

# JESUS AS PROPHET IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

---



New Testament Monographs, 15

*Series Editor*  
Stanley E. Porter



# JESUS AS PROPHET IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Sukmin Cho



SHEFFIELD PHOENIX PRESS

2006

Copyright 2006 Sheffield Phoenix Press

Published by Sheffield Phoenix Press  
Department of Biblical Studies, University of Sheffield  
Sheffield S10 2TN

[www.sheffieldphoenix.com](http://www.sheffieldphoenix.com)

*All rights reserved.*

*No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without the publishers' permission in writing.*

A CIP catalogue record for this book  
is available from the British Library

Typeset by Elaine Bingham, Dronfield, Derbyshire  
Printed on acid-free paper by Lightning Source

13 digit ISBN 978-1-905048-42-7  
10 digit ISBN 1-905048-42-4  
ISSN 1747-9606

In memory of my beloved son

Seyoun Cho

(28 January 1984–1 September 2005)



## CONTENTS

List of Tables	xi
Acknowledgments	xii
Abbreviations	xiv
 1. INTRODUCTION	 1
 PART I: PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS	 9
2. CONTEXT OF PRESENT STUDY, HISTORICAL SURVEY AND METHODOLOGY	 10
Context of Present Study	10
Author, Date and Place of the Gospel	10
Sources, Religious Milieu and the Johannine Community	15
Excursus: The Possibility of a Relationship between the Johannine Community and Other Early Christian Communities	 24
The Purpose of the Gospel and the Identity of the Readers	30
A Brief Historical Survey of Studies on Jesus as Prophet in the Fourth Gospel	 33
Wayne A. Meeks's <i>The Prophet-King</i> (1967)	34
Before 1967	37
After 1967	45
Methodological Considerations	53
Historical Criticism Applied to John's Gospel	56
Narrative Criticism Applied to John's Gospel	58
Integrative Approaches to John's Gospel	61
The Method Adopted in This Study	65
 3. 'PROPHET' AND PROPHETIC FIGURES AS BACKGROUND FOR JESUS AS PROPHET	 68
'Prophet' and Prophetic Figures in the Old Testament	69
Elijah	70
Elisha	71

Isaiah	71
Jeremiah	73
Moses	75
Summary	76
‘Prophet’ and Prophetic Figures in the Late Second Temple Period	77
Philo	78
Josephus	80
The Samaritan Literature	83
The Dead Sea Scrolls	87
Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	90
Summary	93
Conclusions	93
 PART II: PROPHETIC FEATURES OF JESUS’ MINISTRY	 95
4. Jesus’ Prophetic Actions	96
Jesus’ First Miracle: Water into Wine (John 2.1-11)	98
Jesus’ Healing of the Royal Official’s Son (John 4.46-54)	100
Jesus’ Healing of the Paralytic (John 5.1-47)	103
Jesus’ Raising of the Dead, Lazarus (John 11.1-44)	106
Jesus’ Actions in the Temple (John 2.13-25)	111
Conclusions	119
5. JESUS’ PROPHETIC WORDS	121
Jesus’ Prophetic Intercession in John 17	121
Jesus’ Predictions in the Fourth Gospel	130
Jesus’ Prophetic Role as Spokesman for God	135
Conclusions	140
6. JESUS’ SELF-AWARENESS AS PROPHET	142
The Proverbial Saying in John 4.44	144
The Sending Formula	153
Jesus’ Self-consciousness of his Coming Violent Death as the Figure of a Rejected Prophet	159
The Double Amen Formula	164
Conclusions	169
 PART III: JESUS AS PROPHET	 171
7. JESUS AS THE EXPECTED ESCHATOLOGICAL PROPHET (I)	172
Jesus as the Expected Samaritan Prophet (John 4.4-42)	172



Perception of the Samaritan Woman of Jesus as Prophet	174
Understanding Jesus as the Expected Samaritan Prophet	180
Summary	187
Jesus as the Expected Jewish Prophet (John 9.1–10.21)	187
Recognition by the Blind Man of Jesus as Prophet	190
Understanding Jesus as the Expected Jewish Prophet	194
Summary	202
Conclusions	203
8. JESUS AS THE EXPECTED ESCHATOLOGICAL PROPHET (II)	205
Jesus as the Expected Deuteronomic Eschatological Prophet (John 1.19-28)	205
Identity of ‘the Prophet’ in John 1.21, 25	205
Implication of Jesus as the Expected Deuteronomic Eschatological Prophet	210
Summary	212
Jesus as the Expected Mosaic Eschatological Prophet (John 6.1-15)	212
Intention of the Use of ‘the Prophet’ in John 6.14	213
Understanding Jesus as the Expected Mosaic Eschatological Prophet	216
Summary	220
Jesus as the Expected Messianic Eschatological Prophet (John 7.37-52)	221
Significance of the Use of ‘the Prophet’ in John 7.40, 52	221
Understanding Jesus as the Expected Messianic Eschatological Prophet	224
Summary	227
Conclusions	228
PART IV: THE ROLE OF ‘PROPHET’ IN CHARACTERIZATION AND ITS CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE	231
9. THE ROLE OF ‘PROPHET’ IN CHARACTERIZATION	232
The Theory of Characterization	232
The Role of ‘Prophet’ in Characterization	239
Direct Definition in Characterization	239
Indirect Presentation in Characterization	242
Summary	251
Conclusions	252

10. THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS AS PROPHET	254
Other Johannine Christological Titles and Jesus as Prophet	254
Logos and Prophet	255
God and Prophet	257
Son of God and Prophet	259
Messiah and Prophet	262
Coming One and Prophet	263
Teacher and Prophet	264
King and Prophet	265
Son of Man and Prophet	267
Summary	271
The Significance of the Johannine Jesus as Prophet in	
Johannine Christology	272
Didactic Christological Role of the Johannine Jesus	
as Prophet	274
Apologetic Christological Role of the Johannine Jesus	
as Prophet	277
Conclusions	283
11. CONCLUSION	285
Bibliography	288
Index of References	331
Index of Authors	352

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 Water into wine (Jn 2.1-11)	99
Table 4.2 Healing of the royal official's son (Jn 4.46-54)	101
Table 4.3 The raising of Lazarus (Jn 11.1-44)	107
Table 6.1 The maxim in Mk 6.4, Mt. 13.57 and Lk. 4.24	145
Table 6.2 The maxim in Jn 4.44 and Lk. 4.24	146
Table 8.1 Feeding of the five thousand (Jn 6.1-15)	219

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is a minor revision of my 2004 doctoral dissertation at the University of Bristol. My special thanks go to my supervisor, the Revd Dr John Nolland, who has enabled me to study John's Gospel and also to look into the world of the Gospels. Those who have had the privilege to work with him respect his erudition and able supervision, tendered in a spirit of kindness and patience. Those who know his work in the Gospels respect his judicious judgment and careful scholarship. I would like to thank him for his patient and diligent supervision, helpful guidance and insightful criticism throughout my research.

I am also grateful to those who have offered valuable comments on my research. In particular, my second adviser, the Revd Dr Ruth B. Edwards, who was a tutor at Ripon College Cuddesdon, Oxford until her retirement in December 1999, offered valuable suggestions about the overall structure of this book. The Revd Dr Paul Ellingworth, who is an honorary lecturer in New Testament at the University of Aberdeen, and the Revd Dr Philip Jenson, who was a lecturer in Old Testament at Trinity College, Bristol, offered very helpful comments on my research.

Particularly, I am grateful to the Revd Margaret Embry, who was my pastoral tutor at Trinity College, Bristol in 1993–94 and her friend the Revd Waveney Bishop, who proofread the manuscript. I also wish to thank Su Brown, the librarian at Trinity College, who provided the inter-library loan services that have offered me access to many items, which were inaccessible to me.

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr Stanley E. Porter, who is President and Dean, and Professor of New Testament, at McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario, and the editor of the New Testament Monographs Series, and Dr D.J.A. Clines, who is Professor of Biblical Studies and Head of Department at the University of Sheffield, who read the manuscript and offered practical suggestions for publication. I am grateful to the two examiners, who offered valuable advice and encouragement, the Revd Dr Stephen Motyer, who is a lecturer in New Testament and Hermeneutics at London School of Theology (previously London Bible College),

and the Revd Dr Ernest Lucas, who is a lecturer in Old Testament Studies at Bristol Baptist College. I also wish to express my gratitude to Elaine Bingham, who painstakingly copy-edited the manuscript for publication, and to the team at Sheffield Phoenix Press.

For financial and prayerful assistance, I wish to thank a number of churches in South Korea, America and England, and many people, who do not wish to reveal themselves. In particular, I am deeply grateful to Mr and Mrs Alfred Hill for their substantial support, love and encouragement in times of financial difficulties during my research. Mrs Hill (Rosemary Scarth) and her sister Mrs Earl (Wendy) are grandchildren of James Scarth Gale (1863–1937), who was a Canadian and one of Korea's early missionaries who arrived in 1888 and touched almost every significant development in the modernization of Korea.

My greatest praise and thanks are reserved for my wife, Choonran, who always gives love, encouragement and wholehearted support, and also for my daughter Eunyong and son Seyoun (who suddenly passed away on 1 September 2005), who never complained to their 'student daddy'. To my wife Choonran, I dedicate this book with respect, appreciation and love.

Sukmin Cho

Ezra Bible Institute for Graduate Studies  
South Korea

July 2006

## ABBREVIATIONS

1QH <sup>a</sup>	<i>1Q Hodayot<sup>a</sup></i>
1QM	<i>1Q War Scroll</i>
1QpHab	<i>1Q Pesher to Habakkuk</i>
1QS	<i>1Q Rule of the Community</i>
1QS <sup>a</sup>	<i>1Q Rule of the Community<sup>a</sup></i>
1Q14	<i>1Q Pesher to Micah</i>
1Q15	<i>1Q Pesher to Zephaniah</i>
4QMMT	<i>4Q Halakhic Letter</i>
4Q166	<i>4Q Hosea Pesher<sup>a</sup></i>
4Q167	<i>4Q Hosea Pesher<sup>b</sup></i>
4Q168	<i>4Q Micah Pesher (?)</i>
4Q169	<i>4Q Nahum Pesher</i>
4Q174	<i>4Q Florilegium</i>
4Q175	<i>4Q Testimonia</i>
4Q182	<i>4Q Catena<sup>b</sup></i>
4Q286	<i>4Q Blessings<sup>a</sup></i>
4Q287	<i>4Q Blessings<sup>b</sup></i>
4Q289	<i>4Q Blessings<sup>d</sup></i>
4Q293	<i>4Q Work Containing Prayers C</i>
4Q382	<i>4Q Paraphrase of Kings</i>
4Q504	<i>4Q Words of the Luminaries</i>
4Q505	<i>4Q Words of the Luminaries<sup>b</sup> (?)</i>
4Q507	<i>4Q Festival Prayers<sup>a</sup> (?)</i>
4Q509	<i>4Q Festival Prayers<sup>c</sup></i>
4Q511	<i>4Q Songs of the Sage<sup>b</sup></i>
5Q4	<i>5Q Amos</i>
5Q10	<i>5Q Malachi Pesher</i>
11Q13	<i>11Q Deuteronomy</i>
11QPs <sup>a</sup>	<i>11Q Psalms<sup>a</sup></i>
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	D.N. Freedman (ed.), <i>The Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992)

ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ACNT	Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ANRW	H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds.), <i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1972–)
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Antiquities of the Jews</i>
ANTC	Abingdon New Testament Commentary
<i>Apion</i>	Josephus, <i>Against Apion</i>
<i>Asc. Isa.</i>	<i>Ascension of Isaiah</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
<i>ATR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
<i>b.</i>	<i>Babylonian Talmud</i>
BAFCS	The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
<i>BBR</i>	<i>Bulletin for Biblical Research</i>
BDAG	W. Bauer, F.W. Danker <i>et al.</i> , <i>A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 3rd edn, 2000)
BDB	F. Brown, S.R. Driver <i>et al.</i> , <i>A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907)
<i>Ber.</i>	<i>Berakot</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
<i>BETS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>Bib Res</i>	<i>Biblical Research</i>
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>
<i>BO</i>	<i>Bibliotheca orientalis</i>
<i>BR</i>	<i>Bible Review</i>
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca sacra</i>
BSR	Biblioteca di scienze religiose
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theological Bulletin</i>
BthS	Biblisch-theologische Studien
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen

BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur <i>ZAW</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur <i>ZNW</i>
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBNTS	Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CD	Cairo, Damascus Document
CD-A	Cairo, Damascus Document <sup>a</sup>
CD-B	Cairo, Damascus Document <sup>b</sup>
<i>Cher.</i>	Philo, <i>De cherubim (On the Cherubim)</i>
<i>Congr.</i>	Philo, <i>De congressu quaerendae eruditionis gratia (On the Preliminary Studies)</i>
<i>CRBS</i>	<i>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</i>
<i>CTR</i>	<i>Criswell Theological Review</i>
<i>DBI</i>	R.J. Coggins and J.L. Houlden (eds.), <i>A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation</i> (London: SCM Press, 1990)
<i>Dec.</i>	Philo, <i>De decalogo (On the Decalogue)</i>
<i>Det. pot. ins.</i>	Philo, <i>Quod deterius potiori insidiari solet (The Worse Attacks the Better)</i>
<i>Deus imm.</i>	Philo, <i>Quod deus sit immutabilis (On the Unchangeableness of God)</i>
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache</i>
<i>DJG</i>	J.B. Green and S. McKnight (eds.), <i>Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels</i> (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1992)
<i>EDNT</i>	Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider (eds.), <i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–93 [1978–80])
<i>EHPR</i>	Etudes d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses
<i>EncJud</i>	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica</i> (16 vols.; Jerusalem: Keter, 1972)
<i>EQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>ExAud</i>	<i>Ex auditu</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GCT	Gender, Culture, Theory
<i>Gig.</i>	Philo, <i>De gigantibus (On the Giants)</i>
<i>Gos. Thom.</i>	<i>The Gospel of Thomas</i>
<i>HAR</i>	<i>Hebrew Annual Review</i>



<i>HBT</i>	<i>Horizons in Biblical Theology</i>
<i>HeyJ</i>	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HTS</i>	<i>Hervormde teologiese studies</i>
HThKNT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IBT	Interpreting Biblical Texts
ICC	The International Critical Commentary
<i>IDB</i>	G.A. Buttrick <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i> (4 vols.; New York: Abingdon Press, 1962)
<i>IJST</i>	<i>International Journal of Systematic Theology</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>ITQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
ITSORS	Italian Texts and Studies on Religion and Society
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	JBL Monograph Series
<i>JETS</i>	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JLT</i>	<i>Journal of Literature and Theology</i>
JPTSup	<i>Journal of Pentecostal Theology</i> , Supplement Series
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	<i>JSNT</i> , Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	<i>JSOT</i> , Supplement Series
JSPSup	<i>JSP</i> , Supplement Series
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KEKNT	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
KNT	Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>KNTTM</i>	H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch</i> (4 vols.; Munich: C.H. Beck, 1922–28)
LCC	Library of Christian Classics
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
<i>Leg. all.</i> <i>m.</i>	Philo, <i>Legum allegoriae (Allegorical Interpretation)</i> <i>Mishnah</i>

<i>Migr. Abr.</i>	Philo, <i>De migratione Abrahami</i> ( <i>On the Migration of Abraham</i> )
MNTC	Moffatt New Testament Commentary
<i>Mut. nom.</i>	Philo, <i>De mutatione nominum</i> ( <i>On the Change of Names</i> )
NBC	D.A. Carson <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>New Bible Commentary</i> (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 4th edn, 1994)
NCBC	New Century Bible Commentary
NEBKNT	Die Neue Echter Bibel: Kommentar zum Neuen Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung
<i>NedTTs</i>	<i>Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift</i>
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NIBC	New International Bible Commentary
NICNT	New International Commentary on the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
<i>NIDNTT</i>	C. Brown (ed.), <i>The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> (4 vols.; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1986)
<i>NIDOTTE</i>	W.A. VanGemeren (ed.), <i>New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis</i> (5 vols.; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997 [1996])
NIGTC	The New International Greek Testament Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to <i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NTAM	New Testament Archaeology Monograph
NTD	Das Neue Testament Deutsch
NTL	New Testament Library
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OBL	Orientalia et biblica Iovaniensia
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
<i>OPTAT</i>	<i>Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics</i>
ÖTK	Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>OTS</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
<i>Plant.</i>	Philo, <i>De plantatione</i> ( <i>On Noah's Work as a Planter</i> )
PNTC	Pelican New Testament Commentaries
POTTS	Pittsburgh Original Texts and Translations Series
<i>Praem. poen.</i>	Philo, <i>De praemiis et poenis</i> ( <i>On Rewards and Punishments</i> )
<i>Ps.-Philo</i>	<i>Pseudo-Philo</i>

PTMS	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
<i>Quaest. in Gen.</i>	Philo, <i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin (Questions and Answers on Genesis)</i>
<i>Ques. Ezra</i>	<i>Questions of Ezra</i>
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>Rer. div. her.</i>	Philo, <i>Quis rerum divinarum heres sit (Who is the Heir)</i>
RevExp	<i>Review and Expositor</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RILP	Roehampton Institute London Papers
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
<i>Roš Haš.</i>	<i>Roš haš-Šanah</i>
RSR	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
RTR	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
<i>Sanh.</i>	<i>Sanhedrin</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLMS	SBL Monograph Series
SBLSBS	SBL Sources for Biblical Study
<i>SBLSP</i>	SBL Seminar Papers
SBLSS	SBL Symposium Series
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SE	<i>Studia evangelica</i>
<i>SémB</i>	<i>Sémiotique et Bible</i>
<i>Šeq.</i>	<i>Šeqalim</i>
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
SNTA	Studiorum novi testamenti auxilia
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>Somn.</i>	Philo, <i>De somniis (On Dreams)</i>
<i>Soṭ.</i>	<i>Soṭah</i>
<i>Spec. leg.</i>	Philo, <i>De specialibus legibus (On the Special Laws)</i>
SPB	Studia postbiblica
ST	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
SVTQ	<i>St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>t.</i>	<i>Tosefta</i>
T&S	<i>Theology and Sexuality</i>
TBT	<i>The Bible Today</i>
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> (trans. G.W. Bromiley; 10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)

<i>TDOT</i>	G.J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren <i>et al.</i> (eds.), <i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> (trans. J.T. Willis, G.W. Bromiley <i>et al.</i> ; 14 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2004)
<i>TGL</i>	<i>Tijdschrift voor geestelijk leven</i>
<i>THNT</i>	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>TKNT</i>	Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>TLOT</i>	E. Jenni and C. Westermann (eds.), <i>Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (trans. M.E. Biddle; 3 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997)
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>T. Mos.</i>	<i>Testament of Moses</i>
<i>TNTC</i>	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
<i>TRu</i>	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
<i>TUGAL</i>	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
<i>TWNT</i>	Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich (eds.), <i>Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i> (11 vols.; Stuttgart, Kohlhammer, 1932–79)
<i>TynB</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>TZ</i>	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>UNT</i>	Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>VE</i>	<i>Vox evangelica</i>
<i>Virt.</i>	Philo, <i>De virtutibus</i> ( <i>On the Virtues</i> )
<i>Vit. Mos.</i>	Philo, <i>De vita Mosis</i> ( <i>On the Life of Moses</i> )
<i>War</i>	Josephus, <i>The Jewish War</i>
<i>WBC</i>	Word Biblical Commentary
<i>WTJ</i>	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
<i>WUNT</i>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>y.</i>	<i>Yerushalmi</i> ( <i>Palestinian Talmud</i> )
<i>Yom.</i>	<i>Yoma</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZRGG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

# 1

## INTRODUCTION

The aim of this study is to investigate the degree to which the Johannine Jesus is depicted as prophet in the Fourth Gospel as a whole, and to understand the use of προφήτης in respect of Jesus' identity in the Gospel. The word προφήτης in connection with the identity of Jesus is explicitly or implicitly used in Jn 1.21, 25; 4.19, 44; 6.14; 7.40, 52; 9.17,<sup>1</sup> and the use of prophetic images related to Jesus is not hard to find in the Fourth Gospel. What is the Johannine background for the image of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel? In what sense is the term προφήτης used in the Gospel with regard to Jesus' identity? On what basis does the Johannine Jesus identify himself as prophet? What is the role of Jesus as prophet with respect to characterization in the Gospel as a whole? What is the christological significance of Jesus as prophet in respect of Johannine Christology?

Traditionally, it has been recognized by theologians that Jesus has three functions: the kingly, the priestly and the prophetic.<sup>2</sup> Among the

1. In Jn 6.14 and 7.40, Jesus is explicitly recognized as ὁ προφήτης, in Jn 4.19 and 9.17 as προφήτης, and ὁ προφήτης is implicitly linked with Jesus in Jn 1.21, 25, and προφήτης is so in Jn 4.44.

2. Although Jesus' three-fold function had been mentioned by Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* (trans. K. Lake and J.E.L. Oulton; 2 vols.; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1926–32), I, Bk III, pp. 7-8, John Calvin was the first to recognize the importance of distinguishing the three offices of Jesus and to call attention to it in his *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (trans. F.L. Battles; LCC, 20; London: SCM Press, 1961), Bk II, Ch. 15; see J.F. Jansen, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Work of Christ* (London: James Clarke, 1956), pp. 16-38, who presents some useful data on the background of the formulation of the triple office of Jesus. He holds that the prophetic office of Christ largely drops from Calvin's attention. However, the triple office gives structure to the doctrine of the work of Christ as Mediator in typical works of Reformed theology. Cf. H. Heppe, *Dogmatik der deutschen Protestantismus im 16. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols. (1857), which is revised by E. Berger and translated into English by G.T. Thomson as *Reformed Dogmatics* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1950), pp. 452-87; C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (3 vols.;

three offices, the kingly and priestly roles of Jesus have been emphasized, but the prophetic function has not been paid serious attention.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the concept of 'prophet' has not played much of a role in Christology, and so the place of *Prophet Christology* has not yet been adequately explored in New Testament Christology.<sup>4</sup> Reasons why the concept of prophet plays no significant role in New Testament Christology have partly been suggested by O. Cullmann.<sup>5</sup> However, it is clear that the idea of a coming prophet as

Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952), II, pp. 459-79; W. Cunningham, *Historical Theology: A Review of the Principal Doctrinal Discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age* (2 vols.; London: Banner of Truth Trust, 4th edn, 1960), II, pp. 237-49; T.F. Torrance, *The School of Faith: The Catechisms of the Reformed Church* (London: James Clarke, 1959), pp. lxxvii-xcv, ciii-cvi; L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1958), pp. 356-412. In contrast to the three-fold office, D.T. Williams, 'The Four-Fold Office of Christ', *ExpTim* 100 (1989), pp. 134-37, suggests a four-fold office of Christ, that is to say, he adds Jesus as servant to the list; see also R.B. Edwards, 'The Christological Basis of the Johannine Footwashing', in J.B. Green and M. Turner (eds.), *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994), pp. 367-83.

3. See K. Barth, *Church Dogmatics. IV. The Doctrine of Reconciliation, Part One* (trans. G.W. Bromiley; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956), who also notes that the prophetic office used to be largely ignored (pp. 137-38); see W. Pannenberg, *Jesus-God and Man* (trans. Lewis L. Wilkins, and D.A. Priebe; London: SCM Press, 1968), pp. 212-44, who thinks that only the prophetic office characterizes the earthly work of Jesus (p. 221). More recently H.P. Jansma focuses on Jesus' prophetic office in relation to the theology of John Calvin; see his doctoral dissertation, 'The Prophetic Office of Christ in John Calvin's Theology' (unpublished doctoral thesis; Durham: University of Durham, 1991); see also M.J. Erickson, *Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983-85), pp. 762-67 (this book was originally published in three volumes: vol. 1 (Parts 1-4), 1983; vol. 2 (Parts 5-8), 1984; vol. 3 (Parts 9-12), 1985); S.J. Grenz, *Theology for the Community of God* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994), pp. 424-43.

4. See C.H. Dodd, 'Jesus as Teacher and Prophet', in G.K.A. Bell and D.A. Deissmann (eds.), *Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies by British and German Theologians* (London: Longmans, Green, 1930), pp. 53-66; C.K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1947), pp. 94-99; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel: Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), which is translated by H. Knight and G. Ogg as *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1969), pp. 352-406.

5. This issue will be discussed in detail in this book, see Chapter 10; O. Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, rev. edn, 1963), pp. 45-49; D. Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981), pp. 269-70. For a different opinion, see G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973), p. 88.

a messianic figure was strong in Jewish belief based on Deut. 18.15, 18. In Acts 3.22 and 7.37, it is implied that Jesus is the coming prophet.<sup>6</sup> All four Gospels contain evidence that Jesus was regarded as a prophet during his lifetime, although all four evangelists recognize that Jesus is greater than a prophet. Hence, the prophetic aspects of Jesus' life and ministry are easily found in the Gospels.<sup>7</sup> In particular, the prophetic role of Jesus seems to be more strikingly emphasized in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the prophetic concept seems

6. On messianic expectations in Jewish belief, see G.S. Oegema, *The Anointed and his People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPSup, 27; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); R. Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); J.H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger and G.S. Oegema (eds.), *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998); J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriften von Qumran* (WUNT, 2.104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

7. See M.D. Hooker, *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1997), who argues that 'Jesus must have appeared to his contemporaries to stand firmly in the Jewish prophetic tradition' (pp. 78-79), when his actions and words are considered; H. Krämer, R. Rendtorff, R. Meyer and G. Friedrich, 'προφήτης, προφήτης, κτλ', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 781-861, see esp. pp. 841-48.

8. For the subject of Jesus as prophet in relation to the Synoptics, see F. Gils, *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques* (OBL, 2; Leuven: Université de Leuven, 1957); F. Schnider, *Jesus der Prophet* (OBO, 2; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), pp. 89-190; P.B. Decocq, 'The Concept of Jesus as Prophet in the Synoptic Tradition' (unpublished PhD thesis; Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal, 1974).

In Mark's Gospel, popular opinion regarding Jesus as a prophet is found in Mk 6.4, 15 and 8.28, but Mark does not attempt to develop the issue. The issue has been examined by E.K. Broadhead, *Prophet, Son, Messiah: Narrative Form and Function in Mark 14-16* (JSNTSup, 97; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), who focuses on Mark 14-16 and argues for Jesus to be seen as the teaching prophet who guides his followers, the prophet of God, and the suffering prophet.

Matthew follows a similar pattern, but he betrays no real christological interest in the title. Although Matthew utilizes a number of literary devices and theological motifs to depict Jesus as a new Moses, he never attempts to identify Jesus with the eschatological Mosaic prophet; see D.C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993); A. Sand, *Das Gesetz und die Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangeliums nach Matthäus* (BU, 11; Regensburg: Pustet, 1974), esp. pp. 168-77; H.M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (JBLMS, 10; Philadelphia: SBL, 1957), who mistakenly argues that Jesus could not be identified with the prophet of Mosaic type, despite his own investigation of 'the Mosaic eschatological prophet' (see esp. pp. 74-83). Recently the subject has been examined by M. McVann, 'One of the Prophets: Matthew's Testing Narrative as a Rite

to play a significant role in Johannine Christology. The subject of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel, however, has been paid little serious attention in the study of Johannine Christology.<sup>9</sup>

of Passage', *BTB* 23 (1993), pp. 14-20, and M. Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthaean Redaction* (JSNTSup, 68; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), who argues that Jesus is portrayed as a rejected prophet in relation to Matthew's three explicit references to the prophet Jeremiah (Mt. 2.17-18; 16.14; 27.9-10).

Luke shows far more interest than the other Synoptic evangelists in portraying Jesus as a prophet. In Acts 3.23 and 7.37, the coming of a prophet like Moses is implicitly referred to Jesus, but Luke nowhere in his Gospel makes any attempt to depict Jesus in terms of Moses *redivivus*, or as a prophet like Moses. In his Gospel, Luke presents an acclamation by the people that 'A great prophet has arisen among us!' (Προφήτης μέγας ἤγέρθη ἐν ἡμῖν) in Lk. 7.16, and the same popular opinion is also expressed, although in a negative way, by Simon the Pharisee in Lk. 7.39; see J. Nolland, *Luke* (3 vols.; WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1989-93), I, pp. 323, 355; E. Charpentier, 'Le Prophète, ami des pécheurs: Lc 7,36-8,3', *Assemblées du Seigneur* 42 (1970), pp. 80-92; A.H. Dammers, 'Studies in Tests: A Note on Luke vii, 36-50', *Theology* 49 (1946), pp. 78-80. Further, the two disciples on the road to Emmaus say to their unknown fellow, 'Jesus of Nazareth who was a prophet mighty (προφήτης δυνάτῳς) in deed and word before God and all the people' in Lk. 24.19; see Nolland, *Luke*, III, p. 1202. Luke nowhere in his Gospel presents Jesus as the eschatological prophet. Luke's interest in Jesus as a prophet is intimately bound up with his conception of the violent fate of the prophets as a way of conceptualizing the meaning of Jesus' death; see Nolland, *Luke*, I, p. 200; M. Goguel, 'Le rejet de Jésus à Nazareth', *ZNW* 12 (1911), pp. 321-24; D. Hill, 'The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke iv 16-30)', *NovT* 13 (1971), pp. 161-80. For more details on the violent fate of the prophets; see D.E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), pp. 157-59. In the overall structure of Luke-Acts, the author describes a flurry of prophetic activity both before and after the appearance of Jesus, but he portrays only Jesus as a prophet during Jesus' lifetime; see A. Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1958); T.R. Carruth, 'The Jesus-as-Prophet Motif in Luke-Acts' (unpublished PhD thesis; Waco, TX: Baylor University, 1973); G.R. Greene, 'The Portrayal of Jesus as Prophet in Luke-Acts' (unpublished PhD thesis; Louisville, KY: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975); M. Karimattam, 'Jesus the Prophet: A Study of the Prophet Motif in the Christology of Luke-Acts' (unpublished PhD thesis; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978); J.-L. Vesco, *Jérusalem et son prophète: Une lecture de l'évangile selon saint Luc* (Paris: Cerf, 1988); G. Nebe, *Prophetische Züge im Bilde Jesu bei Lukas* (BWANT, 127; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989); M. McVann, 'Rituals of Status Transformation in Luke-Acts: The Case of Jesus the Prophet', in J.H. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), pp. 333-60.

9. See J. Dupont, *Essais sur la christologie de Saint Jean* (Bruges: Saint-André, 1951); J.E. Davey, *The Jesus of St John: Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958); E.M. Sidebottom, *The*



Since R. Meyer's book, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa: Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelien* appeared in 1940,<sup>10</sup> the subject of

*Christ of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of First-Century Thought* (London: SPCK, 1961); T.E. Pollard, *Johannine Christology and the Early Church* (SNTSMS, 13; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970); U.B. Müller, *Die Geschichte der Christologie in der johanneischen Gemeinde* (SBS, 77; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975); M. de Jonge, *Jesus, Stranger from Heaven and Son of God: Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (ed. and trans. J.E. Steely; SBL/SBS, 11; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977); J. Guillet, *Jésus Christ dans l'Évangile de Jean* (Cahiers Évangile, 31; Paris: Cerf, 1980); W. Grundmann, *Der Zeuge der Wahrheit: Grundzüge der Christologie des Johannesevangeliums* (ed. W. Wiefel; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1985); L.T. Witkamp, *Jezus van Nazareth in de gemeente van Johannes: Over de interactie van traditie en ervaring* (Kampen: Van den Berg, 1986); G. Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (AnBib, 117; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987); U. Schnelle, *Antidoketische Christologie im Johannesevangelium: Eine Untersuchung zur Stellung des vierten Evangeliums in der johanneischen Schule* (FRLANT, 144; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), which is translated into English by L.M. Maloney, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John: An Investigation of the Place of the Fourth Gospel in the Johannine School* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992); W. Loader, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Structure and Issues* (BBET, 23; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2nd edn, 1992); M.E. Willett, *Wisdom Christology in the Fourth Gospel* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992); P.N. Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996); J.F. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology* (SNTSMS, 111; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); M. Endo, *Creation and Christology: A Study on the Johannine Prologue in the Light of Early Jewish Creation Accounts* (WUNT, 2.149; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002); however, none of them focuses on the subject of Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel. See also M.J.J. Menken, 'The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research', in M.C. de Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (JSNTSup, 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 292-320. For a full bibliography of Johannine Christology, see G. van Belle, *Johannine Bibliography 1966-1985: A Cumulative Bibliography on the Fourth Gospel* (Collectanea biblica et religiosa antiqua, 1; Brussels: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België; BETL, 82; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 1988), pp. 339-57; W.E. Mills, *The Gospel of John* (Bibliographies for Biblical Research, New Testament Series, 4; Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), pp. 206-14.

10. The monograph was reprinted in 1970 by Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft in Darmstadt. In his book, Meyer seeks to isolate a level of the Synoptic tradition in which Jesus appeared as a prophet. He begins with a brief survey of the relevant Synoptic data and then analyses in detail Jesus' self-designation as a prophet, the statements of those who acknowledge his messianic-prophetic role, the Elijah pericopes and Mk 6.14. He then discusses the whole context of prophecy in

Jesus as prophet has been examined by a considerable number of scholars.<sup>11</sup> However, the scholars have focused on the topic of Jesus as prophet in connection with Christology more generally, and/or they have considered it in the Synoptic Gospels, but not in the Fourth Gospel. Only a few articles and books have focused on the issue of Jesus as prophet in John's Gospel.<sup>12</sup> However, they have concentrated on the theme of Jesus as prophet not in respect of the meaning, the role in characterization and the christological significance in John's Gospel as a whole, but in respect

Hellenistic and Roman times, for example, seers, prophets and charismatic leaders, and concludes with a sketch of the contrasts between Jesus and the prophetic movements of his time. Before Meyer's monograph appeared in 1940, there was some literature focused on Jesus' prophetic identity; see S. Burnham, 'Jesus as a Prophet', *Biblical World* 10 (1897), pp. 327-32; E.B. Pollard, 'The Prophetic Activity of Jesus', *Biblical World* 24 (1904), pp. 94-99; N. Schmidt, *The Prophet of Nazareth* (London: Macmillan, 1905).

11. For example, P.E. Davies, 'Jesus and the Role of the Prophet', *JBL* 64 (1945), pp. 241-54; J. Daniélou, 'Le Christ Prophète', *Vie Spirituelle* 78 (1948), pp. 154-70; F.W. Young, 'Jesus the Prophet: A Re-Examination', *JBL* 68 (1949), pp. 285-99; A.J.B. Higgins, 'Jesus as Prophet', *ExpTim* 57 (1945-46), pp. 292-94; Teeple, *Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*; Gils, *Jésus prophète*; Hastings, *Prophet and Witness*; Schnider, *Jesus der Prophet*; K.H. Schelke, 'Jesus-Lehrer und Prophet', in P. Hoffman, N. Brox and W. Pesch (eds.), *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Für Josef Schmid* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973), pp. 300-308; Sand, *Gesetz und die Propheten*; Decocq, *Concept of Jesus*; Vesco, *Jérusalem et son prophète*; Nebe, *Prophetische Züge*; Broadhead, *Prophet, Son, Messiah*; Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel*; R.D. Kaylor, *Jesus the Prophet: His Vision of the Kingdom on Earth* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994); D.C. Allison, *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998); B.D. Ehrman, *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

12. For example, T.F. Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel* (SBT, 40; London: SCM Press, 1963); B.P. Robinson, 'Christ as a Northern Prophet in St John', *Scripture* 17 (1965), pp. 104-108; W.A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup, 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967); S.E. Johnson, 'Notes on the Prophet-King in John', *ATR* 51 (1969), pp. 35-37; É. Cothenet, 'Prophétisme dans le Nouveau Testament', in L. Pirot and A. Robert (continued by H. Cazelles and A. Feuillet) (eds.), *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, XLVII-XLVIII (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1971-72), pp. 1222-337, see esp. pp. 1316-21, 'L'Esprit de prophétie dans le "corpus" johannique'; M. de Jonge, 'Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel', *ETL* 49 (1973), pp. 160-77; L. van der Water, 'De profeet Jezus', *TGL* 25 (1969), pp. 321-34; M.-É. Boismard, 'Jesu, le prophète par excellence, d'après Jean 10,24-39', in J. Gnilya (ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974), pp. 160-71; *idem*, *Moïse ou Jésus: Essai de christologie johannique* (BETL, 84; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 1988), which is translated by B.T. Viviano as *Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology* (BETL, 84; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); for this study the English translation is used.

of the Mosaic tradition or other christological themes in the Gospel. A. Reinhartz took first steps towards explaining the significance of Jesus as prophet in the literary context of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>13</sup> However, the scope of the study is very limited. In this respect, the subject of Jesus as prophet in John's Gospel has not yet been adequately explored in any single extensive investigation. Furthermore, the theme has not yet been examined in a manner that brings together the meaning and the role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet in the Gospel with the significance of the Mosaic tradition, and sets the prophetic role of Jesus within a wider Johannine Christology. It is to be expected that the bringing together of the different approaches will offer mutual illumination and correction. Part of the argument of this study will be on the title *the/a prophet* in the Fourth Gospel, and this may have a significant bearing on the understanding of the Gospel as a whole and of Johannine Christology in particular. This book will investigate Jesus' prophetic identity which has too often been ignored or just vaguely hinted at in the study of John's Gospel.

In Part I (Chapters 2–3), preliminary considerations for Jesus as prophet will be offered. In Chapter 2, therefore, a context of the present study will be provided, setting out working assumptions, giving a brief historical survey of studies on Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel and exploring methodological matters. In Chapter 3, as background for Jesus as prophet, 'prophet' and prophetic figures in relation to the Old Testament and in some of the literature of the late Second Temple period will be explored.<sup>14</sup>

In Part II (Chapters 4–6), prophetic features of Jesus' ministry will be investigated in respect of his prophetic identity. Thus, Jesus' prophetic actions will be discussed in Chapter 4 with reference to his miraculous deeds, such as his first and second miracles at Cana in Galilee, the healing of the paralytic and the raising of Lazarus, and the Temple incident. Chapter 5 will examine Jesus' prophetic words with regard to his prayer recorded in John 17, his predictions and his prophetic role as spokesman for God. In Chapter 6, Jesus' self-awareness as prophet will be defended in connection with the proverbial saying in Jn 4.44, the sending formula, Jesus' self-consciousness of his fate as a rejected-prophet in the Old Testament tradition and the double Amen formula.

Part III (Chapters 7–8) will argue for an understanding of Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel, in which Jesus is seen as the expected

13. A. Reinhartz, 'Jesus as Prophet: Predictive Prolepses in the Fourth Gospel', *JSNT* 36 (1989), pp. 3-16.

14. The late Second Temple period is approximately 150 BCE to 70 CE. In this book, I use 'BCE' (before the Common Era) and 'CE' (the Common Era) instead of 'BC' (before Christ) and 'AD' (*anno Domini*).

eschatological prophet. Hence, in Chapter 7, Jesus as the expected Samaritan prophet will be discussed with respect to the narrative of the Samaritan woman (Jn 4.4-42), and Jesus as the expected Jewish prophet will be considered in connection with the narrative of the man born blind (Jn 9.1-10.21). Chapter 8 will first consider Jesus as the deuteronomical eschatological prophet in Jn 1.19-28; secondly, Jesus as the Mosaic eschatological prophet will be discussed, with regard to the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand (Jn 6.1-15); and finally, Jesus as the messianic eschatological prophet will be explored in Jn 7.37-52.

In Part IV (Chapters 9-10), as the final part of the study, the role of Jesus as prophet in connection with characterization in John's Gospel and the christological significance of Jesus as prophet will be investigated. Chapter 9 will discuss the function of 'prophet' in characterization, and in Chapter 10, the christological significance of Jesus as prophet will be contemplated in respect of Johannine Christology, in which a christological role of Jesus as prophet will be discovered.

Finally, it should be noted that there are some limitations to this study, as follows. (1) For the background of the concept of 'prophet' and prophetic figures for Jesus, this investigation does not trace all the possible sources from the Mediterranean world, but focuses on the Old Testament and some literature of the late Second Temple period. (2) The subsequent investigation is not an attempt at a full explanation of *Prophet Christology* in connection with the New Testament as a whole, but only intends to examine how John's Gospel portrays the figure of Jesus as prophet in relation to its christological function.

# PART I

## PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

In Part I, as preliminary considerations for Jesus as prophet in John's Gospel, first, a context of the present study, a brief historical survey of studies on Jesus as prophet in the Gospel and methodological considerations for this study will be discussed, and then 'prophet' and prophetic figures as background for Jesus as prophet will be considered in the Old Testament and some of the literature of the late Second Temple period.

## 2

### CONTEXT OF PRESENT STUDY, HISTORICAL SURVEY AND METHODOLOGY

#### *Context of Present Study*

There are a number of working assumptions underlying the following study. A brief summary will, therefore, be offered of scholarly views on some of the controversial issues related to these assumptions. In particular, I will consider (1) author, date and place of the Gospel; (2) sources, religious milieu and the Johannine community; and (3) the purpose of the Gospel and the identity of the readers. The working assumptions adopted play no central role, but their influences may be noted at points in the study to follow.

#### *Author, Date and Place of the Gospel*

*Author.* The Fourth Gospel itself does not identify its author, and when the Gospel refers to the author it is imprecise and inconsistent (e.g. Jn 13.23; 19.26-27; 21.7, 20-23). There is a tradition, supported by early evidence from patristic sources, that the author was the apostle John, the son of Zebedee, the one beloved of Jesus. At the end of the nineteenth century this tradition was widely accepted on the basis of the external evidence, and was in particular supported by B.F. Westcott; in the twentieth century it had been updated by R.H. Lightfoot, and L. Morris.<sup>1</sup> However, a large majority of contemporary scholars reject the classical opinion.<sup>2</sup>

1. B.F. Westcott, *The Gospel according to St John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes* (London: John Murray, 1908), pp. xxxii-xxxv; R.H. Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel: A Commentary* (ed. C.F. Evans; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), pp. 5-7; L. Morris, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1969), pp. 139-292.

2. E. Käsemann, *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* (trans. G. Krodel; NTL; London: SCM Press, 1968), p. 1, who notes that 'historical criticism has demolished the traditional opinion that the Fourth Gospel was written by John, the son of Zebedee'; see also R.E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John* (AB; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1966-70), I, pp. lxxxv-cii;

Since then, there have been various suggestions about the author of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>3</sup> This study assumes that the author of the Gospel was an eyewitness,<sup>4</sup> the Beloved Disciple,<sup>5</sup> a Jewish Christian,<sup>6</sup> on the basis of

C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel according to St John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: SPCK, 2nd edn, 1978), pp. 100-109; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2nd edn, 1999), pp. lxvi-lxxv; R. Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St John* (trans. K. Smyth, C. Hastings, D. Smith and G.A. Kon; 3 vols.; London: Burns & Oates, 1968), I, pp. 75-104; J. Becker, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (ÖTK; 2 vols.; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1979), I, pp. 62-64; B. Witherington III, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), pp. 11-18; F.J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (Sacra Pagina Series, 4; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), pp. 6-9; K. Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2000), I, pp. 21-22.

3. See R. Kysar, *The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975), pp. 88-89. On recent discussion of the author of the Fourth Gospel, see S.M. Schneiders, "'Because of the Woman's Testimony ...': Reexamining the Issue of Authorship", *NTS* 44 (1998), pp. 513-35; U. Wilckens, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), pp. 14-17; M.-É. Boismard, *Le martyre de Jean l'apôtre* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 35; Paris: Gabalda, 1996); R.A. Culpepper, *John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend* (Studies on Personalities in the New Testament; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994); M. Hengel, *The Johannine Question* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1989); R. Bauckham, 'Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel', *JTS* 44 (1993), pp. 24-69; M. Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup, 69; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), pp. 242-55; D.A. Carson, *The Gospel according to John* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1991), pp. 68-81; V.S. Poythress, 'Testing for Johannine Authorship by Examining the Use of Conjunctions', *WTJ* 46 (1984), pp. 350-69; D.E.H. Whiteley, 'Was John Written by a Sadducee?', *ANRW* II, 25.3 (1985), pp. 2481-505; L. Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), pp. 8-30; S.S. Smalley, *John: Evangelist and Interpreter* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 2nd edn, 1998), pp. 75-90; J. Schneider, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (THNT; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1976), pp. 38-45; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, pp. 100-34.

4. See M. Rese, 'Das Selbstzeugnis des Johannesevangeliums über seinen Verfasser', *ETL* 72 (1996), pp. 75-111; B. de Solages, *Jean et les Synoptiques* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 200-201; Morris, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 139-214; W.H. Rigg, *The Fourth Gospel and its Message for To-day* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), pp. 247-53. For a different view, see R.L. Sturch, 'The Alleged Eyewitness Material in the Fourth Gospel', in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Biblica 1978. II. Papers on the Gospels* (JSNTSup, 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), pp. 313-27.

5. See R. Bauckham, 'The Beloved Disciple as Ideal Author', *JSNT* 49 (1993), pp. 21-44; Schneiders, "'Because of the Woman's Testimony...'", pp. 513-35. The identity of the Beloved Disciple in John's Gospel is still an enigma; see for instance, R.E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an*

external evidences such as Irenaeus, who is the first writer clearly to attribute the Fourth Gospel to the apostle John, *Against Heresies*, 2.22.5; 3.3.4 and 3.1.1; Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, 5.20.5-6; 6.14.7 and internal evidences expressed in Jn 13.23; 19.26-27; 21.7, 20-23.<sup>7</sup>

*Date.* For the date of the Gospel, various suggestions have been made, ranging from before 70 CE to as late as the last quarter of the second century.<sup>8</sup> Source and redaction criticism on the Fourth Gospel during the

*Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979); *idem*, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. xcii-xcviii, who regards the Beloved Disciple as the apostle John but not as the Evangelist; however, O. Cullmann, *The Johannine Circle* (London: SPCK, 1976), pp. 74-85, recognizes the Beloved Disciple as the Evangelist but not the apostle John; M.W.G. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS, 73; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 76-82, argues that the Beloved Disciple is Lazarus of Bethany; see also G. Klockenbring, *Das Johannes-Evangelium: Ein Kurs in 22 Betrachtungen* (Stuttgart: Urachhaus, 1995), the German version of a work first published in French under the title *L'Évangile selon Jean* (1988), which also considers that the Beloved Disciple is Lazarus; see further F.W. Baltz, *Lazarus and the Fourth Gospel Community* (Mellen Biblical Press Series, 37; Lampeter: Mellen Press, 1996); A. Reinhartz, *Befriending the Beloved Disciple: A Jewish Reading of the Gospel of John* (New York: Continuum, 2001), who considers the identity of the Beloved Disciple in relation to reading of the Gospel. For a comprehensive study on the subject of the Beloved Disciple, see J.H. Charlesworth, *The Beloved Disciple: Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995), who investigates various scholarly suggestions regarding the Beloved Disciple in ch. 3 (pp. 127-224). After reviewing the hypotheses of the identity of the Beloved Disciple, he himself proposes that the Beloved Disciple is Didymus Thomas. There seems to be a wider acceptance among Johannine experts that behind the figure of the Beloved Disciple lies a real historical person, although some do not fully agree with this view.

6. I use the term 'Jewish Christian' in terms of 'a type of Christian thought expressing itself in forms borrowed from Judaism'; see J. Daniélou, *The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea. I. The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (trans. and ed. J.A. Baker; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964), p. 9.

7. For the discussion of the external and internal evidence, see D.A. Carson, D.J. Moo and L. Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), pp. 138-51.

