflect intertextual methods.[43] Focused in particular on tracing how John's use of Isaiah resonates with Jewish interpretive traditions surrounding the prophet, Williams argues that the Gospel does much more than simply use Isaiah quotations to prooftext its narrative. Instead, Williams underscores the significant weight Isaiah traditions place on Johannine Christology by examining the explicit references to "Isaiah" in John 1:23 and 12:38–41, which bracket Jesus's public ministry. Reviewing ancient Jewish beliefs surrounding Isaiah, Williams suggests that Isaiah was particularly open to interpretations that combined its images of a future, returning, triumphal Lord *and* a Suffering Servant. Noting the confluence of vocabulary in Isaiah 6, 40–42, and 52–53, Williams concludes that the reception history of Isaiah paved the way for John's shaping of the material around his presentation of Jesus as the Christ.[44] John's Gospel, therefore, reflects awareness of this broader intertextual environment and uses it to support its Christology.

The results from intertextual studies, however, can vary widely in their findings, depending on the perspective from which the study is conducted. Many repeat the practices of earlier redaction and source-critical models to note variations in the form of a citation before offering theological rationales for such changes based on the larger context from which the original citation comes. Others use the reader-oriented method of intertextuality to prioritize contemporary perspectives over ancient ones, finding fodder for more ideological interpretations. Intertextuality, then, has opened a number of avenues for continued reflection on John's employment of Scripture, encouraging interpretive possibilities that have remained previously unexplored and taking seriously the variety of implications emerging from John's incorporation of Scripture. Yet it can be difficult to place methodological parameters on intertextual readings. This is both a strength that allows for a variety of interpretations and voices otherwise muted by tradi-

43. Williams, "Testimony of Isaiah," 107–24; Williams, "'He Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him': The Testimony of Isaiah and Johannine Christology," in *Honouring the Past and Shaping the Future: Religious and Biblical Studies in Wales. Essays in Honour of Gareth Lloyd Jones*, ed. Robert Pope (Leominster: Gracewing, 2003), 53–80; Williams, "Isaiah in John's Gospel," in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 101–16.

44. Williams, "Testimony of Isaiah," 121–22.

tional approaches and a potential weakness, particularly for those seeking to discover how texts were heard and understood by ancient audiences.[45]

1.3. The Functions of John's Scripture References

All studies on John's use of Scripture generally hope to touch on at least some of the theological implications of his incorporation of Israel's traditions, even if these theological aspects are limited to individual passages or citations. Thus the studies described above often aim to uncover unique aspects of Johannine theology, especially Christology, by means of their analyses. For the most part these studies underscore the Christocentric hermeneutic of the Gospel and its interest in presenting Scripture as somehow made complete by Jesus's ministry and death.[46] A few studies, however, have devoted extended attention to the various functions the use of Scripture has in John's Gospel.

In her 2003 monograph, Jaime Clark-Soles lays out a sociological model for analyzing the Gospel's use of Scripture. Influenced by the work of Wayne Meeks, Clark-Soles likewise turns to sociology in order to explore how John's use of Scripture sheds light on the Johannine community's historical situation.[47] For Clark-Soles, John's incorporation of

45. See Thomas R. Hatina's criticism of the use of "intertextuality" by historical-critical biblical scholars in "Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?" *BibInt* 7 (1999): 28–42; cf. Stanley E. Porter, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148, SSEJC 5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 80–88. Other scholars have responded to these criticisms by suggesting even more precise terms for the different types of intertextuality that are often explored. Stefan Alkier, for example, suggests using three categories: production-oriented, reception-oriented, and experimental perspectives ("Intertextuality," 9–11). See also Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament," in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. L. Noth*, ed. Steve Moyise, JSNTSup 189 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 14–41.

46. See especially Francis J. Moloney, "The Gospel of John as Scripture," *CBQ* 67 (2005): 454–68. Moloney's own argument interfaces on many fronts with that of Andreas Obermann, which is discussed below.

47. Jaime Clark-Soles, *Scripture Cannot Be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 7–8. The influence of J. Louis Martyn's historical and compositional reconstruction of the Johannine community is also present: "To be sure, the reader will easily detect my debt to Martyn's scholarship

Scripture reflects a sectarian community, much like the Qumran community in the ancient world and even similar to the modern-day example of the Branch Davidians. Scripture is used to justify and, indeed, exalt the members of the sect as ones who have truly understood in contrast to those who remain a part of the "parent" tradition.[48] Clark-Soles contends that the Johannine leaders used Scripture as an authoritative voice to reinforce their community's elect, sectarian status in the midst of their conflict with mainstream Jewish thought. In this way, John's use of Scripture reflects the Gospel's social reality and constructs an identity of "elect" insiders versus those who are outside the believing group.