8. The most colourful discussion of this whole issue of dating is presented by J.A.T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1976), pp. 254-311; see Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, pp. 123-28; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. lxxx-lxxxvi; Smalley, *John*, pp. 90-93; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, pp. 243-51; Kysar, *Fourth Evangelist*, pp. 166-68; F.L. Cribbs, 'A Reassessment of the Date of Origin and the Destination of the Gospel of John', *JBL* 89 (1970), pp. 38-55; G.A. Turner, 'The Date and Purpose of the Gospel by John', *BETS* 6 (1963), pp. 82-85.



last two or three decades have raised further questions on dating. There seem to be many possible theories regarding its date, but all present difficulties. In this situation, a firm conclusion can hardly be reached. For the present study, however, a date between 85 CE as *terminus post quem* and 95 CE as *terminus ante quem* is presumed for the Gospel in its present final form. This assumption is based on the following: first, the discovery of Rylands Papyrus 457 (P<sup>52</sup>), an Egyptian codex fragment, which contains Jn 18.31-33, 37-38, dated by scholars to the early second century (c. 125 CE), indicates that John can hardly be later than the end of the first century,<sup>9</sup> second, the Gospel's silence on the Sadducees and the scribes seems to reflect the condition after 70 CE.<sup>10</sup>

9. See C.H. Roberts, *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1935); K. Aland and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2nd edn, 1989), pp. 85-87; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, pp. 243-52; M.M. Thompson, 'Gospel of John', *DJG*, pp. 368-83, esp. pp. 370-71; D. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 4th edn, 1990), p. 297, who notes that 'the discovery of this fragment [the Rylands Papyrus 457], together with the Ergerton Papyrus 2, has effectively silenced the earlier radical dating of the gospel late in the second century'. Most scholars are agreed that the date of the Gospel is roughly between 85 CE and 95 CE; see Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 83-85; B. Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972), p. 42.

10. However, a minority favour the period prior to the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem in 70 CE. See J.A.T. Robinson, *The Priority of John* (ed. J.F. Coakley; London: SCM Press, 1985), pp. 67-93; *idem*, *Redating the New Testament*, pp. 256-88, who insists an earlier date of the Fourth Gospel than 70 CE; K. Berger, *Im Anfang war Johannes: Datierung und Theologie des vierten Evangeliums* (Stuttgart: Quell, 1997), who also recently argues that John's Gospel was composed before 70 CE, about the same time as Mark's Gospel was written; W.H. Brownlee, 'Whence the Gospel according to John?', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad, 1990 [The original title was *John and Qumran*, 1972]), pp. 166-94 (182-83), who believes that Jn 12.42 describes an earlier situation.

Some scholars consider the occurrences of the term ἀποσυνάγωγος, which only occurs in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 9.22; 12.42; 16.2), to be a reflection of the ברכה המינים (*birkat ha-minim*); see J.L. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2nd edn, 1979 [1968]), pp. 37-62; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 369-70; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. lxxiii-lxxv. However, J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 82, comments that 'aposynagogos in the Gospel of John may have nothing to do with the *Birkath hām-Minim*', and W.A. Meeks, 'Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity's Separation from the Jewish Communities', in J. Neusner and E. Frerichs

*Place.* For the location of the author of John's Gospel four places have commonly been suggested: Ephesus, Alexandria, Syrian Antioch and Palestine.<sup>11</sup> First, Ephesus has been traditionally proposed based on the writings of Irenaeus and Eusebius.<sup>12</sup> Second, Alexandria has been put forward, on the ground that the Gospel has some affinities in the use of *logos* to Philo.<sup>13</sup> Third, some propose Syrian Antioch<sup>14</sup> as the place of the Gospel in view of postulated connections with the Syriac *Odes of Solomon*<sup>15</sup> and with Ignatius, who served Antioch as its bishop. Finally,

(eds.), *'To See Ourselves as Others See Us': Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 93-115, argues that the *birkat ha-minim* is 'a red herring in Johannine research' (p. 102). On the *birkat ha-minim*, see P.W. van der Horst, 'The *Birkat ha-minim* in Recent Research', *ExpTim* 105 (1994), pp. 363-68; T.C.G. Thornton, 'Christian Understandings of the *birkat ha-minim* in the Eastern Roman Empire', *JTS* 38 (1987), pp. 419-31; W. Horbury, 'The Benediction of the *Minim* and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy', *JTS* 33 (1982), pp. 19-61; R. Kimelman, '*Birkat Ha-Minim* and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity', in E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (3 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1981), I, pp. 226-44, 391-403; S.C. Mimouni, 'La "Birkat Ha-Minim": une prière juive contre les judéo-chrétiens', *RSR* 71 (1997), pp. 275-98.

11. See Carson *et al.*, *Introduction to the New Testament*, pp. 157-58; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. lxxviii-lxxxii; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. ciii-civ; Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, pp. 47-50.

12. See Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, 2.22.5; 3.3.4 and 3.1.1, see esp. 3.1.1: 'Afterwards, John, the disciple of the Lord, who also had leaned upon His breast, did himself publish a gospel during his residence at Ephesus in Asia'; Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History*, 4.14.3-8; 5.8.4 and 5.20.4-8; W. Schneemelcher, 'General Introduction', in W. Schneemelcher and R. McL. Wilson (eds.), *New Testament Apocrypha* (2 vols.; trans. R. McL. Wilson; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2nd edn, 1991), I, pp. 9-75, see esp. p. 34.

13. See J.N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943), pp. 85-87, who considered Alexandria as the place of origin of the Gospel, though later he favoured the Ephesian tradition; see *idem*, 'St John on Patmos', *NTS* 9 (1962), pp. 75-85; Brownlee, 'Whence', pp. 179-91; A.M. Perry, 'Is John an Alexandrian Gospel?', *JBL* 63 (1944), pp. 99-106.

14. See C.F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), pp. 126-52; W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT, 6; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 3rd edn, 1933), pp. 241-44; R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray *et al.*; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), p. 12.

15. See J.H. Charlesworth and R.A. Culpepper, 'The Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of John', *CBQ* 35 (1973), pp. 298-322; J.H. Charlesworth, 'Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon', in Charlesworth (ed.), *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 107-36; *idem*, 'The Odes of Solomon—not Gnostic', *CBQ* 31 (1969), pp. 357-69.

others consider that the Gospel originally derived from Palestine, but was shaped into its final form elsewhere, where the influence of diaspora Judaism and Hellenistic religions was greater.<sup>16</sup> Thus, the place of writing of the Gospel is still a puzzling problem. This situation implies that no claim to any specific territory for the Gospel can be confidently made; however, for various reasons<sup>17</sup> this study takes as a working assumption the view that Ephesus is closely related to the final form of the Gospel on the basis of epigraphical data from Ephesus, supplemented by literary and other sources.<sup>18</sup>

### *Sources, Religious Milieu and the Johannine Community*

*Sources.* There is no reason to doubt that the author of the Fourth Gospel used sources, as Luke did (Lk. 1.1-4). Thus, the conjecture that John followed some similar course to Luke is quite natural with appropriate adjustment for eyewitness awareness.<sup>19</sup> The hypothesis that the author of the Fourth Gospel used written sources is a different matter from the surmise that they can be retrieved. The Synoptics have been considered as the original sources used in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>20</sup> There are some literary similarities

16. See J.L. Martyn, 'Glimpses into the History of the Johannine Community', in M. de Jonge (ed.), *L'Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (BETL, 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), pp. 149-75, see esp. pp. 151-75; T.W. Manson, 'The Fourth Gospel', *BJRL* 30 (1946-47), pp. 312-29; Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel*, pp. 5-6; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, pp. 149-52. However, both Lindars, *Gospel of John*, pp. 43-44, and Hengel, *Johannine Question*, p. 115, doubt the Palestinian origin.

17. Ephesus is favoured by Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel*, p. 2; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. ciii-iv; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 131; Hengel, *Johannine Question*, pp. 109-24; and Witherington III, *John's Wisdom*, pp. 28-29; see S. van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus* (NovTSup, 83; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), who recently contends that the final version of the Fourth Gospel originated in a Jewish quarter of a Hellenistic city, and that the traditional location of the Gospel in Ephesus is defensible.

18. See G.H.R. Horsley, 'The Inscriptions of Ephesos and the New Testament', *NovT* 34 (1992), pp. 105-68; G. Kalantzis, 'Ephesus as a Roman, Christian, and Jewish Metropolis in the First and Second Centuries C.E.', *Jian Dao* 8 (1997), pp. 103-19.

19. There is no need to think that if the author of the Fourth Gospel was an eyewitness he had no use for written sources. The assumption that the author of the Gospel was an eyewitness is a separate issue from the premise that the author used written sources.

20. The relationship between John and the Synoptics is still one of the cardinal issues in the Johannine studies; see A. Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL, 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992); D.M. Smith, *John among the Gospels*

between the Synoptics and John,<sup>21</sup> which provide evidence of a literary relationship of some kind. In view of these resemblances some scholars believe that John depends on the Synoptics.<sup>22</sup> Many others, however, consider John was composed independently of the Synoptics.<sup>23</sup> Denying any

(Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2nd edn, 2001); *idem*, 'John and the Synoptics: Some Dimensions of the Problem', *NTS* 26 (1980), pp. 425-44; F. Neirynck, 'John and the Synoptics: 1975-1990', in Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics*, pp. 3-62; *idem*, *Evangelica III: 1992-2000. Collected Essays* (BETL, 150; Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters, 2001).

21. This is based on possible existence of common oral traditions and/or Synoptic-like material behind the Synoptics and John without considering the so-called 'Two-Documents Hypothesis' for the Synoptics. See H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), pp. 31-43; W. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul and Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983); F.C. Grant, *The Gospels: Their Origin and their Growth* (London: Faber & Faber, 1957); M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B.L. Woolf; Cambridge: James Clark, 1971); Ø. Andersen, 'Oral Tradition', in H. Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (JSNTSup, 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), pp. 17-58; J.D.G. Dunn, 'John and the Oral Gospel Tradition', in Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel*, pp. 351-79; cf. B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity with Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Livonia, MI: Dove Booksellers, 1998); S. Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (WUNT, 123; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

22. For example, J.A. Bailey, *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963); M.-É. Boismard, 'Saint Luc et la rédaction du quatrième évangile (Jn. IV,46-54)', *RB* 69 (1962), pp. 185-211; M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *L'Évangile de Jean* (Synopse des quatre évangiles en français, 3; Paris: Cerf, 1977); F.L. Cribbs, 'St Luke and the Johannine Tradition', *JBL* 90 (1971), pp. 422-50; C.K. Barrett, 'John and the Synoptic Gospels', *ExpTim* 85 (1974), pp. 228-33; H. Klein, 'Die lukanisch-johanneische Passionstradition', *ZNW* 67 (1976), pp. 155-86; F. Neirynck, 'John and the Synoptics', in de Jonge (ed.), *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 73-106; R. Morgan, 'Which Was the Fourth Gospel? The Order of the Gospels and the Unity of Scripture', *JSNT* 54 (1994), pp. 3-28; B. Shellard, 'The Relationship of Luke and John: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem', *JTS* 46 (1995), pp. 71-98; J.D.G. Dunn, 'John and the Synoptics as a Theological Question', in R.A. Culpepper and C.C. Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), pp. 301-13; J.D. Dvorak, 'The Relationship between John and the Synoptic Gospels', *JETS* 41 (1998), pp. 201-13.

23. P. Gardner-Smith, *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938), who argues persuasively that John is independent from the Synoptics, and his claim has gained widespread approval by those such as Bultmann, *Gospel of John*; C.H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge:

direct dependence has led to the question, 'If the Synoptics were not employed as the sources of the Fourth Gospel, from where was the source material obtained?' Thus, many scholars have searched for the sources of the Gospel. As a result of the investigation on the sources of the Fourth Gospel, Bultmann proposes in his commentary three sources: *Offenbarungsreden* (revelatory-discourse source), *semeia*-source and passion source.<sup>24</sup> Since Bultmann offered his theory of sources, all subsequent discussion of sources of the Gospel has been related to his proposals, whether positively or negatively.<sup>25</sup> Bultmann's theory of a discourse source is no longer widely accepted,<sup>26</sup> but the idea of a *semeia*-source has been widely accepted among the source critics, including R.T. Fortna, W. Nicol and D.M. Smith.<sup>27</sup> In particular, Fortna has provided more detailed reconstruction of the *semeia*-source based on his criterion of aporias. The reconstruction of a *semeia*-source, however, has frequently been criticized, and the existence

Cambridge University Press, 1953); and B. Noack, *Zur johanneischen Tradition: Beiträge zur Kritik an der literarkritischen Analyse des vierten Evangeliums* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1954). See Hengel, *Johannine Question*, pp. 75-77, 91-92, 127-30, who considers that John knew at least one of the Synoptics but did not use it as sources; de Solages, *Jean et les Synoptiques*, pp. 98-99, who contends that John only knew the tradition behind the Synoptics, or at least behind Mark; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. xlv-xlvii (xlv); P. Borgen, 'John and the Synoptics: Can Paul Offer Help?', in G.F. Hawthorne (ed.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), pp. 80-94; B. Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1971), pp. 27-42.

24. Bultmann's theory of sources is fully evaluated by D.M. Smith, *The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), pp. 15-115.

25. For example, J. Becker, 'Wunder und Christologie: Zum literarkritischen und christologischen Problem der Wunder im Johannesevangelium', *NTS* 16 (1970), pp. 130-48, who has adopted Bultmann's theory of sources, and H.M. Teeple, *The Literary Origin of the Gospel of John* (Evanston, IL: Religion and Ethics Institute, 1974), who has expounded the theory. See D.M. Smith, 'The Sources of the Gospel of John: An Assessment of the Present State of the Problem', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 336-51.

26. See B.S. Easton, 'Bultmann's RQ Source', *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 143-56; E. Käsemann, 'Ketzer und Zeuge: Zum johanneischen Verfasserproblem', *ZTK* 48 (1951), pp. 292-311, who severely criticized Bultmann's *Offenbarungsreden*; M.L. Appold, *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel: Motif Analysis and Exegetical Probe into the Theology of John* (WUNT, 2.1; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1976); Smith, *Composition*.

27. See R.T. Fortna, *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS, 11; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970); W. Nicol, *The Semeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972); D.M. Smith, *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987 [1984]), pp. 39-93.

of a *semeia*-source has been questioned.<sup>28</sup> G. van Belle, who has made the most detailed study of this hypothesis, concludes that it cannot be sustained.<sup>29</sup>

The question of sources is quite closely related to the redactions and editions of the Fourth Gospel. The present form of the Gospel seems to suggest that there were different editions of the Gospel, as suggested by the two apparent endings in Jn 20.30 and 21.24-25, for example. In this respect, there is a view that the Gospel has been built on a *Grundschrift*, which for many scholars included a *semeia*-source, and had been expanded, redacted and edited over a long period.<sup>30</sup> However, the assumption of the *Grundschrift* containing a *semeia*-source for the Gospel is not very convincing. In this situation, the present study will presume, first, that John probably knew Mark and Luke (and possibly Matthew),<sup>31</sup> and so was probably influenced by the Synoptics, but wrote his own Gospel without making verbatim use of any of the Synoptics as sources. Second, while assuming that John used sources, it will not rely on reconstructed sources, because of uncertainties as to nature, scope and context. Finally, this study will concentrate on the present final form of the Gospel.

*Religious Milieu.* To know the original religious setting of the Fourth Gospel is quite important for understanding the Gospel as a whole.<sup>32</sup> In view of

28. See Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 27-42; E.D. Freed and R.B. Hunt, 'Fortna's Signs-Source in John', *JBL* 94 (1975), pp. 563-79; J.J. O'Rourke, 'The Historical Present in the Gospel of John', *JBL* 93 (1974), pp. 585-90; D.A. Carson, 'Current Source Criticism of the Fourth Gospel: Some Methodological Questions', *JBL* 97 (1978), pp. 411-29; R. Kysar, 'The Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel: A Growing Consensus?', *NovT* 15 (1973), pp. 134-52; W.J. Bittner, *Jesu Zeichen im Johannesevangelium: Die Messias-Erkennntnis im Johannesevangelium vor ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund* (WUNT, 2.26; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987), pp. 1-16, who rejects a *semeia*-source.

29. G. van Belle, *The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis* (BETL, 116; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994), p. 376.

30. There are various opinions on the redactions and editions of the Gospel, for example, Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, pp. 48-52, esp. p. 49; Lindars, *Behind the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 11-26, esp. p. 14; Boismard, 'Saint Luc', pp. 185-211; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. xxxiv-xxxix.

31. If it is right to assume that the date of writing of the Synoptic Gospels is earlier than John, and among the Synoptics, Mark is the first and then Matthew and Luke, John probably knew the Synoptics as a written form. Even if this is not the case, John probably knew Synoptic-like material and/or common oral traditions shared between John and the Synoptic evangelists; cf. Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, pp. 2-5.

32. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 119, who comments that 'the spiritual background, the world of thought in which it is situated, is of supreme

the cardinal importance of the religious background, various possibilities have been proposed.<sup>33</sup> Until the Dead Sea Scrolls were found in 1947, the influence of Hellenism had been emphasized for a long time as the Johannine religious background.<sup>34</sup> In particular Gnosticism had been highlighted for the background of the Gospel by authors such as Bultmann, Dodd and Davies.<sup>35</sup>

The discovery of the Qumran Scrolls, however, has brought a distinct paradigm shift in Johannine studies.<sup>36</sup> Hengel notes that 'the Qumran

importance for the whole understanding of John ... [Thus] our chief task today is to determine what were the most insistent, effective and dominating influences to which the fourth evangelist was subject'.

33. See J. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991), pp. 23-27, who has proposed six possibilities: the Synoptic tradition, Paul, Judaism, Hellenistic Judaism, Hellenistic religion and Gnosticism; T.L. Brodie, *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), pp. 7-9, who notes three main influences: Gnosticism, Hellenism and Judaism; E.E. Ellis, *The World of St John: St John's Gospel and the Epistles* (Bible Guides, 14; London: Lutterworth Press; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965), pp. 13-32; E.K. Lee, *The Religious Thought of St. John* (London: SPCK, 1950), pp. 12-22.

34. See B.W. Bacon, *The Gospel of the Hellenists* (ed. C.H. Kraeling; New York: Henry Holt, 1933); Grant, *Gospels*, pp. 154-79; W.F. Howard, *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (revised by C.K. Barrett; London: Epworth Press, 4th edn, 1955), pp. 144-59.

35. See R. Bultmann, 'Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums', *ZNW* 24 (1925), pp. 100-46, who strongly argued a Gnostic influence on John by citing many parallels between the Gospel and Mandaean and Manichean literature. In his commentary, Bultmann consistently applied his theory of a Gnostic Redeemer myth to the Gospel; however, his theory has largely been rejected by significant scholarship. Dodd, *Interpretation*; *idem*, *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935), pp. 99-424, believed that the Hellenistic religion expressed in the Hermetica provides the background of John's Gospel. W.D. Davies, *Invitation to the New Testament: A Guide to its Main Witnesses* (Anchor Books; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), pp. 398-408, followed up Dodd's proposal and offered many comparisons between John and the Hermetica.

36. Before the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls, there were voices emphasizing Jewish background, but the volume of the voices was not strong enough to make a claim. See Westcott, *Gospel according to St John*, pp. lxiv-lxix; F.L. Godet, *Commentary on John's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1978 [1864-65]), pp. 127-34; cf. W. Temple, *Readings in St. John's Gospel* (London: Macmillan, complete edn, 1947 [1939, 1940]), p. xix, who also says that 'the Gospel is through and through Palestinian' and 'the notion that it is in any sense Hellenistic is contrary to its whole tenor'; Burney, *Aramaic Origin*, who emphasizes an Aramaic original of the Gospel based on his argument that the mother tongue of the author of the Gospel is Aramaic;

discoveries are a landmark for a new assessment of the situation of the Fourth Gospel in the history of religion'.<sup>37</sup> Since the Dead Sea Scrolls were found, many scholars have come to believe the milieu of the Gospel to be Jewish.<sup>38</sup> The reasons for this lie not only in the affinities between the Scrolls and John in language and thought, but in the recognition of a number of other Jewish features and connections in John.<sup>39</sup> In particular, the Old Testament background of the Gospel has been more emphasized than that of any other Jewish literature,<sup>40</sup> although the Gospel reflects on the Jewish background.<sup>41</sup> The following arguments are made: (1) The

A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt* (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1930), who also argues for Semitism as the religious background of the Gospel.

37. Hengel, *Johannine Question*, p. 111; see also *idem*, 'Die Schriftauslegung des 4. Evangeliums auf dem Hintergrund der urchristlichen Exegese', in I. Baldermann (ed.), "*Gesetz*" als Thema biblischer Theologie (Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie, 4; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), pp. 249-88, which appears in *HBT* 12 (1990), pp. 19-41, in a shortened English version entitled 'The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel'; C.K. Barrett, *The Gospel of John and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), pp. 7-8, who also mentions that the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls is more important than a Gnostic background.

38. J.A.T. Robinson, 'The New Look on the Fourth Gospel', in Robinson, *Twelve New Testament Studies* (SBT, 34; London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 94-106, an essay originally published in 1959; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. lii-lxvi, who notes that 'a large number of scholars are coming to agree that the principal background for Johannine thought was the Palestinian Judaism of Jesus' time' (p. lix); Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, pp. 119-49; Kysar, *Fourth Evangelist*, pp. 102-46, who comments, in his conclusion, that 'contemporary research favours a Palestinian, Old Testament, Jewish setting for the thought of the Gospel' (p. 144); D.M. Smith, *John* (Proclamation Commentaries; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2nd edn, 1986), pp. 15-18; *idem*, *The Theology of the Gospel of John* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), pp. 10-20; Smalley, *John*, pp. 45-74, who concludes that 'John's ethos is at root more in touch with Judaism than Hellenism' after investigating John's background (p. 74); W.D. Davies, 'Reflections on Aspects of the Jewish Background of the Gospel of John', in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 43-64.

39. Smith, *John* (1986), p. 18, who says that 'a Jewish interaction with Johannine Christianity has increasingly been regarded as the proximate background and seedbed of the Fourth Gospel'.

40. See G. Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannes-evangeliums* (SNTSMS, 22; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974); A.T. Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991); C. Westermann, *The Gospel of John: In the Light of the Old Testament* (trans. S.S. Schatzmann; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998).

41. See J.J. Kanagaraj, 'Mysticism' in the Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background (JSNTSup, 158; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), who



Gospel clearly recognizes Jewish feasts rather than other cultic religious festivals;<sup>42</sup> (2) There are many allusions to Old Testament narratives and significant events, and there are also many exact citations and altered quotations from the Old Testament;<sup>43</sup> (3) Old Testament theological motifs are explicitly or implicitly used in the Gospel.<sup>44</sup> This study, therefore, will assume that John is more deeply rooted in Old Testament background and/or Jewish tradition rather than Hellenistic culture.<sup>45</sup>

concludes that 'the Gospel of John is a "mystical" document', and suggests that 'John has used two strands of Jewish mysticism: principally the mystical experience centred on Ezekiel 1; Isaiah 6; and Daniel 7, and occasionally the mystical practice based on Genesis 1 ... for his christological purpose' (p. 317); J.A. Emerton, 'Melchizedek and the Gods: Fresh Evidence for the Jewish Background of John X,34-36', *JTS* 17 (1966), pp. 399-401; J.D.M. Derrett, 'The Good Shepherd: St. John's Use of Jewish Halakah and Haggadah', *ST* 27 (1973), pp. 25-50; D.K. Clark, 'Signs in Wisdom and John', *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 201-209.

42. See A. Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960); L. Morris, *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries* (London: Tyndale Press, 1964), pp. 41-52; G.A. Yee, *Jewish Feasts and the Gospel of John* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1989); Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 5-6.

43. See J. Beutler, 'Psalm 42/43 im Johannesevangelium', *NTS* 25 (1978), pp. 33-57, who argues that in the Fourth Gospel the influence of Psalms 42 and 43 is found not only in Jn 12.27 and 13.21, but also other parts such as Jn 11.33, 35, 38; 14.1-9, 27; 19.28; E.D. Freed, 'Psalm 42/43 in John's Gospel', *NTS* 29 (1983), pp. 62-73, who has a similar opinion with Beutler; J.V. Dahms, 'Isaiah 55:11 and the Gospel of John', *EQ* 53 (1981), pp. 78-88; C.A. Evans, 'On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel', *BZ* 26 (1982), pp. 79-83; E.D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (NovTSup, 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965); B.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); J. Beutler, 'The Use of "Scripture" in the Gospel of John', in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 147-62.

44. See Reim, *Studien*; R.A. Hammer, 'Gen 3:15 and Johannine Theology', *Marian Studies* 27 (1976), pp. 99-109; Hanson, *Prophetic Gospel*; J. Beutler, 'Der alt-testamentlich-jüdische Hintergrund der Hirtenrede in Johannes 10', in J. Beutler and R.T. Fortna (eds.), *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context: Studies by Members of the Johannine Writings Seminar* (SNTSMS, 67; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 18-32; Westermann, *Gospel of John*.

45. The emphasis on the Jewish background of the Gospel does not mean that the Hellenistic cultural background of the Gospel is totally ignored, in view of the fact that the Hellenization of Jewish Palestine in the early first century allows for no clear-cut decision between Judaism and Hellenism; see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; 2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1974); *idem*, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press; Philadelphia:

*The Johannine Community.* It is generally assumed that there was a community behind the Fourth Gospel. Under this general assumption many have attempted to reconstruct the Johannine community, because the community hypotheses could be related to several issues such as the authorship of the Gospel, the date of writing of the Gospel, the identity of the readers of the Gospel, Christology, etc. R.A. Culpepper examined the characteristic of schools in the Greco-Roman world, and demonstrated that many of the characteristics of the ancient schools apply to the Johannine community.<sup>46</sup> Oscar Cullmann also reached similar conclusions around the same time, but preferred to talk about a 'Kreis' (Circle) rather than a 'School'.<sup>47</sup> Their proposals have achieved widespread acceptance, and so the Johannine community behind the Gospel is now commonly recognized.<sup>48</sup>

In his major contribution, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (1968), Martyn sees a conflict between the Johannine community and the synagogue in the Gospel as reflected in Jesus' conflict with the Jews. On the basis of his investigation, Martyn attempts to reconstruct three stages in the development of the history of the Johannine community.<sup>49</sup> Martyn's

Trinity Press International, 1989); L.H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993); see also P. Borgen, 'The Gospel of John and Hellenism: Some Observations', in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 98-123.

46. R.A. Culpepper, *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools* (SBLDS, 26; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975). He has shifted his ground since then, and now adopts a more 'narrative' approach.

47. Cullmann's *The Johannine Circle* originally appeared in 1975 with the German title, *Der johanneische Kreis, Sein Platz im Spätjudentum, in der Jüngerschaft Jesu und im Urchristentum*.

48. See G. Richter, 'Präsentische und futurische Eschatologie in 4. Evangelium', in P. Fiedler and D. Zeller (eds.), *Gegenwart und kommendes Reich* (A. Vögtle Schülergabe; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975), pp. 117-52; A.J. Mattill, 'Johannine Communities behind the Fourth Gospel: Georg Richter's Analysis', *TS* 38 (1977), pp. 294-315; Boismard and Lamouille, *L'Évangile de Jean*; W. Langbrandtner, *Weltferner Gott oder Gott der Liebe: Die Ketzerstreit in der johanneischen Kirche. Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung mit Berücksichtigung der koptisch-gnostischen Texte aus Nag-Hammadi* (BBET, 6; Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1977); F. Vouga, 'The Johannine School: A Gnostic Tradition in Primitive Christianity?', *Bib* 69 (1988), pp. 371-85.

49. See Martyn, 'Glimpses', pp. 149-75; according to his reconstruction of the Johannine community, the first stage involves 'the conception of a messianic group with in the community of the synagogue' (p. 151). In the second stage 'part of the group is born as a separate community by experiencing two major traumas: excommunication from the synagogue and martyrdom' (p. 160). The final stage is charac-

reconstruction of the community has been adapted by many scholars.<sup>50</sup> In particular, Brown has suggested a more detailed hypothesis of the history of the community than Martyn's. His proposal is that a five-stage history of the community is reflected in the composition of the Fourth Gospel.<sup>51</sup> In comparison with Martyn's hypothesis, Brown's reconstruction is quite different, although the first stage of Brown's theory is set in roughly the same period as Martyn's. Similarly other proposals also have their own varied views of the reconstruction of the community.<sup>52</sup> In view of the diversity of proposals, the actual process of reconstruction of the community is extremely hazardous, although each theory has its own plausibility.<sup>53</sup>

Nevertheless, it should be recognized that the attempted reconstructions of the Johannine community sheds light on the *Sitz im Leben* of the Gospel. Out of the various hypotheses concerning the reconstruction of the Johannine community the following features are generally shared. First, the community has its roots in Jewish Christianity. Second, the community suffered expulsion from the synagogue (although there is considerable difference of opinions as to the degree of the effect of this on the community). Finally, in the community there was a remarkable degree of development of Christology.<sup>54</sup>

For this study, therefore, I will make the following assumptions about the Johannine community. (1) The community was probably a Jewish

terized as a 'movement toward firm social and theological configurations' (p. 164). In this hypothesis of the history of the community, the beloved disciple is not given any role.

50. See K. Wengst, *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus: Der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu seiner Interpretation* (BthS, 5; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1983 [1981]); Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, III, pp. 203-217; J. Becker, 'Die Geschichte der johanneischen Gemeinden', *TRu* 47 (1982), pp. 305-12; U.C. von Wahlde, 'Community in Conflict: The History and Social Context of the Johannine Community', in J.D. Kingsbury (ed.), *Gospel Interpretation: Narrative-Critical and Social-Scientific Approaches* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), pp. 222-33.

51. See Brown, *Community*; *idem*, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. xxxiv-xxxix.

52. See Brodie, *Quest for the Origin*, pp. 15-21; Brown, *Community*, pp. 171-82; Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 160-98; J. Painter, *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn, 1993 [1991]), pp. 61-87.

53. For a new challenge to the whole idea of community behind the Gospels, see R. Bauckham, 'John for Readers of Mark', in Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 147-71.

54. See R. Kysar, 'The Fourth Gospel: A Report on Recent Research', *ANRW* II, 25.3 (1985), pp. 2389-480, esp. pp. 2432-35.

Christian community, although the character of the community cannot precisely be identified. (2) The community would have suffered expulsion from the synagogue because of their confession of Jesus as the Son of God. I will not, however, rely much on our understanding of the community as reconstructed for clarifying such issues, in view of the diversity of the hypotheses.

*Excursus: The Possibility of a Relationship between the Johannine Community and Other Early Christian Communities*

The possibility of interrelation between the Johannine community and other similar groups has not seriously been considered in the various hypotheses of the Johannine community.<sup>55</sup> Most of the hypotheses of the community explicitly or implicitly emphasize the character of the community as an idiosyncratic group. W.A. Meeks, for example, argues that 'the Fourth Gospel not only describes ... the birth of that community; it also provides *reinforcement of the community's isolation*'.<sup>56</sup> Similarly, in his hypothesis of the history of the Johannine community, Martyn concludes that the community was 'sharply differentiated from the parent synagogue' and 'even more alienated from a group of so-called Christian Jews who remain within the synagogue'.<sup>57</sup> Brown also admits that 'the sectarian element in the Johannine picture would be the peculiar sense of estrangement from one's own people'.<sup>58</sup> In this view, the character of the community has been assumed to be that of an isolated group. The community, how-

55. See Culpepper, *Johannine School*; Cullmann, *Johannine Circle*; Richter, 'Präsentische'; Mattill, 'Johannine Communities'; Langbrandtner, *Weltferner Gott*; Martyn, 'Glimpses'; Brown, *Community*; Vouga, 'Johannine School'; Wengst, *Bedrängte Gemeinde*; Becker, 'Die Geschichte der johanneischen Gemeinden'; von Wahlde, 'Community in Conflict'.

56. W.A. Meeks, 'The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism', in J. Ashton (ed.), *The Interpretation of John* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; London: SPCK, 1986), pp. 141-73 (163), who continues to argue that 'the christological claims of the Johannine Christians resulted in their becoming alienated, and finally expelled, from the synagogue; that alienation in turn is "explained" by a further development of the christological motifs ...; these developed christological motifs in turn drive the group into *further isolation*' (the italics are mine). This article was originally published in *JBL* 91 (1972), pp. 44-72; see also R.W. Wall, 'Community: New Testament Koinōnia', *ABD*, I, pp. 1103-10.

57. Martyn, 'Glimpses', p. 174. He comments that the community was aware of the existence of other Jewish Christian communities.

58. See Brown, *Community*, p. 89. He, however, notes that the community had not become a real sect (p. 90). This could be a starting point for considering the possibility of interrelationship between the Johannine community and other groups.

ever, seems not to be completely isolated from other similar groups, but to be interrelated with other groups, at least to some degree.

First, the relationship of the Synoptic Gospels to the Fourth Gospel seems to suggest that the Johannine community was not a group isolated from other Christian communities. The Synoptic relationship (assuming Marcan priority) implies that Matthew and Luke both had Mark's Gospel available to them. This situation indicates that Mark's Gospel had already circulated quite widely around the Christian communities. Furthermore, if we are right to assume that John knew Mark and Luke (and possibly Matthew), this implies not only that the Gospel of Mark had circulated around the community of Luke and Matthew, but also that the Johannine community was in touch directly or indirectly with the place of origin of the respective Synoptic Gospels.<sup>59</sup> Thus, it is a quite plausible consideration that the Johannine community was not totally isolated from other similar groups such as the communities of Mark, Luke and Matthew.

Second, the phrases ἄλλα πρόβατα in Jn 10.16 and Ἑλληνές τινες in Jn 12.20, could be used as a window for seeing that the Johannine community would know of other groups and/or would have been linked with other communities. In Jn 10.16, the identity of 'other sheep' expressed in the figurative speech of the Johannine Jesus is ambiguous, but to be sure the 'other sheep' do not belong to the Johannine community (cf. Jn 17.20-21). In the same verse ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς ταύτης clearly indicates that they are groups different from the Johannine community, but regarded positively by the Johannine community. E. Haenchen comments that 'there is apparently an allusion here [in v. 16] to different groups of Christians'.<sup>60</sup> Furthermore, Martyn thinks that:

the ἄλλα πρόβατα are probably other Jewish Christians who, like those of the Johannine community, have been *scattered* from their parent synagogues by experiencing excommunication.<sup>61</sup>

59. See R. Bauckham, 'For Whom Were Gospels Written?', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 9-48; *idem*, 'John for Readers of Mark'; L. Alexander, 'Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 71-111, see esp. pp. 99-105; Hengel, *Johannine Question*, p. 75, who notes that 'we must assume that the four earliest Gospels [the Synoptics and John] were circulated among the most important communities relatively quickly'.

60. E. Haenchen, *John* (trans. R.W. Funk; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), II, p. 49; see also Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 376; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 299-300; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 395-98; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 388-90; Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, pp. 389-91; Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, pp. 167-68.

61. Martyn, 'Glimpses', p. 174; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 390, who does not agree with Martyn's consideration, and comments that this view is needlessly

Along with the 'other sheep' in Jn 10.16, 'the Greeks' in Jn 12.20 more clearly indicates that the Johannine community had been linked with other groups.<sup>62</sup> The term Ἕλληνας refers to 'a person(s) of Greek language and culture', or 'in the broader sense, all persons who came under the influence of Greek' (cf. Jn 7.35).<sup>63</sup> John explicitly shows why the Greeks came to Jerusalem in v. 20, ἵνα προσκυνήσωσιν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ.<sup>64</sup> According to this reference, the Greeks were probably God-fearers, although their identity is not precisely recognizable (cf. Acts 13.16).<sup>65</sup> The references to 'other sheep' in Jn 10.16 and 'the Greeks' in Jn 12.20, therefore, evidently demonstrate the possibility that the Johannine community was not absolutely isolated from other groups.

Third, mobility in the first century suggests that the Johannine community need not have been segregated from other similar groups. This possibility of mobility is based on the situation with respect to accommodation, and road and sea travel. The situation of roads and sea in the first century was much better than we might imagine. Lionel Casson notes that:

by the first century A.D., the Mediterranean was girdled along its various coasts by a nearly continuous ring road. Trunk roads and branches radiated from it deep into Europe and Asia, somewhat less deeply into North Africa.<sup>66</sup>

anachronistic and hopelessly speculative. However, he does not offer any reason for the disagreement; cf. J.W. Pryor, 'Covenant and Community in John's Gospel', *RTR* 47 (1988), pp. 44-51, esp. p. 46.

62. See H.B. Kossen, 'Who Where the Greeks of John XII 20?', in M.C. Rientsma, A. Geyser and K. Hanhart (eds.), *Studies in John: Presented to Professor Dr J.N. Sevenster on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (NovTSup, 24; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970), pp. 97-110.

63. BDAG, p. 318.

64. The Feast (τῇ ἑορτῇ) in v. 20 points to the Passover according to Jn 12.1.

65. See Smalley, *John*, p. 181, n. 102, who thinks that Ἕλληνες here means Gentiles, rather than proselytes or Hellenistic Jews; Barrett, *Gospel of John and Judaism*, pp. 18-19, who also considers that 'the argument that the Ἕλληνες in 12.20 are not Greek or pagan but Jews of the Diaspora is not convincing ... these Ἕλληνες are most naturally Greeks who are interested in the culture and religion of Judaism' (p. 18); *idem*, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 421-22; H. Strathmann, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951), p. 188; A. Wind, 'Destination and Purpose of the Gospel of John', *NovT* 14 (1972), pp. 26-69 (see esp. p. 55); Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 435-36; Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, II, pp. 449-51; Morris, *Gospel according to John*, p. 591; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, pp. 381-82; Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, pp. 190-91; M. Goodman, 'Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century', in J. Lieu, J. North and T. Rajak (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 53-78.

66. L. Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: George Allen & Unwin,

Accommodation in the first century was mainly provided by mutual hospitality.<sup>67</sup> Thus, travel was a common way of life in the first century.<sup>68</sup> Jesus and his disciples in the Fourth Gospel walked from Galilee to Jerusalem several times.<sup>69</sup> J.E. Stambaugh and D.L. Balch note that 'a high degree of mobility was typical of the Roman empire in the first century'.<sup>70</sup> Against the background of high levels of mobility in the first century, Stambaugh and Balch note that 'the New Testament is full of reference to [the] intercommunication [between the Christian communities] and is itself a product of [the] interdependence and mutual hospitality'.<sup>71</sup> In this situation,

1974), p. 165; see also R. Chevallier, *Roman Roads* (trans. N.H. Eield; London: B.T. Batsford, 1976), esp. pp. 131-58; J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'Travelling Conditions in the First Century: On the Road and on the Sea with St Paul', *BR* 1/2 (1985), pp. 38-47.

67. See D.W. Riddle, 'Early Christian Hospitality: A Factor in the Gospel Transmission', *JBL* 57 (1938), pp. 141-54; R.B. Edwards, *The Johannine Epistles* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), pp. 24-25; A.J. Malherbe, 'The Inhospitability of Diotrophes', in J. Jervell and W.A. Meeks (eds.), *God's Christ and his People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977), pp. 222-32; A. Edersheim, *Sketches of Jewish Social Life* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, updated edn, 1994 [1876]), pp. 42-57; J.E. Stambaugh and D.L. Balch, *The New Testament in its Social Environment* (Library of Early Christianity, 2; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986), pp. 37-62; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period* (trans. F.H. Cave and C.H. Cave; London: SCM Press, 1969), pp. 58-84.

68. Riddle, 'Early Christian Hospitality', p. 145, who comments that 'travel was a common feature of Hellenistic life, as it had not been in classical times'.

69. See Jn 2.13; 5.1; 7.1-10. Throughout the New Testament people continually moved from one place to another, for example, Lk. 1.39-56; 2.1-5, 22-39 (Mary's three trips within a single year); Acts 8.5, 26, 40 (Philip's trip); Acts 8.14, 9.35-39; 10.1-24; Gal. 2.11; 1 Cor. 1.12 (Peter's visiting to many different places); Acts 9.26; 11.29-30; 15.1-29; 15.41-21.17; 27.1-28.16; Gal. 1.17; Tit. 1.5 (Paul's travelling).

70. Stambaugh and Balch, *Social Environment*, p. 37; On mobility in the first century, see W.A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), pp. 16-23; Casson, *Travel*; *idem*, *The Ancient Mariners: Seafarers and Sea Fighters of the Mediterranean in Ancient Times* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2nd edn, 1991); B.M. Rapske, 'Acts, Travel and Shipwreck', in D.W.J. Gill and C. Gempf (eds.), *The Book of Acts in its Graeco-Roman Setting* (BAFCS, 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994), pp. 1-47; Murphy-O'Connor, 'Travelling Conditions'; F.F. Bruce, 'Travel and Communication: The New Testament World', *ABD*, VI, pp. 648-53; C.A.J. Skeel, *Travel in the First Century after Christ, with Special Reference to Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901).

71. Stambaugh and Balch, *Social Environment*, pp. 55-56; see also M.B. Thompson, 'The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 49-70; Riddle, 'Early Christian Hospitality', pp. 141-54.

the consideration that the Johannine community as a sectarian group was hardly related to other groups becomes less likely. Rather, the assumption that the community was related to other groups is more probable.

Fourth, the relationship of Diaspora Jewish communities in general indicates the possibility that the Johannine community as a Jewish Christian community was not completely excluded from other Jewish communities.<sup>72</sup> The Diaspora Jewish communities had a reasonably good relationship with each other.<sup>73</sup> Behind this relationship there was 'an organized Jewish community'<sup>74</sup> as a community network for preventing assimilation. Thus, Feldman thinks that 'an organized Jewish community existed wherever we can establish the existence of a synagogue'.<sup>75</sup> The organized Jewish community as a network of socio-religious community explicitly indicates that the Jewish communities were closely linked with each other even over remote distances. In this view, it is probable that the Johannine community as a Jewish Christian community would be related to other Jewish groups.<sup>76</sup> Of course there were many conflicts between the Diaspora Jewish communities and the Christian communities.<sup>77</sup> These conflicts, however, imply that there was vigorous interaction between the Jewish community and the Christian communities.<sup>78</sup> This is also true of

72. See Barrett, *Gospel of John and Judaism*, p. 11; *idem*, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 376, 407-408, who thinks that Jn 10.16 and 11.52 imply the Diaspora Jews.

73. See J.M.G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996); F. Millar, 'The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora between Paganism and Christianity, AD 312–438', in Lieu *et al.* (eds.), *Jews among Pagans*, pp. 97-123; Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, pp. 43-83; I. Levinskaya, *The Book of Acts in its Diaspora Setting* (BAFCS, 5; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996); M.H. Williams, *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook* (London: Duckworth, 1998).

74. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, p. 67.

75. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, p. 67; see Stambaugh and Balch, *Social Environment*, pp. 46-52.

76. See Barclay, *Jews*, pp. 399-444 (see esp. pp. 402-13); J. Neusner, *Jews and Christians: The Myth of a Common Tradition* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991), pp. 16-29.

77. See Barclay, *Jews*, pp. 103-24, 320-35; J. Lieu, 'History and Theology in Christian Views of Judaism', in Lieu *et al.* (eds.), *Jews among Pagans*, pp. 79-96 (see esp. pp. 87-91); T. Rajak, 'The Jewish Community and its Boundaries', in Lieu *et al.* (eds.), *Jews among Pagans*, pp. 9-28.

78. One of the possible reasons for the conflicts could be the task of mission and the different view of theological doctrine (probably, more precisely, Christology) between the Johannine community and other Jewish communities; on the Jewish mission, see Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, pp. 288-341; Goodman, 'Jewish Proselytizing'; Stambaugh and Balch, *Social Environment*, pp. 46-62.



the Johannine community. In this view, it is a plausible assumption that the Johannine community positively or negatively interrelated with other groups of the Jewish communities.

Finally, the influence of other groups on the Qumran community,<sup>79</sup> despite all its apparent isolation, implies a possibility that the Johannine community would not be isolated from other similar groups of Christian communities. The Qumran community is generally assumed to be a strictly segregated Jewish sect in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>80</sup> Feldman calls the Qumran community an 'ultra-pious Jewish sect'.<sup>81</sup> However, in spite of sectarian segregation, there is some evidence of contact with Hellenism.<sup>82</sup> Hengel notes that in the Qumran community there is 'a considerable degree of foreign influences in their Hellenistic environment from Babylonia and Iran and indeed from Ptolemaic Egypt'.<sup>83</sup> This clearly shows that the Qumran community could not be isolated completely from other groups. In comparison with the strict segregative character of the Qumran community, the character of the Johannine community would not be more strict and isolated than the Qumran community. In this respect,

79. I assume that the Qumran community was a branch of the Essenes without offering any detailed discussion. On this issue, see A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. R.D. Barnett; London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1954); F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, rev. edn, 1980), pp. 51-106; G. Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SCM Press, 1999), pp. 127-44; P.R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (JSPSup, 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), pp. 63-87; N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (London: BCA, 1995), pp. 95-115; J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), pp. 71-119. It needs to be noted that all the Essenes were not equally sectarians; see Philo, *Every Good Man Is Free*, 75-91; Josephus, *War* 2.119-161; see also M. Smith, 'The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena', *HUCA* 29 (1958), pp. 273-313; S. Zeitlin, 'The Account of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena', *JQR* 49 (1958-59), pp. 292-300.

80. See 1QS 5.1-3; 8.13; 9.20.

81. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, p. 27, the emphasis is mine; see also J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'Community, Rule of the (1QS)', *ABD*, I, pp. 1110-12; J.J. Collins, 'Essenes', *ABD*, II, pp. 619-26; F.G. Martínez and J.T. Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), pp. 9-11, 32-35.

82. See Feldman, *Jew and Gentile*, pp. 3-83; Hengel, *Judaism*, I, pp. 218-47.

83. Hengel, *Judaism*, I, p. 246; J.J. Collins, 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *ABD*, II, pp. 85-101, who comments that 'in recent years increasing attention has been paid to the presence of nonsectarian material in the Qumran library (conceivably including the entire Aramaic corpus)' (p. 100); italics are mine.

the Johannine community is not likely to have been absolutely apart from other similar groups.

On the ground of the above discussions a proposal can be made as follows: (1) the Johannine community was not completely isolated from other similar groups of Christian communities and the early Christian movement in general; (2) the Johannine community and other groups intercommunicated as a socio-religious network supporting each other in their various needs in the situation of the late first century.

*The Purpose of the Gospel and the Identity of the Readers*

*The Purpose of the Gospel.* The purpose of the Gospel is closely related to the interpretation of the Gospel as a whole and to the identity of the readers of the Gospel, which will be discussed in the following section. In spite of the significance of the subject, no consensus has been reached as to the purpose of the Gospel. There are various suggestions for the aim of the Gospel.<sup>84</sup> First, in the earlier proposals the Gospel had been regarded as supplement, replacement, or interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels on the ground of the assumption that John knew the Synoptics and intended to present his own version in relation to the tradition preserved by the Synoptic evangelists.<sup>85</sup> Second, other proposals suggest that the Gospel was written for various polemical reasons that could be apologetic in terms of the positive result of the polemical intentions. There are four versions of the polemical approach: (1) polemic against the Baptist sect; (2) polemic concerning the sacramental teaching of the Church; (3) polemic concerning the eschatological teaching of the Church; (4) polemic against heresy.<sup>86</sup> Third, others suggest that the Gospel was written for liturgical use on the ground of the assumption that the background of the Gospel is essentially liturgical.<sup>87</sup> Finally, in relation to the Christology of the Gospel as the central feature of the Gospel many suggest that the Gospel as a

84. See Smalley, *John*, pp. 158-76; Wind, 'Destination', pp. 26-69.

85. See H. Windisch, *Johannes und die Synoptiker: Wollte der vierte Evangelist die älteren Evangelien ergänzen oder ersetzen?* (UNT, 12; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1926); Howard, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 58-60, 121; Smith, *John among the Gospels*, pp. 19-31; Lightfoot, *John's Gospel*, pp. 26-42. Along with this view, E. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn, 1923), pp. 1-28, esp. pp. 4-9, who believes that the fundamental purpose of the Gospel is a reinterpretation of the Christian tradition for the Gentile world, although he sees other purposes.

86. See Smalley, *John*, pp. 161-72; R.A. Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology* (SBLDS, 67; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982).

87. See W.H. Raney, *The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Christian Cultus* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1933); Guilding, *Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*.

missionary document was written for evangelizing either Jews or Gentiles to the Christian faith.<sup>88</sup>

Since the various proposals have been made, the issue of the purpose of the Gospel has become much more sophisticated with the recognition that the Gospel as a whole reflects various aims. These suggestions concerning the intention of the author of the Gospel seem to be closely inter-related to one another rather than mutually exclusive proposals. Thus, the author seems to have more than one intention in the writing of the Gospel.<sup>89</sup>

In this situation it is very difficult to reach a solid conclusion. However, for the subsequent study, the purpose of the Gospel is assumed to be articulated in Jn 20.30-31,<sup>90</sup> and this text is taken to be indicating that the Gospel is primarily written for strengthening the faith of those who already believe in Jesus, who are probably in the Johannine community, but also secondarily for evangelistic purposes (directed both to Jews and Gentiles).

*The Identity of the Readers.* If the readers of the Gospel can precisely be identified, the Gospel as a whole could be interpreted more clearly. The identity of the readers of the Gospel seems to be a potentially important key to the interpretation of the Gospel as a whole. For the identity of the

88. See K. Bornhäuser, *Das Johannesevangelium: Eine Missionschrift für Israel* (BFCT, 2.15: Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928); W. Oehler, *Das Johannesevangelium: Eine Missionschrift für die Welt* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1936); W.C. van Unnik, 'The Purpose of St John's Gospel', *SE* 1 (1959), pp. 382-411; J.A.T. Robinson, 'The Destination and Purpose of St John's Gospel', *NTS* 6 (1960), pp. 117-31; E.D. Freed, 'Did John Write his Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts?', *NovT* 12 (1970), pp. 241-56; M.R. Ruiz, *Der Missionsgedanke des Johannesevangeliums: Ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Soteriologie und Ekklesiologie* (Forschung zur Bibel, 55; Würzburg: Echter, 1986); D.A. Carson, 'The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered', *JBL* 106 (1987), pp. 639-51; T. Okure, *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1-42* (WUNT, 2.31; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988); A.J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); Smalley, *John*, pp. 174-75.

89. See Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, p. 102, who also considers that '[the] possibilities [of the author's intention proposed] are not mutually exclusive, since a writer may have more than one purpose in writing'.

90. On the discussion of the textual variants in Jn 20.31, see Carson, 'Purpose of the Fourth Gospel', who provides a detailed discussion on the controversial issue of the textual variants in Jn 20.31; see also B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; New York: United Bible Societies, 2nd edn, 1994), pp. 219-20; L. Morris, *Jesus Is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1989), pp. 1-19.

readers of the Gospel, various suggestions have been made: (1) unbelieving Jewish people;<sup>91</sup> (2) all Christians including Diaspora Jewish Christians;<sup>92</sup> (3) the Johannine Community.<sup>93</sup> It is hard to make a decision as to which group of people John had in mind. In relation to the purpose of the Gospel assumed, the recipients of the Gospel would be not only one particular group of people, but also other groups of people as well. However, the suggestion that the readers of the Gospel are the unbelieving Jewish people seems to be less likely. The tension between unbelieving Jewish people and Christians indicated by the term ἀποσυνάγωγος in the Gospel (Jn 9.22; 12.42; 16.2) seems not to allow the unbelieving Jewish people to be the recipients of the Gospel. The other proposal that the Gospel is written for all Christians seems to be plausible in a broad sense, but it is more sensible that the author of the Gospel probably had in mind some particular group of people. Even if the Fourth Gospel belongs to the genre of ancient βίος (biography),<sup>94</sup> and so can be regarded as an 'open text',<sup>95</sup> for an undefined general readership, some particular readers seem to be placed in the author's consciousness. Smalley remarks that 'it is most improbable that in the first place John wrote without being sensitive to some particular group around him'.<sup>96</sup> Although the readers cannot precisely be identified, the implied readers can be identified with a social group or a social level of people.

91. See Bornhäuser, *Johannesevangelium*, pp. 19-23, 158-63; Okure, *Johannine Approach*, pp. 280-81; Robinson, 'Destination and Purpose'; van Unnik, 'Purpose of St John's Gospel'; Smalley, *John*, pp. 177-79, who does not accept this view.

92. See G.W. MacRae, 'The Fourth Gospel and *Religionsgeschichte*', *CBQ* 32 (1970), pp. 13-24; Smalley, *John*, pp. 180-81; Bauckham, 'For Whom Were Gospels Written?'; *idem*, 'John for Readers of Mark'; R.A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTSMS, 70; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), pp. 220-39; *idem*, 'About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audience', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 113-45; S.C. Barton, 'Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 173-94, see esp. pp. 189-94; cf. C.G. Lingard, *The Problems of Jewish Christians in the Johannine Community* (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia, 73; Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2001). For Diaspora Jewish Christians, see Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. lxxiii-lxxv.

93. See Smalley, *John*, pp. 181-85.

94. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?*; *idem*, 'About People'.

95. Bauckham, 'For Whom Were Gospels Written?', p. 48, who employs the term 'open-texts' by borrowing U. Eco's term for the Gospels without precisely defining the term for the interpretation of the Gospels. The usefulness of the terms 'open-texts' and 'closed-texts' heavily depends on their definition, so they need to be defined more accurately in relation to biblical hermeneutics.

96. Smalley, *John*, p. 182.

From this perspective, I assume that the readers of the Gospel are primarily identified as those who are in the Johannine community, and also secondarily those who are outside the community, in particular, the Jewish Christians, who acknowledged Jesus as a prophet or a Messiah but not as the Son of God. John has not written for unbelieving Jewish people.

*A Brief Historical Survey of Studies on Jesus as Prophet  
in the Fourth Gospel*

A brief historical survey of studies on Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel will be provided in this section. The study of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel does not seem to have been favoured by Johannine scholars. Before Wayne A. Meeks's 1967 monograph, it was rare for the subject to be considered in an article or in a monograph,<sup>97</sup> although many commentators had frequently noted the appearance and significance of the issue of Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel: they will be discussed briefly. David E. Aune notes that:

in spite of the fact that the prophetic aspects of Jesus' life and ministry are more prominently emphasized in the Fourth Gospel than in the synoptic gospels, earlier studies of the Christology of John paid little serious attention to the Johannine conception of Jesus as prophet.<sup>98</sup>

There have been many articles and monographs regarding the Christology of the Fourth Gospel in general,<sup>99</sup> and although a few contributions to the subject have been made in subsections of studies of Johannine Christology, none of them focuses on the topic of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel in a single extensive study. The appearance in 1967 of Meeks's work, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* marked an important development. In his monograph, Meeks notes that the subject of 'the Prophet [in the Fourth Gospel] has seldom been accorded independent significance'<sup>100</sup> by Johannine scholars. In part he attempts to fill this gap. Since his remark, the situation has slightly improved, but not much. A few have attempted to focus on the subject in

97. For example, Glasson, *Moses*; Robinson, 'Christ as a Northern Prophet'.

98. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, p. 155; see M.E. Boring, 'Prophecy (Early Christian)', *ABD*, V, pp. 495-502, see esp. p. 500, who also comments that '[o]nly Jesus is called "prophet" in the gospel of John (John 4.19, 44; 9.17)'.

99. On the Christology of the Fourth Gospel, see Kysar, *Fourth Evangelist*, pp. 178-206; *idem*, 'Fourth Gospel', esp. pp. 2443-49; Menken, 'Christology of the Fourth Gospel'; also see Davey, *The Jesus of St. John*; Sidebottom, *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel*.

100. Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, p. 21.

the Gospel, but the scope of the study is limited.<sup>101</sup> By contrast, there are many essays and monographs concerning the subject of Jesus as prophet in the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>102</sup> Meeks's contribution, therefore, remains foundational.<sup>103</sup> On this basis, first Meeks's study will be discussed briefly. Second, studies on Jesus as prophet before Meeks's work will be surveyed. Finally, the works after Meeks's monograph will be investigated. This survey, of course, will not be exhaustive, but selective and offer a brief historical overview on the subject.

*Wayne A. Meeks's The Prophet-King (1967)*

Meeks's monograph consists of seven chapters, but the parts related to the present study are the introduction and the second chapter. In the following chapters, he merely focuses on the figure of Moses in relation to Philo, Josephus, Dead Sea Scrolls, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and on Moses' specific role as king and prophet in connection with the rabbinic Haggada, Samaritan, and Mandaean sources. In the final chapter, he examines whether

101. For example, Boismard, 'Jesu, le prophète par excellence'; Boismard, *Moses or Jesus*; Reinhartz, 'Jesus as Prophet'.

102. For example, Dodd, 'Jesus as Teacher and Prophet'; Gils, *Jésus*; R. Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa: Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelien* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970 [1940]); Higgins, 'Jesus as Prophet'; Davies, 'Jesus and the Role of the Prophet'; *idem*, 'Did Jesus Die as a Martyr-Prophet?', *BR* 19 (1974), pp. 37-47; P. Benoit, 'Les outrages à Jésus prophète (Mc xiv 65 par.)', in A.N. Wilder, K.W. Clark, A. Descamps and P. Schubert (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht* (NovTSup, 6; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962), pp. 92-110; C.K. Barrett, 'Jesus as prophet', in Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 94-99; Daniélou, 'Le Christ Prophète'; Schnider, *Jesus der Prophet*, who discusses the Marcan perspective on Jesus as prophet (the results are quite meagre); C.E. Freire, 'Jesús profeta, libertador del hombre: Vision lucana de su ministerio terrestre', *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 51 (1976), pp. 463-95; M.J. Borg, 'Luke 19:42-44 and Jesus as Prophet?', *Forum* 8 (1992), pp. 99-112; Knowles, *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel*; McVann, 'Rituals of Status Transformation'; *idem*, 'One of the Prophets'; Broadhead, *Prophet, Son, Messiah*; B.J. Malina, 'Jesus as Astral Prophet', *BTB* 27 (1997), pp. 83-98; R. Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (JPTSUP, 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 35-53.

103. See some reviews: O. Böcher, *BO* 25 (1968), pp. 372-74, who notes that perhaps the Old Testament roots of the Jewish-Samaritan picture of Moses should have been developed in more detail; T. Holtz, *TLZ* 93 (1968), pp. 917-19, who comments that all Meeks has proved is that in Judaism, including Samaritanism, the tradition of Moses as king and prophet had an eschatological significance; J.C.H. Lebram, *NedTTs* 22 (1968), pp. 440-42; R. Schnackenburg, *BZ* 13 (1969), pp. 136-38; L. Fazekaš, *TZ* 27 (1971), pp. 53-54.

the Mosaic traditions offer sufficient foundation for the peculiar combination of the two figures, prophet and king, found in the Fourth Gospel.

In the introduction, Meeks begins with some questions in relation to Jn 6.14:

Who is 'the prophet who is coming into the world?' Why does the 'sign' of the multiplication of loaves indicate his identity? Why is it so self-evident that 'the prophet' is to be made 'king'?<sup>104</sup>

Along with these questions, he clearly shows that the purpose of his study is to investigate the assumption that:

the two terms 'prophet' and 'king' in the Fourth Gospel not only are inter-related, but interpret each other [in relation to] a study of similar combinations of the prophetic and royal motifs in representative sources from the Mediterranean religious world of the first Christian centuries.<sup>105</sup>

For this purpose, he asks the question: 'Is there a gnostic redeemer characterized as a "prophet-king" in the way Jesus is in the Fourth Gospel?'<sup>106</sup> In a subsection of the introduction, he offers some views on 'the prophet' in previous Johannine research.<sup>107</sup>

In the second chapter, Meeks examines some pericopes such as Jn 7.37-52; 18.28-19.22; 1.49; 12.12-19; and 6.1-15 to investigate the thematic functions of prophet and king in John. Among the passages, Jn 18.28-19.22; 1.49; and 12.12-19 focus on the subject of Jesus as king. In Jn

104. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, p. 1.

105. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, p. 1.

106. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, p. 30.

107. See Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 21-25. In his review, Meeks mentions the following works: Barrett, *Gospel according to St John* (1955), which was updated as the second edition in 1978; G.P. Wetter, *Der Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannes-Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916); Bauer, *Johannesevangelium*; E. Fascher, *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1927), which is a philological study, and is not focused on the subject of the Fourth Gospel; Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, which is not focused on the Gospel, although it is commented that 'the Fourth Gospel presents Jesus as the Prophet of the Hellenistic miracle-worker type, the bringer of *gnosis*, with prophetic knowledge of the past, present, and future' (p. 120, emphasis in the original); A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianische Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957), which does not concentrate on the Gospel, although it is noted that Jn 1.21 and 7.40 cannot be separated from 6.14 and that Deut. 18.15 and 18 lie behind all three passages (see pp. 76-89); Glasson, *Moses*; Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*; Hahn does not focus on John's Gospel, although the appendix of his book, the eschatological prophet, is in part related to the issue of Jesus as prophet (see pp. 352-406).

7.37-52,<sup>108</sup> Meeks investigates how ‘the prophet’ is related to ‘the Christ’ and to the Son of David ideology. He argues that Jesus is definitely the Christ in John (Jn 1.41; 11.27; 20.31), and:

while the evangelist can use the term in the fashion of general Hellenistic Christianity as a proper name (1.17; 17.3), he is quite aware also of its ‘official’ signification and, alone of all New Testament writers, equates it explicitly with the transliterated Hebrew (1.41; 4.25).<sup>109</sup>

Moving from ‘Christ’ to ‘prophet’, Meeks asks whether the identification of Jesus as the prophet is also a proper Christian affirmation. To this question, he answers that ‘the use of the adverb ἄληθῶς already suggests that *it is*’,<sup>110</sup> noting the use of the adverb in Jn 1.47; 4.42; 6.14; 7.26; 8.31; 17.8. However, it is to be doubted whether the use of the adverb ἄληθῶς is sufficient to establish that ‘the prophet’ is used of Jesus as a Christian affirmation.

In the discussion of the theory of displacement on John 7,<sup>111</sup> which is supported by some scholars such as Bernard, Bultmann and Hoskyns, Meeks argues against the hypothesis and reads the chapter as it stands, where he considers that ‘if verses 14-18 suggest that Jesus is the prophet like Moses, then the official plot to kill Jesus implies the accusation that he is [the] false prophet [in Deut. 18.18-22]’.<sup>112</sup> The consideration of Jesus as a false prophet in relation to the official plot to kill him is very significant for understanding the trial of Jesus and his identity as ‘the prophet’ in the Gospel. Following on from this, the figure of Jesus can be seen as a rejected prophet akin to those of the Old Testament. To have opened up this possible line of understanding is one of his contributions on the issue of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel, but it is not examined any further in his study, because the focus of his study is not on Jesus as prophet, but on ‘the prophet-king’ in connection with the tradition of a prophet like Moses.

In the analysis of Jn 6.1-15,<sup>113</sup> Meeks comments on Jn 6.14-15 that the real difficulties of the pericope have nothing to do with textual uncertainties, but with the common view that ‘the prophet’ is naturally to be ‘a king’. For the use of ‘the prophet’ in v. 14, he focuses on the phrase ὁ ἐρχόμενος,<sup>114</sup> which is often supposed to be a messianic title, and argues that:

108. See Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 32-61.

109. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, p. 33.

110. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 33-34, italics are mine.

111. See Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 42-47.

112. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, p. 47.

113. See Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 87-99.

114. This phrase occurs 15 times in John (Jn 1.9, 15, 27, 29, 47; 3.31 [twice]; 6.14, 35, 37; 10.12; 11.27; 12.13; 16.13; 18.4), but as he suggested (p. 90 n. 1), among



what the participial phrase, in conjunction with the definite article, does indicate in 6.14 is that 'the Prophet' with whom Jesus is identified is one who is a well-known eschatological figure.<sup>115</sup>

He thinks that the phrase 'the prophet coming into the world' in Jn 6.14 naturally calls to mind the prophet like Moses of Deut. 18.15-22. In relation to John 6, Meeks believes that:

the fourth evangelist has set the traditional feeding miracle into the context of the manna from heaven enjoyed by the wilderness generation under Moses' leadership and connected with the eschatological interpretation of the Passover bread.<sup>116</sup>

On this ground, he claims that the miracle of Jesus, the feeding of the five thousand, and the discourse in John 6 parallel God's miraculous care of Israel under Moses' leadership. Thus, he considers that 'the prophet' in Jn 6.14 is the Mosaic eschatological prophet.<sup>117</sup> This supposition is valuable for understanding the prophetic figure of Jesus in the Gospel as a whole.

In sum, the scope of Meeks's work in connection with the prophetic figure of Jesus in the Gospel is very limited, even if he attempts to show the subject of Jesus as prophet in the figure of 'the prophet-king' in relation to Mosaic traditions. His work, however, is significant for the following reasons: (1) it calls for an attention to the subject of the figure of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel, (2) the implication that Jesus is to be seen as a rejected prophet akin to those of the Old Testament in John 7 and the understanding of 'the prophet' in Jn 6.14 as the Mosaic eschatological prophet provides some valuable insights for understanding Jesus as prophet in the Gospel as a whole.

### *Before 1967*

This investigation will begin with John Calvin because his commentary was so powerful and influential during the Reformation era. The survey will not be exhaustive, but will give a brief review of the subject, and will rely mainly on commentaries on John's Gospel because of the extreme shortage of monographs or articles on the issue before 1967.<sup>118</sup>

them the following are relevant for a messianic title: Jn 1.9, 15, 27; 3.31 [twice]; 6.14; 11.27; 12.13.

115. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, p. 90.

116. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, p. 98.

117. See Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 90-93.

118. See D.G. Danner, 'Johannine Christology During the Reformation', in J.E. Priest (ed.), *Johannine Studies: Essays in Honor of Frank Pack* (Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University Press, 1989), pp. 36-53; van Belle, *Johannine Bibliography*, pp. 339-58.

John Calvin (1509–64)<sup>119</sup> does not fully pay attention to ‘the prophet’ in Jn 1.21; 6.14; 7.40 and ‘a prophet’ in Jn 4.19, 44; 9.17.<sup>120</sup> He translates ὁ προφήτης in Jn 1.21 as ‘a prophet’ rather than ‘the prophet’, and maintains that ‘Erasmus incorrectly restricts this to Christ’.<sup>121</sup> The reasons for Calvin’s translation are as follows: first, ‘the addition of the article has no weight in this verse’;<sup>122</sup> second, ‘the messengers afterwards declare plainly enough that they meant a different prophet from Christ, when they summarise it all by saying: “If you are neither Christ, nor Elijah, nor a Prophet” [in v. 25]’.<sup>123</sup> His translation is based on the understanding of the use of the article as generic.<sup>124</sup>

H.A.W. Meyer (1800–73), F.L. Godet (1812–1900) and R.C.H. Lenski, in their commentaries on John, in contrast to Calvin, find a reference to ‘the prophet’ in Jn 1.21 with the definite article, although they do not treat the issue of the prophet in relation to the Johannine Jesus as an important subject.<sup>125</sup> Meyer comments that:

ὁ προφήτης [in Jn 1.21] is marked out by the article as the *well-known promised* prophet ... the one *intended* in Deut. xviii.15, the reference of whom to the Messiah Himself (Acts iii.22, vii.37, John i.46, vi.14) was at least not universal (comp. vii.40), and was not adopted by the interrogators here.<sup>126</sup>

In Jn 6.14, he considers that ‘the prophet’ is ‘the Messiah’, but this raises a difficulty because the two figures are not united in Jn 1.21 and

119. J. Calvin, *In Evangelium secundum Iohannem, Commentarius Iohannis Calvini* (Geneva, 1553), ET by C. Fetherstone, 1584; by W. Pringle, 1847; rev. by T.H.L. Parker, *The Gospel according to St John 1–10* and *The Gospel according to St John 11–21 and the First Epistle of John* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1961).

120. See Calvin, *John 1–10*, pp. 94–95, 110–11, 148–50, 200–201, 204–205, 246.

121. Calvin, *John 1–10*, p. 27.

122. Calvin, *John 1–10*, p. 27.

123. Calvin, *John 1–10*, pp. 27–28.

124. The definite article, however, should be understood in its basic or fundamental sense, but not as generic; see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and ed. R.W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), pp. 131–32; J.A. Brooks and C.L. Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988), pp. 73–79; N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek. III. Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963), pp. 165–84, esp. pp. 180–81.

125. See H.A.W. Meyer, *Kritisch exegetisches Handbuch über das Evangelium des Johannes* (KEKNT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 5th rev. edn, 1869), ET by W. Urwick, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of John* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876), which is used for this study; R.C.H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St John’s Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1943); Godet, *Commentary on John’s Gospel*.

126. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook*, I, p. 106, italics in the original.

7.40.<sup>127</sup> He notes that by ‘ὁ προφήτης [in Jn 7.40], as in 1.21, is meant the prophet promised in Deut. 18:15, not as being himself the Messiah, but a prophet preceding Him’.<sup>128</sup> Godet regards the appearance of ὁ προφήτης in Jn 1.21 as proving ‘an expectation of the reappearance of some other prophet of the ancient times ... among these expected personages, there was one who was especially called *the prophet*’.<sup>129</sup> In Jn 6.14, he notes that the participle ὁ ἐρχόμενος is ‘an allusion to the prophecy on which the expectation of such a personage rested, Deut. xviii.18’.<sup>130</sup> Lenski also says that:

we must note the article in the Greek: ὁ προφήτης [in Jn 1.21] ... but ‘the’ specific prophet, the one mentioned in Deut. 18:15 and 18, 19 and conceived to be, as [John] 7:40 shows, a special prophet who would precede the Messiah.<sup>131</sup>

He considers ‘the prophet’ in Jn 1.21 and 7.40 as a forerunner of the Messiah, but in Jn 6.14 as being identified with the Christ.<sup>132</sup>

On the one hand, some commentators on John, for example, E.W. Hengstenberg (1802–69), B.F. Westcott (1825–1901), J.H. Bernard and Edwyn C. Hoskyns, consider the reference to the prophet in Jn 1.21, 6.14 and 7.40 to be in relation to Deut. 18.15, though the subject of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel is not discussed seriously in their commentaries.<sup>133</sup> Hengstenberg, for instance, merely comments that ‘this is the only passage of the Old Testament in which a future messenger of God is announced as a “Prophet”’,<sup>134</sup> and recognizes that Jesus is the prophet in relation to John the Baptist’s answer, ‘No’, to the question, ‘Are you the Prophet?’<sup>135</sup> Bernard also similarly notes that ‘the prophet’ in Jn 1.21 and 6.14 identifies

127. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook*, I, p. 275.

128. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook*, I, p. 343.

129. Godet, *Commentary on John’s Gospel*, p. 304, italics in the original.

130. Godet, *Commentary on John’s Gospel*, p. 570; he considers that Jesus was frequently called ‘prophet of Galilee’, in relation to an allusion of the title in Jn 7.52 (see also p. 643).

131. Lenski, *Interpretation of St John’s Gospel*, p. 110.

132. See Lenski, *Interpretation of St John’s Gospel*, pp. 109–14, 438, 580–81.

133. See E.W. Hengstenberg, *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John* (2 vols.; Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1980 [1865]), pp. 59–74, 231–32, 246–49, 315–16, 409–11, 493–94; Westcott, *John*, pp. 18, 71, 77–78, 97, 124, 147; J.H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St John* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928), I, pp. 33–42, 183; E.C. Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel* (ed. F.N. Davey; London: Faber & Faber, 2nd edn, 1947), pp. 172–75, 233–48, 252–61, 288–90, 324–26, 356.

134. Hengstenberg, *Commentary on John*, p. 65.

135. Hengstenberg, *Commentary on John*, p. 66.

'Jesus with the prophet of popular belief whom Israel expected ... as the fulfilment of the prophecy [of Deut. 18.15]'.<sup>136</sup> On the other hand, R.H. Lightfoot notes that among the occurrences of 'the prophet' in Jn 1.21, 6.14 and 7.40, in the first and last cases the prophet is clearly distinguished from the Messiah, which may be explained in relation to the expectation illustrated by 1 Macc. 4.46 and Mk 8.28.<sup>137</sup> He considers that the prophet in Jn 6.14 'may mean, in the light of the next verse, the Messiah'.<sup>138</sup> But he does not take the discussion further.<sup>139</sup>

Gillis P. Wetter and Walter Bauer consider the term 'prophet' in the Fourth Gospel to reflect a Hellenistic perspective.<sup>140</sup> Wetter, in his monograph on *Der Sohn Gottes*, argues that the term 'prophet' in John derives from a Hellenistic background. He discusses the wandering prophets of Syria-Palestine for comparison, and considers that 'the prophet' in the Gospel is much closer to the wandering prophets. On this basis, he thinks 'the prophet' in the Gospel is a synonym for 'Son of God',<sup>141</sup> which is equivalent to the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος of popular Hellenistic piety. His statement, however, cannot be maintained because the term προφήτης occurs eight times in John (Jn 1.21, 25; 4.19, 44; 6.14; 7.40, 52; 9.17), and never in any relation to the title, 'Son of God'. Walter Bauer, in his commentary on John, moves in a similar direction to Wetter. Bauer doubts the view that the term 'the prophet' derives either from the Old Testament or from early Christian tradition. Thus, he turns to the Gnostics, Mandaeans and the Hermetic corpus, for seeking similarities as to the background of 'the prophet' between John and the mystery religions.<sup>142</sup>

C.H. Dodd recognizes the significance of the prophet in John's Gospel.<sup>143</sup> He argues against the idea of the prophet as a messianic title for the following reasons: (1) in Jn 7.40 the prophet is 'suggested by some of the crowd as an *alternative* to the title ὁ χριστός favoured by others'; (2) the recognition of Jesus as 'the coming prophet' in 6.14 leads the crowd to attempt to make Him king, therefore, it is 'quasi-messianic'; (3) in Jn 1.21:

John the Baptist, having repudiated the title ὁ χριστός, is offered the alternatives, Elijah or ὁ προφήτης, both of which he rejects ... therefore, ὁ

136. Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, p. 183.

137. See Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel*, p. 102.

138. Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel*, pp. 165-66.

139. See Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel*, pp. 92-25, 120-35, 151-86, 197-203.

140. See Wetter, *Der Sohn Gottes*; Bauer, *Johannesevangelium*.

141. Wetter, *Der Sohn Gottes*, p. 25.

142. See Bauer, *Johannesevangelium*, pp. 30-31, 89, 108-111.

143. See Dodd, *Interpretation*, pp. 239-40.

προφήτης is not strictly a messianic title, although it has some analogy with messianic titles.<sup>144</sup>

He thinks that ‘other places where Jesus is acknowledged by various persons as a prophet are not relevant’<sup>145</sup> for the discussion of the messianic title. A suggestion that:

the influence of the idea of the one prophet who is incarnated in different historical individuals at various periods ... [which] plays a part in Manichean and Mandaean doctrines<sup>146</sup>

is considered improbable by him. He suggests a possibility that ‘the evangelist had in mind the prophetic figure called תנאכה, who in Samaritan eschatology is understood to have corresponded to the Messiah; or he may have thought of the “prophet like unto Moses” of Deut. xviii.15’.<sup>147</sup> He concludes that in any case ‘the title ὁ προφήτης is not an appropriate one’ for the evangelist.<sup>148</sup> The scope of his study is very limited, although he correctly understands the importance of the prophet in relation to the messianic title in the Gospel. On the one hand, however, he leaves a door open for further study of ‘the prophet’ in the Gospel by expressing the view that ‘the meaning of the term [the prophet] as used by this evangelist (and by him alone) is *enigmatic*’.<sup>149</sup> On the other hand he indirectly implies a probability that ‘it [the prophet] may represent *a stage towards a true estimate of the status of Jesus*’.<sup>150</sup>

T.F. Glasson, in a subsection of his monograph *Moses in the Fourth Gospel* in 1963, discusses the issue of Jesus as prophet in relation to Jn 1.21, 6.14 and 7.40 as follows:<sup>151</sup> (1) with regard to the references to ‘the prophet’ in Jn 6.14 and 7.40 it is a moot point whether Jesus himself is the prophet, and in both cases Moses is in mind; (2) the prophet in Jn 1.21 and 7.40 is distinguished from the Messiah; (3) in Jn 6.14, however, the prophet and the Messiah seem to be equated; (4) ‘there can be little doubt that the Evangelist himself regards Jesus as (among other things) the true fulfilment of the hope for “the prophet that should come into the world” [which is intended to indicate that Jesus is the fulfilment of Deut. 18.15-19]’.<sup>152</sup> His discussions are too general and the scope of his study is

144. All quotations are from Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 239.

145. Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 239.

146. Dodd, *Interpretation*, pp. 239-40.

147. Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 240.

148. Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 240.

149. Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 239, italics are mine.

150. Dodd, *Interpretation*, p. 240, italics are mine.

151. See Glasson, *Moses*, pp. 27-32.

152. Glasson, *Moses*, p. 29.

extremely limited, although he recognizes the prophetic figure of Jesus in the Gospel to be a significant subject.

R. Bultmann,<sup>153</sup> in his commentary on John, argues that ‘it is characteristic for him [John] that Jesus is the “prophet” (Jn 6.14; cf. Jn 4.19, 44; 5.52; 9.17), and the titles *ὁ προφήτης* and *ὁ χριστός* are coordinated’,<sup>154</sup> in Jn 7.40-52. He comments on ‘the prophet’ in Jn 1.21 that:

It is not possible to determine with certainty who is meant by the *figure of the ‘prophet’*. For the general expectation of a prophet who can announce the will of God in a time of doubt and perplexity has nothing to do with this (1 Macc. 4.46; 9.27; 14.41); it must refer to a particular messianic figure such as Elijah, and the expectation of such a figure is also clearly presupposed in 6.14 and 7.40, where the figure is of equal importance with the Messiah.<sup>155</sup>

In this comment, he apparently implies a messianic understanding of the prophet in Jn 1.21, 6.14 and 7.40. He, however, notes that:

in Judaism the expectation of the “prophet” is not attested ... [but] for Judaism Moses is the prophet above all others, and ... the return of Moses was also expected in the time of salvation.<sup>156</sup>

He, therefore, considers that ‘it is possible that the expectation of the “prophet” is ... the expectation of Moses’.<sup>157</sup> He adds to his comment that:

the evidence for the expectation of the return of Moses is admittedly relatively late; the expectation that the Messiah will be a second Moses ... is clearly earlier; ... this expectation is presupposed in John 6.31.<sup>158</sup>

In the comment on Jn 4.16-19, he considers that:

the story [of the Samaritan woman] represents Jesus as the *προφήτης*, as the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* who knows the secret things which are hidden from other men, and who knows the strangers whom he meets.<sup>159</sup>

In this comment on Jn 1.40-42, he clearly insists that the episode of the Samaritan woman is a demonstration of Jesus as the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος*.<sup>160</sup> He thinks that the idea of the *θεῖος ἄνθρωπος* is widespread in pagan and Christian Hellenism, and that the same motif is undoubtedly found in Jn 1.47-51; 2.24-25; 4.17-19; 11.11-14, although it is not a decisive

153. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*.

154. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 84.

155. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 89, italics in the original.

156. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 89-90.

157. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 90.

158. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 90 n. 1.

159. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 187-88; see also pp. 333-35.

160. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 101-102.

element in the Gospel.<sup>161</sup> He notes that ‘the Johannine Jesus is not ... portrayed as a prophet, but in his omniscience he is more like the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος’.<sup>162</sup> In Jn 6.14-15, he comments that the crowd of people have at least apprehended that ‘the miracle worker is the eschatological bringer of salvation; but they have a false conception of the eschatological salvation’.<sup>163</sup> He notes that Jn 6.15 demonstrates that ‘the “prophet who comes into the world” is *not a forerunner of salvation but the bringer of salvation himself*, for the people believe that the “prophet” must be king’.<sup>164</sup> Thus, he considers that ‘the prophet can hardly be meant to refer to Moses at his second coming’<sup>165</sup> because it is hard to find evidence that Moses was expected to return as “king” in Judaism. Consequently, in his comments on ‘the prophet’ in John’s Gospel, Bultmann focuses not on the expectation of Moses, but on the Johannine Jesus as the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, like his predecessors, Gillis P. Wetter and Walter Bauer. In his discussion, Bultmann clearly recognizes the significance of ‘the prophet’ in the Gospel, so he attempts to explain the identity of ‘the prophet’, although there are not many fruitful answers. Bultmann’s comments are very informative in relation to the expectation of Moses in Judaism and the idea of the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, but the idea of the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος is not plausible and his assertion that ‘the prophet’ is the Johannine Jesus as the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος is not acceptable, because the analogy between Jesus and the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος is arbitrarily alleged and even if the idea could be possible in relation to the analogy, it would not be proved.<sup>166</sup> The scope of Bultmann’s study on the subject of ‘the prophet’ in relation to the prophetic figure of Jesus in the Gospel is not sufficient.

B.P. Robinson, in his 1965 article, focuses on the prophetic figure of Jesus in the Gospel.<sup>167</sup> He argues that the author of the Fourth Gospel evidently wished to represent Christ as a northern prophet in relation to the figure of Elijah-Elisha. His argument begins with the account of the wedding feast of Cana (Jn 2.1-11). He argues that:

although the fourth gospel recounts in general the Jerusalem ministry of Jesus, a number of his signs are performed in the north, in Galilee, and ... the ‘sign’

161. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 102 n. 1.

162. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 102 n. 1.

163. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 213-14.

164. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 213 n. 7, italics are mine; see pp. 305-306.

165. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 213 n. 7.

166. The theme of θεῖος ἄνθρωπος will be discussed later; see Chapter 7, ‘Perception of the Samaritan Woman of Jesus as Prophet’.

167. See Robinson, ‘Christ as a Northern Prophet’, pp. 104-108.

at Cana is *inter alia* intended to remind us how Elisha began *his* ministry by sweetening the water supply (2 Kings 2:19-22).<sup>168</sup>

Robinson turns next to the multiplication of the loaves in John 6. He argues that 'the least controvertible instance of Jesus being portrayed as an Elijah-Elisha figure by John is in the story of the multiplication of loaves, in Chapter 6'.<sup>169</sup> He claims that 'in 2 Kings 4:42-44 Elisha multiplies barley loaves (hence the mention in Jn 6:9 that the loaves used were of *barley*) and grain ... as in John 6'.<sup>170</sup> His argument on the idea of Jesus as a northern prophet in the tradition of Elijah and Elisha is significant, but the scope of his study is extremely confined: the article has five pages only.

R.E. Brown, in his *magnum opus* on John,<sup>171</sup> does not fully pay attention to 'the prophet' in relation to the figure of Jesus as prophet. His discussion of 'the prophet' appears in the comment on Jn 1.19-28. He considers that the emissary's question, 'Are you the prophet?' in Jn 1.21 is an echo of Deut. 18.15-18 where the prediction of the coming of a particular figure would be 'the Prophet-like-Moses'.<sup>172</sup> In support of this view, he notes that 'the expectations of people concerning the coming of this Prophet are seen in John vi 14 and vii 40 in contexts where Moses is in mind'.<sup>173</sup> On Jn 4.19, he notes that 'the identification of Jesus [as a prophet] stems from the special knowledge that he has exhibited, but may also refer to his obvious wish to reform her life'.<sup>174</sup> He explains that the Samaritans only accept the Pentateuch, so the figure of the prophet probably derives from Deut. 18.15-18, and 'they expected a Taheb ... seemingly the Prophet-like Moses'.<sup>175</sup> On Jn 6.14-15, he comments that 'the prophet who is to come into the world' is:

most likely ... a reference to the expectation of the Prophet-like-Moses for in verse 31 the crowd of people draws a connection between the food supplied by Jesus and the manna given by Moses.<sup>176</sup>

In the comment on Jn 7.52, he accepts the reading of the two Bodmer papyri (P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup>) 'the prophet', for 'the Johannine concept of the Prophet-like-Moses could easily have been misunderstood in the process of copying',

168. Robinson, 'Christ as a Northern Prophet', p. 106, italics in the original.

169. Robinson, 'Christ as a Northern Prophet', p. 107.

170. Robinson, 'Christ as a Northern Prophet', p. 107, italics in the original.

171. Brown, *Gospel according to John*.

172. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 49.

173. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 49.

174. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 171.

175. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 172.

176. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 234, see also pp. 249-50.



although the vast majority of witnesses read ‘a prophet’.<sup>177</sup> He suggests that a figure of ‘the prophet’ in the Gospel is the Prophet-like-Moses. His proposal, however, is not a new idea, and the figure of the Prophet-like-Moses is not sufficiently discussed in relation to ‘the prophet’ in the Gospel.

In sum, before 1967 scholars of John’s Gospel do not fully pay attention to ‘the prophet’ in relation to the prophetic figure of Jesus in the Gospel. The significance of ‘the prophet’ in the Gospel is merely understood in relation to Deut. 18.15-18 by the majority of the Johannine scholars as surveyed above. Only a few take the identity of ‘the prophet’ in an alternative way, and their views are idiosyncratic, and have not been accepted: (1) Bultmann’s proposal, like Gillis P. Wetter and Walter Bauer, that ‘the prophet’ is the Johannine Jesus as the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος; (2) Robinson’s suggestion that ‘the prophet’ is Christ as a northern prophet in relation to the figure of Elijah-Elisha.

### *After 1967*

After Meeks’s monograph appeared in 1967, the study of ‘the/a prophet’ in relation to Jesus’ identity in the Fourth Gospel has slightly been extended; however, it is still very rare that the subject has been considered in a single extensive monograph or in an article of considerable length. In order to survey the subject of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel after 1967, (1) some major commentaries on John will briefly be considered in relation to the issue; (2) some significant articles, which are closely related to the topic of Jesus as prophet in John, and monographs on the Johannine Christology, in which the subject of Jesus as prophet has extensively been treated in a subsection, will be discussed; however, the discussion will not be exhaustive.

Rudolf Schnackenburg’s three-volume commentary on John began to appear in 1965. At that time, only the first volume which covers chs. 1–4 was published. The work was completed in 1975.<sup>178</sup> Before writing the commentary on John, Schnackenburg in an article recognizes the significance of ‘the prophet’ in John, and had attempted to examine it in relation to the eschatological prophet, focusing on not only the Fourth Gospel, but also the New Testament as a whole and the Qumran literature.<sup>179</sup> He does

177. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 325, see also pp. 329-30.

178. R. Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium, Teil I-III* (HThKNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1965–75); the first volume of the commentary appeared in 1965, and was translated into English by K. Smyth *et al.* as *The Gospel according to St John*. For this study, the English translation is used.

179. See R. Schnackenburg, ‘Die Erwartung des “Propheten” nach dem Neuen Tetsment und den Qumran-Texten’, *SE* 1 (1959), pp. 622-39, see esp. pp. 629-31.

not fully pay attention to the subject of Jesus as prophet in connection with the Fourth Gospel, however; rather, the subject is briefly surveyed in the New Testament as a whole in relation to Deut. 18.15, 18 and the Qumran literature. In the three-volume commentary, Schnackenburg considers 'the prophet' in related passages, but the scope of his discussion is very limited. In the excursus 'the titles of Jesus in John 1', Schnackenburg briefly comments that Jesus was believed to be 'the prophet' (Jn 6.14; 7.40, 52), and considers that Jesus accepted the title for his identity according to John 7.<sup>180</sup> He does not, however, go further to examine 'the prophet' as a christological title for Jesus in the Gospel. He does not think of the possibility of the identity of Jesus as the expected eschatological prophet in relation to Jn 4.19, because of the absence of the definite article.<sup>181</sup> He comments on 'a prophet' in Jn 9.17 that 'it is unlikely that the term "a prophet" has a messianic significance'.<sup>182</sup> In his comment on 'the prophet' in Jn 6.14 and 7.40, although Schnackenburg admits that this is 'a broadly messianic term, which occupies a not insignificant place among the titles of honour applied to Jesus ... and always in a positive sense',<sup>183</sup> he does not seriously discuss the issue in detail.

Leon Morris's commentary on John appeared in 1971 and was updated in 1995 (but the second edition has not been changed much from the first edition, except minor corrections). He does not pay much attention to the title 'prophet' in relation to christological titles for Jesus.<sup>184</sup> In his commentary on John published in 1972, Barnabas Lindars considers that Jesus was widely held to be a prophet in his lifetime, and was identified with a prophetic figure,<sup>185</sup> but he also does not consider the subject in much detail.<sup>186</sup>

J.P. Miranda's monograph, *Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat*, originally appeared in 1972 and was revised in 1976.<sup>187</sup> Miranda carefully examines the 'sending' terminology of the Fourth Gospel within the Johannine literature, the New Testament, and other appropriate bodies of Old Testament, Jewish and Gnostic literature. In the investigation of the 'sending' termin-

180. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 508; see also pp. 289-90.

181. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, pp. 433-34.

182. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 248.

183. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 157; see also II, pp. 18-20, 157-59, 161-62.

184. See Morris, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 134-36, 266, 345-47, 428, 485-86.

185. See Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 104.

186. Lindars, *Gospel of John*, pp. 187, 244, 302, 346.

187. J.P. Miranda, *Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den johanneischen Sendungsformeln; zugleich ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Christologie und Ekklesiologie* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, 23.7; Bern: Peter Lang; Frankfurt: Herbert Lang, 2nd edn, 1976 [1972]).

ology, Jesus is considered to be the eschatological prophet. In the final part of the monograph, the Jewish expectation of an eschatological prophet 'like Moses' is examined in relation to ὁ προφήτης; however, the focus of the study is not on the subject of Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel, but on the *johanneischen Sendungsformeln*.<sup>188</sup>

Two significant articles related to the issue of Jesus as prophet appeared in 1973 by M. de Jonge and in 1974 by Boismard.<sup>189</sup> In his article, de Jonge thinks that the term 'prophet' is neither the most suitable nor the final title for Jesus in John's Gospel.<sup>190</sup> He argues that '*Jesus' kingship and his prophetic mission are both redefined in terms of the unique relationship between Son and Father, as portrayed in the Fourth Gospel*'.<sup>191</sup> He, therefore, rejects Meeks's argument that 'the two terms "prophet" and "king" in the Fourth Gospel not only are interrelated, but interpret each other'.<sup>192</sup> In his essay, de Jonge concludes that 'Jesus is prophet and king because he is the Son sent by the Father, and only as Son of the Father'. In his article, Boismard has attempted to find the significance of Jesus as a prophetic figure in relation to Jn 10.24-39. In particular, Jesus as a prophetic figure is compared with Moses in connection with Deut. 18.18. Thus, he reads Jn 10.27 in the light of Deut. 5.1-27.<sup>193</sup> The subject of Jesus as prophet is not, however, considered as one of the key issues in the Gospel as a whole, and the scope of the essay is very limited.

In the commentary on John which appeared in 1977, M.-É. Boismard and Arnaud Lamouille recognize the figure of Jesus as prophet in regard to Moses (Deut. 18.18-19).<sup>194</sup> They consider that the reference to Moses in Deut. 18.18-19 is a theme running through the whole Gospel. In the commentary, however, the subject of Jesus as prophet is not considered to be a major issue in the Gospel.<sup>195</sup> After the commentary on John, Boismard's extensive study, which focused on the issue of Jesus as prophet in the

188. See Miranda, *Der Vater*, pp. 308-86; see *idem*, *Die Sendung Jesu im vierten Evangelium: Religions- und theologiegeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Sendungsformeln* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 87; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977).

189. De Jonge, 'Jesus as Prophet and King'; this article was republished in his book, *Jesus, Stranger from Heaven and Son of God*, pp. 49-76, which is used in this study; Boismard, 'Jésus, le prophète par excellence'.

190. De Jonge, 'Jesus as Prophet and King', p. 50.

191. De Jonge, 'Jesus as Prophet and King', p. 52, italics in the original.

192. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, p. 1; see de Jonge, 'Jesus as Prophet and King', pp. 51-52.

193. See Boismard, 'Jésus, le prophète par excellence', pp. 167-68.

194. Boismard and Lamouille, *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 48-50.

195. See Boismard and Lamouille, *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 90, 138, 185.

Fourth Gospel, appeared in 1988.<sup>196</sup> In his monograph, which is collected essays in relation to his study of the Johannine Christology, Boismard attempts to explain how Jesus realizes in his person the promise made by God to send to his people a 'prophet like Moses' (Deut. 18.18-19).<sup>197</sup> He considers that even if Jesus and Moses have the same mission, to transmit the words of God, Jesus is much superior to Moses. Moses in fact only speaks in the name of God, as if God put his words in his mouth, to use the biblical expression; however, Jesus is the Wisdom of God made man, the Word of God made flesh, the Only Begotten of God, God himself come in person to speak to all people.<sup>198</sup> He argues that the Johannine Jesus is situated in the line of the prophets of the Old Testament, and especially of Moses, who were sent by God to reveal his will to people, and so considers Jesus as the new Moses. In this respect, Boismard's contribution could be the most significant stepping-stone for the study of Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel, since Meeks's monograph. However, the scope of this study is still limited because the subject is treated only in one chapter of the collected essays constituted by seven chapters,<sup>199</sup> and so further extensive and comprehensive approaches to the subject are required in the Gospel as a whole.<sup>200</sup>

C.K. Barrett's commentary on John originally appeared in 1955, and was revised in 1978. In his commentary, Barrett discusses the Johannine Christology in the subsection, the theology of the Gospel, in which the development of Christology and the reflection of Christian traditions in the Gospel are discussed, but 'the prophet' is not treated.<sup>201</sup> On Jn 1.21, Barrett comments that:

since it has already been ascertained that John is not the Christ (v. 20) ὁ προφήτης cannot here be a title of the Christ ... There are other indications of a belief, or hope, that a new prophet, or one of the prophets of old, would be sent to the assistance of Israel.<sup>202</sup>

He seems not to realize the significance of 'the prophet' as a distinct eschatological figure, because his comment is very vague. In Jn 4.19, he

196. Boismard, *Moses or Jesus*.

197. See Boismard, *Moses or Jesus*, pp. 1-10.

198. See Boismard, *Moses or Jesus*, pp. 69-123.

199. In the monograph, the volume of the chapter entitled 'Jesus, the prophet like Moses' is almost a half of the whole book.

200. See Menken, 'The Christology of the Fourth Gospel', pp. 315-16.

201. See Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 70-75; he comments that 'none of the Synoptic Gospels presents a developed and systematic Christology, but they are all full of the raw material of Christology' (p. 70).

202. Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, p. 173.

considers a possibility that ‘although προφήτης is anarthrous, the woman is thinking of “the prophet” [in Jn 1.21] ... giving a messianic interpretation to Deut. 18.15’,<sup>203</sup> however, he doubts whether John has much knowledge of Samaritan theology. In Jn 6.14-15, he notes that ‘the prophet [in v. 14] is understood not as a forerunner of the Messiah but as in some sense the Messiah himself’<sup>204</sup> and discusses this in relation to Deut. 18.15-18, 4Q175, and 1QS 9.11. In Jn 7.40, however, he comments that the prophet is clearly distinguished from the Messiah.<sup>205</sup> He does not give a clear picture of the figure of ‘the prophet’ in the Gospel.