Andreas Obermann and Saeed Hamid-Khani are more interested in the theological implications of John's use of Scripture, though similarities to Clark-Soles's conclusions also emerge. Both Obermann and Hamid-Khani note the role of Scripture in addressing John's opponents, "the Jews." In these contexts, Scripture acts as a witness, testifying in favor of Jesus's identity and points toward his coming passion. For Obermann, Scripture specifically supports various presentations of Jesus, including as temple (2:17), living bread (6:31), and the king (12:15), among others.[49] Because of Scripture's christological and testifying role, Hamid-Khani suggests that it can act as part of a polemic against those who deny Jesus as the Christ since "true" scriptural understanding only occurs as a result of belief.[50] John's conviction that Jesus fulfills Scripture, and indeed somehow makes Scripture manifest as the *Logos* (Word) incarnate, guides the Gospel's use of Scripture. Obermann argues that such a hermeneutical position enables the Gospel to function as a new Scripture for Johannine believers.[51] For Hamid-Khani, Jesus's fulfillment and completion of Scripture renders Israel's institutions "obsolete" except for the ways in which they can help one understand the Christ event more clearly.[52]

---

as my presuppositions about the traumatic, antagonistic social situation in which the Fourth Gospel was forged become evident" (p. 5).

48. Clark-Soles, *Scripture Cannot Be Broken*, 317.

49. Andreas Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium: Eine Untersuchung zur johanneseichen Hermeneutik anhand der Schriftzitate*, WUNT 2/83 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 91–203.

50. Saeed Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 2/120 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 251–52.

51. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift*, 418–22.

52. Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment*, 258–59.

The recent work of Ruth Sheridan and myself also centers on the function of John's incorporation of Scripture; however, we are more interested in the characterizations that result from the Gospel's scriptural appeals. Sheridan focuses on the presentation of "the Jews" in John's Gospel. Analyzing the explicit citations of Scripture in John 1:19–12:15, Sheridan uses contemporary rhetorical theory to examine how "the Jews" are constructed as characters by the ideal reader. For Sheridan, studying the rhetorical function, instead of potential historical situations, of this characterization puts the examination of John's "anti-Judaism" in sharper focus and exposes "the Jews' " role in drawing the ideal reader to faith in Jesus even as "the Jews" themselves are presented as increasingly "obdurate."[53] My own approach differs from that of Sheridan in my use of classical Greco-Roman rhetorical categories as well as my attention to the characterization of Jesus rather than "the Jews."[54] Nevertheless, we agree that Scripture acts as a witness for Jesus's identity and simultaneously draws in the ideal audience while, or even by means of, alienating other characters within the narrative itself. Moreover, both studies call attention to the need to understand the rhetorical functions of scripture in John's Gospel in addition to primarily historically oriented studies.

The preceding overview of these three approaches—by form, method, and function—demonstrates the lasting interest in studying the Fourth Gospel's use of Scripture. Overall, such studies have some basic areas of consensus. Scholars generally emphasize the Gospel's use of Greek source material and cite Jewish interpretive practices as predecessors for John's incorporation of Scripture as well as intertextual echoes to explain John's incorporation of larger scriptural contexts into the narrative. Building on these conclusions, interpreters seek to understand unique aspects of John's theology, especially his christological emphases, as well as the wider implications of this theology. Nevertheless, just as the consensus

53. Ruth Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture: "The Jews" and the Scriptural Citations in John 1:19–12:15*, BIS 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 235. This conclusion does not signify that Sheridan understands "the Jews" to be undeveloped characters in John's Gospel. Instead, she writes that "'hope' is held out to 'the Jews' in the Gospel narrative" but that since they "do not avail themselves of this hope (cf. 12:39–42), … they remain on the underside of the Gospel's dualism despite the relative character development and occasional understanding and belief" (236).

54. Myers, *Characterizing Jesus*, 39–77. Sheridan suggests that John's scripture citations "should be generically categorized as *midrash/pesher*" instead (*Retelling Scripture*, 46).

concerning John's Christocentric hermeneutic has not dampened studies on our topic, these areas of agreement have not quelled debates. Continued research in these areas along with emerging approaches are pushing the understanding of John's use of Scripture in new directions, sometimes down avenues quite divergent from the accepted conclusions. It is to these more current projects and approaches that we now turn.

2. Continuing the Conversations: The Present Contribution

The present volume continues the conversation on John's use of Scripture, offering both studies that highlight and perpetuate several of the approaches discussed above as well as others that initiate new methodological possibilities. The following essays are divided into three parts, intended to highlight the various approaches utilized in each section.

The first section contains the work of Bruce Schuchard, William Randolph Bynum, and Michael Daise, who are interested in what the form of John's explicit quotations can reveal about their functions in the Gospel. Schuchard traces the "explicit" citations in John, analyzing them to demonstrate that the evangelist's citations consistently rely on a Greek source. The differences that do exist between extant versions of the Greek Bible and forms of John's quotations are the result of John's intentional shaping and, indeed, his ability as a storyteller to cast these Scriptures into the new literary and theological contexts of the Gospel. The resulting quotations, therefore, serve to elucidate the person and work of Jesus, especially his crucifixion, with the goal of convincing the hearer to believe and "have life in his name." Bynum limits his own study to the references to Zech 9:9 and 12:10 in John 12:15 and 19:37. He argues that John uses citation techniques reflected in his own milieu and creates a Zecharian *inclusio* around the passion narrative. Such a move effectively evokes the postexilic context of Zechariah 9–14 throughout the passion sequence to underscore the Johannine irony of Jesus's exalted death. Like Schuchard, Bynum suggests that such use of Israel's Scriptures ultimately encourages the faith of the Gospel audience. Rounding out the first part of this collection is the work of Daise, which centers on the "remembrance" quotations found in John 2:17, 12:13, and 12:15. Daise maintains that these quotations should be read in light of each other since they all mention the role of "remembering" on the part of the disciples. Suggesting that these three quotations were originally located together in an earlier form of the tradition, Daise contends that in their present form they create an

inclusio in the Book of Signs that has profound pneumatological implications.