After Barrett’s revised commentary on John was published, several new commentaries and some significant monographs in relation to Johannine Christology appeared in the 1980s. First, regarding some commentaries, two-volume commentaries were published by Jürgen Becker in 1979–81 and Ernst Haenchen in 1980.<sup>206</sup> In their commentaries on John, Becker and Haenchen do not give full attention to the reference to ‘the/a prophet’ in connection with Jesus’ identity in the Gospel.<sup>207</sup> Joachim Gnilka’s commentary, *Johannesevangelium*, appeared in 1983, and G.R. Beasley-Murray’s *John* was published in 1987 and revised in 1999, and Herman Ridderbos’s two-volume commentary, *Het Evangelie naar Johannes*, appeared in 1987–92.<sup>208</sup> In their commentaries on John, Gnilka, Beasley-Murray and Ridderbos make an extremely brief comment on the subject of Jesus as prophet in relation to a ‘prophet like Moses’ (Deut. 18.18-19).<sup>209</sup> This situation seems to show that the issue of Jesus’ prophetic identity in the Gospel is not of interest to scholarly minds, and has, therefore, not become a serious subject of Johannine research. Second, concerning

203. Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, p. 236.

204. Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, p. 277.

205. See Barrett, *Gospel according to John*, p. 330.

206. Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*; Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*.

207. See Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, pp. 113-15, 204-206, 228-34, 322-30, 370-78; Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, I, pp. 144-46, 222-26; 272-73; II, pp. 17-20, 39.

208. J. Gnilka, *Johannesevangelium* (NEBKNT; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1983), pp. 17-18, 34-35, 46-47; 61-63, 75-80; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 23-24, 61, 88-89, 117-21, 157; H. Ridderbos, *Het Evangelie naar Johannes: Proeve van een theologische Exegese* (2 vols.; Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J.H. Kok, 1987–92), ET by J. Vriend, *The Gospel according to John: A Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), pp. 61-68, 160-61, 215-16, 276-82.

209. See Gnilka, *Johannesevangelium*, pp. 17-18, 34-35, 46-47; 61-63, 75-80; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 23-24, 61, 88-89, 117-21, 157; Ridderbos, *John*, pp. 61-68, 160-61, 215-16, 276-82.

some monographs in relation to Johannine Christology, F. Grob's monograph, *Faire l'œuvre de Dieu*, appeared in 1986.<sup>210</sup> He examines the theme of the significance of Jesus' work in relation to the Johannine Christology, but does not focus on Jesus as prophet in the Gospel. In relation to the subject of Jesus as prophet, he combines the Jewish expectations of the prophet and that of the Messiah; however, they should not be mixed up together in relation to Jn 1.21, 25; 6.15; 7.37-52, where two appellations 'the Christ' and 'the Prophet' are clearly distinguished from each other.<sup>211</sup> In 1987, two monographs regarding Johannine Christology were published: Udo Schnelle's *Antidoketische Christologie im Johannesevangelium*, which was translated into English in 1992,<sup>212</sup> and William R.G. Loader's *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, which was revised in 1992.<sup>213</sup> In both monographs Schnell and Loader do not pay attention to the subject of Jesus as prophet at all. Adele Reinhartz's short essay, 'Jesus as Prophet', which appeared in 1989, focuses on the christological significance of the Johannine prolepses, which are attributed to the Johannine Jesus, for indicating Jesus as a prophet and the Son of God.<sup>214</sup> Attention to the use of the Johannine prolepses as a literary technique, in order to understand their christological significance is fruitful in terms of recognizing Jesus as a true prophet in the Gospel; however, the scope of this essay is very restricted.

Finally, in the period from 1990 to 2002, several commentaries on John's Gospel appeared; however, nearly all of them are not very significant in relation to Jesus as prophet in the Gospel.<sup>215</sup> Many commentators generally see in 'the prophet' in Jn 1.21; 6.14; and 7.40 a definite eschatological figure of Jewish expectation, to be identified with the 'prophet like Moses' promised in Deut. 18.15, 18; however, it is very rare to pay considerable attention to Jesus as prophet in the Gospel.<sup>216</sup> In the same

210. F. Grob, *Faire l'œuvre de Dieu: Christologie et éthique dans l'Évangile de Jean* (EHPR, 68; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1986).

211. See Grob, *Faire l'œuvre de Dieu*, pp. 49-56.

212. Schnelle, *Antidoketic Christology*.

213. Loader, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*; see also Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. cix-cxii.

214. Reinhartz, 'Jesus as Prophet'.

215. For example, Carson, *Gospel according to John* (1991); Brodie, *Quest for the Origin* (1993); Witherington III, *John's Wisdom* (1995); B. Schwank, *Evangelium nach Johannes* (St Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1996); L. Schenke, *Johannes Kommentar* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1998); Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes* (1998); Moloney, *Gospel of John* (1998); Wengst, *Johannesevangelium* (2000).

216. See Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 143-46, 221, 271-73, 321-33, 368; Brodie, *Quest for the Origin*, pp. 148-51, 263-64, 319-22, 348-49; Witherington III, *John's Wisdom*, pp. 65-66, 117-25, 151-54, 173-76, 180-85; Schwank, *Johannes*,

period, some monographs in relation to the subject of the Johannine Christology have been published,<sup>217</sup> but a very few are significant in connection with Jesus' prophetic identity in the Gospel. In 1990, Robert Rhea's monograph, *The Johannine Son of Man*, appeared, in which he examines Jesus as prophet in relation to the use of the title, the Son of Man, in the Gospel; however, this is not a full-scale investigation, but a very limited contribution.<sup>218</sup> In his book, *John's Gospel in New Perspectives*, which appeared in 1992, R.J. Cassidy demonstrates the correlation between particular Johannine themes and elements of the text, and key terms and practices of the Roman authorities, and utilizes John's particular christological titles and the implicit or explicit indications of persecution. The epithet of Jesus as prophet is used in an extremely limited way.<sup>219</sup> In 1992, M.E. Willett's *Wisdom Christology in the Fourth Gospel* also appeared. This is a revision of a doctoral dissertation accepted in 1985. Willett discusses Wisdom in biblical and early Jewish literature and its transformation in the Johannine Prologue. After reconstructing the picture of Wisdom in pre-Christian Judaism, Willett investigates how Wisdom themes influenced various aspects of the Johannine portrayal of Jesus,<sup>220</sup> but the figure of Jesus as prophet in relation to the reference to 'the/a prophet' in the Fourth Gospel is not treated in the investigation at all. Paul N. Anderson's monograph appeared in 1996 entitled *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, which is a revision of his doctoral dissertation submitted in 1988 to the University of Glasgow. It focuses on John 6 for understanding the unity and disunity of the Johannine Christology. He attempts to explain the christological tensions of John 6 by means of 'a

pp. 51-55, 143-61, 192-202, 245-51, 275-76; Schenke, *Johannes Kommentar*, pp. 41-43, 84-90, 122-24, 163-67, 183-201; Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, pp. 37-40, 78-89, 95-97, 132-37, 154-69; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 48-53, 125-36, 193-24, 251-58, 289-312; Wengst, *Johannesevangelium*, I, pp. 78-82, 151-75, 215-23, 289-301, 361-62.

217. See R. Rhea, *The Johannine Son of Man* (ATANT, 76; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1990); R.J. Cassidy, *John's Gospel in New Perspectives: Christology and the Realities of Roman Power* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992); Willett, *Wisdom Christology*; Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*; S.H. Ringe, *Wisdom's Friends: Community and Christology in the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999); McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*; Endo, *Creation and Christology*.

218. See Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 49-68; see Menken, 'Christology of the Fourth Gospel', pp. 317-18.

219. See Cassidy, *John's Gospel*, pp. 34-35, 50-53, 84-88; see Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. cxii-cxiv.

220. See Willett, *Wisdom Christology*, pp. 46-47, 59-60, 70-75, 93-94, 105-25.

different compositional model: that of the evangelist as a follower of Jesus, who is reflecting dialectically upon the significance of Jesus' ministry for future generations'.<sup>221</sup> He does focus on the identity of the Johannine Jesus as prophet in relation to the explicit reference to 'the prophet' used in Jn 6.14, but simply explains the epithet in connection with the Moses typology described in Deut. 18.15-22.<sup>222</sup> He comments on Jn 6.14 that:

[s]everal themes in this passage bear a remarkably close resemblance to John's Christology; and therefore, the connection between Deuteronomy 18 and John's Christology is by no means insignificant.<sup>223</sup>

He considers that the Messianic-prophet motifs, which appear in relation to the reference to 'the/a prophet' in the Gospel, are 'absolutely characteristic of John's christology',<sup>224</sup> but the scope of the study in relation to the subject of Jesus as prophet is very limited. Sharon H. Ringe's monograph, *Wisdom's Friends*, appearing in 1999, explores the hitherto neglected links between the concepts of friendship, community and the embodiment of Wisdom in the Gospel of John, but Johannine Prophet Christology in connection with the explicit references to 'the/a prophet' in the Gospel is neglected.<sup>225</sup> In his monograph, *John's Apologetic Christology*, appearing in 2001, James F. McGrath briefly refers to the identity of Jesus in relation to the prophet like Moses in an extremely small section,<sup>226</sup> in which he notes that 'in John the belief that Jesus is the "prophet (like Moses)" is perhaps made more explicit than elsewhere in the New Testament'.<sup>227</sup> Nonetheless, he does not provide any further investigation in relation to the reference to Jesus as the prophet like Moses (Jn 1.21, 25, 45; 5.46; 6.14; 7.40, 52), and only gives some positive implications about the probability of the Johannine Jesus as prophet in his fragmentary descriptions.<sup>228</sup> In the recent monograph, *Creation and Christology*, published in 2002, Masanobu Endo explores the hypothesis that the Johannine Christology in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel was developed on the basis of the biblical and early Jewish exegetical traditions of the Genesis creation account. The aim of the study is to find a link to the theological background of the Johannine Prologue. Thus, his investigation of the

221. Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 164.

222. See Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 170-79.

223. Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 174.

224. Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 175.

225. Ringe, *Wisdom's Friends*, pp. 58-59, 77-83.

226. See McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, pp. 58-59.

227. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, p. 59.

228. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, pp. 114-15, 142-43, 157-59, 166-70, 176-79, 185-95, 204.



Johannine Christology is extremely limited, with its focus on the Prologue of the Gospel in relation to the creation accounts.<sup>229</sup> In this respect, although several monographs that focused on various aspects of Johannine Christology were published during the last decade, no considerable subsection of the monographs contributed to the Johannine prophet Christology in relation to the reference to Jesus as the/a prophet in the Gospel.

To sum up, after Meeks's monograph appeared in 1967, there is some significant progress in the attention paid to the reference to 'the/a prophet' in relation to Jesus' identity in the Fourth Gospel, for example, the two short essays which appeared in 1973 and 1974 by de Jonge and Boismard respectively, Boismard's contribution in 1988, which could be a very significant stepping-stone for research on the Johannine Jesus as prophet, Adele Reinhartz's short essay which appeared in 1989 and Robert Rhea's monograph in 1990. The scope and degree of these contributions, however, are still limited, and so a full-scale investigation of the subject of the Johannine Jesus as prophet is required in a single extensive monograph or in an article of considerable length.

### *Methodological Considerations*

For the study of John's Gospel, methodological considerations are unavoidable.<sup>230</sup> Since Jürgen Becker noted *the conflict of methods* in 1986, various methodological approaches and focuses of interest have been evident in the study of the Gospel.<sup>231</sup> In his review of Johannine scholarship in 1980–84, Becker points out methodological conflict between traditional historical-critical approaches and literary approaches. Such conflict still remains in the reading of John's Gospel. In his monograph, for example, Mark W.G. Stibbe recognizes the conflict of methods in the study of the

229. See Endo, *Creation and Christology*, pp. 206–48, in which he focuses on the Prologue of the Gospel in relation to the biblical and early Jewish exegetical traditions of the Genesis creation account.

230. See H.K. Nielsen, 'Johannine Research', in J. Nissen and S. Pedersen (eds.), *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel, Århus 1997* (JSNTSup, 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 11–30; S. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and the Jews* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997), pp. 8–20; J. Ashton, *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 184–208; Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 5–92; M.C. de Boer, 'Narrative Criticism, Historical Criticism, and the Gospel of John', *JSNT* 47 (1992), pp. 35–48; Okure, *Johannine Approach*, pp. 36–57.

231. J. Becker, 'Das Johannesevangelium im Streit der Methoden (1980–1984)', *TRu* 51 (1986), pp. 1–78, esp. pp. 7–21, 65–72.

Gospel as ‘two current extremes in biblical criticism’.<sup>232</sup> He identifies the two extremes with ‘the recent anti-historical bias of text-immanent, literary analysis of biblical texts’ and ‘the largely anti-aesthetic bias of traditional, historical-critical methods’.<sup>233</sup> Stephen Motyer also recognizes the methodological clash in the study of John’s Gospel. He reviews the main methodological impulses in contemporary study of the Gospel under the heading of ‘arguments about methods in the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel’ in the first chapter of his monograph.<sup>234</sup>

In the methodological conflict, there seems at first glance to be a great chasm between diachronic and synchronic approaches applied to John’s Gospel. Yet, the two approaches do not seem to be totally isolated from each other; rather, they seem to be able to correlate with each other for the understanding of the Gospel. Indeed, an integrative method using both diachronic and synchronic approaches has been employed for the reading of the Gospel.<sup>235</sup> In this section, first, historical criticism as a diachronic approach will briefly be discussed in relation to the study of John’s Gospel. The reasons for focusing on historical criticism are as follows: (a) it has been applied to the study of the Gospel as the major methodology, and has been the most favoured among the diachronic approaches; (b) although form, source and redaction criticism have been employed for the study of the Gospel by Johannine scholars (but not many at present), these methods are still under the big umbrella of diachronic approaches in relation to the consideration of historical aspects of literary source, form and composition.<sup>236</sup> Second, narrative criticism<sup>237</sup> as a synchronic approach will be examined in connection with the reading of the Gospel. Other synchronic approaches such as structuralism, rhetorical criticism, and reader-response criticism<sup>238</sup> will not be considered in this discussion for the following

232. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, p. 1, italics are mine.

233. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, p. 1.

234. See Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, pp. 8-34.

235. For example, Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*; Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*; Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*

236. See J. Muddiman, ‘Form Criticism’, *DBI*, pp. 240-43; S.H. Travis, ‘Form Criticism’, in I.H. Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1977), pp. 153-164; C.M. Tuckett, ‘Redaction Criticism’, *DBI*, pp. 580-82; *idem*, ‘Source Criticism (New Testament)’, *DBI*, pp. 646-48; D. Wenham, ‘Source Criticism’, in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 139-52.

237. For the definition of narrative criticism, see M.A. Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 85-101.

238. For structuralism, see D. Patte, *Structural Exegesis for New Testament Critics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); M.W.G. Stibbe, ‘Structuralism’, *DBI*, pp. 650-55.

reasons; (a) structuralism, rhetorical criticism and reader-response criticism have not often been the preferred method to apply to John's Gospel, since they appeared;<sup>239</sup> (b) since synchronic approaches emerged in biblical

For rhetorical criticism, see B.L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990); J.I.H. McDonald, 'Rhetorical Criticism', *DBI*, pp. 599-600; C.C. Black, 'Rhetorical Criticism', in J.B. Green (ed.), *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), pp. 256-77. For reader-response criticism, see M. Davies, 'Reader-Response Criticism', *DBI*, pp. 578-80; A.C. Thiselton, 'Communicative Action and Promise in Interdisciplinary, Biblical, and Theological Hermeneutics', in R. Lundin *et al.*, *The Promise of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), pp. 133-239, esp. pp. 152-72; *idem*, *New Horizons in Hermeneutics* (London: HarperCollins, 1992), pp. 515-55.

239. For the use of structuralism, see Patte, *Structural Exegesis*, who examines Jn 3.1-21 by using structural criticism; J.D. Crossan, 'It Is Written: A Structuralist Analysis of John 6', *Semeia* 26 (1983), pp. 3-21. For rhetorical criticism, see J.L. Staley, *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS, 82; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988). For the use of reader-response criticism, see L. Eslinger, 'The Wooing of the Woman at the Well: Jesus, the Reader, and Reader-Response Criticism', *JLT* 1 (1987), pp. 167-83; C.H. Koester, 'The Spectrum of Johannine Readers', in F.F. Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?: Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel* (SBLSS, 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), pp. 5-19; R. Kysar, 'The Making of Metaphor: Another Reading of John 3:1-15', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 21-41; M.W. Newheart, 'Toward a Psycho-literary Reading of the Fourth Gospel', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 43-58; J.L. Staley, 'Reading Myself, Reading the Text: The Johannine Passion Narrative in Postmodern Perspective', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 59-104; S.E. Porter, 'Why Hasn't Reader-Response Criticism Caught on in New Testament Studies?', *JLT* 4 (1990), pp. 278-92, who suggests five reasons why reader-response criticism has not caught on in New Testament studies: (1) the difficulty of arriving at a firm definition; (2) the unwillingness of biblical scholars to free themselves of historical concerns; (3) a gross misunderstanding of reader-response criticism as a reading strategy; (4) the lack of a significant, cohesive group practising the method; and (5) the movement of sympathetic scholars into other areas of criticism; see also J. Barton, 'Thinking about Reader-Response Criticism', *ExpTim* 113 (2002), pp. 147-51.

The use of feminist approaches and social-scientific approaches to the Fourth Gospel will not be considered in this study because they have not often been the preferred method to apply to the Gospel. For feminist approaches, see S.M. Schneiders, *Written That You May Believe: Encountering Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1999); A. Jasper, *The Shining Garment of the Text: Gendered Readings of John's Prologue* (JSNTSup, 165; GCT, 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998); I.R. Kitzberger, 'How Can this Be? (John 3:9): A Feminist-Theological Re-Reading of the Gospel of John', in F.F. Segovia (ed.), *What Is John? II. Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel* (SBLSS, 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), pp. 19-41; J. Ashton, 'John and the Johannine Literature: The Woman at the Well', in J. Barton (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University

studies, narrative criticism in particular has predominated in the Johannine studies: and so will be discussed. Third, some integrative methods containing diachronic and synchronic approaches used for investigating John's Gospel will be discussed briefly. Finally, a statement of the method employed in this study will be made.

### *Historical Criticism Applied to John's Gospel*

In the study of John's Gospel, traditional historical-critical methods were employed as major methodologies until the early 1970s. In particular, until the 1940s the approaches had dominated German Johannine scholars, who had the presupposition that the Fourth Gospel cannot be a historical document because of its poetic characteristic and idiosyncratic layout in comparison with the Synoptics.<sup>240</sup> In contrast, British scholarship also adopted historical approaches to John's Gospel, but did not come to the same conclusions as German scholars.<sup>241</sup> In adopting historical-critical

Press, 1998), pp. 259-75. For social-scientific approaches, see J. Elliott, *Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1995 [1993]); B.J. Malina and R.L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998); J.H. Neyrey, 'The Sociology of Secrecy and the Fourth Gospel', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 79-109; A. Reinhartz, 'The Johannine Community and Its Jewish Neighbors: A Reappraisal', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 111-56; D. Rensberger, *Overcoming the World: Politics and Community in the Gospel of John* (London: SPCK, 1989); *idem*, 'Sectarianism and Theological Interpretation in John', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 139-56; L. Schottroff, 'The Samaritan Woman and the Notion of Sexuality in the Fourth Gospel', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 157-81; F.F. Segovia, 'Inclusion and Exclusion in John 17: An Intercultural Reading', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 183-210.

240. For example, B. Bauer, *Kritik der Evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes* (Leipzig: Owigand, 1846); F.C. Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Kanonischen Evangelien* (Tübingen: L.F. Fues, 1847); E. Schwartz, 'Aporien im vierten Evangelium', *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 1 (1907), pp. 347-72; J. Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1908); H. Windisch, 'Der Johanneische Erzählungsstil', in H. Schmidt (ed.), *EYXAPISTHPION: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstags, den 23 Mai 1922, dargebracht von seinem Schülern und Freunden (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pp. 174-213; E. Hirsch, *Das vierte Evangelium in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt verdeutscht und erklärt* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1936); R. Eisler, *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel: Its Author and its Writer* (London: Methuen, 1938); see also Howard, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 53-91.

241. For example, W. Sanday, *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905); Scott, *Fourth Gospel*; Westcott, *John*; J.A. Robinson, *The Historical Character of St John's Gospel* (London: Longmans, Green, 1908); Burney, *Aramaic Origin*; G.H.C. Macgregor, *The Gospel of John* (MNTC; London: Hodder &

methods, questions for the reading of John's Gospel mostly concentrated on the origin and the historical value of the Gospel. As historical methods were applied to the Gospel, (1) the historical character of some aspects of the Gospel has been discussed in relation to archaeological and palaeographical evidences;<sup>242</sup> (2) the theory of a community behind the Gospel has been perceived as a highly probable hypothesis (thus it is undoubtedly recognized that the Gospel was not given in a vacuum, but placed in a historical *Sitz im Leben*, even if absolute certainty is unobtainable); (3) the religious background of the Gospel has been discussed, and so the Jewish religious milieu of the Gospel has been established in relation to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, (a) in using historical-critical approaches, literary aspects of the Gospel have largely been ignored, and recently some scholars have recognized the anti-aesthetic bias of historical methods;<sup>243</sup> (b) for the authorship, date, and place of the Gospel, there is no consensus.<sup>244</sup> On the basis of the limitations, historical-critical methods have frequently been challenged and their limitations struggled with.<sup>245</sup> This, however, does not mean that historical methods should be abandoned, because diachronic approaches have already established some

Stoughton, 1928); R.H. Strachan, *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment* (London: SCM Press, 3rd edn, 1941); Sanders, *Fourth Gospel*; Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*; see also Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*; Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel*; see also Howard, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 19-52.

242. See J. Jeremias, *Die Wiederentdeckung von Bethesda: Johannes 5,2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1949), which is translated with major revision by J. Vardaman, C. Burchard, D. Hume and M. Zalampas, *The Rediscovery of Bethesda, John 5:2* (NTAM, 1; Louisville, KY: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966); van Tilborg, *Reading John in Ephesus*.

243. For example, Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*; Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*.

244. See Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 4-8; W.A. Meeks, 'The Divine Agent and his Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel', in E.S. Fiorenza (ed.), *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976), pp. 43-67, who remarks that 'if only we knew with comparable certainty one-tenth as much about the Gospel's author and the setting of his community as we know about Philo and the Alexandrian Jews, then our task would be much simpler' (p. 60).

245. It is beyond the scope of this study to recapitulate the issues of historical-critical methods applied to the Gospel in detail: it has already been done by many scholars; see Howard, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 243-67; S. Neil and T. Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861-1986* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 1988), pp. 335-47. R. Schnackenburg, 'Entwicklung und Stand der johanneischen Forschung seit 1955', in de Jonge, *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 19-44; Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 9-117; de Boer, 'Narrative Criticism'.

important foundation for the reading of the Gospel, and will probably illuminate the ultimate truth of the Gospel.<sup>246</sup> During the 1940s and 1950s, historical-critical approaches were confronted with form, source and redaction criticism.<sup>247</sup> The application of the new methods to the Gospel, however, was not able to change the stature of historical methods in a drastic way, since the new methods were under the big umbrella of historical approaches as noted above. In the early 1980s, a significant shift from historical criticism to literary approaches, more precisely narrative criticism, was made in the study of John's Gospel.

### *Narrative Criticism Applied to John's Gospel*

A pioneer of literary approaches to the New Testament was Amos Wilder who employed the methods of literary criticism in 1964.<sup>248</sup> Since then,

246. See Ashton, *Studying John*, pp. 184-90.

247. In this situation, Johannine scholarship has changed in so many ways from the path of historical-critical approaches. For form criticism applied to John's Gospel, see J. Mulenbourg, 'Literary Form in the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 51 (1932), pp. 40-53; J. Beutler, 'Literarische Gattungen im Johannesevangelium: Ein Forschungsbericht 1919-1980', *ANRW* II, 25.3 (1985), pp. 2506-68; O. Merlier, *Le quatrième évangile: La question johannique* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1962). For source criticism, see F. Neugebauer, *Die Entstehung des Johannesevangeliums: Altes und Neues zur Frage seines historischen Ursprungs* (Arbeiten zur Theologie, 1.36; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1968); R. Schnackenburg, 'Zur Herkunft des Johannesevangeliums', *BZ* 14 (1970), pp. 1-23; A.Q. Morton and J. McLeman, *The Genesis of John* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1980); Teeple, *Literary Origin*; S. Temple, *The Core of the Fourth Gospel* (London: Mowbrays, 1975); Fortna, *Gospel of Signs*; D.M. Smith, 'Sources of the Gospel'; Kysar, 'Source Analysis'; Carson, 'Current Source Criticism'. For redaction criticism, see Martyn, *History and Theology*; K. Gatzweiler, 'La rédaction du quatrième évangile: Deux essais de solution', *La Foi et le Temps* 10 (1980), pp. 359-79.

248. A. Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel* (London: SCM Press, 1964), which is concerned about rhetorical forms and various genres presented in the New Testament. Afterwards several handbooks on these new methods appeared, such as W.A. Beardslee, *Literary Criticism of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970); N.R. Petersen, *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); R. Alter and F. Kermode (eds.), *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987); D.E. Aune, *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (Library of Early Christianity, 8; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987); T. Longman, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Leicester: Apollos, 1987); Mack, *Rhetoric*; Patte, *Structural Exegesis*; Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?*; J.L. Bailey and L.D.V. Broek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1992); L. Ryken, *Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2nd edn, 1992), which was originally published separately as *Words of Delight* and *Words of Life* in 1987;

many scholars began to experiment with literary approaches to the New Testament. This new stream of synchronic approaches was partly due to the uncertainty of fruitfulness of historical criticism and its limitations identified above.<sup>249</sup> The weaknesses of historical-critical methods, in fact, did not directly bring synchronic approaches to the New Testament. It was an outcome of the fruitlessness of form, source and redaction criticism, that a literary method has been applied to the New Testament. For John's Gospel, narrative criticism has dominated after the emergence of Alan Culpepper's work, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* in 1983. In fact, before Culpepper's contribution, there were a number of attempts to examine the literary qualities of the Fourth Gospel,<sup>250</sup> but serious attention was not paid to this: only a few undertook to explore some literary features of the Gospel.<sup>251</sup> The influence of Culpepper's contribution, however, has continued to expand the study of the Gospel. Thus, many adopt narrative criticism for the reading of the Gospel without any critical considerations.<sup>252</sup>

E.S. Malbon and E.V. McKnight (eds.), *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (JSNTSup, 109; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).

249. For the uncertainty of fruitfulness of historical-critical criticism, see A.L. Nations, 'Historical Criticism and the Current Methodological Crisis', *SJT* 36 (1983), pp. 59-71; I.H. Marshall, 'Historical Criticism', in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 126-38; de Jonge, *Jesus, Stranger from Heaven*, pp. 197-200; S.D. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

250. For example, F.R.M. Hitchcock, 'The Dramatic Development of the Fourth Gospel', *Expositor*, Series 7, 4 (1907), pp. 266-79; *idem*, 'Is the Fourth Gospel a Drama?', *Theology* 7 (1923), pp. 307-17; E.B. Pratt, 'The Gospel of John from the Standpoint of Greek Tragedy', *Biblical World* 30 (1907), pp. 448-59; R.H. Strachan, *The Fourth Evangelist: Dramatist or Historian* (New York: George H. Doran, 1925); C.R. Bowen, 'The Fourth Gospel as Dramatic Material', *JBL* 49 (1930), pp. 292-305; M. Connick, 'The Dramatic Character of the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 67 (1948), pp. 159-69; H. Clavier, 'L'ironie dans le quatrième évangile', *SE* 1 (1959), pp. 261-76; J.E. Bruns, 'The Use of Time in the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 13 (1967), pp. 285-90. For more details on the literary analysis of the Gospel before Culpepper, see van Belle, *Johannine Bibliography*, pp. 114-17; Mills, *Gospel of John*, pp. 260-62.

251. See D.W. Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1970); B. Olsson, *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1-11 and 4:1-42* (CBNTS, 6; trans. Jean Gray; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1974); N. Flanagan, 'The Gospel of John as Drama', *The Bible Today* 19 (1981), pp. 264-70.

252. For example, R. Kysar, *John's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); P.D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985); G.R. O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Literary Structure*;

The purpose of narrative criticism employed for the reading of the Gospel is to understand it synchronically. This approach abandons earlier historical methods, and concentrates on the present final form of the Gospel. The approach attempts to understand how the final editor viewed the material used in the Gospel and why it was arranged in this way. Narrative criticism, therefore, is concerned with the literary issues of characterization, plot and structure. The method provides a potentially rich resource for approaching the Gospel as literature. The benefits of narrative criticism applied to the Gospel, therefore, can be summarized as follows: first, it focuses on the text of the Gospel itself. Second, it provides some insight into the Gospel for which the historical background is uncertain, and so offers a fresh interpretation of the Gospel. Finally, it redresses the balance in relation to traditional methods applied to the Gospel, for example, the discovery of some aesthetic features in the Gospel that have largely been ignored by historical approaches.<sup>253</sup>

Even if, however, narrative criticism provides important insights into the meaning of the Gospel, the approach has evoked some objections. Culpepper has already admitted some objections to narrative criticism as follows: (1) it is not legitimate to apply methods developed for the study of modern literature to ancient writings; (2) methods developed for the study of fiction are inappropriate for the study of scripture; and (3) literary

Staley, *Print's First Kiss*; Okure, *Johannine Approach*; H. Boers, *Neither on this Mountain Nor in Jerusalem: A Study of John 4* (SBLMS, 35; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988); F.F. Segovia, *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991); Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*; C.H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1992); T.L. Brodie, *The Gospel according to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); S. van Tilborg, *Imaginative Love in John* (BIS, 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993); D.A. Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning* (JSNTSup, 95; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994); D.F. Tolmie, *Jesus' Farewell to the Disciples: John 13:1-17:26 in Narratological Perspective* (BIS, 12; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995); S. Booth, *Selected Peak Marking Features in the Gospel of John* (American University Studies, 7; Theology and Religion, 178; New York: Peter Lang, 1996); L.P. Jones, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup, 145; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); D. Tovey, *Narrative Art and Act in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup, 151; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); F.J. Moloney, *Belief in Word: Reading John 1-4* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); *idem*, *Signs and Shadows: Reading John 5-12* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996); *idem*, *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998); *idem*, *Gospel of John*; F. Lozada, *A Literary Reading of John 5: Text as Construction* (Studies in Biblical Literature, 20; New York: Peter Lang, 2000).

253. See Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?*, pp. 85-91.



criticism ignores the gains of historical criticism and the nature of the gospels as historical accounts.<sup>254</sup> He did attempt a response to the chorus of objections, but difficulties still remain in narrative criticism.<sup>255</sup> In particular, an anti-historical propensity of narrative criticism is an unavoidable feature.<sup>256</sup> The anti-historical bias of narrative criticism has frequently been pointed out, since the method was adopted in the study of the Gospel.<sup>257</sup> In this respect, Ashton sees narrative criticism as a passing fashion like form, source and redaction criticism, which cannot replace historical criticism.<sup>258</sup> Narrative criticism has faced a new phase in the limitations of the method, since some scholars (who will be discussed in the following section) challenged the methods.

### *Integrative Approaches to John's Gospel*

In the current situation of the conflict of methods in the study of John's Gospel, some scholars, such as Margaret Davies, Mark W.G. Stibbe and Stephen Motyer, have attempted to apply an integrative method to the study of John's Gospel. Their methods are based on integrating both diachronic and synchronic approaches to the Gospel. Their emphases or interests, however, seem to be diverse in terms of integrating diachronic approaches with multiple synchronic approaches.

First, in her monograph, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel* in 1992, Davies undertakes a comprehensive reading of John's Gospel on the basis of a conviction that history, theology and aesthetics are intrinsically related in the Fourth Gospel itself.<sup>259</sup> She believes that a just appreciation of the text requires us to recognize that particular historical situations

254. R.A. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), p. 8.

255. See Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 8-11; G.R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991), pp. 164-68, who succinctly identifies the weaknesses of narrative criticism as follows: (1) a dehistoricizing tendency, (2) setting aside the author, (3) a denial of intended or referential meaning, (4) reductionistic and disjunctive thinking, (5) the imposition of modern literary categories upon ancient genres, (6) a preoccupation with obscure theories, (7) ignoring the understanding of the early church, (8) a rejection of the sources behind the books.

256. See Smalley, *John*, pp. 121-28; Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?*, pp. 91-98.

257. See Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?*, pp. 96-98; Smalley, *John*, p. 127; Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, p. 1; Ashton, *Studying John*, pp. 141-65; de Boer, 'Narrative Criticism', pp. 35-48; Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral*, pp. 164-65.

258. See Ashton, *Studying John*, pp. 141-65, 184-208.

259. Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, p. 7.

affect the nature of any narrative.<sup>260</sup> In the comprehensive approach, structuralism and reader-response criticism as synchronic approaches, which are regarded by her as valuable methods for the study of the Gospel, are intended to integrate with the historical approach.<sup>261</sup> Her contribution, however, is not so much focused on methodologies, but offers some useful studies on features of the Gospel, for example, some aspects of Johannine rhetoric, key concepts and metaphors, and points of historical reference. In her integrative method, therefore, it is hard to find any correlation or interaction between diachronic and synchronic approaches.

Second, Stibbe offers an integrative approach as a new methodology for John's Gospel, and criticizes Culpepper's narrative criticism as ignoring historical enquiries.<sup>262</sup> He clearly states that the purpose of his study is to introduce 'a form of narrative criticism which does full justice to John as a first-century narrative by taking into account historical questions concerning sources and community'.<sup>263</sup> His reason for applying the new approach is that John's storytelling technique cannot properly be apprehended unless a comprehensive exegetical approach, which has room for historical as well as literary questions, is prepared to expose his story. He believes that John's Gospel is 'poetic history: it is a creative re-description of historical tradition in which the concrete reality of Jesus' life is by no means destroyed'.<sup>264</sup> He clearly remarks that in the study of John's Gospel 'we are dealing with history, not with myth, with fact and not with fiction'.<sup>265</sup> In his methodology, (1) structuralism and historical criticism are integrated for showing how narrative critics can identify the deep generic structures of the Gospel,<sup>266</sup> (2) socio-redaction criticism and narrative criticism are combined for demonstrating the possibility of investigating John's narrative as a code determining community values;<sup>267</sup> (3) literary and historical methods are affiliated by relating the significance of the narrative form to the social reconstruction of history.<sup>268</sup> The integrative approaches are applied to John 18–19 where it is demonstrated that John as storyteller re-describes his historical tradition in story form.<sup>269</sup> The methodologies,

260. Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, p. 7.

261. See Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, pp. 7, 44–66, 350–75.

262. See Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 9–12.

263. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, p. 12.

264. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, p. 1.

265. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, p. 122.

266. See Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 30–49.

267. See Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 50–66.

268. See Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 67–92.

269. See Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 96–196.

which combined for an integrative approach, are persuasive and productive in terms of bringing fresh insights, including a fresh view on the Gospel's historicity. However, (a) the argument that Jesus' story is a real-life tragedy based on the detailed comparison between John 18–19 and Euripides' story of Dionysus is questionable in terms of the chronological distance between the Gospel and the comparison text;<sup>270</sup> (b) the identification of Lazarus as the Beloved Disciple, along with the reconstruction of 'the gospel of Lazarus'<sup>271</sup> as John's source needs to fully justify why the author uses the name of Lazarus in ch. 11, and the Beloved Disciple elsewhere;<sup>272</sup> (c) how the four methodologies are integrated is not clear in terms of interpenetration of the four methods, since narrative criticism overpowers his integrative approaches in his study.

Finally, in his recent monograph, Motyer recognizes the crucial need for a method integrating 'the new literary approaches with historical criticism'<sup>273</sup> for the study of John's Gospel. Thus, he employs an integrative method for investigating the relationship between Jesus and the Jews in Jn 8.31–59.<sup>274</sup> For an integrative method, he employs a historical-critical approach as a diachronic approach and reader-response criticism and narrative criticism as synchronic approaches. His reason for using reader-response criticism is for focusing on the reading experience that the text provides; however, for the reading experience his study concentrates on that of a first-century person, rather than a later or a contemporary one. Moreover, the concept of the implied reader in his study is not a purely literary one, but also includes historical figures. This reflects his historical interest and approach. In adopting narrative criticism, plot, irony, symbolism and dialogue are also used in his study.<sup>275</sup> Thus, his integrative method is a holistic approach formulated in relation to the background and foreground information of the text. In his integrative method, (1) some reflections of the social setting of the text by 'mirror-reading'<sup>276</sup> are sought; (2) attention is paid outside of the text for looking at the broad scene of the text; (3) then, the attention returns to the text

270. See Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 121–47.

271. See Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, p. 82.

272. See Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, pp. 148–67, 179–89. For more detailed discussions on the Beloved Disciple, see Charlesworth, *Beloved Disciple*.

273. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, p. 32.

274. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, pp. 32–34, 105–21.

275. See Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, p. 6.

276. The metaphors of window and mirror originally came from the literary critic; see M. Krieger, *A Window to Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964), pp. 3–4.

itself for rereading it against the background.<sup>277</sup> His reason for applying the holistic approach is as follows: 'this movement from the text outwards, and then inwards again, offers us the best hope for a realistic "hearing" of its message within its social setting'.<sup>278</sup> By employing an integrative method of interpretation that holds together the diachronic and the synchronic approaches, he achieves some fruitful results on the issue of the Jews in the Gospel. He concludes that the motivation for anti-Jewish statements in John's Gospel is '*not at all hostile towards the groups concerned*'<sup>279</sup> for the following reasons: (a) 'the language of the Fourth Gospel is comparatively mild according to both Graeco-Roman and Jewish standards'<sup>280</sup> in relation to the nature of first-century polemic; therefore, 'the polemic of John 8 serves not merely to *denounce* but more particularly to *warn*, to *persuade*, in fact to *prompt its own negation*';<sup>281</sup> (b) although the use of the language is complex, the designation of the Jews in the Gospel is not a global appellation of all Abraham's descendants, but refers to 'a distinct group within Judaism, the Judea-based, Torah-loyal adherents of the Yavneh ideals, the direct heirs of pre-70 Pharisaism';<sup>282</sup> (c) the dialogues of Jn 8.31-59 are 'historical points of reference which would be sensed by Jewish readers of the late first century'.<sup>283</sup> His integrative method, however, has a considerable tendency towards a diachronic approach, although synchronic approaches are not totally ignored. In his integrative method, (1) reader-response criticism is reasonably combined with historical approaches in relation to the concept of the implied reader of the Gospel as a historical character in the first century; (2) however, the role of narrative criticism in his integrative method is minimized because it is overpowered by the historical approach, so the historical approach is not sufficiently integrated with narrative criticism or literary criteria in his method.

For the study of John's Gospel, integrative approaches are experimental, but so far the methods are more positive and profitable than using a diachronic approach or a synchronic approach alone. They avoid the anti-aesthetic tendency of diachronic methods and the anti-historical bias of synchronic approaches, although there are some limitations, which will be noted in the next section.

277. See Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, pp. 32-33.

278. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, p. 34.

279. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, p. 211, italics in the original.

280. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, p. 211.

281. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, p. 212, italics in the original.

282. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, p. 213.

283. Motyer, *Your Father the Devil?*, p. 215.

*The Method Adopted in This Study*

The conflict of methods in the study of John's Gospel seems to encourage an integrative method embracing both diachronic and synchronic approaches. Since narrative criticism as a synchronic approach was predominately applied to the Gospel, the need for an integrative method has been widely recognized. In a syntactical and narratological reading of John 9–10, for example, Jan A. du Rand points out that 'criteria of interpretation of classical texts could not and should not one-sidedly be text-internal', and comments that 'the historical information on the possible socio-cultural setting of the Johannine community (although hypothetical) should be linked up with the text-immanent analyses'.<sup>284</sup> In his article, Ashton also notes that 'there is no obvious reason why the two approaches should not be combined'.<sup>285</sup> His remark indirectly implies a possibility of using an integrative method for the reading of the Gospel. After surveying recent Johannine studies, Klaus Scholtissek comments in his conclusion that 'the different methodological approaches demand an integration that provides a self-critical and realistic evaluation of each perspective'.<sup>286</sup> Furthermore, Smalley in his recent review on the Johannine studies expresses the view that the synchronic and diachronic styles of biblical criticism cannot be separated.<sup>287</sup> He implies that a new integrative approach using both disciplines is needed for the study of the Gospel.

The demanding of an integrative method is, therefore, quite clear for John's Gospel. Moreover, if John's Gospel is the final production of a long development of tradition, it could be approached in two ways: as a bearer of previous tradition, and as a final literary production. In this view, synchronic and diachronic approaches to the Gospel could be both valid and complementary. For this study, therefore, an integrative method using both narrative criticism as a synchronic approach and historical

284. J.A. du Rand, 'A Syntactical and Narratological Reading of John 10 in Coherence with Chapter 9', in Beutler and Fortna (eds.), *Shepherd Discourse*, pp. 94–115 (96).

285. Ashton, *Studying John*, p. 208; see de Boer, 'Narrative Criticism', p. 47, who comments that 'Culpepper's own recent work shows that historical and literary approaches need not be mutually exclusive'. In his book, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, Culpepper notes that 'there needs to be dialogue between the two [historical critical approaches and literary approaches]' (p. 5).

286. K. Scholtissek, 'Johannine Studies: A Survey of Recent Research with Special Regard to German Contributions', *CRBS* 6 (1998), pp. 227–59 (254).

287. See S.S. Smalley, 'The Johannine Literature: A Sample of Recent Studies in English', *Theology* 103 (2000), pp. 13–28 (20); see also *idem*, *John*, pp. 121–40.

criticism as a diachronic approach will be employed.<sup>288</sup> The integrative approach may allow the component methods to interpenetrate and interact with each other, and so enrich the understanding of the Gospel. This method could be called *historical narrative analysis* in the light of the following considerations: (1) it sees John's Gospel as a historical document that reflects the situation of the early church, more precisely the Johannine community; (2) it offers the view that the author of the Gospel wrote about the historical Jesus by using a narrative form where the theology of the author is reflected; (3) it analyses the narrative form in the Gospel using the narrative critical devices that are employed in narrative criticism; (4) it does not ignore the fact that sources of the Gospel were used by the author of the Gospel for the theological intentionality of the author. In adopting *historical narrative analysis*, some limitations are unavoidable, for example, (a) there is no absolute certainty about the Johannine community, (b) it is uncertain whether narrative forms employed in the Gospel are the same as modern narrative forms, and (c) sources used in the Gospel are largely untraceable and unidentifiable.

The general approach to be adopted in this study has been identified as *historical narrative analysis*, but something further needs to be said about the specific methodological investment of the present work. The work sets out to show how a significant amount of the materials in the Gospel of John *can* credibly be read in terms of a prophetic Christology. Of course there are times when some of these materials can be read in other ways. The places where I judge another way of reading the materials to be important for John's message I draw attention to this; but the investment of the work is in the part played by prophetic Christology. The way the argument proceeds is by building a cumulative case for the appropriateness of *necessarily* reading specific materials in connection with a prophetic Christology. Confidence that particular passages are to be read with this Christology in mind is gained not so much by eliminating all other possibilities in each case as by showing that such a reading contributes to a well-integrated development of a prophetic Christology perspective through the Gospel as a whole. The degree to which the perspective permeates the Gospel has not yet been appreciated by the Johannine scholarship. It is this gap which the present work seeks to fill.

A survey of material related to the prophetic identity in the Old Testament and late second Temple Judaism will help to develop sensitivity for the kinds of elements that may signal the prophetic in the Gospel of John. Set against this background, some of Jesus' actions, many of his words

288. I do not suggest that the integrative approach can replace other methods: it can be fruitful for this study.

and various features that mark the self-awareness attributed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel can be seen to be presented in the manner that is marked by a prophetic colouration. Again and again the Johannine Jesus acts and speaks in ways that echo the prophetic image embedded in Jewish imagination. It is of course much more certain that a prophetic identity is in view when Jesus is in some way or other directly identified as a prophet; however, the wider phenomenon of colouration frames and gives greater narrative credibility to the instances of more direct identification. In turn the direct identification reinforces confidence that prophetic colouration is present. When Jesus is directly or indirectly identified in prophet language in John, he is, as we will see, not just a prophet, but for the most part the expected eschatological prophet, the one like Moses. The final section of the study works on two fronts to seek to understand the role of the presentation of Jesus in terms of the prophetic. First the role of prophet in the characterization of Jesus is explored. Here we will see that identifying Jesus as a prophet is an important way-station: it sets a foundation for moving further along the journey of discovery to a more profound appreciation of Jesus' identity. Then, in connection with the correlating of prophetic Christology in John with the other main christological categories, the significance of Jesus as a prophet for Johannine Christology is investigated. Two complementary roles are identified: first, a didactic role, parallel to the role in characterization, of providing an entry point for people to begin to discover something more of who Jesus is; second, an apologetic role, as contributing to the Johannine balance between a high-Christology and a low-Christology.

### 3

## ‘PROPHET’ AND PROPHETIC FIGURES AS BACKGROUND FOR JESUS AS PROPHET

Before starting to investigate Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel, what it means to be a ‘prophet’ and the identity of prophetic figures to whom Jesus may be compared need to be precisely clarified. The purpose of this chapter is to investigate these matters. In order to do this, literature in which ‘prophet’ and prophetic figures are described must be examined, but in view of the scope of this study, the range of the literature must be confined. The investigation, therefore, will focus on the Old Testament and some of the literature of the late Second Temple period.<sup>1</sup> This is because the religious background of the Fourth Gospel is more deeply rooted in the Hebrew Scriptures and Jewish tradition than in Hellenistic culture. The discussion will concentrate mainly on texts which use the term נְבִיא or προφήτης and on prophetic figures depicted in the literature. Of course, it is not possible within the space of a single chapter, to detect and discuss in detail. Whenever necessary and relevant, further discussion will be provided in later chapters.

1. On the Greco-Roman prophecy, see Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, pp. 23-79.

2. For the etymology of נְבִיא, see H.P. Müller, ‘נְבִיא’, *TDOT*, IX, pp. 129-50; J. Jeremias, ‘נְבִיא’, *TLOT*, II, pp. 697-710; P.A. Verhoef, ‘Prophecy’, *NIDOTTE*, IV, pp. 1067-78; B. Vawter, ‘Were the Prophets nābî’s?’, *Bib* 66 (1985), pp. 206-19; S. Shaviv, ‘NĀBÎ and NĀĠÎD in 1 Samuel ix 1-x 16’, *VT* 34 (1984), pp. 108-113; J.B. Curtis, ‘A Folk Etymology of NĀBÎ’, *VT* 29 (1979), pp. 491-93; N. Walker, ‘What is NĀBHÎ?’, *ZAW* 73 (1961), pp. 99-100.



*'Prophet' and Prophetic Figures in the Old Testament*

The term 'prophet' (נָבִיא)<sup>3</sup> and prophetic figures in the Old Testament are numerous, so it is beyond the scope of this investigation to cover all of them. This study, therefore, will be confined to the prophets: Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Moses.<sup>4</sup> These prophets seem to be closely related to the Fourth Gospel for the following reasons: (1) the miracles performed by Elijah seem to bear a close parallel to the miracles performed by Jesus in the Gospel, and the name of Elijah is, in particular, actually mentioned in Jn 1.21, 25; (2) like Elijah, the miracles performed by Elisha also seem to have a close affinity to those of Jesus, although his name never appears in the Gospel; (3) Isaiah is apparently the source of the quotations in Jn 1.23 and 12.38-40;<sup>5</sup> (4) Jer. 2.13; 17.13; 23.5; 31.34; 33.22 are probably related to the citations in Jn 6.45; 7.37-38, 42;<sup>6</sup> (5) Moses is clearly mentioned several times in Jn 1.17, 45; 3.14; 5.45, 46; 6.32; 7.19, 22 [twice], 23; 8.5; 9.28, 29. In order to examine the prophets, the texts of the Hebrew Scriptures that are closely related to the prophets will selectively be investigated as relevant, but a detailed exegesis will not be provided in view of the scope of this study. For the investigation of 'prophet' and prophetic figures in the Old Testament, redaction and source-critical

3. In the Old Testament there are alternative titles for prophet, for example, רֹאֶה (1 Sam. 9.9; 2 Sam. 24.11; 2 Kgs 17.13; 1 Chron. 29.29; Isa. 29.10; Amos 7.12), see D. Vetter, 'רֹאֶה', *TLOT*, III, pp. 1176-83; J.A. Naud, 'רֹאֶה', *NIDOTTE*, III, pp. 1007-15; חֹזֶה (2 Sam. 24.11; 1 Chron. 21.9; 25.5; 29.29; 2 Chron. 9.29; 12.15; 29.25), see D. Vetter, 'חֹזֶה', *TLOT*, I, pp. 400-403; J.A. Naud, 'חֹזֶה', *NIDOTTE*, II, pp. 56-61; אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים (1 Sam. 2.27; 9.6; 1 Kgs 13.1-31 [14 times]; 17.24; 2 Kgs 4.9), and הָיָה עֶבֶד (Deut. 34.5; Josh. 1.1, 13; 8.31; 11.12; 12.6; 13.8; 14.7; 22.2, 5; 24.29; Judg. 2.8; 2 Chron. 1.3; 24.6) or אֱלֹהִים עֶבֶד (Neh. 10.30). I will, however, mainly focus on the term נָבִיא because the term is more commonly used for describing prophetic identity in the Old Testament (315 times) than any other words.

4. Although a question in relation to Moses may be raised as to whether he does really deserve to be called a prophet in the first place, in this study I will regard him as a prophet because he is presented as the supreme prototypal prophet for Israel in Deut. 18.9-22 where the term נָבִיא clearly occurs in relation to him. The subject of Moses as the prototypal prophet for Israel will be discussed in a subsection below. For the question whether Moses was a prophet, see B. Witherington III, *Jesus the Seer: The Progress of Prophecy* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), pp. 21-25.

5. F.W. Young, 'A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel', *ZNW* 46 (1955), pp. 215-33.

6. See Freed, *Old Testament Quotations*; Reim, *Studien*, pp. 1-96; Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*; M.J.J. Menken, 'The Old Testament Quotation in John 6.45: Source and Redaction', *ETL* 64 (1988), pp. 164-72; *idem*, 'The Origin of the Old Testament Quotation in John 7:38', *NovT* 38 (1996), pp. 159-74.

theories will not be considered, because (a) such theories would not have much effect on the result of the examination, (b) the scholarly debate on the dates and the reconstructions of the texts continues, and (c) the survey will be concise and concentrate on the present final form of the texts. Now the prophets, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Moses will be investigated in turn in relation to the use of the term 'prophet' and their images as prophet.

### *Elijah*

Elijah is called **נְבִיא** in 1 Kgs 18.22, 36; 19.10, 14, and elsewhere in 2 Chron. 21.12 and Mal. 3.23 (Eng. 4.5).<sup>7</sup> The phrases **אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים** in 1 Kgs 17.18, 24; 2 Kgs 1.9-13 and **הַחֲשָׁבִי** in 1 Kgs 17.1; 21.17, 28; 2 Kgs 1.3, 8; 9.36 are also used for Elijah. The phrase 'man of God' seems to be another epithet for 'prophet' in the case of Elijah,<sup>8</sup> but the meaning of the term 'Tishbite', which is regularly used for him, is uncertain (1 Kgs 17.1; 21.17, 28; 2 Kgs 1.3, 8; 9.36).<sup>9</sup>

Elijah's prophetic ministry was carried out during the reigns of Ahab and Ahaziah (1 Kgs 17.1-19.21; 21.1-29; 2 Kgs 1.1-2.25).<sup>10</sup> In 1 Kgs 17.1-18.46, Elijah seems to be portrayed as a second Moses because of his miraculous works, defying the king Ahab, and insisting on the supremacy of God.<sup>11</sup> He is depicted as the archetypal prophet confronting Ahab on ethical issues in 1 Kgs 21.1-29. What, then, are the characteristics of Elijah as a prophet? (1) He speaks an authoritative word of God that involves the prediction of famine to Ahab (1 Kgs 17.1; cf. Lk. 4.25; Jas 5.17), and commands a widow in Zarephath (1 Kgs 17.5, 10). He himself obeys God's word (1 Kgs 17.5, 10), and his words convey divine promise (1 Kgs 17.13, 14, 16). He confronts Ahab with condemnation for religious infidelity and for social injustice (1 Kgs 17.1; 18.18; 21.20-22; 2 Kgs 1.16). (2) He performed a series of miracles: (a) the feeding miracle in Zarephath where the widow's jar of meal does not empty and her cruse of oil does not fail until

7. In the Historical Books of the Old Testament the term **נְבִיא** occurs 134 times. Most occurrences of the term are related to Elijah (and Elisha).

8. The phrase 'man of God' is also used for Moses in Deuteronomy and Chronicles; see J.M. Hadley, 'Elijah and Elisha', *NIDOTTE*, IV, pp. 572-78, esp. p. 573.

9. See Hadley, 'Elijah and Elisha', p. 573; S.J. De Vries, *1 Kings* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), p. 216; J.T. Walsh, 'Elijah', *ABD*, II, pp. 463-66.

10. The focus of 1 Kgs 17.1-19.21 is on the struggle between Yahweh and Baalism, and 1 Kgs 21.1-29 is on the juridical murder of Naboth and the royal confiscation of his land; 2 Kgs 1.1-2.25 depicts Ahab's son, Ahaziah, as a devotee of Baal-zebul, the god of Ekron, and Elijah's assumption and the prophetic succession.

11. See Hadley, 'Elijah and Elisha', p. 574; De Vries, *1 Kings*, pp. 209-10, who shows how much Elijah's narratives depend on the model of Moses.

the day that the Lord sends rain on the earth (1 Kgs 17.8-16); (b) the miracle of the marvellous restoration of the widow's son who moves from death to life (1 Kgs 17.17-24). After reviving her son, the widow in Zarephath acknowledges Elijah as the chosen bearer of God's own word and a 'man of God' (אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים) in 1 Kgs 17.24. (3) He is an intercessor. He speaks a word of miraculous intercession in 1 Kgs 17.20-21 where he prayed for the widow in Zarephath and her son's life, and his prayer was answered.

### *Elisha*

Elisha as the designated successor of Elijah (1 Kgs 19.16-21; 2 Kgs 2) is one of the notable charismatic prophets of Old Testament times.<sup>12</sup> Elisha, like Elijah, is frequently addressed as a 'man of God' (אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים) as well as a 'prophet' (נָבִיא).<sup>13</sup> Elisha's prophetic mission was undertaken during the reigns of Ahab, Ahaziah and Jehoram (1 Kgs 19.19-21; 2 Kgs 2-13). After his commissioning by Elijah, Elisha's prophetic authority is confirmed by his ability to part the waters of the Jordan (2 Kgs 2.13-14). Elisha's prophetic acts of power are repeated throughout his ministry as follows: (1) he healed the spring outside Jericho of impurities (2 Kgs 2.19-22), and called down a curse on 42 of the boys who taunted him, so two she-bears came out of the woods and mauled them (2 Kgs 2.23-25); (2) he promised a son to the barren Shunammite woman and then revived the son after his death (2 Kgs 4.8-37); (3) he got rid of poison from the pot of stew for the company of prophets (2 Kgs 4.38-41); (4) he fed 100 men with 20 loaves of barley and some fresh ears of grain (2 Kgs 4.42-44); (5) he healed Naaman of leprosy (2 Kgs 5.1-19); (6) he punished Gehazi with leprosy for his dishonesty and greed (2 Kgs 5.20-27); (7) he retrieved a lost axe-head by causing it to float upon the water (2 Kgs 6.1-7); (8) he blinded a Syrian raiding party and led them into Samaria (2 Kgs 6.8-23); and (9) a dead man was revived when he came into contact with Elisha's bones (2 Kgs 13.20-21).

### *Isaiah*

The word נָבִיא occurs seven times in Isaiah (Isa. 3.2; 9.14; 28.7; 29.10; 37.2; 38.1; 39.3).<sup>14</sup> He never presents himself as a 'prophet', but he is

12. See Hadley, 'Elijah and Elisha', pp. 572-78; K.W. Whitelam, 'Elisha', *ABD*, II, pp. 472-73.

13. The phrase 'man of God' (אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים) designating Elisha appears in 2 Kgs 4.9, 16, 21, 22, 25, 27, 40; 5.8, 14, 15, 20; 6.6, 9, 10, 15; 7.2, 17, 18, 19; 8.2, 4, 7, 8, 11, and the word 'prophet' (נָבִיא) in 2 Kgs 3.11; 5.8, 13.

14. For the numerical figures of the word נָבִיא, see A. Even-Shoshan (ed.), *A New Concordance of the Old Testament Using the Hebrew and Aramaic Text* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2nd edn, 1990). Isaiah's wife is also called 'prophetess' in

called **יְשַׁעְיָהוּ בֶן-אֲמֹץ הַנְּבִיא** in Isa. 37.2; 38.1; 39.3.<sup>15</sup> Isaiah's prophetic calling is generally acknowledged on the basis of Isaiah 6,<sup>16</sup> and he is evidently identified as a prophet on the ground of his prophecy.<sup>17</sup>

Isaiah's prophetic role was played out under four Judaeen kings (1.1): Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah. (1) The role of Isaiah as prophet is anchored in his prophecy concerning Judah's future (Isa. 2.1–12.6) and that of the nations (Assyria, Philistia, Moab, Aram, Cush, Egypt, Babylon, Dumah, Arabia and Tyre [Isa. 13.1–23.18]), where the full dimensions of God's judgment and salvation are predicted. The theme of judgment and promise are continued in chs. 24–39. Isaiah's prophecy in chs. 40–66 recognizes that the judgment so clearly prophesied in chs. 1–39 has already happened; therefore, the focus is now on salvation and in particular deliverance from exile.<sup>18</sup> One of Isaiah's distinctive prophecies is messianic prediction, for example, in Isa. 7.14; 9.1–2; 10.27–11.9.<sup>19</sup> (2) In his active prophetic role, Isaiah's symbolic actions as prophet are found as follows: (a) In ch. 20, as his prophetic sign, like Hosea's marriage (Hos. 1–3) and Jeremiah's yoke (Jer. 27), Isaiah takes off his sackcloth and sandals for three years, because God instructs him to play the role of a slave (Isa. 20.2) to illustrate the coming captivity of Egypt and warn his people to place no reliance on help from that quarter;<sup>20</sup> (b) The names of Isaiah's

Isa. 8.3. Sometimes the term 'prophetess' is assumed as a courtesy title for the wife of a prophet, but in the Old Testament several prophetesses are mentioned and no evidence is found for the use of the term as a courtesy title; see K. Koch, *The Prophets* (trans. M. Kohl; 2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1982–83 [1978–80]), I, p. 105.

15. See Jeremias, **נְבִיא**, p. 702, who considers that Isaiah may have seen himself (like Amos) as a seer (**חֹזֶה**); cf. Jer. 1.1; 2.1.

16. See Koch, *Prophets*, I, pp. 108–13; R.E. Clements, *Isaiah 1–39* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), pp. 70–78; J.N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah* (NICOT; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), I, pp. 170–91; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1–12* (trans. J. Bowden; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1983 [1981]), pp. 117–33; J.D.W. Watts, *Isaiah* (WBC; 2 vols.; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), I, pp. 66–77; A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993), pp. 75–80; E.J. Young, *The Book of Isaiah* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965–72), I, pp. 231–65.

17. See Watts, *Isaiah*, I, p. xxviii, who notes that 'Isaiah is portrayed as a prophet'; M. O'Kane, 'Isaiah: A Prophet in the Footsteps of Moses', *JSOT* 69 (1996), pp. 29–51.

18. For the significance of Isaiah's prediction, see Oswalt, *Book of Isaiah*, I, pp. 46–49; Motyer, *Prophecy of Isaiah*, pp. 28–29.

19. See Koch, *Prophets*, I, pp. 123–24, 132–40; Motyer, *Prophecy of Isaiah*, pp. 13–16; W.D. Stacey, *Prophetic Drama in the Old Testament* (London: Epworth Press, 1990), pp. 116–20.

20. See Stacey, *Prophetic Drama*, pp. 122–26; O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 13–39* (trans. R.A. Wilson; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1974 [1973]), pp. 112–18; Oswalt, *Book of*

two sons, **שָׂאֵר יִשׁוּב** (Isa. 7.3) and **מָהֵר שָׁלַל חֵשׁ בָּז** (Isa. 8.3), are also symbolic. The names, which mean 'a remnant will return' and 'swift to the spoil, speed the plunder', were used to emphasize Isaiah's message as a vivid way of showing his contemporaries that Assyria will carry away the riches of Damascus and the people of Samaria (Isa. 8.1-4).<sup>21</sup> (3) He is depicted as a miracle-worker, like other canonical prophets who perform miracles. In Isa. 38.8 (cf. 2 Kgs. 20.8-11) there is the enigmatic story of how Isaiah made 'the shadow cast by the declining sun on the dial of Ahaz turn back ten steps'. (4) His intercessory prayer as a prophetic role is found in Isa. 63.7-64.11 where he asks the Lord to bring about the redemption he has promised.<sup>22</sup> Alec Motyer considers Isaiah's prayer in the pericope, as a 'watchman-intercessor at his task'<sup>23</sup> and F.D. Kidner, as 'one of the most eloquent intercessions of the Bible'.<sup>24</sup>

### *Jeremiah*

The term **נְבִיא** occurs 95 times in Jeremiah, and they are mostly related to Jeremiah's prophetic identity. The written description of his call as prophet in 1.4-19 appears to have been deliberately structured to reflect the account of the call of Moses in Exodus 3. Thus, it seems likely that Jeremiah saw himself as standing firmly in the tradition of Moses. Once in Jer. 1.5 where he seems to know what being a prophet costs, Jeremiah, as Moses had done before, had refused to become a prophet.<sup>25</sup> He himself struggled

*Isaiah*, I, pp. 381-86; Motyer, *Prophecy of Isaiah*, pp. 170-71; Young, *Book of Isaiah*, II, pp. 51-58.

21. See Koch, *Prophets*, I, p. 124; Stacey, *Prophetic Drama*, pp. 113-16, 120-22.

22. Many commentators regard Isa. 63.7-64.11 as a community lament, because of its basic character and psalm form; see C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66* (trans. D.M. Stalker; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1969 [1966]), p. 386; Oswalt, *Book of Isaiah*, II, p. 603; R.N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), pp. 255-56. However, others view the pericope as an intercessory prayer; see Young, *Book of Isaiah*, III, pp. 479-80, who comments that 63.7 is a prayer in 'the theme of the mercies of the Lord' (p. 480); Watts, *Isaiah*, II, pp. 328-29, argues that 'the controlling genre [in Isa. 63.7-64.11] is that of the *sermon-prayer* which is well known from Deuteronomy and Chronicles' (p. 329, my italics).

23. Motyer, *Prophecy of Isaiah*, p. 512.

24. F.D. Kidner, 'Isaiah', *NBC*, pp. 629-70 (668).

25. Jeremiah clearly shows the fate of a prophet throughout his book. Jeremiah's inner suffering is shown in chs. 11-20, for example, Jeremiah is hauled before the temple authorities and put in the stocks in ch. 20. Chapters 26-45 focus on his outward affliction where Jeremiah is threatened with the death sentence (ch. 26), imprisoned in the court of the guard (ch. 32), suffered in a disused water cistern (ch. 38), bound in chains by the Babylonians (ch. 40), ridiculed by Hananiah (ch. 28), ignored by Jehoiakim (ch. 36), and contradicted by Azariah (ch. 43). The prophet Jeremiah, therefore, characterizes what a prophet is by showing his double experience, inner suffering and out-

with his prophetic calling and in his own relationship with God (Jer. 11.18-23; 12.1-6; 15.10-12, 15-21; 17.14-18; 18.18-23; 20.7-13, 14-18).

Jeremiah's prophetic ministry started in the thirteenth year of Josiah (Jer. 1.2-3; 25.3), and continued until the captivity of the people in Babylon.<sup>26</sup> (1) His prophecies are primarily about judgment against Judah and Jerusalem for their disloyalty to God and his covenant (chs. 2-20), although salvation oracles are included (chs. 30-31, 33). His prophetic judgments are concerned not only with Judah and Jerusalem, but also with the nations: Egypt, Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Edom, Damascus, Arabia, Elam and Babylon (Jer. 46.1-51.64). (2) He, like Amos and Hosea, makes considerable use of symbols and pictures to reinforce his message, as follows.<sup>27</sup> (a) He took a waistcloth and buried it by the river (Jer. 13.1-11). When he returned some time later the cloth was ruined. This pictured the way in which Judah, although like a waistcloth it should have been fastened tightly to God, had become useless. (b) He pictured God as the potter and Judah as the clay (Jer. 18.1-12). If the pot was flawed or misshapen then the potter would reshape the clay into something different. Thus Judah must be completely remoulded before the nation could again function as God's people. (c) He is told to buy an earthen flask and go with the elders and senior priests to the Potsherd Gate, there to smash the pot and to declaim God's judgment on Judah and Jerusalem, 'I will smash this nation and this city just as this potter's jar is smashed and cannot be repaired' (Jer. 19.1-15). (d) He went around wearing a yoke trying to explain how real would be the control that Babylon was to have over Judah (Jer. 27.1-28.17). (3) He is a rejected prophet. The temple sermon mentioned in Jer. 26.1-6 and probably recorded in Jer. 7.2-15 appears to have marked a crisis in his ministry.<sup>28</sup> From this point on,

ward affliction; see J. Goldingay, *God's Prophet God's Servant: A Study in Jeremiah and Isaiah 40-55* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1984), pp. 15-30.

26. See Koch, *Prophets*, II, pp. 13-80; E.A. Martens, 'Jeremiah', *NIDOTTE*, IV, pp. 752-55.

27. Stacey, *Prophetic Drama*, pp. 129-70, considers some more symbolic actions such as his celibacy (16.1-4), his being forbidden to mourn (16.5-7) and to feast (16.1-9), his dealing with the Rechabites (35.1-19), his scroll (36.1-32), Tahpanhes (43.8-13), and the book about Babylon (51.59-64); see also K.G. Friebel, *Jeremiah's and Ezekiel's Sign-Acts: Rhetorical Nonverbal Communication* (JSOTSup, 283; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 82-169, 315-29; 351-62; J.R. Lundbom, 'Jeremiah', *ABD*, III, pp. 684-98, esp. p. 697.

28. See J.F.A. Sawyer, *Prophecy and the Prophets of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), pp. 90-92. The account of a prophet's attack on the Temple recurs with variations in ch. 26 and in the Gospels (Mt. 21.12-13; Mk 11.15-19; Lk. 19.45-47; Jn 2.13-22).

opposition appears to have intensified. He was put in the stocks (Jer. 20.2), banned from the temple (Jer. 36.5), mocked and ostracized in various ways (Jer. 17.15; 20.7) and eventually imprisoned (Jer. 37.1–38.28). (4) His prophetic role as an intercessor is found in Jer. 7.16; 11.14; 14.7–9, 11–12; 15.1; 21.2; 37.3; 42.2.<sup>29</sup> He actually prays for his people in Jer. 14.7–9, although his prayer is not answered. He is associated with the intercessory role in Jer. 15.1 where Moses (Exod. 32.11–14; Num. 14.13–24) and Samuel (1 Sam. 7.8–9; 12.19) are invoked precisely to appeal to their potency as intercessors.<sup>30</sup> His prayer practice manifests that intercession is an integral part of a prophet's calling, because his task is not only to speak on God's behalf to people, but also to speak on the people's behalf to God.<sup>31</sup> His intercession is, however, continually prohibited in Jer. 7.16; 11.14; 14.11–12; 15.1. God's repeated prohibition of intercession by Jeremiah can be considered to be a specific exception to a recognized intercessory role on the part of the prophet.<sup>32</sup>

### Moses

The term נָבִיא related to Moses appears once in Num. 12.6 and seven times in Deut. 18.15, 18, 20 [twice], 22 [twice]; 34.10. The call narrative of Moses as prophet is found in Exod. 3.1–4.31. He is portrayed as God's true prophet and a model prophet in Exodus 3–4, 33.7–11; Num. 11.16–17, 24–30; 12.1–15; Deut. 34.10–12. The figure of Moses as a rudimentary form of prophet is also described in Deut. 18.15, 18. In Hos. 12.13, the author claims that Moses was himself a prophet.

The distinctive aspects of Moses as a prophet are as follows: (1) He has an intimate relationship with God which is well expressed by using the idiom פֶּה אֶל-פֶּה ('mouth to mouth') in Num. 12.8 and פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים ('face to face') in Deut. 34.10; Exod. 33.11 (cf. Gen. 32.31; Judg. 6.22; Ezek.

29. See H. Lalleman-de Winkel, *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition: An Examination of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Israel's Prophetic Traditions* (CBET, 26; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), pp. 209–233; Koch, *Prophets*, II, p. 17; S.E. Balentine, 'Jeremiah, Prophet of Prayer', *RevExp* 78 (1981), pp. 331–44.

30. See J.G. McConville, *Judgment and Promise: An Interpretation of the Book of Jeremiah* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993), pp. 50–51; J.A. Thompson, *The Book of Jeremiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), p. 387; J. Bright, *Jeremiah* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), pp. 97–104; D.R. Jones, *Jeremiah* (NCBC; London: Marshall Pickering; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), pp. 214–15; P.C. Craige et al., *Jeremiah 1–25* (WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1991), pp. 194–205.

31. See Goldingay, *God's Prophet*, pp. 31–42.

32. Amos 7.1–6 is certainly a precedent for a prophet's intercessory role; see Gen. 18.23–33; 20.7; Exod. 32.11–14; 1 Sam. 7.5–11; 12.19–23.

20.35).<sup>33</sup> The expression וַיִּבֶּט יְהוָה יְהוֹמָנָה ('he [Moses] beholds the very form of the Lord') in Num. 12.8 also indicates Moses' uniqueness among the prophets in the Old Testament and something peculiar to his experience about direct contact to God.<sup>34</sup> The intimate relationship between God and Moses and his unique position as prophet shows that whereas God had communicated with other prophets through the refractory medium of visions and dreams, he had revealed his will to Moses in a more direct and explicit fashion.<sup>35</sup> (2) Moses is portrayed as a miracle performer: (a) in Exod. 7.14–11.10 he performs the nine miraculous acts; (b) he divides the sea to make a way for the people of Israel in Exod. 14.1–31; (c) he turns bitter water into sweet water by throwing a piece of wood into the water at Marah in Exod. 15.22–25;<sup>36</sup> (d) he provides the miraculous foods, manna and quails, for the people of Israel in Exod. 16.1–36 (cf. Num. 11.16–35); (e) he gives water to the thirsty people of Israel from the rock at Massah and Meribah in Exod. 17.1–7. The miracles performed by Moses clearly show his prophetic identity. (3) Moses' intercession is found in Exod. 32.11–14; 32.30–35 (cf. Deut. 9.18–29); Num. 12.13; 14.11–19, where he intercedes for the whole people and individuals: (a) in Exod. 32.11–14, after the apostasy regarding an image of a calf, God determines to destroy the people of Israel, so Moses intercedes for them; (b) when Miriam challenges Moses' unique authority, she becomes a leper, so Moses intercedes for Miriam's healing in Num. 12.13; (c) in particular, his intercession is highlighted in Exod. 32.30–35 where he offers himself to be blotted out of God's book if God does not forgive the sin of Israel.<sup>37</sup> His intercession is significant for his image as a prophet.<sup>38</sup>

### Summary

So far the term 'prophet' and prophetic figures in the Old Testament have been examined through the prophets Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and

33. A similar expression for an intimate relationship is עֵין בְּעֵין ('eye to eye', Num. 14.14; Isa. 52.8).

34. P.J. Budd, *Numbers* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984), p. 137, comments that the idioms seem to refer to a unique immediacy and directness of revelation to Moses by God.

35. E.W. Davies, *Numbers* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), p. 123.

36. See H.O. Thompson, 'Marah', *ABD*, IV, p. 513.

37. See D.M. Beegle, 'Moses: Old Testament', *ABD*, IV, pp. 909–18; S.E. Balentine, 'Prayer in the Wilderness Traditions: In Pursuit of Divine Justice', *HAR* 9 (1985), pp. 53–74; H.W. Hertzberg, 'Sind die Propheten Fürbitter?', in E. Würthwein and O. Kaiser (eds.), *Tradition und Situation: Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), pp. 63–74.

38. See also Moses' intercession in Exod. 32.11–14; 32.30–35; Num. 14.11–19; Deut. 9.18–29; Budd, *Numbers*, p. 138.



Moses. First, the term נָבִיא (prophet) is explicitly applied to all of them in connection with their prophetic identity. Second, prophetic figures are clearly recognizable in their prophetic ministry as follows: (1) they were a mouthpiece of God, so they received the authoritative word from God in various ways, and they never spoke their own messages; (2) as God's spokesmen they had a special relationship with God; (3) they were able to predict the future through a prophecy that pertains to God's judgment and salvation; (4) sometimes they used symbolic actions for reinforcing their prophetic messages; (5) some of them performed miracles, which are a marker of prophetic identity, but the ability to perform miracles does not always guarantee prophetic identity;<sup>39</sup> (6) they were aware of the function of intercession as one of the prophetic roles.

### *'Prophet' and Prophetic Figures in the Late Second Temple Period*

For investigating 'prophet' and prophetic figures in literature in the late Second Temple period, the literature will be confined to Philo, Josephus, the Samaritan literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha.<sup>40</sup> The focus of the survey will be on the term 'prophet' (נָבִיא or προφήτης) and prophetic figures portrayed in the literature. Although there are some other terms and more prophetic figures in the literature than are included here, the limited scope of this research does not allow an investigation of a full range of prophetic phenomena. Thus, the investigation will not be exhaustive; rather it will be selective as relevant for developing sensitivity for the kinds of elements that may signal the prophetic in the Gospel of John. The literature will not be presented in chronological

39. Deut. 13.1-5 and 18.22 says that false prophets are also able to perform signs and wonders as well as true prophets. See C. Wright, *Deuteronomy* (NIBC, 4; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), p. 179, who comments that 'signs of some kind were an expected part of a prophet's credibility'.

40. There seems to be a prevailing image of 'prophet' and prophetic figures that was formulated before John's Gospel was completed (see Chapter 2, 'Date'). Several passages, for example, Jn 1.21, 25; 4.19, 44; 6.14; 7.40, 52; 9.17, seem to imply such a prevailing image: this will be discussed in the following chapters. In this respect, rabbinic literature, Mandaean literature and Hermetic writings will not be considered in this study because of the date of the literature. For rabbinic literature, see A.J. Saldarini, 'Rabbinic Literature and the NT', *ABD*, V, pp. 602-604. For Mandaean literature, see E. Lupieri, *The Mandaeans: The Last Gnostics* (trans. C. Hindley; ITSORS; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); K. Rudolph, 'Mandaicism', *ABD*, IV, pp. 500-502. For Hermetic writings, see C.H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greek* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935); J.A. Trumbower, 'Hermes Trismegistos', *ABD*, III, pp. 156-57.

order because it is not the aim of this study. The examination will start from Philo and others will follow in due course as mentioned above.

### Philo

In the works of Philo,<sup>41</sup> prophetic figures are identified in relation to various terms, such as ‘prophet’ (προφήτης), ‘divine possession’ (ὑπὸ κατοχῆς ἐνθέου) and ‘corybantic frenzy’ (κορυβαντιᾶν). Philo also identifies prophetic figures in connection with prophetic revelatory experiences and Old Testament prophets. However, due to the limited scope of this study and the fact that prophetic figures are mostly connected with the term προφήτης, I will focus on the term ‘prophet’ and some of the prophetic figures in Philo.

In Philo’s work, the προφητ- word group appears 57 times.<sup>42</sup> Philo uses the term προφήτης in relation to the following prophetic functions depicted in the Hebrew Scripture: (1) the ability to predict the future; (2) the power to know what prayer is to be uttered or sacred rites are to be performed; (3) the authority to receive from God certain communications by which people were to be guided in their life; (4) the ability to know things which cannot be perceived by the senses.<sup>43</sup> Philo, however, does not formally state the prophetic functions, but they can be found in his description of the achievements of Moses.

Moses is described as ‘the prophet’, ‘chief prophet’ (ἀρχιπροφήτης) in *Mut. nom.* 103, 125; *Somm.* II.189, ‘primary prophet’ (πρωτοπροφήτης) in *Quaest. in Gen.* I.86, ‘a prophet of the highest quality’ (προφήτης γέγονε δοκιμώτατος) in *Vit. Mos.* II.187, ‘the most perfect of the prophets’ (τοῦ τελειοτάτου τῶν προφητῶν) in *Dec.* 175 and ‘the most

41. For the texts and translations of the works of Philo, F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo* (LCL; 10 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–62) and R. Marcus, *Philo Supplement* (LCL; 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953) are used in this study.

42. The term προφητεία appears 20 times, προφητεύω 16 times, προφητικός 18 times, προφήτης twice, and προφητοτόκος once in *Somm.* I.254. The special terms ἀρχιπροφήτης (thrice in *Mut. nom.* 103, 125, and *Somm.* II.189) and πρωτοπροφήτης (once in *Quaest. in Gen.* I.86) are also used; see P. Borgen, K. Fuglseth and R. Skarsten (eds.), *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria* (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

43. See H.A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948), II, pp. 11–22, who argues that Philo substitutes the term ‘prophecy’ for the Platonic term ‘recollection’ (ἀνάμνησις); see also D. Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979), pp. 31–33.

holy prophet' (ὁ ἱερώτατος προφήτης) in *Virt.* 218.<sup>44</sup> The word προφήτης is also used for describing many characters in the Pentateuch, including Adam, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Aaron, for example;<sup>45</sup> for Philo regards everything in the Pentateuch as prophetic oracles.<sup>46</sup> In Philo, the term προφήτης is one of the most common titles for Moses.<sup>47</sup>

Philo distinguishes three kinds of prophecy delivered through Moses: (1) the creation of the world; (2) history; (3) legislation (*Praem. poen.* 1, 2). He describes Moses' giving of the law as a prophetic action (*Congr.* 132; *Virt.* 51; *Spec. leg.* II.104; *Vit. Mos.* II.188-191), and identifies Moses' prophetic office with the ecstatic vision (*Vit. Mos.* II.188, 191, 280 cf. 272). Philo deals with Moses as priest, but he still continues to call him prophet in *Vit. Mos.* II.16-17 and describes him as being 'armed with prophetic knowledge' in *Praem. poen.* 56. In this respect, the figure of Moses as prophet seems to shape Philo's idea of the prophetic image.

Philo regards the prophet as interpreter of God (*Praem. poen.* 55), instrument (mouthpiece) of God (*Rer. div. her.* 259; *Quaest. in Gen.* III.10) and man of God (*Gig.* 61; *Deus imm.* 138). He clearly notes that 'a prophet (being a spokesman) has no utterance of his own, but all his utterance came from elsewhere, the echoes of another's voice' in *Rer. div. her.* 259. He considers the divine spirit, the divine voice, angels<sup>48</sup> and prophetic dreams as means of God's prophetic communications. So, for example, Abraham is a prophet in relation to his prophetic vision (*Rer. div. her.* 249, 264). Moses is an interpreter of God (*Vit. Mos.* II.188, 191, 269; *Praem. poen.* 55), and is pictured as 'possessed and prophesying' (κατεχομένου καὶ προφητεύοντα) in *Rer. div. her.* 260.

Philo shows that he regards himself as a prophet by describing his own prophetic revelatory experience as the highest source of his knowledge. In describing his own prophetic experience, Philo uses the terms 'divine possession' (ὑπὸ κατοχῆς ἐνθέου) and 'corybantic frenzy' (κορυβαντιᾶν) in *Migr. Abr.* 35; *Cher.* 27. As Wolfson has noted, Philo's accounts of his

44. Moses is introduced as 'seer'; see *Vit. Mos.* II.269; cf. *Vit. Mos.* I.266. For Philo's connection of 'seer' and 'prophet', see Fascher, *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ*, pp. 155-56.

45. See for Adam, *Leg. all.* II.1; for Noah, *Rer. div. her.* 260; for Abraham, *Rer. div. her.* 258, 266; for Isaac, *Rer. div. her.* 261; for Jacob, *Rer. div. her.* 261; and for Aaron, *Det. pot. ins.* 39; *Migr. Abr.* 84, 169.

46. *Vit. Mos.* II.37-40, 188. In Philo's writings, Samuel (*Migr. Abr.* 38, *Rer. div. her.* 78), Elijah (*Deus imm.* 136, 138), and Hosea (*Plant.* 138) are also called as prophet, but he rarely refers to the Prophets and other Old Testament writings.

47. See Wolfson, *Philo*, II, p. 16.

48. See J.R. Levison, 'The Prophetic Spirit as an Angel according to Philo', *HTR* 88 (1995), pp. 189-207.

own personal experience of apparent prophetic inspiration pertain only to the attainment of knowledge of things by inspiration when ordinary reasoning failed him and not to prophecy in the biblical sense.<sup>49</sup> In sum, although the prophetic images in Philo are broader than those of the Old Testament, his idea of 'prophet' and prophetic figures is basically rooted in the concept of prophet in the Hebrew Scriptures.

### *Josephus*

In the works of Josephus,<sup>50</sup> various prophetic figures and prophecies are introduced, such as the Essene prophets (Menaham and Simon), the prophecy of Judas, the prophecy of the Pharisee named Samaia and the oracle of Joshua ben Hananiah. This examination, however, will concentrate on the term 'prophet' and prophetic figures, as adequate for identifying the main features of Josephus's understanding.

The προφητ- word group appears 404 times in the works of Josephus.<sup>51</sup> The term προφητεία (prophecy, prediction [of God by the mouth of a prophet]; gift of prophecy; office [function] of a prophet) occurs 38 times, προφητεύω (to be a prophet; to foretell, predict, prophesy, speak [impelled by the spirit of God]), announce [the will of God]) 58 times, προφήτης (prophet, seer; author of biblical prophecies) 289 times, προφήτις (prophetess) 3 times<sup>52</sup> and ψευδοπροφήτης (false prophet) 16 times.<sup>53</sup>

Josephus *almost* always uses the word προφήτης for referring to the canonical prophets.<sup>54</sup> In Josephus's writings, the word προφήτης is used for describing prophets who engaged in the forecasting of future events, for example, Moses (*Ant.* 4.312, 313, 320), Samuel (*Ant.* 5.340), Nathan (*Ant.* 7.91-92), Elijah (*War* 3.340; *Ant.* 9.27), Elisha (*Ant.* 9.74, 183), Jeremiah (*Ant.* 10.79), Ezekiel (*Ant.* 10.79) and Daniel (*Ant.* 1.276;

49. See *Migr. Abr.* 34-35; *Cher.* 27; *Somn.* II.38, 252; Wolfson, *Philo*, II, p. 54.

50. The works of Josephus are *Life of Josephus*, *Against Apion*, *The Jewish War*, and *Jewish Antiquities*. For the texts and translations of the works of Josephus, H.St.J. Thackeray and R. Marcus (trans.), *Josephus* (LCL; 10 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926-65) is used in this survey.

51. See K.H. Rengstorff, *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus* (4 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973-83).

52. Josephus uses προφήτις of the prophetess Δαβώρα in *Ant.* 5.200, and Ὑολδά in *Ant.* 10.59, 60. The exact names do not occur in the Hebrew Scriptures, but they are to be identified with Deborah and Huldah.

53. For the use of ψευδοπροφήτης in Josephus, see J. Reiling, 'The Use of ΨΕΥΔΟΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in the Septuaginta, Philo and Josephus', *NovT* 13 (1971), pp. 147-56.

54. See J. Blenkinsopp, 'Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus', *JJS* 25 (1974), pp. 239-62 (240).

10.266), all people already identified as prophets in the Old Testament.<sup>55</sup> Josephus sees prophets as essentially passive, occupied by inspiration (*Ant.* 4.118), speaking even against their own will and intention in order to accomplish God's purpose. In this respect, Moses is regarded as 'the prophet' *par excellence* (*Ant.* 5.20; *Apion* 2.218, 286). In his writing *Apion* 1.37-41, Josephus considers that the prophetic ministry ceased with the completion of the Hebrew Scriptures, and so he has generally a negative view of those who claimed to be prophets during the Second Temple period.<sup>56</sup> Thus, Josephus employs the word *προφήτης* almost exclusively in relation to figures from the distant past, and does not ordinarily apply the word to himself or to others of his own day.

Josephus apparently regards himself as having *prophetic powers* in *War* 3.351-54, and compares his prophetic role with that of the biblical prophets, such as Elijah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Daniel, but he does not use the term *προφήτης* for himself. Josephus, however, positively uses the word *προφήτης* for portraying the prophetic figure of John Hyrcanus in *War* 1.68-69 (cf. *Ant.* 13.299-300). The use of the word *προφήτης* for John Hyrcanus is exceptional. Another exception is found in *War* 6.286, 288 where the term *προφήτης* is used for a group of prophets. Josephus calls these prophets *sign prophets*, because they promised miracles.<sup>57</sup> In the writings of Josephus, the word *προφήτης* and related terms are overwhelmingly used with respect to the Old Testament prophets.<sup>58</sup>

After describing the prophetic figure of John Hyrcanus by the word *προφήτης* and related terms, Josephus no longer uses the *προφητ*- word group for describing any other prophetic figures, who did not belong to

55. See Blenkinsopp, 'Prophecy', pp. 243-46; L.H. Feldman, 'Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus', *JTS* 41 (1990), pp. 386-422, esp. pp. 387-94.

56. Josephus explains in *Apion* 1.41: 'From Artaxerxes to our own time the complete history has been written, but has not been deemed worthy of equal credit with the earlier records, because of the failure of the exact succession of the prophets'. This viewpoint seems to reflect the common Jewish opinion, as it is reflected in later rabbinic literature, *t. Sof.* 13.3: 'When the latter prophets died, that is, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, then the Holy Spirit came to an end in Israel'; see also *m. Sof.* 9.12; *t. Yom.* 9b, *Sof.* 48b, *Sanh.* 11a; cf. 1 Macc. 4.45-46; 9.27; 14.41. For further discussion see Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, pp. 103-106; Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, pp. 7-34.

57. For more detailed discussion on the sign prophets, see Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, pp. 123-44; P.W. Barnett, 'The Jewish Sign Prophets—A.D. 40-70: Their Intentions and Origin', *NTS* 27 (1981), pp. 681-97.

58. D.E. Aune, 'The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 419-21, who argues that 'it can no longer be claimed that Josephus restricts the term *προφήτης* to canonical prophets' on the basis of the evidence found in *War* 6.286 and *Ant.* 1.240-41.

the canonical prophets, except for polemical references to such as Theudas (*Ant.* 20.97), the Egyptian imposter (*War* 2.261; *Ant.* 20.169), and to the men hired by the authorities to lull the people into deceptive hopes (*War* 6.286).<sup>59</sup> For example, the prophet named Theudas, who arose during the procuratorship of Fadus, is described in *Ant.* 20.97-98.<sup>60</sup> According to Josephus's narrative, Theudas claimed to be a prophet, which is one of the few times Josephus uses the *προφητ*- word group for an extracanonical prophet, but he considers him to be an impostor (*γόης*).<sup>61</sup>

In his writings, Josephus regards a prophet as one who has *predictive powers* rather than miraculous actions; however, he does not always use the word *προφήτης* and related terms for them. In *War* 3.351-54, Josephus offers his own prophetic experience and activity. Josephus prophesied the events that transpired under the Romans in 66-70 CE, including the destruction of Jerusalem (*Ant.* 10.266, 276; *War* 4.163, 318, 94, 109-10), but he does not apply the term *προφήτης* for himself, as has been mentioned above.<sup>62</sup> The reason for employing the *προφητ*- word group for John Hyrcanus (135-104 BCE) described in *War* 1.68-69 (cf. *Ant.* 13.299-300) is uncertain in terms of the restriction of the term *προφήτης*. Three individual Essenes are portrayed in prophetic images because of their prophetic powers: (1) The prophecy of Judas the Essene concerning the murder of Antigonos by his brother Aristobulus I in *War* 1.78-80 and *Ant.* 13.311-13; (2) An Essene prophet, Menaham, who predicted the rise of Herod (the Great) to kingship while Herod was still a boy in *Ant.* 15.373-79; (3) The Essene prophet named Simon, who correctly interpreted a dream of Archelaus who was warned of his impending fall from power in

59. The use of 'prophet' here may be no more than a reflection of the accompanying publicity granted to these men.

60. For a discussion of the person named Theudas, see R.L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study* (JSNTSup, 62; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), p. 334 n. 65; see also Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, pp. 114-16; D. Hill, 'Jesus and Josephus' "Messianic Prophets"', in E. Best and R. McL. Wilson (eds.), *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), pp. 143-54, esp. pp. 147-48.

61. Theudas's prophecy consisted of a call for the people to follow him and a promise that certain events would follow: the Jordan River would part and they would cross it with ease. However, we do not know how the action of parting and crossing the Jordan was to be interpreted; see R.A. Horsley, "'Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus", *CBQ* 47 (1985), pp. 435-63, who suggests two possibilities, either a reverse conquest or a new Exodus and/or conquest like Moses (pp. 456-57).

62. See Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, pp. 139-44; Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, pp. 35-79.

the dream in *War* 2.112-13 and *Ant.* 17.345-48. In his concluding summary concerning the Essene prophets in general, Josephus notes that 'many of these men have indeed been [graciously granted] a knowledge of divine things because of their virtue' (*Ant.* 15.379), however, he does not use the word *προφήτης* and related terms for them. As for other prophetic figures, the Pharisee named Samaias is depicted in relation to his prophecy in *Ant.* 14.172-76; 15.3-4, but Josephus does not employ the word *προφήτης* and related terms.<sup>63</sup> Samaias' prophecy consists of predicting the actions of a political leader, but the method of the prophecy is not known.<sup>64</sup> Josephus also mentions Joshua ben Hananiah, who began to pronounce his oracle in the temple, in *War* 6.300-309 and an unnamed prophet, during the final days of the siege of Jerusalem, in *War* 6.285; however, the word *προφήτης* and related terms are not used.

In sum, Josephus understands 'prophet' and prophetic figures in relation to the ability of prediction, but he does not always employ the *προφήτ*-word group for describing prophets and prophetic figures in his writings. For 'prophet' and prophetic figures Josephus takes a canonical perspective, and believes that prophetic ministry ceased in the period of the Old Testament. Thus, Josephus was almost always antagonistic to those who have to be identified as prophets during the late Second Temple period, and tried to avoid the use of the word *προφήτης* and related terms in connection with them. Even Josephus's own prophetic activity does not attract this language. The use of the language in relation to John Hyrcanus and a group of prophets is exceptional.

### *The Samaritan Literature*

There are many written Samaritan sources,<sup>65</sup> for example, the Samaritan

63. The two accounts conflict as to whether the prophecy was uttered by a Pharisee named Pollion (*Ant.* 15.3-4) or his disciple Samaias (*Ant.* 14.172-76). In *Ant.* 15.3-4, Pollion is named along with his disciple Samaias, but it is actually Pollion who utters the prophecy. What is important, however, is that both Samaias and Pollion are identified with Pharisees in *Ant.* 15.3-4.

64. Horsley, "Like One of the Prophets of Old", who argues concerning *Ant.* 17.41-45 that since no particular Pharisaic prophet is mentioned, their prophecy 'appear[s] to have been a kind of political "lobbying" through application of their own or current "messianic" hopes' (p. 449); see also Webb, *John the Baptizer*, pp. 329-30, who argues against Horsley; see Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, pp. 148-52.

65. See J.-P. Rothschild, 'Samaritan Manuscripts: A Guide to the Collections and Catalogues', in A.D. Crown (ed.), *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989), pp. 771-94. For the Samaritan literature in general, see R.T. Anderson, 'Samaritans', *ABD*, V, pp. 940-47, esp. pp. 945-46; B.K. Waltke, 'Samaritan Pentateuch', *ABD*, V, pp. 932-40; A.L. Loewenstamm, 'Samaritan Chronology',

Pentateuch,<sup>66</sup> the Samaritan Targum,<sup>67</sup> *Memar Marqah*,<sup>68</sup> Liturgical Works,<sup>69</sup> Asatir,<sup>70</sup> the Samaritan Book of Joshua,<sup>71</sup> 1 and 2 Chronicles.<sup>72</sup> This study, however, will not exhaustively examine all Samaritan literature, because most of the literature is irrelevant due to its late editions; for example, in the Samaritan Book of Joshua 'the oldest part of the manuscript originates from the year 1362',<sup>73</sup> and the Samaritan Pentateuch, which survives in about 150 manuscripts and some of which are in a fragmentary state, dates 'from about the 9th century C.E. to the present century'.<sup>74</sup> However, it should be noted that although some of the manuscripts of the Samaritan literature are quite late editions, it is assumed that behind the Samaritan literature there is a long historical background that may be able to reflect primitive features of the Samaritan religious practice. In this view, almost all of the Samaritan literature may be important in relation to this study. This study, however, must be selective as relevant, because of the aim of this study. This investigation, therefore, will be confined to *Memar Marqah*

*EncJud*, XIV, pp. 748-52; *idem*, 'Samaritan Language and Literature', *EncJud*, XIV, pp. 752-57; J. Bowman, *Samaritan Documents Relating to their History, Religion and Life* (POTS, 2; Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick Press, 1977); J.A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect, their History, Theology and Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1968 [1907]), pp. 270-316.

66. See R.T. Anderson, 'Samaritan Pentateuch: General Account' in Crown, *Samaritans*, pp. 390-96; E. Tov, 'Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch' in Crown, *Samaritans*, pp. 397-407; J.D. Purvis, *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (HSM, 2; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), pp. 88-118.

67. See A. Tal, 'Targum', in A.D. Crown, R. Pummer and A. Tal (eds.), *A Companion to Samaritan Studies* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1993), pp. 226-28.

68. See J. Macdonald (ed. and trans.), *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah* (BZAW, 84; 2 vols.; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1963).

69. See A.E. Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1909).

70. See A. Tal, 'Asatir', in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion*, p. 34.

71. See H. Shehadeh, 'Book of Joshua', in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion*, pp. 42-43.

72. See P. Stenhouse, 'Samaritan Chronicles', in Crown (ed.), *Samaritans*, pp. 218-65; J.M. Cohen, *A Samaritan Chronicle: A Source-Critical Analysis of the Life and Times of the Great Samaritan Reformer, Baba Rabbah* (SPB; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981), pp. 174-99.

73. J. Bowman, *The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity* (PTMS, 4; Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick Press, 1975), p. 15.

74. Anderson, 'Samaritans', p. 945.



and the Samaritan Liturgy,<sup>75</sup> because they are relatively early compared to other Samaritan literature, and may be able to provide a reliable picture of the Samaritan religion.<sup>76</sup> The focus of the survey will be on the figure of Moses, because almost always the word 'prophet' is used in relation to him, as will be discussed.<sup>77</sup> Along with the figure of Moses as prophet, the Samaritan eschatological prophet, who is called *Taheb*, will briefly be discussed, although the term 'prophet' is rarely used in connection with the *Taheb*.