In the second portion of the book, the essays of Jaime Clark-Soles, Ruth Sheridan, Benjamin Lappenga, and me provide examples of sociological and rhetorical methodologies in the study of John's use of Scripture. Clark-Soles's chapter begins this section by outlining her sociological method described in the previous section. She describes the impact of John's incorporation of Scripture on the construction of various social identities, especially those "inside" and those "outside" the Johannine community. My essay explores the insight classical rhetoric can provide on understanding how the Gospel of John uses Scripture. After providing an overview of the relevance of classical rhetoric for the interpretation of the use of Scripture in the New Testament, I explore John 1:19–34 and suggest that the use of Isaiah as *exemplum* results in the blending of his voice with that of John (the Baptist) to offer a confession, and indeed a "divine testimony," consistent with that of the Johannine believers. Building on his research of ζῆλος in other New Testament works, Lappenga here turns his attention to the quotation of Ps 69:9 in John 2:17. Rather than "zeal for your house" simply acting as a description of Jesus's devotion to the Father, Lappenga uses literary-compositional arguments to conclude that this zeal is *also* a reference to the zeal of "the Jews," which ultimately, but not inevitably, leads them to pursue Jesus's death (i.e., their zeal "consumes" Jesus). This portrayal of the "misguided zeal" of "the Jews" leads *not* to a "portrait of hatred" but instead to an emphasis on the importance of accepting Jesus's identity claims. Sheridan's essay also centers on the presentation of "the Jews" in John's Gospel. Mixing contemporary rhetorical theory with ancient Jewish practices of biblical interpretation, Sheridan centers her attention on John 8:17. Her work explores neglected resonance between John 7–8, the accusations, and the three scriptural texts that express the stipulation of the testimony of two or more witnesses (Deut 17:6; 19:15; Num 35:30) in order to assess how they are rhetorically reconfigured in John 8:17. In this mutually hostile exchange, Jesus and his opponents mete out accusations of deception and apostasy (Deut 13; 17:2–7; 29:18, 25–28), homicide, the punishment for "false witnesses" and perjury (Deut 19:16). As a result, the two groups persist in speaking past each other through their scriptural applications, "the Jews" identifying Jesus as an apostate, while he condemns them of perjury. Overall, John 7–8 reinforce that it is not necessarily the use of Scripture on its own that makes the Gospel's identification of Jesus persuasive to an audience, but rather the Gospel's rhetoric, which

uses Scripture to elevate its perspective over that of other characters in the text and those outside the Gospel community.

The third part of this collection includes essays in the growing area of memory and performance theory, which pays particular attention to the oral preservation and transmission of New Testament traditions. Catrin Williams's contribution opens this section by examining the presentation of various figures from Israel's past into the Gospel of John. Using insights from social memory and social identity theories, Williams focuses on how these figures are reconfigured in the Johannine narrative in order to explore how John's christological beliefs, and encounters with other group(s), shape his presentation of scriptural figures as witnesses to Jesus and, in the case of Abraham and Isaiah, as prototypes of the Johannine community's group identity. As part of a larger project exploring memory theory in John's Gospel, Jeffrey Brickle draws on insights from a number of subdisciplines in addition to memory theorists in order to explore how John shapes his Gospel in light of septuagintal subtexts and personal participation. Examining first the farewell discourse, passion narrative, and epilogue, Brickle then turns to the prologue to demonstrate how John uses the Jewish Scriptures as the primary locus upon which he builds his memory images for his audience. Recognizing the significance of orality, aurality, and memory in antiquity, these essays remind contemporary readers how ancients built on traditions to cue the memories of their audiences in the formation of group beliefs.

This collection of essays offers a snapshot of some current approaches to the lasting questions surrounding John's use of Scripture. Although a gospel often highlighted for anti-Jewish tendencies, it is nevertheless a gospel that uses Israel's Scripture as the backdrop for its presentation of Jesus as the Christ. Acknowledging the crucial role that Scripture plays in the Gospel of John, the essays in this volume consistently argue for the intentional shaping of John's citations in light of the late first century CE. Moreover, they show appreciation for the larger context from which these scriptural references come, exploring the possible influences these contexts have on John's theology and rhetoric. This collection also gives voice to a diversity of perspectives, providing space for those examining the form of John's quotations, the sociological ramifications and rhetorical techniques, and the role of memory in John's scriptural interlacing. In this way, we hope that this volume enables readers to catch a glimpse at how Scripture informs the world constructed by the Gospel, both for those in the ancient Mediterranean and for contemporary readers.