The word 'prophet' is predominantly used for describing the figure of Moses in the Samaritan literature. Designations for the prophetic figure of Moses include, for example, 'the great prophet Moses',<sup>78</sup> 'the prophet Moses',<sup>79</sup> 'Moses our prophet'.<sup>80</sup> In the Samaritan tradition, it is a core belief that Moses as mediator of the Torah deserves adoration.<sup>81</sup> In the Samaritan Liturgy, Moses is described as 'Exalted man, lord of all the world, the crown of humanity, who was sent as saviour of Israel ... the great prophet Moses, lord of all worlds'.<sup>82</sup> In *Memar Marqah* 6.9, it is said of Moses that:

this is the prophet whose prophethood is a treasure ... the sun of prophethood, like whom there is no prophet from the whole human race. The living listened to him, the dead feared him; heaven and earth did not disobey his words.

In view of Moses' description in the Samaritan literature, it should be noted that Deuteronomy 32–34 is important for the origins of Samaritan ideas about Moses. 'Not only will there be no other prophet like him

75. For the text and translation of *Memar Marqah*, I will use the edition of Macdonald, *Memar Marqah*, and for the Samaritan Liturgy, Cowley, *Liturgy*, will be used.

76. The Samaritan Pentateuch also must be very significant for this study, but there is no considerable difference between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Pentateuch of the Hebrew Scriptures, so it will be omitted.

77. See J. Macdonald, *The Theology of the Samaritans* (NTL; London: SCM Press, 1964), pp. 204–11.

78. *Memar Marqah* 2.2, 4, 5, 7–10, 12; 3.10; 4.1–12; 5.1–4; 6.4, 7–11; Cowley, *Liturgy*, p. 877, line 23.

79. *Memar Marqah* 2.7, 9; 4.1, 9; 4.12; 6.6.

80. Cowley, *Liturgy*, p. 489, line 13.

81. J. Macdonald, 'The Samaritan Doctrine of Moses', *SJT* 13 (1960), pp. 149–62, who notes that 'the Samaritan doctrine of Moses is the second tenet of the Samaritan Creed' (p. 149); see also Anderson, 'Samaritans', p. 946; J. Bowman, 'The Exegesis of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans and among the Rabbis', in P.A.H. de Boer, *Oudtestamentische Studiën* (OTS, 8; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950), pp. 220–62; Montgomery, *Samaritans*, pp. 225–32.

82. Cowley, *Liturgy*, p. 726, lines 21–22.

(Deut. 34.10), but heaven and earth were obedient to him, a thought derived and expanded in cosmic terms from Deut. 32.1'.<sup>83</sup> Moses' prophetic role is clearly described as the spokesman of God in *Memar Marqah* 1.9 and the role of the intercessor in *Memar Marqah* 4.7.<sup>84</sup> Moses is also described as having prophetic power in *Memar Marqah* 2.9; 3.3. John Macdonald notes that 'if we were to write a history of the Samaritans' understanding of prophecy, we would be writing entirely about Moses' prophethood'.<sup>85</sup> Ferdinand Dexinger also says that 'Moses is the prophet *par excellence* in Samaritanism ... [and he] is practically ... the only acknowledged prophet'.<sup>86</sup> It is, therefore, crystal clear that Moses is the most important prophetic figure in the Samaritan literature.

The *Taheb* is depicted as the Samaritan eschatological prophet in the Samaritan literature.<sup>87</sup> There was a reasonably strong expectation of an eschatological figure in the Samaritan community. Isaac Kalimi and James D. Purvis note that 'the earliest witness to the Samaritan belief that the *Taheb* will reveal the hidden vessels are of the first century C.E.'. <sup>88</sup> The term *Taheb* means 'to return', 'returning one'.<sup>89</sup> In the Samaritan tradition, the Samaritan prophet, *Taheb*, is to come in the fullness of time

83. Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 149.

84. See also Cowley, *Liturgy*, p. 749, line 2.

85. Macdonald, *Theology*, p. 204.

86. F. Dexinger, 'Moses', in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion*, pp. 160-62 (160-61).

87. For example, *Memar Marqah* 2.9; 3.3; 4.12 and Cowley, *Liturgy*, p. 348, lines 16-17; p. 425, line 5.

88. I. Kalimi and J.D. Purvis, 'The Hiding of the Temple Vessels in Jewish and Samaritan Literature', *CBQ* 56 (1994), pp. 679-85 (685 n. 18). How much alive this hope was in the times of Jesus may be seen from Josephus, *Ant.* 18.85-89. According to Josephus, in 36 CE there arose under Pontius Pilate a Samaritan who summoned people to go with him up Mt Gerizim and promised he would show those who came with him the hidden vessels which Moses had put there; see also M.F. Collins, 'The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions', *JSJ* 3 (1972), pp. 97-116; Krämer *et al.*, 'προφήτης, προφήτις, κτλ', pp. 826-27; M. Gaster, *The Samaritans: Their History, Doctrine and Literature* (The Schweich Lectures; London: British Academy, 1925), pp. 90-91. *Contra*, see B.W. Hall, *Samaritan Religion from John Hyrcanus to Baba Rabba: A Critical Examination of the Relevant Material in Contemporary Christian Literature, the Writings of Josephus, and the Mishnah* (Studies in Judaica, 3; Sydney: Mandelbaum Trust, University of Sydney, 1987), pp. 226-53.

89. See F. Dexinger, 'Taheb', in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion*, pp. 224-26 (224); Bowman, *Samaritan Documents*, pp. 263-83; Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, pp. 362-71. For detailed discussion on the *Taheb*, see F. Dexinger, *Der Taheb: Ein 'messianischer' Heilsbringer der Samaritaner* (Kairos, Religionswissenschaftliche Studien, 3; Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1986).

(*Memar Marqah* 4.12), and comes to be a restorer of the true worship.<sup>90</sup> *Memar Marqah* 4.12 says that the *Taheb* will reveal the truth, and so will be able to proclaim everything including the right place of worship (cf. Jn 4.25). The figure of the *Taheb* is depicted as the one who will come in the future: *Memar Marqah* 2.9, 'when the *Taheb* comes he will reveal the truth and God will glorify the dead', and 4.12, 'the *Taheb* will come in peace to repossess the place which God chose for those good people'. In *Memar Marqah* 3.3, 'The great prophet Moses ... spoke concerning Israel words of blessing ... He will come ... and seek out their enemy and deliver Israel'. Here it is clear that the *Taheb* is identified with Moses. Thus it can be said that the figure of the *Taheb* is modelled on Moses. In the Samaritan literature, therefore, the *Taheb* is regarded as *Moses redivivus*, who is promised in Deut. 18.15, 18.<sup>91</sup> In the Samaritan literature, therefore, prophetic figures are extremely focused on the figure of Moses, who was the great prophet, and who will come back in future. Although the Samaritans expected an eschatological prophet, the *Taheb*, who will reveal the truth including the right place of worship, the figure of the *Taheb* is identified with Moses.

#### *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

In the Dead Sea Scrolls,<sup>92</sup> prophetic figures and prophecies are described in relation to the term **נביא**, although sometimes prophets are given the epithet 'his [God's] servants' in the Qumran scrolls, for example, 1QS 1.3; 1QpHab 2.9; 7.5; 4Q166 2.5, but there is no instance that **עבד** is employed for prophets without the title **הנביא**.<sup>93</sup> Of the various prophetic figures and prophecies in the Qumran scrolls I will focus on the word

90. See Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 362.

91. See *Memar Marqah*, 1.9; 2.9; 3.3; 4.7-9; Macdonald, 'Samaritan Doctrine', p. 157, who says that 'Tahebship is the true role of Moses'.

92. For the texts and translation of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the edition of F.G. Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pbk edn, 2000) is used in this study.

93. The other title **משיח** is used for prophets as anointed by the spirit of God in the Qumran literature, for example, 1QM 11.8; CD-A 2.12; 6.1. The term **חוריה** is also occasionally utilized for describing prophets and prophetic activity in Israel's past, for example, in 1QM 11.7-8; CD-A 2.12. However, the use of the terms **משיח** and **חוריה** are not very significant in terms of prophetic figures and prophecies, so they will not be examined; see J.E. Bowley, 'Prophet and Prophecy at Qumran', in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), II, pp. 354-78; M. Burrows, 'Prophecy and the Prophets at Qumran', in B.W. Anderson and W. Harrelson (eds.), *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 223-32.

נביא in connection with prophetic figures and prophecies for two reasons: (1) because prophetic figures and prophecies are mostly related to the term נביא; (2) in order to limit appropriately the scale of this research.

In the Qumran scrolls, the word נביא (including הנביא and נביאים, but excluding possible reconstructions) appears more than thirty times in relation to prophetic figures according to the lists currently available.<sup>94</sup> The prophetic figures described by the word נביא are almost always the prophets of the Old Testament.<sup>95</sup> Many references to prophets are found in formulas identifying a source before a citation.<sup>96</sup> The Qumran community seems to regard Moses as prophet, although the title נביא is never directly applied to him,<sup>97</sup> because in the Qumran scrolls the name of Moses appears in relation to the use of the term הנביאים, which refers to a group of prophets, for example, 1QS 1.3, 8.15-16; 4Q175 1-8; 4Q504 3.12-13; 4QMMT C.10, 17; cf. 1QpHab 2.9, 7.5, 8; CD 7.17.<sup>98</sup>

94. For the numerical figures, the concordance of J.H. Charlesworth, L.G. Hickerson, S.R. Starbuck, L.T. Stuckenbruck and R.E. Whitaker, *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991) is used in this study. It is actually difficult to obtain precise statistical figures; see also K. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).

95. The word נביא appears in the Qumran scrolls with respect to the name of the classical prophets mentioned in the Old Testament: Isaiah (CD-A 4.13; 7.10; 4Q174 1.15), Jeremiah (4Q182 1.4), Ezekiel (CD-A 3.21; 4Q174 1.16), Amos (5Q4), Habakkuk (1QpHab 1.1; 7.1) and Zechariahs (CD-B 19.7). It is assumed that the *peshtarim* on Hosea (4Q166-167), Micah (1Q14, 4Q168), Nahum (4Q169), Zephaniah (1Q15) and Malachi (5Q10) would contain their names as prophet in the texts, if their complete texts were preserved. The name of Elijah and Elisha are both mentioned in 4Q382 frags. 9+11, 6; see G.J. Brooke, 'Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives', in Flint and VanderKam, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, I, pp. 271-301, esp. pp. 272-78; Burrows, 'Prophecy and the Prophets', pp. 223-24; Bowley, 'Prophet and Prophecy', pp. 360-66; G.J. Brooke, 'E Pluribus Unum: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls', in T.H. Lim *et al.* (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), pp. 107-19, esp. pp. 118-19.

96. For instance, CD-A 3.21, 7.10; 4Q174 1.16; see J. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7 (1960-61), pp. 297-333.

97. See Brooke, 'Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives', pp. 272-75.

98. David also seems to be regarded as a prophet in the Qumran community, although the word נביא is not directly used. In 11QPs<sup>a</sup> 27.4-11, David is introduced as composer of his myriad of psalms and songs through divine *prophecy*. The New Testament also speaks of David as a prophet (Acts 2.29-31; cf. 1.15-26). See C.A. Evans, 'David in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in S.E. Porter and C.A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup, 26; RILP, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 183-97; Brooke, 'Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives', pp. 275-76.

The word נביא in the Qumran literature is used not only for describing the classical prophets, but also with reference to an eschatological prophet. The figure of a future prophet is found in the Community Rule. In 1QS 9.11, ... עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרן וישראל... ('until the prophet comes, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel...'), the figure of a future prophet is most explicitly expressed. His arrival was expected together with the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.<sup>99</sup> Geza Vermes suggests that the prophet mentioned in this text was identified with 'the Teacher of Righteousness'. He says that 'at some point of the sect's history the coming of the Prophet was no longer expected; he was believed to have already appeared in the person of the Teacher of Righteousness'.<sup>100</sup> Bowley, however, does not agree with Vermes' suggestion, and considers that 'the future prophet is not a person whose role is clearly defined in the Qumran documents'.<sup>101</sup> John Collins comments that 'if the Teacher [of Righteousness] were regarded as the eschatological prophet, this would have been made explicit at some point'.<sup>102</sup> In 1QS 9.11, it is clearly expressed that a future prophet, who will be associated with other eschatological and priestly characters, is expected. The figure of a future prophet also appears in 4Q175, which begins with four biblical passages. In 4Q175, the first text quoted is Deut. 5.28-29 (4Q175 1.1-4), and then immediately Deut. 18.18-19 is cited (4Q175 1.5-8), where it is confirmed that the expectation is of a prophet who, like Moses, will act as spokesman of divine revelation.<sup>103</sup> It is, therefore, clear that the Qumran community expected an eschatological prophet, who is depicted by the use of the word נביא, and he is imaged as similar to a 'prophet like Moses' described in Deut. 18.18-19.

The word נביא is not utilized for depicting any contemporary prophetic figures in the Qumran community. In the Qumran scrolls, 202 biblical manuscripts are found; among them 21 are copies of Isaiah, eight of the Twelve Minor Prophets and six each of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, according

99. Vermes, *An Introduction*, p. 166, notes that 'viewed in the context of inter-testamental Jewish ideas, the Prophet was to be either an Elijah returned as a precursor of the Messiah (Mal. 4.5; *1 En.* 90.31, 37; Mt. 11.13; 17.12), or a divine guide sent to Israel in the final day (1 Macc. 4.46; 14.41; Jn 1.21) no doubt identical with "the Prophet" promised by God to Moses ("I will raise up for them a prophet like you ... He shall convey all my commands to them", Deut. 18.15-18; cf. Acts 3.22-23; 7.37)'.

100. Vermes, *An Introduction*, p. 166.

101. Bowley, 'Prophet and Prophecy', p. 367.

102. J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), p. 113.

103. 11Q13 2.15-18 seems to mention a future prophet, but the title הנביא (the prophet) as the eschatological figure does not occur, instead המשיח (the anointed one) is used. See Collins, *Scepter and the Star*, pp. 112-14.

to the statistics of James VanderKam.<sup>104</sup> This feature clearly demonstrates that the Qumran community recognized the authority of the prophets in the Old Testament and their important role; however, the title נביא is never applied to any contemporary prophetic figures. In the Qumran scrolls, the figure of 'the Teacher of Righteousness', in some ways, can be compared to Moses, but the title נביא is not precisely used for his prophetic identity.<sup>105</sup> The reason is that in the Qumran community prophets were a phenomenon of the past (1QS 8.16), as considered in Josephus. However, the eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15 was still to come in the future (1QS 9.10-11), as mentioned above. Howard Teeple thinks that the cessation of prophecy was the 'official doctrine' of the Qumran community.<sup>106</sup> Burrows also argues that 'there were no prophets in the [Qumran] community'.<sup>107</sup> Thus, the word נביא is never precisely used for the contemporary prophetic figures in the Qumran community, even for the Teacher of Righteousness. In sum, the word נביא in the Qumran scrolls is only used for depicting the classical prophets in the Old Testament and an eschatological prophetic figure, who is to come in the future, but never used for any contemporary prophetic figures in the Qumran community.

### *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*

Prophetic phenomena in relation to the word 'prophet' in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are numerous, therefore an exhaustive investigation of prophetic figures and prophecies is obviously beyond the scope of this study.<sup>108</sup> This survey, therefore, will confine itself to the

104. VanderKam, *Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, pp. 30-31.

105. In 1QS 1.3 and 1QpHab 2.9, prophets are called 'God's servants', and 'the Teacher of Righteousness' frequently refers to himself as 'God's servant' in the Qumran Hymns (1QH<sup>a</sup> 10.10-18; 12.27-28; 15.26-27; 16.16-19; 23.10-14; see also 1QS 8.12; CD-A 6.7, 7.18; cf. 1 QpHab 2.8-9). In this respect, the Teacher can be identified with a prophetic figure in terms of the use of 'God's servant'; see D. Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979), p. 41.

106. Teeple, *Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, p. 52.

107. Burrows, 'Prophecy and the Prophets', p. 225; Hill, *New Testament Prophecy*, p. 42; cf. Bowley, 'Prophet and Prophecy', p. 375.

108. The terms, 'Apocrypha' and 'Pseudepigrapha', should not be understood etymologically, because they are not employed in the sense here. Since there are currently several definitions of the terms, I will not define the technical terms. On the definition of pseudepigrapha, see J.H. Charlesworth, 'Introduction for the General Reader', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985), I, pp. xxi-xxxiv, esp. pp. xxiv-xxvii; *idem*, 'Pseudepigrapha, OT', *ABD*, V, pp. 537-40. On the definition of Old Testament apocrypha, see J.H. Charlesworth, 'Old Testament Apocrypha', *ABD*, I, pp. 292-94. The heading 'Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha' will cover the 13 books of the conventional Old

term 'prophet' in order to provide a brief sketch on prophetic figures and prophecies.

In the Old Testament Apocrypha the word 'prophet' and 'prophets' appear 40 times.<sup>109</sup> The word 'prophet' is used for describing the canonical prophets: Samuel (1 Esd. 1.20; Sir. 46.13, 15), Elijah (Sir. 48.1), Jeremiah (1 Esd. 1.28, 32, 47; 2 Macc. 2.1; 15.14), Isaiah (Sir. 48.22), Habakkuk (Bel 1.33), Haggai and Zechariah (1 Esd. 6.1; 7.3). On many occasions the word 'prophet' is employed in a plural form for depicting the classical prophets, as a group, in the Old Testament Apocrypha.<sup>110</sup> The explicit use of a plural form of the word 'prophet' for describing the canonical prophets as a whole is found in, for example, Sir. 49.10, 'May the bones of the Twelve Prophets send forth new life from where they lie...'; Tob. 14.4, 'everything that was spoken by the prophets of Israel, whom God sent, will occur'; 1 Macc. 9.27, 'such as had not been since the time that prophets ceased to appear among them'.<sup>111</sup> The word 'prophet' is sometimes used for illustrating the figure of a future prophet, for example, 1 Macc. 4.46, 'and stored the stones in a convenient place on the temple hill until a prophet should come to tell what to do with them'; 1 Macc. 14.41, 'The Jews and their priests have resolved that Simon should be their leader and high priest forever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise (ὥς τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν)'.

In the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the word 'prophet' is also used for depicting the canonical prophets, like in the Apocrypha.<sup>112</sup> In *The Lives of the Prophets*, the lives and deaths of the three major prophets (Jeremiah,<sup>113</sup> Isaiah and Ezekiel) and the twelve prophets as well as Daniel

Testament Apocrypha and the 65 Old Testament pseudepigraphal documents collected in Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Unless otherwise indicated, in this study pseudepigraphal quotations are from Charlesworth's edition and apocryphal quotations from the edition of J.R. Kohlenberger, III (ed.), *The Parallel Apocrypha* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).

109. 1 Esd. 1.20, 28, 32, 47, 51; 6.1, 2; 7.3; 8.82 (9 times); Tob. 4.12; 14.4, 5 (3 times); Wis. 7.27; 11.1; 19.22 [twice] (4 times); Sir. 36.16; 46.13, 15; 48.1, 8, 22; 49.7, 10 (8 times); Bar. 1.16, 21; 2.20, 24 (4 times); Song 3 Childr. 1.15 (once); Bel 1.33 (once); 1 Macc. 4.46; 9.27, 54; 14.41 (4 times); 2 Macc. 2.1, 2, 4, 13; 15.9, 14 (6 times).

110. For example, 1 Esd. 1.51; 6.2; 8.82; Tob. 4.12; 14.5; Wis. 7.27; Bar. 1.16, 21; 2.20, 24; 1 Macc. 9.27, 54.

111. A revival of prophecy, however, was expected in 1 Macc. 4.46; 14.41.

112. The investigation of the use of the term 'prophet' in the Pseudepigrapha is not exhaustive, but selective as necessary and important for this study.

113. In the title of *4 Baruch*, the term 'prophet' is used for referring to Jeremiah; see Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, p. 418.

are described. In addition, the seven non-literary prophets (Nathan, Ahijah, Joad, Azariah, Elijah, Elisha and Zechariah son of Jehoiada) mentioned in the Hebrew Scriptures are also portrayed. The term 'prophet' is not very often used explicitly for the prophetic figure of Moses. In the *Testament of Moses*, the word 'prophet' is used only once in 11.16, where Moses is described as 'the divine prophet'. Although the *Testament of Moses* is about Moses' prophecy, the word 'prophet' is very rarely employed for Moses' prophetic identity.<sup>114</sup> In *Pseudo-Philo*, Moses is given the title 'prophet' (53.8), and the phrase 'my servant' (53.8, 10) is also used for him. Samuel is also more often called 'prophet' than Moses in *Ps.-Philo* 57.4; 64.2; cf. 49.8; 50.8; 56.4; 59.4; in particular, he is described as 'the one who sees' in 56.4 and 59.2. In *Ps.-Philo* 28.1, two names, Jabis and Phinehas, are introduced under the title 'prophet', but they do not belong to the classical prophets.<sup>115</sup> In *Jubilees*, Moses is summoned to the mountain (*Jub.* 1.1-4) and his prayer of intercession (*Jub.* 1.19-21) is described, but his prophetic identity is not explicitly described by the use of the word 'prophet'. In some other literature of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, the term 'prophet' is also used for depicting the canonical prophets, for example, Isaiah (*Asc. Isa.* 1.2), Jeremiah (*Ps.-Philo* 56.6), Ezekiel (the introduction of the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel*), and Ezra (*4 Ezra* [= 2 Esd.] 1.1;<sup>116</sup> *Ques. Ezra*, Recension A.1, 2, 4, 9, 18, 22, 23, 31). In *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the word 'prophet' is used for describing the eschatological prophet, in particular, in *T. Benj.* 9.2, 'until such time as the Most High shall send forth his salvation through the ministration of the unique prophet'.<sup>117</sup> The term 'prophet' is sometimes used for describing false prophets in *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*: *T. Jud.* 21.9 (cf. *Sib. Or.*, Book 7.130-140). In the New Testament, Enoch is clearly depicted as a prophet in Jude 14-15, however, in *1-3 Enoch*, including appendixes, his prophetic identity is not explicitly described by the use of the word 'prophet', although his prophetic intercession (*1 En.* 13.1-10), prophetic judgments (*1 En.* 53.1-56.4), his vision (*1 En.* 14.8-

114. *T. Mos.* 1.5, 'this is the prophecy which was made by Moses in the book of Deuteronomy'.

115. D.J. Harrington notes on the text that 'originally there may have been only one prophet and one prophet-priest'; see Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, II, p. 341.

116. In *4 Ezra* [= 2 Esd.], the term 'prophet' occurs 6 times (2 Esd. 1.1, 32, 36; 2.1; 7.130; 12.42); once (2 Esd. 1.1) refers to the prophet Ezra, and the rest of them point to the classical prophets as a group.

117. In Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, I, p. 827, H.C. Kee comments on 'the unique prophet' that 'the expectation of the eschatological prophet builds on Deut 18:15 and figures importantly at Qumran: 1 QS 9.10-11; 1QS<sup>a</sup> 2.11-12'.



16.3) and predictions (*1 En.* 65.1-12) are clearly recorded.<sup>118</sup> In sum, the word 'prophet' in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is used almost always for describing the canonical prophets, a future prophet and the eschatological prophet, who is to come in the future, although a few exceptions are found.

### Summary

The uses of the word נְבִיא or προφήτης and prophetic figures in some literature in the late Second Temple period are as follows: (1) in Philo the idea of 'prophet' and prophetic figures are basically rooted in the concept of the prophets in the Hebrew Scriptures; (2) Josephus's use of the word 'prophet' and related terms is fundamentally based on the classical prophets, because his understanding of prophetic figures and prophecies is deeply rooted in the Old Testament; (3) in the Samaritan literature prophetic figures are extremely focused on the figure of Moses, so there is no other prophet but Moses, and so the Samaritan eschatological prophet, the *Taheb*, is identified with him; (4) in the Qumran scrolls the word 'prophet' is only used for depicting the classical prophets and a future prophetic figure, and so it is never employed for any contemporary prophetic figures or prophecies in the Qumran community; (5) prophetic figures related to the word 'prophet' in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha are fundamentally rooted in the canonical prophets and the figure of an eschatological prophet.

### Conclusions

In this chapter the prophetic phenomenon has been investigated in the Old Testament and some literature in the late Second Temple period. In the Old Testament, it is quite clear that the term נְבִיא is almost always applied to the canonical prophets, such as Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Moses with reference to their prophetic identity, although it is sometimes used for describing false prophets. The characteristic elements of the prophets in the Old Testament are found in their prophetic ministry as follows: (1) the function of a mouthpiece of God; (2) an intimate relationship with God; (3) the ability to predict the future; (4) the use of symbolic actions for reinforcing their prophetic messages; (5) the ability to perform miracles for demonstrating the prophetic identity; (6) the role of an intercessor. These elements are at least an integral part of the prophetic figure in the Old Testament, although some of the features are not always found in the prophetic ministry of all prophets.

118. See M. Baker, *The Lost Prophet: The Book of Enoch and its Influence on Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1988), pp. 5-32.

In the late Second Temple period the word נְבִיא or προφήτης is used for not only canonical prophets, but also some other prophetic figures, who do not belong to the canonical prophets, for example, Philo, John Hyrcanus and an eschatological prophetic figure. In the late Second Temple period, however, the use of the word נְבִיא or προφήτης is mostly used for describing the canonical prophets, except for a polemical use of the term. (1) Philo and Josephus almost always use the word ‘prophet’ and related terms for describing the canonical prophets. (2) In the Samaritan literature the term ‘prophet’ is almost always used in relation to the figure of Moses, who is the most significant prophetic figure in the Samaritan tradition. (3) In the Qumran scrolls the term ‘prophet’ is almost always found with reference to the canonical prophets, and is also occasionally used for describing the eschatological prophet in the future. (4) The use of the word ‘prophet’ in the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is almost always found in relation to the canonical prophets. In this respect, the use of the term נְבִיא or προφήτης and prophetic figures in both the Old Testament and some literature in the late Second Temple period is almost identical, with only a few instances of difference. The prophetic figures of the Old Testament and of some literature in the late Second Temple period are fundamentally rooted in the model of the canonical prophets in the Old Testament.

## PART II

### PROPHETIC FEATURES OF JESUS' MINISTRY

In Part I, as preliminary considerations, the context of the present study has been set, a brief historical survey has been provided and methodology has been discussed. In addition, 'prophet' and prophetic figures in the Old Testament and some literature in the late Second Temple period have been examined in order to offer a reliable background for Jesus as prophet in the following study. In Part II, the Johannine Jesus will be investigated as to whether he is portrayed as 'prophet' in relation to his deeds, words and self-awareness in the Fourth Gospel. In Part II, therefore, Jesus' prophetic actions will be discussed first, and then Jesus' prophetic words and Jesus' self-awareness as prophet will follow.

## 4

### JESUS' PROPHETIC ACTIONS

In this chapter, Jesus' actions in the Fourth Gospel will be examined for their contribution to the Johannine demonstration of Jesus' prophetic identity. In order to do this, Jesus' deeds will be investigated as to whether they can be regarded as his prophetic actions, like those of Old Testament prophets, and whether the figure of Jesus can be seen in terms of the images of the prophetic actions of the Old Testament prophets. There are many actions performed by Jesus in the Gospel. In particular, Jesus did many miraculous signs, which are reported in Jn 10.32; 11.47; 12.37; cf. 2.23; 3.2; 6.2; 10.38, although not all of them that the Gospel is aware of are recorded in it (Jn 20.30; 21.25). The miracles performed by the Johannine Jesus, therefore, will be considered in relation to his prophetic identity, but not all of them are the subjects of this study. In this chapter, only four miracles, Jesus' first (Jn 2.1-11) and second miracle (Jn 4.46-54), Jesus' healing of the paralytic (Jn 5.1-47) and Jesus' raising of the dead (Jn 11.1-44), will be explored.<sup>1</sup> The reason for investigating the miraculous signs performed by Jesus is that the ability to produce a miraculous sign seems to demonstrate an identification of the person, who performs the miracu-

1. The two miracles, Jesus' healing of the man born blind (Jn 9.1-10.21) and Jesus' feeding of the five thousand (Jn 6.1-15), will be discussed respectively. However, Jesus' walking on the sea (Jn 6.16-21) and the miraculous catch of fish (Jn 21.1-8) will not be considered due to lack of Jesus' prophetic identity involved in the two miracles. For a detailed investigation of Jesus' walking on the sea, see P.J. Madden, *Jesus' Walking on the Sea: An Investigation of the Origin of the Narrative Account* (BZNW, 81; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1997); J.P. Heil, *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21* (AnBib, 87; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981). For the miraculous catch of fish, see Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 547-53; J. Breck, 'John 21: Appendix, Epilogue or Conclusion?', *SVTQ* 36 (1992), pp. 27-49; S.M. Schneiders, 'John 21:1-14', *Int* 43 (1989), pp. 70-75; N.J. McLenny, '153 Great Fishes—Gematriachal Atbash', *Bib* 58 (1977), pp. 411-17; S.S. Smalley, 'The Sign in John 21', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 275-88.

lous sign.<sup>2</sup> Jn 2.18; 4.48; 6.30 (cf. Jn 7.31) show that the ability to perform a miraculous sign is closely related to the authority of the person who performs the miracle, although this ability is not sufficient to identify what sort of authority is designated by the miraculous sign. However, it would be comprehensible that the authority related to the ability to perform a miracle is closely linked with a prophetic authority, like that of the prophets in the Old Testament, for example, Moses, Elijah, Elisha and Isaiah, although not all of the Old Testament prophets performed miracles.<sup>3</sup>

Along with the miraculous signs, Jesus also did other actions in the Gospel, such as those involved in the Temple incident (Jn 2.13-22), the triumphal entry (Jn 12.12-16), the footwashing (Jn 13.1-17) and the Passover meal (Jn 13.18-38). Among the actions taken by Jesus, the Temple incident will be examined as to whether it can be regarded as his prophetic symbolic action for demonstrating his prophetic identity.<sup>4</sup> The reason for investigating only the Temple incident is that other actions, for example, the triumphal entry, the footwashing and the Passover meal, are not relevant for this study due to the lack of Jesus' prophetic identity being

2. Dodd, 'Jesus as Teacher and Prophet', who suggests 15 reasons why Jesus was regarded as a prophet, although not all of them are equally valid; however, in his 15 reasons, Dodd omits Jesus' miraculous signs, which are one of the bases for identifying Jesus as prophet (Jn 6.14-15; cf. Mk 6.15; Lk. 7.16), and his judgment speeches, which have a formal similarity to that of the Old Testament prophets. For a succinct summary of Dodd's 15 reasons, see Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, p. 160.

3. Jesus himself uses his miraculous works as evidence for proving his intimate relationship with God in Jn 10.38 and 14.10-11, where the word σημεῖον is not actually employed, instead the term ἔργον is used by Jesus for indicating his miraculous signs (cf. Jn 5.36; 7.21; 10.25, 32); see van Belle, *Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 380-89, who argues that 'in the Fourth Gospel the miracles can be called either σημεῖα or ἔργα; both terms are largely synonymous (p. 380)'; see also K.H. Rengstorf, 'σημεῖον, σημαίνω, κτλ', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 200-69, esp. pp. 247-50; in particular, the term ἔργον in Jn 14.10-11 is used for not only Jesus' miraculous deeds, but also his whole ministry; see Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 525-32, esp. pp. 526-29; see P.W. Ensor, *Jesus and his 'Work': The Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective* (WUNT, 2.85; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996), pp. 232-41; C. Welck, *Erzählte Zeichen: Die Wundergeschichten des Johannesevangeliums literarisch untersucht. Mit einem Ausblick auf Joh 21* (WUNT, 2.69; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994), pp. 93-100.

4. For the triumphal entry (Jn 12.12-16), see Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 431-35; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 350-51; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 459-63. For the footwashing (Jn 13.1-17), see J.C. Thomas, *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community* (JSNTSup, 61; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991). For the Passover meal (Jn 13.18-38), see F.J. Moloney, 'A Sacramental Reading of John 13:1-38', *CBQ* 53 (1991), pp. 237-56; J. Klawans, 'Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice', *NTS* 48 (2002), pp. 1-17.

involved in the deeds. In particular, the Fourth Gospel does not offer a full picture of the Passover meal, and the focus of the Lord's Supper in the Gospel is on Jesus' prediction about his betrayal rather than the Last Supper as such.<sup>5</sup>

*Jesus' First Miracle: Water into Wine (John 2.1-11)*

Jesus' first miracle is the transformation of water into wine at Cana of Galilee, and this is only recorded in the Gospel of John.<sup>6</sup> In the narrative of the miracle the specific details of place and time seem to emphasize the historicity of the miracle (Jn 2.11).<sup>7</sup> The purpose of Jesus' first miracle after entering Galilee is not explicitly stated, but the effect of this miracle is noteworthy: (a) it marks the beginning of Jesus' ministry accompanied by supernatural power; (b) it reveals the glory of Jesus so that the disciples saw his glory (Jn 2.11); (c) it proves so convincing to Jesus' disciples that they 'put their faith in him' (Jn 2.11).

Jesus' first miracle at Cana can be compared with Elisha's first miracle at Jericho, the transformation of polluted water into pure and wholesome water (2 Kgs 2.19-22),<sup>8</sup> and Moses' miracle where bitter water turns into sweet water by throwing a piece of wood into the water at Marah (Exod. 15.22-27),<sup>9</sup> in terms of the theme of water involved in the miraculous acts. Both Jesus' miracle and that of Elisha and Moses are transformation miracles that are performed by means of water. Thus, the narrative of Jesus' first miracle at Cana is quite closely related to the miracle of Elisha and that of Moses. In this respect, it is not totally impossible to consider that John would have in mind the account of the miracle of Elisha and that of Moses as the background of Jesus' first miracle.<sup>10</sup> Thus, Jesus' first

5. See W.D. Stacey, 'The Lord's Supper as Prophetic Drama', *Epworth Review* 21 (1994), pp. 65-74; this study focuses on the account of the Lord's Supper of the Synoptics, not on that of the Fourth Gospel.

6. For a more comprehensive discussion on the story of water into wine, see Olsson, *Structure and Meaning*, pp. 18-114; R.F. Collins, 'Cana (Jn 2:1-12)—The First of his Sign or the Key to his Signs?', *ITQ* 47 (1980), pp. 79-95; K.T. Cooper, 'The Best Wine: John 2:1-11', *WTJ* 41 (1978-79), pp. 364-80.

7. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 334.

8. See D.G. Bostock, 'Jesus as the New Elisha', *ExpTim* 92 (1980), pp. 39-41, who compares Jesus' first miracle with that of Elisha in 2 Kgs 2.19-22; B. Lindars, 'Elijah, Elisha and the Gospel Miracles', in C.F.D. Moule (ed.), *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History* (London: A.R. Mowbray, 1965), pp. 61-79; T.R. Hobbs, *2 Kings* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), pp. 23-24.

9. See J.I. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), pp. 210-15.

10. See A. Mayer, 'Elijah and Elisha in John's Signs Source', *ExpTim* 99 (1988), pp. 171-73.

miracle performed at Cana can be regarded as a prophetic sign for demonstrating his prophetic identity; by means of the transformation of water Jesus is depicted as prophet-like-Moses or Elisha.

Jesus' first miracle is also reminiscent of Elijah's miracle of oil and flour in Zarephath of Sidon (1 Kgs 17.7-16) and Elisha's miracle of oil (2 Kgs 4.1-7) in the following respects (Table 4.1).

Table 4.1 *Water into wine (Jn 2.1-11)*

<i>Jn 2.1-11</i>	<i>1 Kgs 17.8-16</i>	<i>2 Kgs 4.1-7</i>
In the miracle story <i>a woman</i> appears: the mother of Jesus (vv. 3-5).	In the miracle narrative <i>a woman</i> appears: the widow in Zarephath of Sidon (v. 9).	In the miracle narrative <i>a woman</i> appears: the widow of a prophet (v. 1).
Jesus <i>commands</i> the servants to fill the water jars with water and to draw it out and serve (vv. 7-8).	Elijah <i>commands</i> to bring a handful of meal in a jar and a little oil in a jug for himself (v. 13).	Elisha <i>commands</i> the widow of a prophet to borrow and bring vessels (vv. 3-4).
In the narrative of the miracle water <i>jars</i> (λίθινα ὑδρῖαι) appear (vv. 7-8).	In the narrative of the miracle a <i>jar</i> and a <i>jug</i> are mentioned (vv. 12-16).	In the narrative of the miracle a <i>jar</i> and <i>vessels</i> are mentioned (vv. 2-6).
The miracle provides plenty of food: wine (vv. 8-10).	The miracle provides plenty of food: oil and flour (vv. 14-15).	The miracle provides plenty of food: oil (vv. 5-6).

Although Jesus' miracle is concerned with qualitative change, and the Elijah–Elisha miracles with quantitative, there are several similarities: (1) a woman appears in the narrative of the miracles, and informs about a shortage of food; (2) there is a command before performing the miracles; (3) the miracles occur in the vessels; (4) the situation is changed from one of lack to one of abundance.<sup>11</sup> In this respect, it is not completely implausible that John would have in mind the narrative of Elijah's miracle of oil and flour and that of Elisha's miracle of oil as the background of the narrative of Jesus' first miracle for depicting a picture of Jesus as prophet in the Gospel. R.E. Brown also compares Jesus' first miracle at Cana with Elijah's furnishing of meal and oil and Elisha's similar miracle.<sup>12</sup> In the end of the narrative of Jesus' first miracle, the term 'sign' (σημεῖον) is

11. See Mayer, 'Elijah and Elisha', p. 171; Lindars, 'Elijah', pp. 61-79.

12. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 101, who thinks of a possibility of connection with the Elijah–Elisha miracles; T.L. Brodie, *The Crucial Bridge: The Elijah–Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis–Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000), pp. 79-97.

employed for describing the miracle,<sup>13</sup> and Jesus' disciples believed in him.<sup>14</sup> Jesus' prophetic identity is, therefore, envisaged by readers in relation to his first miracle performed at Cana of Galilee and in conjunction with the miracle stories of Moses, Elijah and Elisha.

*Jesus' Healing of the Royal Official's Son (John 4.46-54)*

The healing narrative of the royal official's son (Jn 4.46-54) is similar to that of Mt. 8.5-13 and Lk. 7.1-10. The similarity between the Synoptic tradition and that of John could raise the question whether these are two descriptions of the same event. There are, however, considerable differences not only between the Synoptic narrative and that of John, but also between the versions of Matthew and Luke.<sup>15</sup>

The miracle narrative of a certain official in the royal service whose son was ill (Jn 4.46-54) is placed in the structure of Jn 4.43-5.47 that contains two signs, both healing miracles.<sup>16</sup> The miracle took place at Cana, where the miracle at the wedding had earlier been performed. The nobleman probably served in the army of Herod Agrippa<sup>17</sup> and his son was sick at Capernaum. The official's son was close to death with a high fever (Jn 4.47, 49). In the description of the nobleman's son, the use of the aorist tense of 'die' (ἀποθανεῖν) in Jn 4.49 seems to imply an impending crisis of the son. The present tense in Jn 4.47 (ἀποθνῄσκειν) describes the progress of the illness of the official's son, and indicates that the case was desperate. The nobleman, therefore, went to Jesus and asked him to come down and heal his son (Jn 4.47, 49). Had the royal official approached Jesus as a worker of miracles? It is not certain, but the man had heard about Jesus, who performed many miraculous signs and wonders at the

13. The word 'sign' (σημεῖον) with regard to the miracles performed by Jesus in the Gospel will be discussed in the following section.

14. It is not very clear whether the disciples believed the identity of Jesus as the Messiah (Jn 1.41) or the Son of God (Jn 1.49) or the prophet (Jn 1.19-28, cf. 1.45) or a miracle worker.

15. See H. van der Loos, *The Miracle of Jesus* (NovTSup, 9; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), pp. 530-42.

16. Some scholars consider that the present order of chs. 5 and 6 is not the original one, for example, Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 209-10; Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, pp. 32-36. The theory of displacement, however, seems 'arbitrary and finds no support' in John's method of work, see Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 53-56 esp. p. 53; therefore, it would be better and more fruitful to read the Fourth Gospel as it stands.

17. See Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 69; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 190; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 465.



Passover in Jerusalem (Jn 4.47-48, cf. Jn 2.23; 3.2). When Jesus heard the man's request, he replied, πορεύου, ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ in Jn 4.50. Jesus' saying is not only a prophecy, but also words of power: the official's son was healed at the time when Jesus said to him, ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ in Jn 4.53. As a consequence he and his household believed (ἐπίστευσεν). However, the object of his and his whole household believing is an open question.<sup>18</sup> It remains uncertain whether they believed (ἐπίστευσεν) in Jesus as Christ, or the Son of God, or a prophet as miracle worker, who performed miraculous signs and wonders as had some of the prophets in the Old Testament. It might be possible that the nobleman and his household would envisage Jesus' identity as one like the prophets in the Old Testament, because this healing miracle is reminiscent of Elijah's miracle of the marvellous restoration of the son of the widow at Zarephath, who moves from death to life in 1 Kgs 17.17-24, and of that of Elisha who revives the son of the Shunammite woman after his death in 2 Kgs 4.8-37.<sup>19</sup> The similarities are shown in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2 *Healing of the royal official's son (Jn 4.46-54)*

<i>Jn 4.46-54</i>	<i>1 Kgs 17.17-24</i>	<i>2 Kgs 4.8-37</i>
The royal official's son is close to death from his illness (v. 47).	The son of the widow at Zarephath becomes ill and finally has died (v. 17).	The Shunammite woman's son has died (vv. 18-31).
The royal official asks Jesus to heal his son (v. 49).	The widow at Zarephath is angry with Elijah because of her son's death (v. 18). <sup>a</sup>	The Shunammite woman asks Elisha to bring back her son (vv. 27-31).
Jesus heals the royal official's son, and so the official and his household believed Jesus (vv. 50-53).	Elijah restores the son of the widow at Zarephath, and she confesses Elijah as a man of God (vv. 19-24).	Elisha brings back from death the son of the Shunammite woman (vv. 33-37).

- a. This is a different feature from the miracle of the royal official's son and that of the Shunammite woman's son. The royal official asked Jesus to heal his son, but the widow at Zarephath did not ask for healing of her son.

It is true that there are some differences between Jesus' healing of the royal official's son and the Elijah–Elisha miracles, but similarities are also found as follows: (1) the miracles happened to the boys; (2) the boys were

18. See van der Loos, *Miracle of Jesus*, pp. 547-49; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 196; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 468.

19. See Bostock, 'Jesus as the New Elisha', p. 40; Brodie, *Crucial Bridge*, pp. 79-97; Lindars, 'Elijah', pp. 61-79.

seriously ill and/or died; (3) the miracles were performed by requests, except for the widow at Zarephath; (4) in the miracles, Jesus said 'your son lives' (Jn 4.50, 53) and Elijah said 'see, your son is alive' (1 Kgs 17.23).<sup>20</sup> In Jn 4.46-54, therefore, readers may be able to envisage Jesus' prophetic identity in conjunction with the Elijah-Elisha miracles.

The miracle of Jesus' healing of the royal official's son is described by the use of the term 'sign' (σημεῖον) in Jn 4.54, as employed when referring to his first miracle in Jn 2.11. What purpose is the word σημεῖον used for illustrating Jesus' miraculous actions in the Fourth Gospel?<sup>21</sup> The term σημεῖον is used 17 times in the Gospel.<sup>22</sup> Among them, 11 uses refer to the miracles of Jesus.<sup>23</sup> In the Fourth Gospel, the term σημεῖον is clearly used for certain miraculous events instead of δύνάμις (see Jn 10.41). In the Synoptic Gospels the term δύνάμις is employed for referring to Jesus' miraculous works instead of the word σημεῖον, which is never used for referring to his miracles in the Synoptics.<sup>24</sup> The use of the term σημεῖον for describing Jesus' miraculous works is characteristic of John's Gospel. In John, the word σημεῖον is used by someone else other than Jesus, except for Jn 4.48; 6.26. Jesus employs the term ἔργον for referring to his miraculous works, including his ministry as a whole, instead of σημεῖον.<sup>25</sup>

The word σημεῖον is used for directly referring to Jesus' first and second miracle at Cana in Jn 2.11; 4.54 and to the feeding of five thousand in Jn 6.14. On many other occasions, the word σημεῖον points to unidentified miracles performed by Jesus.<sup>26</sup> In this view, the use of the term σημεῖον

20. See J. Marsh, *The Gospel of St John* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968), p. 238, who comments on a similarity between the miracle of Jesus and that of Elijah in relation to their sayings; Brodie, *Crucial Bridge*, pp. 79-97; P. Hinnebusch, *Jesus, the New Elijah: An Inspiring New Light into the Person of Jesus* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1978); A. Wiener, *The Prophet Elijah in the Development of Judaism: A Depth-Psychological Study* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), pp. 141-51.

21. In order to answer the question, I will only briefly discuss the issue, since there is abundant literature about the word σημεῖον. For a bibliography of the subject, see van Belle, *Signs Source*, pp. 430-88.

22. Jn 2.11, 18, 23; 3.2; 4.48, 54; 6.2, 14, 26, 30; 7.31; 9.16; 10.41; 11.47; 12.18, 37; 20.30.

23. Jn 2.11, 23; 4.54; 6.2, 14, 26; 9.16; 11.47; 12.18, 37; 20.30.

24. The word σημεῖον is found in Matthew 13 times, Mark 7 times, and Luke 11 times, but in none of them is it applied to the miracles of Jesus; see Rengstorf, 'σημεῖον, σημαίνω, κτλ', p. 229, in which the statistics for the word σημεῖον in Matthew and Luke are incorrect; see Bittner, *Jesu Zeichen im Johannesevangelium*, pp. 41-56.

25. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 526.

26. In Jn 2.18; 4.48; 6.30; 7.31; 10.41, the term σημεῖον is used in a general

in Jn 2.11; 4.54; 6.14 seems to be more significant than other instances. What is it that these signs in particular point to? Since we have already seen that in the case of the first, two of Jesus' miracles are brought into connection with Old Testament miracles performed by prophets, the best answer would seem to be that in Jn 2.11; 4.54; 6.14 the word σημεῖον is being used as the Johannine indicator of Jesus' prophetic identity as prophet-like-Moses or Elijah–Elisha. It is employed in the Johannine asides, which means that the word σημεῖον is deliberately used by the narrator in order to indicate something which Jesus' supernatural power in connection with his miraculous works points to.<sup>27</sup> Jesus' first miracle and his healing of the royal official's son at Cana of Galilee, therefore, can be considered as his prophetic action, like those of the Old Testament prophets. In this respect, in both Jesus' first and second miracle at Cana of Galilee the use of σημεῖον seems to point to Jesus' prophetic identity.<sup>28</sup> M.D. Hooker considers that the term σημεῖον in the Gospel is used for describing Jesus' prophetic actions.<sup>29</sup>

The use of the word σημεῖον in the Septuagint (LXX) provides further support for the view that the term σημεῖον used in the Fourth Gospel in connection with Jesus' miracles indicates the prophetic identity of Jesus, because the term σημεῖον in the LXX almost always refers to the mighty deeds of God in association with works of prophets (e.g., Isa. 8.18; 20.3; Ezek. 4.1-3) and particularly miraculous deeds of Moses (e.g., Deut. 34.10-11; Jer. 32.20).<sup>30</sup> Moses' signs are specifically brought into connection with his prophetic identity in Deut. 34.10-11.

#### *Jesus' Healing of the Paralytic (John 5.1-47)*

It has been noted by most commentators that a similar narrative to the healing of the paralytic described in Jn 5.1-47 is found in Mk 2.1-12 (and

sense. In Jn 9.16 the word σημεῖον is identified with Jesus' healing of the man born blind, and in Jn 12.18 it is related to Jesus' raising of Lazarus; see M.M. Thompson, 'Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel', *BBR* 1 (1991), pp. 89-108; Nicol, *Sēmeia in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 113-16; M. Labahn, 'Between Tradition and Literary Art: The Miracle Tradition in the Fourth Gospel', *Bib* 80 (1999), pp. 178-203.

27. See Rengstorf, 'σημεῖον, σημαίνω, κτλ', p. 247.

28. See Stacey, *Prophetic Drama*, pp. 112-26, 129-70; S. McKnight, 'Jesus and Prophetic Actions', *BBR* 10 (2000), pp. 197-232.

29. Hooker, *Signs of a Prophet*, pp. 62-76; see also Bittner, *Jesu Zeichen*, pp. 122-35.

30. See Rengstorf, 'σημεῖον, σημαίνω, κτλ', pp. 208-21; Nicol, *Sēmeia in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 62-68; cf. Bittner, *Jesu Zeichen*, pp. 17-40; R. Formesyn, 'Le sēmeion johannique et le sēmeion hellénistique', *ETL* 38 (1962), pp. 856-94.

Mt. 9.1-8; Lk. 5.17-26).<sup>31</sup> There are, however, some significant dissimilarities between the narrative of the paralytic in John and that of the Synoptics, for example, the setting of the narratives (Capernaum versus Jerusalem), local details (a house versus the side of a pool) and the emphasis in the stories.<sup>32</sup> In Jn 5.1-47, the setting of the narrative of the lame man is described in connection with Jesus having travelled to Jerusalem on the occasion of a 'feast of the Jews'. It is, however, uncertain which feast of the Jews is referred to in the narrative, because no further details are given of this feast. Jesus heals the man, who had been ill for 38 years, at the pool of Bethesda,<sup>33</sup> on a Sabbath (Jn 5.1-9).

In the narrative of the healing of the paralytic, Jesus seems to be implicitly depicted as one like the prophets in the Old Testament both in relation to his supernatural knowledge about a lame man's long-term illness and in relation to his miraculous healing. First, Jesus' supernatural knowledge about the paralytic's long-term illness is clearly described (Jn 5.6). The narrator comments on the paralytic, who has been ill for 38 years (Jn

31. For example, Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 208-209; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, pp. 52-53; Gnllka, *Johannesevangelium*, p. 39; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 71-72; McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, pp. 81-86.

32. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 208-209; J.N. Sanders, *The Gospel according to Saint John* (London: A. & C. Black, 1968), pp. 160-61; McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, pp. 81-86; Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 139-40.

33. The name of the city where the pool was located is variously given in the MS tradition as Bethzatha, Bethesda and Bethsaida. There seems to be no consensus among commentators; Morris, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 300-301, favours 'Bethesda'; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 206-207, and Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 171, who agree on 'Bethesda'; W. Hendriksen, *The Gospel of John* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1959), pp. 189-90, who accepts 'Bethzatha'. For the discussion of Bethesda, see Jeremias, *The Rediscovery of Bethesda*; D.J. Weiand, 'John V.2 and the Pool of Bethesda', *NTS* 12 (1966), pp. 392-404; W.D. Davies, *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), pp. 302-13; M.-É. Boismard, 'Bethzatha ou Siloé?', *RB* 106 (1999), pp. 206-18; L. Devillers, 'Une piscine peut en cacher une autre: A propos de Jean 5,1-9a', *RB* 106 (1999), pp. 175-205; M. Asiedu-Pepurah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts as Juridical Controversy: An Exegetical Study of John 5 and 9:1-10:21* (WUNT, 2.132; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2001), pp. 53, 59 n. 34; cf. T. Baarda, "'Siloam" in John 5,2? Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron', *ETL* 76 (2000), pp. 136-48. Another problem in relation to the pool arises from the absence of Jn 5.4 from the best MS texts. All MSS dated prior to the fourth century omit the verse, though the rest generally include it with numerous variations. It is generally regarded as an explanatory gloss, which explains the intermittent agitation of the water, dating probably from the late second century; see Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 94-95; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 207; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 253.

5.5-6), so readers are able to know the circumstances of the man's illness. The narrator's remark on Jesus' supernatural knowledge about the paralytic recalls the encounter with Nathanael (Jn 1.47-48) and the Samaritan woman (Jn 4.18).<sup>34</sup> The narrator's expression of Jesus' supernatural knowledge may lead readers to see his identity in relation to the Old Testament prophets, who have supernatural knowledge, such as Elisha (2 Kgs 2.3-6; 4.27; 5.25-27), Isaiah (Isa. 40.1-55.13), Amos (Amos 9.1-15); in particular, 2 Kgs 4.27, although it is negative, is more relevant as concerned with an immediate matter to hand than the other examples in relation to Jesus' supernatural knowledge described in v. 6.<sup>35</sup> In the narrative of the Samaritan woman, Jesus' supernatural knowledge leads her to confess Jesus as a prophet (Jn 4.19).

Second, the miraculous healing of the lame man is actually performed by means of Jesus' authoritative word, 'stand up, take your mat and walk' (Jn 5.8). After Jesus' authoritative command, 'immediately (εὐθέως) the man was cured' without any action, so he 'took his mat and walked' (Jn 5.9). This is another impressive miracle of Jesus in connection with the two earlier miracles accomplished by him (Jn 2.1-11; 4.46-54). The narrator clearly makes a close link between the two earlier miracles and the healing of the paralytic by means of the use of μετὰ ταῦτα, which is one of the characteristic Johannine linking words,<sup>36</sup> in the introduction of this healing narrative (Jn 5.1). The narrative of the healing of the lame man, therefore, is not totally isolated from the previous miracle stories; rather it is reciprocally related. There is no real parallel to this kind of authoritative command in relation to miracles of the Old Testament prophets, but readers can consider Jesus' identity as prophet, like one of the prophets in the Old Testament, in relation to this miraculous healing and the two earlier miracles performed by Jesus. The narrator, therefore, implicitly depicts Jesus' prophetic identity in relation to his supernatural knowledge and his miraculous healing of the lame man, and so the readers may see him as prophet, like one of the Old Testament prophets.

34. In the narrative of the Samaritan woman, Jesus' supernatural knowledge is indicated not in the narrator's aside, but in the conversation between her and Jesus; see Asiedu-Peprah, *Johannine Sabbath*, p. 63.

35. In the Old Testament, the prophets' supernatural knowledge seems to be related to their prophecies, in which prediction of the future, visions and eccentric behaviour appear as integral parts of the prophetic traditions recorded in the Prophets Isaiah to Malachi.

36. See also Jn 3.22; 5.1, 14; 6.1; 7.1; 11.11; 13.7; 19.38; 21.1; see Booth, *Selected Peak Marking Features*, pp. 44-46.

After healing the paralytic, the Jews ask the man about Jesus' identity (Jn 5.12), however, he does not know him at this stage because Jesus had already disappeared in the crowd (Jn 5.13). Later the paralytic recognizes Jesus who healed his illness when he appears the second time in the temple and says to him, 'see, you have been made well. Do not sin any more, so nothing worse happens to you' (Jn 5.14). In fact, the Jews at least could recognize Jesus' identity in relation to the miraculous healing, because they know that prophets perform healing miracles in the Old Testament, although not all of the prophets did perform miracles. In this respect, the question of the Jews may have an unavoidable answer that the identity of Jesus, who has cured the paralytic, is very closely related to that of the prophets in the Old Testament, but they focus on the Sabbath law (Jn 5.10-12) rather than on his identity, whether he is a prophet as miracle worker. The healing miracle, therefore, leads to a discussion on the Sabbath and the significance of Jesus' work (Jn 5.10-47).<sup>37</sup> Jesus' prophetic identity is, however, implied by the miraculous healing of the paralytic, which is closely related to the two earlier miracles performed by him, although the narrator does not express Jesus' prophetic identity directly and verbally in the narrative.

*Jesus' Raising of the Dead, Lazarus (John 11.1-44)*

Jesus' raising of the dead is recorded not only in the Fourth Gospel, but also in the Synoptics.<sup>38</sup> The story that Jesus brings Lazarus back to life from the grave, however, only appears in the Gospel of John. The raising of Lazarus is the seventh miraculous sign of Jesus in the Gospel. Since seven is a number connoting a perfection in Judaism, the raising of Lazarus is the climactic sign as Jesus' final sign before his death, and is also a prophetic sign pointing to Jesus' death and resurrection in the Gospel.<sup>39</sup> This final sign of the Gospel is not isolated from those that have preceded it, but is closely related to them.

The miracle of the raising of the dead in Jn 11.1-44 seems to make a contribution to the image of Jesus as prophet in conjunction with the story of a widow's son returned to life in 1 Kgs 17.17-24 and that of the

37. On the subject of the healing on Sabbath in John, see Asiedu-Pepurah, *Johannine Sabbath*, pp. 52-116.

38. Jairus' daughter (Mt. 9.18-19, 23-25; Mk 5.22-24, 38-42; Lk. 8.41-42, 49-56); Widow's son at Nain (Lk. 7.11-15).

39. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 316; M.W.G. Stibbe, 'A Tomb with a View: John 11.1-44 in Narrative-Critical Perspective', *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 38-54, esp. p. 39.

Shunammite's son restored to life in 2 Kgs 4.8-37.<sup>40</sup> The account of Lazarus's return to life in Jn 11.1-44 parallels Elijah's miracle described in 1 Kgs 17.17-24 and Elisha's miracle portrayed in 2 Kgs 4.8-37 as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 *The raising of Lazarus (Jn 11.1-44)*

<i>Jn 11.1-44</i>	<i>1 Kgs 17.17-24</i>	<i>2 Kgs 4.8-37</i>
The death of a member of the family at Bethany: Lazarus, the brother of Mary and Martha.	The death of a member of the family at Zarephath: a widow's son.	The death of a member of the family at Shunem: the Shunammite woman's son.
The miracle performed by Jesus.	The miracle performed by the prophet, Elijah.	The miracle performed by the prophet, Elisha.
Jesus <i>prays</i> to God, the Father (vv. 41-42).	Elijah <i>prays</i> to God (vv. 20-21).	Elisha <i>prays</i> to the Lord (v. 33).
The raising of Lazarus (vv. 43-44).	A widow's son returned to life (vv. 22-23).	The woman's son restored to life (vv. 34-35).

There is a very similar storyline between the miracle performed by Jesus and those of Elijah and Elisha.<sup>41</sup> (1) In all three-miracle stories, the main point is that the death of a member of a family is miraculously restored to life: Lazarus is brother of Martha and Mary; children who

40. I will not exhaustively examine the story of Lazarus as a whole, but mainly focus on the image of Jesus as prophet in relation to the prophets in the Old Testament. For more detailed discussion on the narrative of Lazarus, see W.E.S. North, *The Lazarus Story within the Johannine Tradition* (JSNTSup, 212; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); J. Kremer, *Lazarus: Die Geschichte einer Auferstehung. Text, Wirkungsgeschichte und Botschaft von Joh 11,1-46* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985); D. Burkett, 'Two Accounts of Lazarus's Resurrection in John 11', *NovT* 36 (1994), pp. 209-32; R. Hakola, 'A Character Resurrected: Lazarus in the Fourth Gospel and Afterwards', in D. Rhoads and K. Syreeni (eds.), *Characterization in the Gospel: Re-conceiving Narrative Criticism* (JSNTSup, 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 223-63; E. Reinmuth, 'Lazarus und seine Schwestern—was wollte Johannes erzählen? Narratologische Beobachtungen zu Joh 11,1-44', *TLZ* 124 (1999), cols. 127-38; W. Wuellner, 'Putting Life Back into the Lazarus Story and its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith', *Semeia* 53 (1991), pp. 113-32.

41. It is true that there is some dissimilarity in the stories. For example, Lazarus is an adult, and is dead for four days; however, the sons of the women are all children who have died and they have not yet been buried. In 1 Kgs 17.17-24 Elijah raises the son of a widow, and Elisha performs a very similar miracle for a woman at Shunem in 2 Kgs 4.8-37. In these stories the prophets carry out certain actions such as lying on the child, shutting himself within the room; however, Jesus does not perform any deeds for the raising of Lazarus, like the prophets.

have died are the sons of the women. (2) Jesus is already recognized as a man of God, who has supernatural power, by Martha, a sister of Lazarus, in Jn 11.21-22. Likewise, Elijah and Elisha are also recognized as men of God by the mothers of the sons, respectively (1 Kgs 17.18; 2 Kgs 4.9, 16, 22). (3) Before performing the miracles, Jesus and Elijah–Elisha prayed for the raising of the dead, and their prayers are answered by God. In this respect, people, who see the miraculous event performed by Jesus, can simply envisage Jesus as a prophet like Elijah or Elisha in relation to the miracle, although there is no language of ‘prophet’ used by the people.

Jesus’ miracle of the raising of Lazarus is, therefore, reminiscent of the prophets, Elijah and Elisha, who perform a similar miracle.<sup>42</sup> Some people know the miraculous story of the man born blind, who has once confessed Jesus as prophet to the Pharisees (Jn 11.37; 9.17), and some of them believed in Jesus after seeing Lazarus restored from the grave (Jn 11.45). It is an open question whether they believe in Jesus as Christ or prophet or as something else. Jesus is, however, probably believed to be a prophet like Elijah or Elisha in relation to his miracle of the raising of Lazarus. Some of them know that Jesus had performed many signs (Jn 11.47), so his prophetic image as a miracle worker, like the prophet Elijah–Elisha, is apparently recognizable. Jesus’ miracle of the raising of Lazarus from the dead, therefore, shows his prophetic identity in conjunction with the miracles of Elijah–Elisha.

Furthermore, there are some more indications about Jesus’ prophetic identity in the narrative of the raising of Lazarus from the dead. First, Jesus’ prophecy concerning the raising of Lazarus from the dead suggests his prophetic identity. Jesus’ sayings in Jn 11.4 and 11.23 are prophetic predictions that Lazarus will not die, or even if he die, he will rise again.<sup>43</sup> Readers know that Jesus is giving a prophecy concerning the raising of Lazarus from the dead, but Mary and Martha do not understand. In particular, Martha misunderstands Jesus’ saying in Jn 11.23 and responds to him with what she believes in Jn 11.24. Jesus’ predictions about the raising of Lazarus from the dead expressed in Jn 11.4 and 11.23 are fulfilled in Jn 11.40-44.<sup>44</sup> Jesus’ predictions indicate that he is not an ordinary Jewish man but perhaps a wise man or a prophet, somehow associated with the eschatological period.

42. See Brodie, *Crucial Bridge*, pp. 79-97; Lindars, ‘Elijah’, pp. 61-79.

43. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 322-23; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 412; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 327-28; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 434.

44. The subject of Jesus’ predictions will be discussed in connection with his prophetic identity in the following chapter.



Second, Jesus' supernatural knowledge about Lazarus's death, which is expressed in figurative language in Jn 11.11, Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν κεκοίμηται, shows Jesus' prophetic identity. The metaphorical saying, 'Lazarus has fallen asleep', indicates that Jesus has supernatural power to know about Lazarus's death from a distance. Jesus was not in the place where Lazarus and his sisters were, but he knew what had happened to Lazarus in Bethany. Jesus clearly tells his disciples that χαίρω δι' ὑμᾶς ἵνα πιστεύσητε, ὅτι οὐκ ἤμην ἐκεῖ in Jn 11.15, in which it is implied that he knows already what he will do, raising Lazarus from the dead.<sup>45</sup> The Johannine aside in Jn 11.13 clearly explains that Jesus had been speaking about Lazarus's death. When Jesus uses the expression 'asleep' for Lazarus's death, his disciples do not understand correctly, so he eventually plainly explains Λάζαρος ἀπέθανε in Jn 11.14. The same supernatural knowledge characterizes the Johannine Jesus from the beginning (Jn 1.47-48; 2.24-25; 4.18; 5.6, etc.) and also makes him aware of his own destiny (Jn 6.64; 12.33; 13.3, 18, 26, etc.). Jesus' supernatural knowledge in the narrative of the raising of Lazarus from the dead shows his prophetic identity, like prophets in the Old Testament, for example, Elisha's supernatural knowledge about Gehazi's deceptive behaviour to Naaman (2 Kgs 5.25-27) and Elijah's departure, which is also known to the company of the prophets at Bethel and Jericho (2 Kgs 2.3-6).

Third, Jesus' supernatural power that can restore those who are ill, such as Lazarus and the man born blind, seems to reflect a prophetic image, like prophets in the Old Testament who show supernatural power, as has been discussed earlier in relation to the miracles of Elijah-Elisha. Jesus' supernatural power is implicitly expressed by Martha in Jn 11.21, κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός μου, and also by Mary in Jn 11.32, where the same expression as Martha's is found. Martha and Mary already know that Jesus has supernatural power,<sup>46</sup> and people also understand his miraculous healing power in connection with the man born blind, who has been restored by Jesus, in Jn 11.37. This impression is strengthened by the negative undertone of οὐκ ἐδύνατο. Readers are, however, meant to draw a line from the healing of the man born blind to the raising of Lazarus from the dead.<sup>47</sup> After Lazarus was restored from

45. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 327; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 410-11; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 432; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 326-27.

46. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 329-30; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 329; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 415.

47. See Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 416-17; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 337.

the dead, many of the Jews believed in Jesus on the basis of what he did. Hence Jesus' supernatural power expressed by Martha, Mary and some of the Jews demonstrates his prophetic image as a miracle worker.

Finally, Jesus' prayer expressed in Jn 11.41b-42 seems to imply his prophetic role as intercessor, like some of the Old Testament prophets. This is not entirely surprising in the Gospel as a whole. Jesus' prayer before performing miracles is found in Jn 6.11, where he gave thanks, and in Jn 9.31, where there is a strong implication that he had prayed before curing the man born blind,<sup>48</sup> and in Jn 17.1-26, which will be discussed in the following chapter. Martha's recognition about Jesus expressed in Jn 11.22, ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοι ὁ θεός, indicates that she understands a role of Jesus to be that of intercessor. Has, then, Martha the raising of her brother in mind? It is hard to be sure. Jesus' reply in Jn 11.23 might suggest the possibility; however, the conversation outside the tomb in Jn 11.39 seems to imply that Martha does not expect her brother's raising from the dead. Martha's reply in Jn 11.24, therefore, can be understood in terms of the Jewish belief in the eschatological raising of the dead, which was held by the Pharisees in opposition to the Sadducees (cf. Mk 12.18-27).<sup>49</sup> Jesus' prayer in Jn 11.41b-42, at first glance, seems not to be a petition at all; rather, it seems to suggest a confident acknowledgment that Jesus' prayer is always heard.<sup>50</sup> Jesus' prayer found in Jn 11.41b-42, however, seems to be a real intercession or to include implicitly a real intercession in light of the following considerations: (1) The reference to Jesus lifting up his eyes in v. 41b, ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ᾤρεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω, is a clear signal of a prayer, so he is really praying here, not pretending. (2) In his prayer, Jesus actually says πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου. ἐγὼ δὲ ᾔδειν ὅτι πάντοτέ μου ἀκούεις (Jn 11.41b-42a). This prayer parallels Ps. 118.21a (LXX 117.21).<sup>51</sup> In both the concept of prayer is present explicitly. (3) The aorist ἤκουσας in v. 41b indicates some definite act of prayer and the context has the implication that Jesus' prayer for the raising of Lazarus from the dead has already

48. See Lindars, *John*, p. 400; North, *Lazarus Story*, p. 102.

49. See Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 412; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 330.

50. In this situation, some considerable suggestions about Jesus' prayer in vv. 41b-42 have been put forward. For the range of opinion about Jesus' prayer, see North, *Lazarus Story*, pp. 102-17; W.B. Hunter, 'The Prayers of Jesus in the Gospel of John' (unpublished PhD thesis; Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen, 1979), pp. 106-37.

51. See A.T. Hanson, 'The Old Testament Background to the Raising of Lazarus', *SE VI* (1973), pp. 252-55; M. Wilcox, 'The "Prayer" of Jesus in John XI.41b-42', *NTS* 24 (1977), pp. 128-32.

been accepted. (4) The raising of Lazarus from the dead takes place after his prayer to the Father in Jn 11.42. This implies that Jesus has prayed for the raising of Lazarus from the dead, like the Old Testament prophets mentioned earlier. (5) Jesus' prayer focuses not only on bringing Lazarus back to life, but also on the relationship between himself as the Son and the Father as the one who sent his Son. In v. 42b, one of the purposes of Jesus' prayer is clearly expressed: ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιστῶτα εἶπον, ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας. Jesus' prayer shows his prophetic identity that he is sent by God, in which the typical characteristic of prophets in the Old Testament, who are sent by God, is implied. A similar expression is also found in Moses' words in Num. 16.28, 'This is how you shall know that the Lord has sent me to do all these works'. Thus, Jesus' prayer in Jn 11.41b-42 shows his prophetic identity in connection with the prophetic role as intercessor. In this respect, the image of Jesus portrayed in the narrative of the raising of Lazarus from the dead shows his prophetic identity, like one of the Old Testament prophets.

#### *Jesus' Actions in the Temple (John 2.13-25)*

Jesus' actions in the Jerusalem Temple during a Passover festival appear not only in the Fourth Gospel, but also in the Synoptics (Mt. 21.12-13; Mk 11.15-17; Lk. 19.45-46).<sup>52</sup> The Synoptics offer three slightly different portraits of what is probably the same event. John, at first glance, seems to provide the same incident as that of the Synoptics, but in detail it is quite different from the Synoptics. The most conspicuous difference between John's account of the Temple incident and that of the Synoptics is its chronology.<sup>53</sup> In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus' actions in the Temple

52. I do not use the conventional title, 'the cleansing of the Temple', because characterization for the story in the Fourth Gospel is an open question; see R. Bauckham, 'Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple', in B. Lindars (ed.), *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988), pp. 72-89, 171-76, who also notes that 'the traditional term "the cleansing of the temple" is doubly misleading' (p. 72).

53. Because of the difference of the chronology between John's account on the Temple incident and that of the Synoptics, in his book, M. Casey, *Is John's Gospel True?* (London: Routledge, 1996), pp. 4-14, concludes that Mark's account is true, but John's is wrong. However, Casey's argument is not decisive; see Robinson, *Priority of John*, p. 128, who considers that 'John's placing [of the Temple incident] is far more convincing [than that of the Synoptics]'; B. Witherington III, *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), pp. 107-13, who argues the historicity of Jesus' Temple incident based on the account of the Fourth Gospel; cf. Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 175-80; Morris, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 188-96;

occur at the very beginning of Jesus' public ministry, but in the Synoptics the Temple incident takes place just prior to his arrest, trial and crucifixion. The differences between John's account of the Temple incident and that of the Synoptics are found not only in the chronology, but also in many other features of the Temple incident.<sup>54</sup> Many scholars, therefore, have argued the merits of either Synoptic chronology<sup>55</sup> or Johannine chronology,<sup>56</sup> and some argue that there may have been two such incidents in Jesus' ministry, one at the beginning and one at the end.<sup>57</sup> Some have debated whether John's picture is historically probable or not.<sup>58</sup> I, however, will not focus on the matters of chronology or historicity, because it is not relevant for this study, but on the issue whether the Temple incident in the

C.L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2001), pp. 87-91; *idem*, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1987), pp. 169-73; see R.T. France, 'Chronological Aspects of "Gospel Harmony"', *VE* 16 (1986), pp. 33-59.

54. For the differences of the Temple incident between John and the Synoptics, see Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, pp. 17-19; M.D. Goulder, 'John 1,1-2,12 and the Synoptics', in Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics*, pp. 201-37, see esp. pp. 223-26.

55. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, pp. 353-55; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 195, who suggests dependency on Mark; F.F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), p. 77; W. Roth, 'Scriptural Coding in the Fourth Gospel', *Bib Res* 32 (1987), pp. 6-29, who suggests that John has produced a selective inverting narrative rewriting of the Law and the Prophets, while Mark represents a 'veiled, selective and non-inverting rewriting of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative. Cf. A. Lacocque, 'The Narrative Code of the Fourth Gospel: Response to Wolfgang Roth's Paper', *Bib Res* 32 (1987), pp. 30-41.

56. See F.J. Moloney, 'The Fourth Gospel and the Jesus of History', *NTS* 46 (2000), pp. 42-58, esp. pp. 52-57; P. Trudinger, 'The Cleansing of the Temple: St John's Independent, Subtle Reflections', *ExpTim* 108 (1997), pp. 329-30; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 175-80; Robinson, *Priority of John*, pp. 127-31; Morris, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 188-96; I. Buse, 'The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John', *ExpTim* 70 (1958-59), pp. 22-24, esp. p. 24; Temple, *Readings in St John's Gospel*, p. 41.

57. See Morris, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 188-91; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 177-80.

58. See Casey, *Is John's Gospel True?*, pp. 4-14; Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, I, pp. 187-90; S. Mendner, 'Die Tempelreinigung', *ZNW* 47 (1956), pp. 93-112, esp. p. 104; V. Epstein, 'The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple', *ZNW* 55 (1964), pp. 42-58; R.J. Campbell, 'Evidence for the Historicity of the Fourth Gospel in John 2:13-22', *SE* 7 (1982), pp. 101-20; M.A. Matson, 'The Contribution to the Temple Cleansing by the Fourth Gospel', *SBLSP* (1992), pp. 489-506; J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'Jesus and the Money Changers (Mark 11:15-17; John 2:13-17)', *RB* 107 (2000), pp. 42-55.

Fourth Gospel can be seen as Jesus' symbolic action reflecting his prophetic identity.<sup>59</sup>

In order to investigate the issue whether the Temple incident in the Gospel illuminates Jesus' prophetic identity, first of all an overall view of the Temple incident will briefly be offered. For the Temple incident in the Fourth Gospel, the narrator provides the apparent introduction in Jn 2.13, where time, place and the reason for Jesus' movement from Galilee to Jerusalem are clearly described, and the conclusion in Jn 2.23-25, where the Passover feast and Jerusalem are also clearly mentioned.<sup>60</sup> The account opens with the description of Jesus' actions in Jn 2.14-16, highlighted by his words in Jn 2.16, followed by the reaction of 'the Jews', also marked by direct speech from Jesus and the Jews in Jn 2.18-20 and a closing comment on the true meaning of Jesus' words offered by the narrator in Jn 2.21-22.<sup>61</sup>

In the first part of the Temple incident (Jn 2.14-17), Jesus discovers merchants in the Temple area (ἱερόν). They were selling the oxen, sheep and pigeons, which are necessary for the Temple cult. They were also changing Roman money into Tyrian currency so that people might pay the Temple tax with coins.<sup>62</sup> Jesus drives out with a whip of cords those selling animals, scatters the coins, and overturns the tables of the money-changers. The reference to the scourge of small cords (φραγέλλιον ἐκ

59. For other issues in connection with the Temple incident in the Fourth Gospel, see some recent monographs: M.L. Coloe, *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001); R.L. Rosas, *La Señal del Templo: Jn 2,13-22, redefinición cristológica de lo sacro* (Biblioteca mexicana, 12; Mexico City: Universidad Pontificia de México, 2001), not available to me; A.R. Kerr, *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup, 220; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).

60. In the narrative structure of the Temple incident, Jn 2.23-25 are considered not only the conclusion of the incident, but also a 'bridge-section', which links between the Temple incident and the narrative of Nicodemus; see Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Literary Structure*, p. 106.

61. For the narrative structure of the Temple incident, see Coloe, *God Dwells with Us*, pp. 69-79; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, pp. 78-79.

62. See M. Reiser, 'Numismatik und Neues Testament', *Bib* 81 (2000), pp. 457-88, esp. pp. 473-74, who argues that Tyrian coins were the only ones accepted in the Jerusalem Temple; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 38; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 76; Blomberg, *Historical Reliability of John's Gospel*, pp. 87-91; J.W. Betlyon, 'Coinage', *ABD*, I, pp. 1076-88, who notes that 'Tyrian shekels had been used as payment for the Temple taxes' (p. 1087); Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, p. 36. *Contra* D.R. Edwards, 'Tyre', *ABD*, VI, pp. 686-92, who comments that 'numismatic evidence indicates that Tyrian coins were not preferred to Roman silver coins for payment of the temple tax' (p. 691); see also D. Ariel, 'A Survey of Coin Finds in Jerusalem', *Liber annuus studii biblici franciscani* 32 (1982), pp. 273-326.

σχοινίων), the sheep and oxen (τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας) only occur in John, not in the Synoptics. For the reference to the oxen and sheep in the Gospel, there would be little evidence, but it is not totally impossible in relation to the sacrificial worship in the Temple.<sup>63</sup> In this respect, John's account on the Temple incident is more in detail than that of the Synoptics. John refers to the moneychangers as τοὺς κερματιστάς in Jn 2.14 rather than τῶν κολλυβιστῶν used in the Synoptics: the term κερματιστής is *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament.<sup>64</sup> During Jesus' actions, he does not speak, but every verb used in Jn 2.14-15 has him as its subject, and the actions described take place in rapid succession. In Jn 2.16, Jesus tells the pigeon sellers, 'Take these things away', and also speaks to his Jewish listeners, 'You shall not make my Father's house a house of trade'. In Jn 2.16 Jesus clearly mentions the Temple as his Father's house, in which he implicitly indicates his identity in relation to God, as his Father. The use of the word οἶκος for temple in Jn 2.16 recalls Zech. 14.21b, 'And there shall no longer be traders in the house of the Lord (ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Κυρίου, LXX) of hosts on that day'.<sup>65</sup> The background of the Johannine sayings in Jn 2.16 is, therefore, more likely to be Zech. 14.21b rather than Isa. 56.7 and Jer. 7.11, which stand behind the Synoptic sayings. After the words of Jesus, the narrator provides a comment on Jesus' words with the use of the citation from the LXX Greek text of Ps. 68.10 [69.9], ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με ('Zeal for your house will consume me'). In the Temple incident of the Synoptics, Ps. 68.10 is not cited. In John, however, there is significant alteration in the tense of the verb in the Psalm. In the Greek text of Ps. 68.10 the suffering and abuse of the person dedicated to Temple prayer is described in the aorist tense, 'Zeal for your house *has consumed* (κατέφαγεν) me'. Except for the change of the tense of the verb, Ps. 68.10 LXX and Jn 2.17 are very similar. Thus it can easily be assumed that John changed the tense of the verb in the quotation from an aorist (κατέφαγεν) to a future (καταφάγεται). Why, then, did John prefer to change the tense of the verb? The reason for alteration of the tense of the verb is uncertain, but it is comprehensible that by means of the change of the verbal tense of the text of Ps. 68.10 John implicitly implies a prophetic announcement of Jesus' impending death.<sup>66</sup>

63. See Bauckham, 'Jesus' Demonstration', p. 78.

64. The genitive τῶν κολλυβιστῶν occurs in Jn 2.15, but it modifies 'coins' rather than 'tables'.

65. See Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 300; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 77; Witherington III, *Christology of Jesus*, pp. 111-16.

66. The future tense in Greek grammaticalizes the semantic feature of expectation. See S.E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Biblical Languages: Greek,

The Hebrew verb **אכל** in the citation can mean 'to consume' in the sense of 'to destroy' and by implication can be taken to mean 'to cause to be put to death'.<sup>67</sup> Thus, the citation of Ps. 68.10 LXX means that Jesus' zeal for the house of God will cause his death on the cross.<sup>68</sup> C.H. Dodd notes that the citation of Ps. 68.10 LXX is 'a veiled forecast of the Passion'.<sup>69</sup>

In the second part of the Temple incident (Jn 2.18-22), there is direct speech between the Jews and Jesus. In the direct speech of the Jewish people, they demand a sign, a miraculous proof to guarantee Jesus' authority for his behaviour in the Temple. Jesus' response to the Jews is highlighted by the use of the different word for Temple (**ναός**) in Jn 2.19, **λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν**, in which he is not speaking about the destruction of the Temple or of his raising up a Temple of stone, but of a future event related to his violent death and resurrection implicitly, which is clearly indicated in the Johannine aside (Jn 2.21-22).<sup>70</sup> The saying of Jesus is a prediction, which will be discussed in the following chapter, but that is a mystery to the Jews, who are not able to make the distinction between a **ναός** that Jesus will raise after three days and a **ἱερόν** made of stone. Both words can refer to the building of the Temple, but Jesus has distinguished between them.<sup>71</sup> The use of the term **ναός** refers to the Temple of Jesus' body in imagery as indicated by the narrator in Jn 2.21. The Jews, however, misunderstand Jesus' words, so they apply his words literally to the visible Temple of stone. The Jewish people identify the **ἱερόν** with the **ναός**, so they speak of the period of 46 years for building the Temple of stone.<sup>72</sup> In the end, the nar-

2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), pp. 20-49; L.J. Kreitzer, 'The Temple Incident of John 2.13-25: A Preview of What Is to Come', in C. Rowland and C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis (eds.), *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton* (JSNTSup, 153; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 93-101, esp. pp. 97-98.

67. BDB, pp. 37-38; R.H. O'Connell, '**אכל**', *NIDOTTE*, I, pp. 393-97; cf. V.A. Hurowitz, '**אכל** in Malachi 3:11—Caterpillar', *JBL* 121 (2002), pp. 327-30.

68. See M.J.J. Menken, "'Zeal for your House Will Consume Me" (John 2:17)', in Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (CBET, 15; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), pp. 37-45.

69. C.H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 160.

70. For detailed discussions on Jn 2.19, see L. Nerepampil, *Destroy this Temple: An Exegetico-Theological Study on the Meaning of Jesus' Temple-Logion in Jn 2:19* (Bangalore: Dharmaram, 1978).

71. BDAG, pp. 470, 665-66.

72. For the period of 46 years, various symbolic interpretations have been suggested, such as, Jesus' age, the numerical value of the name 'Adam', Gnostic numeric speculations, etc. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 115-16; Barrett, *Gospel*

rator gives the true meaning of Jesus' words, and comments on the disciples' understanding of Jesus' actions and words in their remembering.

In what ways, then, can the Temple incident in the Fourth Gospel be seen as Jesus' symbolic action for demonstrating his prophetic identity? First, in the Temple incident of John's Gospel, Jesus' relationship with the Temple is closely related to the prophetic image of the Old Testament. The relationship between prophets and the Temple of Jerusalem<sup>73</sup> is not hard to find in the Old Testament. In several Old Testament passages there is prophetic criticism of the temple and its worship, and even some predictions of its destruction along with Jerusalem.<sup>74</sup> Sometimes the prophets have a positive attitude towards the Temple as the place in which God is present, but they attack the malpractices of a formalist and sham worship. The Temple built by Solomon came to play a prominent role in the growth of Israel's religion. After the Solomonic Temple was destroyed by the Babylonians, the Jews restored the Temple, and Jerusalem and its Temple came more and more to be regarded as symbols of God's presence, and became increasingly to be the subject of a future hope. In this respect, prophets in the Old Testament were greatly concerned about Israel's worship in the Temple. The prophetic attitude to the worship of the Temple in Jerusalem can be summarized as follows: (1) God's presence means judgment as well as blessing; (2) God's presence in Israel is a gift of grace bestowed in the covenant, and in the face of Israel's persistent breach of this covenant God will abandon his Temple and people.<sup>75</sup> Micah (Mic. 3.12; 4.11-13) and Jeremiah (Jer. 7.14, 34; 26.1-6), for example, had proclaimed that God would destroy his Temple in Jerusalem because it had become the object of a false faith and a self-assured formality (cf. Isa. 10.34; 60.13; Hab. 2.17; Zech. 11.1).<sup>76</sup> By destroying the Temple God would abolish Israel's false idea of worship. In the Fourth Gospel, the subject of the Temple is raised straight away in contrast to the other Gospels, in which Jesus' relationship with the Temple is also apparent.

according to *St John*, pp. 200-201; Robinson, *Priority of John*, pp. 130-31; *idem*, "His Witness Is True": A Test of the Johannine Claim', in E. Bammel and C.F.D. Moule (eds.), *Jesus and the Politics of his Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), pp. 453-76, esp. pp. 458-60.

73. See R.J. McKelvey, *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969), pp. 3-8.

74. For example, Hos. 6.6; Amos 5.4-7, 21-23; Isa. 1.10-12; Jer. 7.14; 26.4-9, 12; Dan. 9.26; 11.31.

75. See R.E. Clements, *God and Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), p. 87.

76. See M. Bockmuehl, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994), pp. 63-68.



The author of the Fourth Gospel focuses immediately on the tension between Jesus and the Temple, as with the Old Testament prophets. The tension is vividly depicted in connection with Jesus' actions described in Jn 2.14-16 and his sayings in Jn 2.16 and 19, in which Jesus is portrayed like prophets of the Old Testament. In particular, Jn 2.16, *μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου*, clearly indicates commercialism in the Temple and an abuse of the Temple. Thus, Jesus pronounces the destruction of the Temple in the manner of a prophetic saying in Jn 2.19, as we shall see. Accordingly, in the picture of the close relationship between prophets and the Temple in the Old Testament, Jesus' actions and sayings in the Temple are not hard to envisage in relation to his prophetic image.

Second, Jesus' actions in the Temple described in Jn 2.14-15 seem to be a symbolic action for a prophetic warning of judgment on the Temple, like prophets of the Old Testament. Jesus' actions in the Temple are unexpected and depict utterly violent behaviour. During or after Jesus' actions described in Jn 2.14-15, however, he was not immediately or later reported to the Temple police by the Jews or bystanders, nor was he instantly arrested by the Jewish authorities, although the Jews or bystanders may have had some knowledge of the rabbinic tradition that threats of violence against the Temple warranted capital punishment.<sup>77</sup> This fact seems to suggest the following: (1) The Jews potentially recognize Jesus' prophetic authority in relation to his behaviour in the Temple. The Jews may, at least, know Jeremiah's symbolic actions and his announcing the impending destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple (Jer. 26.1-11).<sup>78</sup> Probably the Jews also know Jesus' first sign performed at Cana in Galilee, which is implicitly indicated in the Johannine aside (Jn 2.23). After Jesus' actions described in Jn 2.14-15, the Jews immediately ask him, 'What sign can you show us for doing this?', in Jn 2.18. In this question, the Jews seem to think of Jesus' prophetic authority in relation to his actions in the Temple, their knowledge of Jeremiah's prophetic symbolic action and Jesus' first miracle at Cana. (2) Jesus' actions may not be an unlawful enormity, but a permissible deed by an authoritative person such as a prophet. Moreover, Jesus' deeds in the Temple were primarily against corrupted commercialism,<sup>79</sup> rather than worship in the Temple as such, because he challenged an abuse of the Temple, which is indicated by his saying in v. 16, 'You shall not make my Father's house a

77. See *t. Sanh.* 13.5; *b. Roš Haš.* 17a; *y. Ber.* 9.13.

78. See Bockmuehl, *This Jesus*, pp. 62-68.

79. Bockmuehl, *This Jesus*, p. 76, argues that 'the existing operation of the Temple as a corrupt system' is the focal cause of Jesus' prediction of the Temple destruction.

house of trade'.<sup>80</sup> Jesus' behaviour in the Temple, therefore, seems to be not a full-scale action expecting a concrete result, but a symbolic act as a prophetic warning of judgment on the Temple, like those of prophets in the Old Testament.<sup>81</sup> In this respect, Jesus' actions in the Temple can be perceived as a symbolic act of cleansing the Temple for an actual prophetic warning of judgment on the Temple, even if his deeds foreshadowed other judgments.<sup>82</sup> Jesus' actions in the Temple, therefore, can be understood as a symbolic action for his prophetic warning of judgment on the Temple, like prophets of the Old Testament, in which his prophetic identity is implicitly expressed.

Finally, the saying of Jesus in Jn 2.19, λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν, can be interpreted as his prophetic announcement of the destruction of the Temple. For the Jews, Jesus' prophetic announcement of the destruction of the Temple must have been a complete mystery in relation to their asking for a sign of legitimization of his action in the Temple (Jn 2.15-16, 18). The saying of Jesus in Jn 2.19 implicitly refers to his death and resurrection as the Temple of his body (cf. Jn 2.21-22).<sup>83</sup> Moreover, the Jews as the participants in the scene have only heard Jesus' words to the pigeon-sellers, where Jesus called the Temple τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου (Jn 2.16), but the readers know the

80. Bockmuehl, *This Jesus*, pp. 69-70, who has recently argued that 'the legitimate and necessary operation of the Temple was supported by a maze of intrigue, nepotism and corruption which is amply reflected in Josephus and early rabbinic source'; see also Bauckham, 'Jesus' Demonstration', p. 83; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 77; Kerr, *Temple of Jesus' Body*, pp. 79-81; *m. Šeq.* 1.3; 5.1-4; 6.5; 7.7; *t. Šeq.* 3.2-4, 9; Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*, pp. 48-9, 166-67; J. Neusner, 'Money-Changers in the Temple: The Mishnah's Explanation', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 287-90.

81. It seems to be clear that Jesus' actions in the Temple did not oppose the Temple tax and the sacrificial worship in the Temple, therefore, he was not arrested immediately by the Jewish authorities; see Bauckham, 'Jesus' Demonstration', pp. 72-89, 171-76.

82. See E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), pp. 61-76, who sees Jesus' action as a symbolic prophecy of the destruction of the Temple; however, Bauckham, 'Jesus' Demonstration', pp. 86-89, considers Jesus' action as a symbolic denunciation. It is true that Jesus actually attacked the merchants, who may lawfully be selling sacrificial animals and changing money, in the Temple area. However, if Jesus' action in the Temple were a symbolic denunciation, his public condemnation would instantly be dismissed as a mere madman's behaviour by the Temple authorities; C.A. Evans, 'Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction', *CBQ* 51 (1989), pp. 237-70, who refutes Sanders' claim that nothing was amiss in the Temple, and argues that Jesus did effect a cleansing of the Temple; *idem*, 'Jesus' Action in the Temple and Evidence of Corruption in the First-century Temple', *SBLSP* (1989), pp. 522-39.

83. A similar implication of Jesus' death is also implicitly given in Jn 2.17.

narrator's terms for the Temple called τὸ ἱερόν (Jn 2.14, 15) along with τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου (Jn 2.16); and now a new term ὁ ναός (Jn 2.19) is introduced in Jesus' prophetic announcement about the destruction of the Temple. The Johannine saying of the so-called Temple destruction in Jn 2.19 is quite different from that of the Synoptics. In John's Gospel, Jesus' prophecy on the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple is not explicitly given, but it is implicitly pronounced as a future event and it would perhaps unmistakably be decipherable to the readers of the narrative.<sup>84</sup> The use of the future tense (ἐγερῶ) in the saying of Jesus in Jn 2.19 clearly points to the characteristic of a prophetic prediction.<sup>85</sup> Moreover, the condition of ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις for raising of the Temple in Jesus' announcement seems to indicate that it is not an ordinary saying, but a prophetic prediction. In a prophetic prediction of the Old Testament prophets, to give a certain period as a condition for fulfilment of a prophetic prediction is not unusual.<sup>86</sup> Jesus' announcement in Jn 2.19 must be an enigmatic saying, but it seems to point to his prophetic identity in relation to his prophetic announcement of the destruction of the Temple.

To sum up, the Temple incident in the Fourth Gospel can be seen to point to Jesus' prophetic identity for the following reasons: (1) Jesus' relationship with the Temple described in the Gospel implies his prophetic image in relation to the picture of the close relationship between prophets and the Temple in the Old Testament; (2) the Temple incident is regarded as Jesus' symbolic action for a prophetic warning of judgment on the Temple, like prophetic actions of prophets of the Old Testament, in which Jesus' prophetic identity is suggested; (3) in v. 19, Jesus' prophetic announcement of the destruction of the Temple seems to imply his prophetic identity.

### Conclusions

So far Jesus' prophetic actions in the Fourth Gospel, the miracles performed by him and in particular the Temple incident have been investigated in relation to his prophetic identity. In the Gospel, Jesus' miracles and the

84. See P.W.L. Walker, *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), p. 165.

85. See Porter, *Idioms*, pp. 20-49; Witherington III, *Christology of Jesus*, p. 111, comments that 'Jesus apparently did predict the demise of the temple'; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 143.

86. See 1 Kgs 17.1 (cf. Lk. 4.25; Jas 5.17); 2 Kgs 4.16; 5.10; Jon. 3.4; Isa. 38.5; Jer. 27.27; see Witherington III, *Christology of Jesus*, p. 111, comments that 'Jesus apparently did predict the demise of the temple'; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 143, who expresses Jn 2.19 in his own saying, 'Even if the temple be destroyed, I will build it up in a trice'.

Temple incident significantly parallel actions of Old Testament prophets, although there are some differences.

(1) Jesus' first miracle at Cana (Jn 2.1-11) is reminiscent of Elijah's miracle of oil and flour in Zarephath of Sidon (1 Kgs 17.7-16) and Elisha's miracle of oil (2 Kgs 4.1-7). (2) Jesus' second miracle at Cana, the healing of the royal official's son (Jn 4.46-54) is also reminiscent of Elijah's miracle (1 Kgs 17.17-24) and that of Elisha (2 Kgs 4.8-37). In particular, both Jesus' miracles at Cana are regarded as a 'sign' (σημεῖον; Jn 2.11; 4.54) and what each 'sign' seems to point to is Jesus' identity as prophet in the Gospel. (3) The healing miracle of the paralytic described in Jn 5.1-47 does not actually parallel any miraculous healing in the Old Testament; however, the healing miracle clearly demonstrates Jesus' miraculous healing power like those of the prophets in the Old Testament, and so implicitly implies his prophetic identity, like other miracles considered in this chapter. (4) Jesus' raising of the dead, Lazarus's return to life in Jn 11.1-44, parallels Elijah's miracle in 1 Kgs 17.17-24 and that of Elisha in 2 Kgs 4.8-37. For this miracle, the term 'sign' (σημεῖον) as a mark of the Johannine design for portraying Jesus as prophet is not explicitly used, but the chief priests and the Pharisees recognize this as one of Jesus' signs (Jn 11.47). (5) Jesus' actions and sayings in the Temple (Jn 2.13-25) are closely related to those of the prophets in the Old Testament, who have a positive attitude towards the Temple and/or a negative reaction towards the misconduct of worship in the Temple. The Temple incident, therefore, can be regarded as Jesus' symbolic action for his prophetic warning of judgment on the Temple. The Temple incident as a whole offers a reasonable portrait of Jesus as prophet.

Accordingly, it can be legitimately assumed that John intends to point to the prophetic identity of Jesus by means of his prophetic actions, the miracles performed by him and the Temple incident in the Gospel. Readers would not find it difficult to envisage Jesus as prophet in relation to his prophetic actions in the Gospel. The portrait of the Johannine Jesus coloured by Jesus' miracles and the Temple incident in the Gospel gives a prophetic colouring to Jesus' identity. One might consider that the colouring remains muted, but the prophetic colouring is quite sufficient to offer a credible springboard for considering more explicit markers of Jesus' identity as prophet in the Gospel.

## 5

### JESUS' PROPHETIC WORDS

In the preceding chapter, Jesus' prophetic actions have been investigated in relation to his prophetic identity. Jesus' reported actions, with allusion to those of the Old Testament prophets, contribute to a picture of the Johannine Jesus as prophet, although it is not a very clear portrait that yet emerges. In this chapter, Jesus' prophetic words will be investigated in order to sharpen the portrait of Jesus in his prophetic identity. First, Jesus' prayer recorded in John 17 will be examined as to whether the prayer can be regarded as prophetic intercession for demonstrating his prophetic identity in the Gospel. Second, Jesus' sayings in the form of predictions appearing in the Fourth Gospel will be investigated as to whether they can be evidence for his prophetic identity. Finally, Jesus' role as spokesman for God will be discussed in relation to his prophetic identity, because the role as spokesman for God is very significant and closely related to prophetic predictions.

The reason for the use of the term 'prediction' rather than 'prophecy' is that although Jesus' prophetic words are similar to those of the Old Testament prophets in terms of prophetic predictions, the form and content of his predictions in the Gospel are different from those of the Old Testament prophets. Furthermore, the Johannine Jesus is not only a prophet, but also more than a prophet, although he is depicted as a prophetic figure: this will be discussed in the subsequent chapters. In this respect, the meaning of the term 'prediction' used in this study is not totally different from that of the word 'prophecy'.

#### *Jesus' Prophetic Intercession in John 17*

Jesus' prayer expressed in John 17 has been thought of as his high priestly prayer by a large number of scholars,<sup>1</sup> since David Chyträus (1531–1600),

1. For example, Godet, *Commentary on John's Gospel*, p. 883; Morris, *Gospel According to John*, p. 716; W.M.O. Walker, 'The Lord's Prayer in Matthew and in

who described the prayer as '*precatio summi sacerdotis*'.<sup>2</sup> This general consensus on the prayer recorded in John 17, however, should not be allowed to be the last word in relation to whether Jesus' prayer is priestly or prophetic in Old Testament terms. The so-called high priestly prayer of Jesus seems rather to be prophetic intercession, the undertaking of a prophetic role and therefore part of John's presentation of Jesus' prophetic identity. In what ways, then, can the prayer recorded in John 17 be regarded as prophetic intercession rather than high priestly prayer? In order to answer this question, the focus of our investigation will be on the character of Jesus' prayer in John 17 in relation to prophetic identity, rather than its placement, literary genre and *Sitz im Leben*.<sup>3</sup> For the understanding of the character of John 17, there are several different opinions: the worship of the early Johannine community, non-Christian hymns and prayers in the Gnostic Mandaean literature and the Corpus Hermeticum, the teaching role of the Johannine community, a farewell speech and a prayer.<sup>4</sup> In this study, John 17 will be examined in relation to a prayer, more precisely a

John', *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 237-56; O. Cullmann, *Prayer in the New Testament* (trans. John Bowden; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 106-10; Schwank, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 401.

2. See Schwank, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 401, who notes that Cyril of Alexandria and Martin Luther called John 17 the high priestly prayer of Jesus; see also Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 494; Hunter, 'Prayers of Jesus', p. 269; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, III, p. 168 n. 2.

3. For the location, literary genre and *Sitz im Leben* of John 17, see W. Brouwer, *The Literary Development of John 13-17: A Chiastic Reading* (SBLDS, 182; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2000); Tolmie, *Jesus' Farewell to the Disciples*, pp. 221-29; M. Winter, *Das Vermächtnis Jesu und die Abschiedsworte der Vater: Gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der Vermächtnisrede im Blick auf Joh. 13-17* (FRLANT, 161; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994); Hunter, 'Prayers of Jesus', pp. 190-311; F. Watson, 'Trinity and Community: A Reading of John 17', *LJST* 1 (1999), pp. 168-84; Segovia, 'Inclusion and Exclusion in John 17', pp. 183-210; *idem*, *Farewell of the Word*, pp. 1-58; H.-J. Klauck, 'Der Weggang Jesu: Neue Arbeiten zu Joh 13-17', *BZ* 40 (1996), pp. 236-50; J.W. Pryor, 'The Great Thanksgiving and the Fourth Gospel', *BZ* 35 (1991), pp. 157-79; D.A. Black, 'On the Style and Significance of John 17', *CTR* 3 (1988), pp. 141-59; R. Schnackenburg, *Ihr werdet mich sehen: Die Abschiedsworte Jesu nach Joh 13-17* (Freiburg: Herder, 1985); *idem*, 'Strukturanalyse von Joh 17', *BZ* 17 (1973), pp. 67-78, 196-202; J.L. Boyle, 'The Last Discourse (Jn 13,31-16,33) and Prayer (Jn 17): Some Observations on their Unity and Development', *Bib* 56 (1975), pp. 210-22; E. Malatesta, 'The Literary Structure of John 17', *Bib* 52 (1971), pp. 190-214; J. Becker, 'Aufbau, Schichtung und theologiegeschichtliche Stellung des Gebetes in Johannes 17', *ZNW* 60 (1969), pp. 56-83; J.F. Randall, 'The Theme of Unity in John 17:20-23', *ETL* 41 (1965), pp. 373-94.

4. See Hunter, 'Prayers of Jesus', pp. 202-75; C. Evans, 'Christ at Prayer in St. John's Gospel', *Lumen Vitae* 24 (1969), pp. 579-96, esp. pp. 582-85.

prophetic intercessory prayer, on the basis of the use of the phrase 'lifting up the eyes to heaven' (Jn 17.1), which is associated only with prayer in the Fourth Gospel, and the word ἑρωτᾶν (Jn 17.9 [twice], 15, 20).

Before answering our question, the term 'intercession' needs to be defined more precisely. The term 'intercession' is virtually a synonym for 'prayer' and obviously one form of prayer, because all prayer is not intercession.<sup>5</sup> Intercession is fundamentally prayer on behalf of someone else, so 'an intercessor is one who "intercedes for" or "prays for" another person(s), in which the key element is the idea of praying "for"'.<sup>6</sup> In the Old Testament, the language of 'intercession' is primarily related to the Hebrew verbs פלל, פגע and עתר (hiphil) in the sense of prayer for someone else.<sup>7</sup> The three Hebrew verbs are used to convey the sense of 'interceding' or 'praying for' another person(s), but פלל is used most frequently. Not only the verbs, but also some expressions such as נשא תפלה (to lift up a prayer), קרא בשם יהוה (to call upon the name of Yahweh), and עמד לפני יהוה (to stand before Yahweh) may describe an act of addressing God on behalf of another. And other Hebrew verbs, which belong to the semantic field of 'ask', 'inquire' and 'seek', for example, בקש, דרש, שאל, are sometimes used to convey an intercessory prayer.<sup>8</sup> The language of 'intercessory prayer' used in the New Testament is quite diversified, so it should not be limited to a particular term. In his doctoral thesis, W. Bingham Hunter examines the Johannine prayer vocabulary, in which he shows that no less than 22 prayer terms are used in the New Testament.<sup>9</sup> Among the prayer terms of the New Testament, however, only three words, εὐχαριστεῖν (three times in Jn 6.11, 23; 11.41), αἰτεῖν (nine times in Jn 11.22; 14.13, 14; 15.7, 16; 16.23, 24 [twice], 26) and ἑρωτᾶν (six times in Jn 14.16; 16.26; 17.9 [twice], 15, 20) are used in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>10</sup> Among the three Greek words for prayer, only ἑρωτᾶν is used in John 17.

5. See A.R. Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2nd edn, 1962), pp. 58-60; S.E. Balentine, 'The Prophet as Intercessor: A Reassessment', *JBL* 103 (1984), pp. 161-173, see esp. p. 161.

6. Balentine, 'Prophet as Intercessor', p. 162; see W. Brueggemann, 'Amos' Intercessory Formula', *VT* 19 (1969), pp. 385-99.

7. For פלל, see BDB, p. 813; R. Schultz, 'פלל', *NIDOTTE*, III, pp. 627-28. For עתר, see BDB, p. 801. For פגע (hiphil), see BDB, p. 803; M.A. Grisanti, 'פגע', *NIDOTTE*, III, pp. 575-76; see Balentine, 'Prophet as Intercessor', pp. 162-64.

8. See Balentine, 'Prophet as Intercessor', pp. 164-68.

9. Hunter, 'Prayers of Jesus', pp. 57-80, see esp. pp. 58-59.

10. For εὐχαριστεῖν, see H. Patsch, 'εὐχαριστέω', *EDNT*, II, pp. 87-88. For αἰτεῖν, see W. Radl, 'αἰτέω', *EDNT*, I, p. 43. For ἑρωτᾶν, see W. Schenk, 'ἑρωτάω', *EDNT*, II, pp. 57-58.

Turning to our question, the very fact that Jesus is praying in John 17 points to a prophetic function not a priestly function, since intercession is one of the significant roles of prophets in the Old Testament.<sup>11</sup> The function of priests and prophets in the Old Testament is reasonably distinctive in relation to their daily routine duties.<sup>12</sup> Aubrey R. Johnson remarks that 'as the priest became the specialist in sacrifice, so the prophet was a specialist in prayer; he was peculiarly qualified to act in this way as an intercessor'.<sup>13</sup> The Old Testament prophets are often seen as powerful intercessors, and in some places intercession is one of the distinctive activities of their ministry. Arnold B. Rhodes argues that Israel's prophets were intercessors.<sup>14</sup> There are several examples of prophets interceding for people before God in the Old Testament.<sup>15</sup> It is true that priestly intercession was offered on some official occasions (cf. 2 Chron. 30.27), however, the priest's task of intercession occurred primarily on the Day of Atonement in relation to sacrifice.<sup>16</sup> Regarding routine duties of priests in the Old Testament, David M. Crump notes that:

because their responsibilities were largely cultic, *priests were not viewed in the first instance as intercessors*. While this aspect of their work was to gain increasing importance after the cessation of prophets in post-exilic Israel, the OT, unlike the inter-testamental literature, offers *no individual priest as paradigmatic intercessory figure*.<sup>17</sup>

Despite the role of intercessory prayer in the distinctive figure of Old Testament prophets, scholars speak of Jesus' words in John 17 in terms

11. See D.M. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts* (WUNT, 2.49; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), pp. 205-10.

12. See Lalleman-de Winkel, *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition*, pp. 208-33; J. Muilenburg, 'The "Office" of the Prophet in Ancient Israel', in J.P. Hyatt, *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1966), pp. 74-97.

13. Johnson, *Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*, p. 59, see also pp. 3-9; *idem*, *The Cultic Prophet and Israel's Psalmody* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1979), pp. 3, 68, and *passim*; see the counterargument against Johnson by Balentine, 'Prophet as Intercessor', p. 161, who notes that 'the idea that intercession was a prophetic responsibility is strikingly scarce'; however, Johnson's argument is reasonable in terms of the prophetic functions described in the Old Testament.

14. See A.B. Rhodes, 'Israel's Prophets as Intercessors' in A.L. Merrill and T.W. Overholt (eds.), *Scripture in History and Theology: Essays in Honor of J. Coert Rylaarsdam* (Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick Press, 1977), pp. 107-128.

15. See Exod. 32.30-35; Num. 12.13; 1 Kgs 13.6; 17.17-24; 2 Kgs 4.18-37; Amos 7.2; Jer. 7.16; 11.14; 14.7-9, 11-12, 17, 20-21; 15.1.

16. See J. Mauchline, 'Jesus Christ as Intercessor', *ExpTim* 64 (1952-53), p. 356.

17. Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, p. 205, italics are mine.



that imply the presence in the prayer of sacramental and sacrificial ideas.<sup>18</sup> W. Temple, for example, says that 'in Chapter XVII we have His own prayer of self-consecration offered as Priest-Victim, Victim-Priest'.<sup>19</sup> Benedikt Schwank, after citing several remarks on the prayer in John 17, also comments that 'all these texts deal with sacrifice and praying in a representative capacity; therefore our chapter bears rightly the title "high priestly prayer"'.<sup>20</sup> It is not totally impossible that the prayer in John 17 can be called 'the high priestly prayer of Jesus' in connection with the priest's task of intercession occurring on the Day of Atonement; however, the concept of sacrifice or priest or victim is hard to find in the prayer. D.A. Carson says that 'sacrificial language is not strong' in John 17.<sup>21</sup> In his doctoral thesis, W. Bingham Hunter also rightly argues that:

Much too much of the sacrifice/priest/victim concepts have to be introduced from outside John 17 for one to feel comfortable with the priest idea here. The fundamental and striking difficulty is that sin and atonement are *not* mentioned in the chapter.<sup>22</sup>

Some characteristically call the prayer in John 17 'the prayer of consecration'. However, this idea is not fundamentally different from the view of the high priestly prayer. Westcott entitles John 17 'the prayer of consecration', and says that:

The Son offers Himself as a perfect offering, that so His disciples may be offered afterwards, and through them, at the last, the world may be won. In the perfected work of the Saviour lies the consecration of humanity.<sup>23</sup>

18. See Hunter, 'Prayers of Jesus', p. 269.

19. Temple, *Readings in St. John's Gospel*, p. 303; see also Morris, *Gospel according to John*, p. 716; Cullmann, *Prayer in the New Testament*, pp. 106-10; Godet, *Commentary on John's Gospel*, p. 883.

20. 'In all diesen Texten geht es um Opfer und stellvertretendes Gebet; daher trägt unser Kapitel mit Recht den Titel "Hohepriesterliches Gebet"' (Schwank, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 401).

21. Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 553.

22. Hunter, 'Prayers of Jesus', p. 270, italics in the original. In Judaism, all priests had to be from the Tribe of Levi, which Jesus was not. In the Letter to the Hebrews, the portrait of Jesus is clearly described as the great high priest (Heb. 4.14; 6.20; cf. Gen. 14.18-24), but not in the Fourth Gospel; see Crump, *Jesus the Intercessor*, pp. 14-19; see also Ridderbos, *Gospel according to John*, p. 546, who comments that the characterization of the so-called high priestly prayer 'cannot be derived from the text, neither here, while Jesus is still on earth when he makes his intercession, nor from the farewell discourse, which mentions his future intercession in heaven (16:26)'.

23. Westcott, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 237.

Some follow Westcott's view on the prayer, and call John 17 'the prayer of consecration'.<sup>24</sup> In particular, Hoskyns interprets the prayer as 'the consecration prayer', and comments that:

the prayer is the solemn consecration of Himself in the presence of His disciples as their effective sacrifice ... and those who believe through their teaching may be consecrated to the service of God.<sup>25</sup>

The view of the consecration prayer is based on the word ἁγιάζω appearing in John 17, in particular, the phrase in v. 19, ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἑμαυτόν. The verb ἁγιάζω occurs not only in the prayer (Jn 17.17, 19 [twice]), but also elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 10.36), and the adjective 'holy' is found in the expression 'Holy Spirit' in Jn 1.33; 14.26; 20.22, and otherwise in Jn 6.69; 17.11. It is not totally impossible to call John 17 'the prayer of consecration' because of the reference to the verb ἁγιάζω in the prayer, but the prayer deals with far more than his consecration and that of his fellows. Carson comments that 'the theme of consecration by no means exhausts the prayer's themes'.<sup>26</sup> There is, also, in this view too much emphasis on the sacrificial death of Jesus in relation to John 17. The verb ἁγιάζω in itself has no idea of death.<sup>27</sup> Appold notes that 'there is nothing in the usage of ἁγιάζω in vv. 17 and 19 to make necessary and explicit a reference to the death of Jesus in sacrificial terms'.<sup>28</sup> T.W. Manson also correctly remarks that the death/sacrifice idea only 'comes from the purpose of the consecration'.<sup>29</sup>

Why, then, does Jesus pray about his sanctification? The use of the verb ἁγιάζω in the prayer points to Jesus' prophetic identity, as a figure like Jeremiah. In Jer. 1.5, God says to the prophet, 'Before I formed you in the womb, I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you (LXX, ἡγίακά σε); I appointed you a prophet to the nations'. Jeremiah was sanctified by God for his prophetic office, before being called as a prophet. Likewise, Jesus has been sanctified by God, the Father, and was

24. See Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, II, p. 560; Macgregor, *Gospel of John*, p. 314; Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 494. For the view of John 17 as 'the prayer for unity', see Appold, *Oneness Motif*, pp. 157-236; Hunter, 'Prayers of Jesus', pp. 272-73.

25. Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 494.

26. Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 553.

27. See J.P. Louw and E.A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (2 vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 2nd edn, 1989), I, pp. 538 (53.44), 745-46 (88.26-27); BDAG, pp. 9-10.

28. Appold, *Oneness Motif*, p. 195.

29. T.W. Manson, *On Paul and John: Some Selected Theological Themes* (SBT, 38; London: SCM Press, 1963), p. 123.

sent into the world. In his prayer, Jesus sanctifies himself for his prophetic mission. Manson comments that:

it is clear from the context that the consecration is to the prophetic office. With this we may compare John 10.36, "(Do you say of him) whom the Father consecrated (ἡγίασεν), and sent into the world."<sup>30</sup>

The phrase ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἑμαυτόν in Jn 17.19, therefore, implies that Jesus knows his prophetic office, and so he dedicates himself to the task of bringing in God's saving reign, as God's prophet, and also dedicates his disciples for the same mission to the world (Jn 17.18). Thus, Jesus' disciples may also be sanctified in truth (Jn 17.19). The purpose of the sanctification of Jesus' disciples is that they are sent, by Jesus himself, into the world. In John's Gospel, according to Carson, Jesus' prayer for his disciples to be sanctified by God is 'always for mission'.<sup>31</sup> In this respect, the prayer in John 17 should not simply be called 'the high priestly prayer of Jesus' or 'the prayer of consecration'. C.K. Barrett comments that 'the common description of it [John 17] as the "High-priestly prayer" ... or the "prayer of consecration", does not do justice to the full range of the material contained in it'.<sup>32</sup> Moreover, Appold claims that 'to refer ... to the prayer as Jesus' "high priestly prayer" is *clearly a misnomer*'.<sup>33</sup> The prayer in John 17, therefore, should be considered as Jesus' prophetic intercession in connection with his prophetic identity, rather than as the so-called high priestly prayer of Jesus.<sup>34</sup> Accordingly, the prophetic intercession of Jesus expressed in John 17 implicitly points to his prophetic identity in terms of the prophetic role of the Old Testament prophets as intercessor.

Furthermore, the focal point of the prayer in John 17 indicates the characteristic of Jesus' prophetic intercession, in which his petition focuses primarily on his eleven disciples. For the content of the prayer, there is widespread agreement among scholars that the prayer has three parts, although there are various suggestions about the length of the sections of

30. Manson, *On Paul and John*, p. 123.

31. Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 566.

32. Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 500.

33. Appold, *Oneness Motif*, p. 195, italics are mine.

34. It is not easy to understand the character of John 17. S. Agourides, 'The "High Priestly Prayer" of Jesus', *SE* 4 (1968), pp. 137-45, concludes that 'this variety of interpretations and views clearly indicates the difficulty of determining the character of the so-called High Priestly Prayer and the inadequacy of any of the proposed solutions (p. 138)', after a brief examination of the uncertainty in modern research on John 17.

the prayer.<sup>35</sup> R.E. Brown proposes a threefold division based on formal indications of prayer: Jn 17.1, ... ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; Jn 17.9, ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἔρωτῶ; Jn 17.20, οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἔρωτῶ μόνον,<sup>36</sup> and Moloney follows Brown's threefold partition.<sup>37</sup> The tripartite shape seems to be reasonable in terms of the formal indications of prayer. In the first part of the prayer (Jn 17.1-8), Jesus prays for his glorification, but his prayer actually focuses on what he has completed: the work in relation to his disciples. In the prayer, the phrases, πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ δώση αὐτοῖς (Jn 17.2), γινώσκωσιν (Jn 17.3) and σε ἐδόξασα (Jn 17.4) clearly point to the disciples.<sup>38</sup> Moreover, Jesus tells the Father he has accomplished the work among the disciples in Jn 17.6-8. There is no doubt that Jn 17.6-8 indicate the disciples.<sup>39</sup> Thus, Jesus' prayer for his glorification is closely related to the disciples. In the second part of the prayer (Jn 17.9-19), after having described the disciples in Jn 17.6-8, Jesus prays for them. The second part of the prayer opens with Jesus' statement that he is praying for the disciples in Jn 17.9, ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἔρωτῶ. This section focuses almost entirely on the disciples of Jesus. The theme of the fragility of the disciples is strongly expressed in the prayer: (1) the disciples are in the world (Jn 17.11a); (2) the world has hated the disciples (Jn 17.14); (3) the disciples are in danger because of the evil one in the world (Jn 17.15).<sup>40</sup> After describing the disciples' fragile situation, Jesus asks the Holy Father to keep the disciples (Jn 17.11b) from the evil one in the world and to be father to the disciples and to make them holy (Jn 17.17), and they are sent by Jesus 'into the world' (Jn 17.18).<sup>41</sup> In the prayer as a whole, the term κόσμος occurs eleven times, and refers to 'a dark place that is alienated from God but nevertheless remains an object of his love (cf. Jn 3.16)'.<sup>42</sup> In the final part

35. See Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, II, p. 559; Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 496-97; Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel*, pp. 296-97; cf. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, III, pp. 167-69; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 295-96; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 553-71.

36. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, II, pp. 748-51.

37. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 459.

38. See Agourides, 'High Priestly Prayer', pp. 137-45, see esp. p. 141.

39. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 462.

40. In the Fourth Gospel, the word κόσμος is depicted as in bondage to sin (Jn 8.23-24, 34-47; 9.39-41; 15.22; 16.8-11); under judgment and God's wrath (Jn 3.18, 36); blind and unregenerated (Jn 9.39-41; 3.3, 5); undiscerning the true worship of God (Jn 4.24); and hating Jesus, his followers, and the truth (Jn 1.10-11; 15.18-25; 16.8-11; 17.14).

41. See Köstenberger, *Missions of Jesus*, pp. 186-90.

42. Köstenberger, *Missions of Jesus*, p. 187.

of the prayer (Jn 17.20-26), Jesus prays for those who believe in him through the word of the disciples and for oneness among those who believe in him as a result of the word of the disciples (Jn 17.20). Although Jesus prays for future believers, the eleven disciples are not totally excluded because the future believers are related to the result of the disciples' work. Furthermore, both groups will be united in Jesus.<sup>43</sup> Thus, Jesus' prayer for the disciples is continued in the final part of the prayer. Agourides argues that:

the petition for the disciples does not end in verse 19, because the petition 'for those also who through their words put their faith in me; may they all be one' (John 17.20-21) has no reference to the faithful apart from the disciples, but always in relation to them, as is evident from verse 22f.<sup>44</sup>

On this basis, the prayer in John 17 is not to be considered as having three subjects—a prayer for Jesus himself; a prayer for his disciples; and a prayer for the future believers—but one main subject, the petition to the Father *for his disciples*.<sup>45</sup> Thus, the character of the prayer in John 17 as a whole can be understood as Jesus' intercessory prayer *for his eleven disciples*.<sup>46</sup>

In addition, the frequent use of the term ἀποστέλλω in John 17 seems to be a clear indication of the character of Jesus' prayer as prophetic intercession. In the prayer Jesus several times mentions that he has been sent by God, the Father, using the word ἀποστέλλω. It is noticeable that in John 17 the term ἀποστέλλω occurs seven times (Jn 17.3, 8, 18 [twice], 21, 23, 25), but the word πέμπω used elsewhere in the Gospel is never used. The frequent use of the word ἀποστέλλω in the prayer indicates that 'the sending theme' is the focal point in John 17. In the sending theme of the prayer in John 17, Jesus' prophetic identity is implicitly revealed, as we shall see. In the prayer of John 17, the expression of the sending of Jesus by God, the Father, implies that Jesus is the completely authorized messenger of God. In the Old Testament, the absolute authorized messenger of God refers to his prophets, who deliver the message of God. The sending formula is frequently found in the call narrative of prophets, for example, Moses (Exod. 3.1-15), Isaiah (Isa. 6.1-

43. For the theme of oneness in John 17, see Appold, *Oneness Motif*, pp. 157-236.

44. Agourides, 'High Priestly Prayer', p. 141.

45. See Agourides, 'High Priestly Prayer', p. 141; however, he concludes that 'the character of the so-called High Priestly prayer of Jesus in John 17 is consolatory and admonitory, as are chapters 13-16 of the so-called Farewell Discourse' (p. 145).

46. Glasson, *Moses*, p. 104, who comments that 'the prayer of John 17 shows him [Jesus] acting as Paraclete, advocate and *intercessor* (cf. Heb. 7.25; Rom. 8.34)' (italics are mine).

13) and Jeremiah (Jer. 1.1-10). The frequent use of the verb  $\pi\lambda\psi$  in the call narrative of the Old Testament prophets indicates that the prophets are sent by God.<sup>47</sup> The use of the word  $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$  in the prayer, therefore, can be a reliable sign for demonstrating Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet and his prayer as prophetic intercession for his disciples, like those of prophets in the Old Testament.

To sum up, the prayer in John 17 is generally regarded as the so-called high priestly prayer of Jesus based on the concept of sacrifice or priest or victim, which is not found in the prayer. The verb  $\alpha\gamma\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$  is found, but is not connected with the idea of death in itself. Jesus' prayer in John 17 should be understood as his prophetic intercession on the following grounds: (1) the distinctive function of priests and prophets in the Old Testament; (2) the character of the prayer for Jesus' eleven disciples; (3) the frequent use of  $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$  in the prayer as an indication of his self-awareness as prophet and his prayer as prophetic intercession. The prayer in John 17 as Jesus' prophetic intercession, therefore, implicitly illuminates his prophetic identity.

### *Jesus' Predictions in the Fourth Gospel*

The supernatural gifts of the true prophets of God include their ability to predict the future, although this gift is sometimes indistinguishable from the powers of the prohibited soothsayers and sorcerers. There is no doubt that prophetic predictions are one of the most important prophetic functions of the Old Testament prophets.<sup>48</sup> Various sayings of Jesus in the form of predictions of the future are found in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>49</sup> Do the various sayings of Jesus in the mode of predictions of the future occurring in the Gospel indicate his prophetic identity? Certainly. Jesus' prophetic identity, from his own perspective as well as from that of many of his con-

47. See C.J. Collins, ' $\pi\lambda\psi$ ', *NIDOTTE*, IV, pp. 119-23.

48. For example, in chs. 40-55 Isaiah predicts the rebuilding of the already ruined city and the triumphant return of the exiles; Amos does the same in ch. 9; at Bethel Amos prophesied (1 Sam. 7.10-17); in the Temple at Jerusalem, Jeremiah and Hananiah prophesied to the priests and all the people (Jer. 28).

49. Jn 1.50-51; 2.19; 3.16; 4.13-14, 21, 23, 50; 5.20, 24-25, 28-29; 6.27, 35, 39-40, 44, 51, 54, 58, 70; 7.34, 37-38; 8.12, 21, 24, 28, 32, 36, 52; 9.39; 10.9, 16, 28; 11.4, 9, 23, 25; 12.8, 24-25, 26, 31-32, 48; 13.10, 17, 19, 21, 33, 36, 38; 14.2-3, 12, 13, 16-20, 26, 28, 30; 15.4-5, 16, 21, 26; 16.2-5, 7-8, 10, 13-14, 16, 20, 22-23, 25-26, 31; 21.18. These numerical features would be controversial in terms of the form and the nature of predictions, but they can generally be dealt with in the category of prediction.

temporaries,<sup>50</sup> is clearly recognized from his predictions of the future found in the Gospel. Eugene Boring considers that the Fourth Gospel emphasizes Jesus' ability to announce events before they happen.<sup>51</sup> Jesus' sayings in the manner of prophecies found in the Gospel can be categorized into five groups as follows: (1) predictions with the double Amen formula; (2) predictions in relation to the theme of judgment; (3) predictions in connection with the reference to his impending death and resurrection; (4) predictions concerning his disciples; (5) predictions on various other subjects occurring in the Gospel.<sup>52</sup>

(1) Sayings of Jesus in the form of predictions with the double Amen formula (ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι) appear in John's Gospel.<sup>53</sup> The double Amen formula, as we shall see, in connection with Jesus' predictions may be compared to the characteristic Old Testament prophetic formula, 'thus says the Lord' (כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה). The traditional prophetic speech formula in the Old Testament is used for an authoritative prophetic introductory saying with a prophetic message. The double Amen formula in Jesus' predictions parallels the characteristic Old Testament prophetic formula. In both cases an authority statement is involved, though with the use of the double Amen John will want both to suggest the likeness to Old Testament prophets, but also mark the distinctiveness. Hence, the double Amen formula used in Jesus' predictions can be understood as the Johannine equivalent to the prophetic speech formula. In Jn 1.51, Jesus' self-designation as 'the Son of Man' is used ambiguously in relation to a prediction that includes the double Amen formula. It is hard to be precise about the meaning of the prediction, but the saying of Jesus is probably related to his death and resurrection through the use of the phrase, 'ascending and descending' and the self-designation 'the Son of Man'.<sup>54</sup> In Jn 5.24-25, the double Amen formula is used with predictive sayings of Jesus that are related to the theme of judgment, which is one of the common themes of the prophetic messages in the Old Testament. The particular sayings of Jesus in Jn 12.24-25 used with the double Amen formula, deal with the

50. For the view regarding Jesus as prophet by many of his contemporaries, see Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, pp. 187-88; Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, pp. 86-102.

51. M.E. Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 120.

52. In this fivefold categorization of Jesus' sayings in the form of prediction found in the Fourth Gospel, some of his predictions overlap categories.

53. See Jn 1.51; 5.24-25; 12.24-25; 13.21, 38; 14.12; 16.20; 21.18.

54. See Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 164-66; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 88-89; J. Kugel, 'The Ladder of Jacob', *HTR* 88 (1995), pp. 209-27.

theme of life and death. In particular, a kernel of wheat that is sown in the ground in Jn 12.24 is peculiarly applicable to Jesus in terms of the soteriological significance of his death (cf. Jn 10.15, 17; 15.13).<sup>55</sup> The predictions of Jesus in Jn 13.38 and 21.18, using the double Amen formula respectively, are related to Peter's denial and his death. The sayings of Jesus in the form of prediction with the double Amen formula found in Jn 14.12 and 16.20 are associated with his impending death. In these prophetic sayings, the double Amen formula is used as the Johannine equivalent to the Old Testament introductory prophetic speech formula. Accordingly, the double Amen formula in Jesus' predictions of the future corroborates (but goes beyond) his prophetic status.

(2) Sayings of Jesus in the manner of prophetic speech related to the theme of judgment found in Jn 8.21; 12.48; 16.8 demonstrate his prophetic characteristics. The theme of prophetic judgment can easily be found in the prophecies of prophets of the Old Testament, for example, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos and Hosea. D.E. Aune speaks of 'the prophetic judgment speech, so characteristic of the preexilic prophets'.<sup>56</sup> The prophetic words of the Old Testament prophets conveyed a message both of promise and judgment to the people of God. One of the roles of prophets was to serve as watchmen among the people. Thus, prophets of the Old Testament were to point out wrong conduct, and give a warning of judgment and punishment that would come in view of it (Ezek. 3.17; 33.7-9). This prophetic task was vitally important in God's sight. First, in Jn 8.21 the dialogue between Jesus and the Jews continues, in which a clear message of judgment upon the Jews is expressed. Jesus predicts ἐγὼ ὑπάγω καὶ ζητήσετέ με, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε in Jn 8.21. In this prediction, Jesus' death and that of the Jews in connection with judgment are announced. The term ὑπάγω in the prediction generally refers to the death of Jesus in the Gospel. The Jews will seek Jesus in vain, and the singular ἁμαρτία in Jn 8.21 focuses on the cardinal sin of rejecting Jesus. Ridderbos notes that 'the expression "die in your sin" occurs repeatedly in the Old Testament (e.g. Ezek. 3.19)'.<sup>57</sup> The expression is repeated twice in Jn 8.24. Second, in Jn 12.48 the language of judgment, κρίνοντα and κρινεῖ, are used. In Jn 12.49, it is clear that the word of Jesus will prove to be judge at the last day because it is not the word of Jesus only but equally the word of the Father.<sup>58</sup> Finally, in Jn 16.8 Jesus predicts the role of the Holy Spirit who

55. See Ridderbos, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 430-31.

56. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, p. 179.

57. Ridderbos, *Gospel according to John*, p. 299.

58. Jesus will judge because the Father has given all judgment to him (cf. Jn 5.22); see Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 438-39.



will expose the world as wrong about sin, righteousness and judgment. In Jn 16.8-11 sin, righteousness and judgment are clearly explained.<sup>59</sup> In these predictions, there is an obvious theme of judgment, which is a common theme of prophecies pronounced by the prophets of the Old Testament.

(3) Predictions of Jesus with reference to his own impending death and resurrection are found in John's Gospel.<sup>60</sup> A substantial amount of indirect references in Jesus' predictions point toward his self-awareness of his own imminent death. Jesus' saying in Jn 2.19 that he will raise up the Temple in three days implies his death and resurrection. In Jn 2.21, the Johannine editorial comment on Jesus' prediction regarding the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem clearly indicates his impending death and resurrection. The expression 'lifted up' (ὑψώω) in Jn 3.14; 8.28; 12.32, implicitly points to the death of Jesus.<sup>61</sup> The word ὑψώω possesses double meaning, 'referring to Jesus' being raised up on the cross, which simultaneously means his exaltation into heaven'.<sup>62</sup> The expressions, 'where I am going, you cannot come' in Jn 7.34; 8.21; 13.33, 36; 14.12, 28; 16.5, 7, 10 (cf. Jn 14.18-20, 30) and 'you will no longer see me [Jesus]' in Jn 16.16, 20, 22, imply Jesus' departure from this world, in which his death is implied. Jesus refers to his martyrdom and death in his predictions concerning his own imminent death and resurrection. The Johannine Jesus clearly shows his ability to predict his own death and resurrection in advance, in which a prophetic image is undoubtedly present; here is one like the biblical prophets.

(4) Jesus' predictions concerning his disciples appear in John's Gospel.<sup>63</sup> First, regarding Judas Iscariot in Jn 6.70, Jesus clearly predicts ἐξ ὑμῶν εἷς διάβολός ἐστιν,<sup>64</sup> in which the one catastrophic failure among the

59. See Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 534-39; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, III, pp. 130-32.

60. See Jn 2.19-22; 3.14; 7.34; 8.21, 28; 12.31-32; 13.33, 36; 14.12, 18-20, 28, 30; 16.5, 7, 10, 16, 20, 22.

61. The word ὑψώω occurs five times in John's Gospel (Jn 3.14 [twice]; 8.28; 12.32, 34).

62. G. Lüdemann, 'ὑψώω', *EDNT*, III, p. 410; see G. Bertram, 'ὕψος, ὑψώω, κτλ', *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 602-20, esp. pp. 608-12.

63. See Jn 6.70; 13.21, 38; 16.2, 32; 21.18.

64. On the ground of Colwell's rule the Greek should not be rendered 'one of you is a devil' (cf. Jn 4.19; 9.17). The use of the verb ἐστιν is probably futuristic. See E.C. Colwell, 'A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament', *JBL* 52 (1933), pp. 12-21; P.B. Harner, 'Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1', *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 75-87; T.H. Kim, 'The Anarthrous υἱὸς θεοῦ in Mark 15:39 and the Roman Imperial Cult', *Bib* 79 (1998),

twelve disciples is expressed by the use of the word, διάβολος, which means 'slanderer' or 'enemy' or 'the Devil' in common Greek,<sup>65</sup> but in the New Testament it always refers to Satan, the prince of darkness (cf. Jn 8.44; 13.2; 13.27).<sup>66</sup> What is involved in Jesus' prediction becomes clear from Jn 13.2. Again Jesus predicts concerning Judas Iscariot in Jn 13.21, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἶς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με. Jesus gives a clear indication of the betrayal to be undertaken by Judas Iscariot in Jn 13.26-30. This prediction is fulfilled in Jn 18.1-5, in which the narrator of the Gospel introduces Judas Iscariot by the expression, 'Judas, who betrayed him [Jesus]', in Jn 18.2 and 5. Second, the fateful prediction about Simon Peter, who will deny all knowledge of Jesus, is announced by Jesus, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς, in Jn 13.38. The credibility of Jesus' prediction about the denials of Peter with its clear time reference means that its fulfilment will add significantly to the prophetic credibility of the one who made the prediction. Jesus' prophecy of the denials of Peter is accurately fulfilled in Jn 18.15-27. Thus, the Johannine Jesus is not only a prophet, but also more than a prophet, the prophet *par excellence*, in relation to his prediction as fulfilled precisely.<sup>67</sup> Along with Peter's denial, Jesus predicts Peter's death in Jn 21.18. The Johannine aside offers an interpretation of Jesus' prediction about the death of Peter in Jn 21.19; however, the fulfilment of the prediction concerning Peter's death cannot be seen in the text.<sup>68</sup> Finally, impending disaster is announced twice by Jesus in terms of the coming 'hour'. In Jn 16.2, 32, Jesus predicts that his disciples will be put out of the synagogues (ἀποσυναγωγούς ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς), and they will be scattered (σκορπισθῇτε), in which most commentators refer to Mt. 26.31 and Mk 14.27, which are interpreted as fulfilment of Zech. 13.7.<sup>69</sup>

pp. 221-41, see esp. pp. 221-22; Blass and Debrunner, *Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, pp. 131-32, 143.

65. See H.G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 9th edn, 1940), p. 390.

66. See O. Böcher, 'διάβολος', *EDNT*, I, pp. 297-98.

67. In the Old Testament, prophecies are normally expressed in ambiguous terms, except in some special cases.

68. This prediction is an example of 'external prolepses' that refer to events outside the temporal framework of the narrative; see G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (trans. J.E. Lewin; New York: Cornell University Press, 1980), pp. 67-85; Reinhartz, 'Jesus as Prophet', pp. 3-16; G. van Belle, 'Prolepsis in the Gospel of John', *NovT* 43 (2001), pp. 334-47.

69. There is no explicit citation of Zech. 13.7, 'strike the shepherd that the sheep may be scattered'; however, both the text and context are so close to Mt. 26.31 and Mk 14.27, in which an implicit reference to the passage is supposed, see Ridderbos,

(5) Jesus' predictions on various subjects occurring in the Gospel point to his identity as a prophetic figure. A number of eschatological events are announced by Jesus, but these predictions refer to an unspecified future time.<sup>70</sup> Among these, the location of future worship (Jn 4.21, 23), the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple (Jn 2.19), the saying that the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God (Jn 5.26-29), and the promise to Nathanael that he will see greater things than this (Jn 1.50-51) are perhaps the most enigmatic of the predictions of the Johannine Jesus. In addition, the prediction about the sending of the paraclete, which is promised by Jesus several times in the farewell discourse (Jn 14.16, 26; 15.26; 16.7, 13), and the promise of answer to prayer, 'I will do whatever you ask in my name ... I will do it' (Jn 14.13; 15.16; 16.23, 26) are also not given a specific future time, and the fulfilment of the predictions cannot be seen in the Gospel. In contrast, Jesus' prediction about Lazarus's death and resurrection, which is accurately fulfilled (Jn 11.4, 23), Jesus' prediction about Peter's denial and his death (Jn 13.38; 21.18), as discussed above, and the miraculous healing of the official's son (Jn 4.46-54) point to the reliability of Jesus' predictions. These various predictions powerfully suggest a strong possibility of Jesus' prophetic identity in line with the Old Testament prophets.

In sum, the ability of the Johannine Jesus to predict future events points to his prophetic identity. The various sayings of Jesus in the manner of predictions characterize him as the true prophet sent from God. Jesus' predictions fulfilled precisely in the Gospel clearly show that he is like one of the Old Testament prophets, but not just any prophet, the prophet *par excellence*, in terms of the most accurate prophecies and their fulfilment.

### *Jesus' Prophetic Role as Spokesman for God*

The role of a prophet as a mouthpiece of God is one of the most important prophetic functions of Old Testament prophets. One of the distinctive characteristics of the Old Testament prophets is to receive and to possess the authoritative words of God, who gave them, and so to speak the words of God, not their own. By doing this, they play a role of a mouthpiece of God. This is an essential part of the function of prophets. Thus, the real essence of the prophets in the Old Testament is to speak God's word given to them. The Johannine Jesus speaks the words of God given to him

*Gospel according to John*, pp. 544-45; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 548-49; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, II, pp. 736-37; Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, pp. 56-57.

70. See Jn 1.50-51; 2.19, 5.20, 25, 28-29; 4.13-14, 21, 23; 6.39-40, 44, 54; cf. 7.37-38.

(Jn 8.28; 12.49; 14.10; cf. Deut. 18.18). Jesus does not speak his own words, but the words of his Father (Jn 3.34; 7.16; 8.26, 38, 40; 14.10, 24; 17.8), as do the prophets of the Old Testament.<sup>71</sup> In this respect, the Johannine Jesus seems to be depicted as God's spokesman, like the Old Testament prophets.<sup>72</sup> How is the Johannine Jesus described as God's spokesman? John depicts the prophetic role of Jesus as spokesman for God, with its affinity with the role of Old Testament prophets, by means of the use of Jesus' own language of self-characterization.

First, the source of Jesus' prophetic messages as the words of God is clearly expressed, for example, in Jn 7.16; 8.28; 12.49; 14.10, 24. In Jn 7.16, ἡ ἐμὴ διδασχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὴ ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με, in which Jesus manifestly declares that his teaching/message is not his own, but from the one who sent him. The context of Jesus' saying in Jn 7.16 is well described in Jn 7.14-15. At the middle of the celebration of the feast Jesus went up into the Jerusalem Temple and taught. This is the first time Jesus has taught in Jerusalem. After teaching in Jn 7.15, the Jews marvelled at Jesus' teaching/message, so the origin of Jesus' teaching/message and authority are questioned. The 'marvelling' (ἐθαύμαζον) of the Jews is an expression for an emotional rejection of Jesus' teaching/message,<sup>73</sup> because traditionally:

a newcomer teaching in the Temple would necessarily be known as a disciple of a certain teacher. This 'traditional' understanding of a teacher became central to the establishment of authority in post-70 rabbinic Judaism.<sup>74</sup>

In this situation of conflict and rejection, Jesus exhibits the source of his teaching/message and authority, in which he implicitly shows his prophetic identity. Furthermore, the place of the Temple and Jesus' teaching/message as the setting of the narrative contributes to his prophetic image. In Jn 7.16, Jesus clearly mentions that his teaching/message comes from God, like that of the Old Testament prophets.

Second, Jesus gives an unambiguous indication of his identity as a God-sent agent, like the Old Testament prophets, and expresses his function as a spokesman for God toward the world in Jn 8.26, κἀγὼ ἃ ἤκουσα παρ'

71. The Johannine Jesus does not do his own works, but the works of his Father (Jn 4.34; 5.17, 19-24, 30, 36; 8.28; 14.10; 17.4, 14), and he does not fulfil his own will, but the will of his Father (Jn 4.34; 5.30; 6.38; 10.25, 37), like one of Old Testament prophets.

72. For example, Jn 7.17-18; 8.26-28; 12.48-50; 14.10, 24 (cf. Jn 3.34).

73. See F. Annen, 'θαυμάζω', *EDNT*, II, pp. 134-35; *BDAG*, pp. 444-45.

74. Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 242; see also S. Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity according to John* (NovTSup, 42; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), pp. 82-83, 87-89, 106-108.

αὐτοῦ ταῦτα λαλῶ εἰς τὸν κόσμον, as a part of his answer to the question of the Jews about his identity in Jn 8.25, 'Who are you?' The Jews did not understand that he spoke to them of the Father and of his identity, which is clearly indicated by the narrator's comment in Jn 8.27.<sup>75</sup> What Jesus has heard from God is a warning to the Jews: in their sins the Jews are moving towards death, a thought which is expressed in Jn 8.21, and which is repeated in Jn 8.24. In particular, both Jn 8.21 and 24 are Jesus' predictions that the Jews will die in their sin. Jesus declares exactly what he has heard from God, who sent him. In his claim to do so his prophetic role as the mouthpiece of God is expressed. Furthermore, in Jn 8.28, καὶ ἅπ' ἑμαυτοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐδίδαξέν με ὁ πατήρ ταῦτα λαλῶ, Jesus more clearly shows the origin of his messages as from God, which is one of the fundamental characteristics of the Old Testament prophets, and his prophetic function as spokesman for God by means of the use of the expression, καθὼς ἐδίδαξέν με ὁ πατήρ ταῦτα λαλῶ, which undoubtedly indicates that Jesus does not speak his own, but speaks of what God taught him. In v. 28, Jesus' death on the cross is implied by the expression 'lifting up the Son of Man', which is mentioned in Jn 3.14, and will be made even clearer in Jn 12.27-36.<sup>76</sup> The reference to Jesus' death in relation to his prophetic role as spokesman for God leads us to envisage a picture of his prophetic identity in the frame of the rejected-prophet tradition. In v. 28, Jesus' self-awareness as God's spokesman is more clearly expressed than in v. 26. Accordingly, Jn 8.26-28 reasonably demonstrates the prophetic image of the Johannine Jesus as spokesman for God.

Third, the indication that Jesus is conscious of his prophetic role as God's spokesman is also found in Jn 12.49-50. This pericope lies in the larger context of Jn 12.37-50, in which Jesus provides a conclusion to his public ministry, and which includes a reflection on the riddle of Jewish unbelief in Jn 12.37-43, and the last revelatory discourse of Jesus in Jn 12.44-50. In particular, in Jn 12.47-50, there seem to be strong resemblances to the idea of the eschatological prophet like Moses in Deut. 18.18-19. In relation to Jn 12.47-50, a number of Johannine scholars have already pointed out many echoes of Deuteronomy.<sup>77</sup> There is a clear

75. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 271.

76. See F.J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man* (BSR, 14; Rome: Ras, 2nd edn, 1978), pp. 135-41.

77. See Boismard, *Moses or Jesus*, pp. 11-14; *idem*, 'Le caractère adventice de Jo., XII,45-50', in J. Coppens, A. Descamps and E. Massaux (eds.), *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea biblica congressus internationalis catholici de re biblica*, II/2 (BETL, 13; Paris: Gabalda, 1959), pp. 188-92; *idem*, 'Les citations targumiques dans le quatrième

connection between the figure of the Johannine Jesus described in Jn 12.47-50 and the expectation of the coming prophet like Moses in Deut. 18.18-19 as follows: (1) The idea of God's punishment of those who do not listen to the words of a messenger from God is clearly expressed in vv. 47-48, and a similar expression is found in Deut. 18.18-19; 39.19, 26; (2) John uses the verbs ἀκούω and λαμβάνω to describe the reaction that the hearers should have to Jesus' words; the LXX of Deut. 18.18-19 also has the verb ἀκούω; (3) John uses ῥῆμα for 'word' as does the LXX of Deut. 18.18; (4) Jesus does not speak on his own but only what the Father has commanded him to speak, as in Deut. 18.18 God will put His words in the mouth of the Prophet-like-Moses; (5) The theme of commandment runs through both passages. M.J. O'Connell has pointed out that the Johannine concept of commandment is deeply rooted in the Old Testament, especially in Deuteronomy.<sup>78</sup> In this respect, it is a possibility that Jesus is being seen more in the role of the eschatological prophet like Moses. Jesus clearly says that 'I have not spoken on my own (ἐγὼ ἐξ ἑμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλάλησα), but the Father who sent me has himself given me a commandment about what to say and what to speak' in Jn 12.49, where the origin of his prophetic message and his prophetic function as the mouthpiece of God are evidently expressed. Schnackenburg comments on Jn 12.49 that 'the power of Jesus' word to judge is explained by the fact (ὅτι) that it is not Jesus' own word, spoken on his own authority, but the word of the Father who sent him, God's word'.<sup>79</sup> Jesus' self-conscious submission to his Father's will is also clearly indicated in the pericope. In both Jn 12.49-50 and 8.26 the sending formula as an indication of Jesus' prophetic identity is found, in which his self-awareness as God-sent prophet is expressed. The sending formula is closely related to Jesus' prophetic role as God's spokesman in both Jn 8.26 and 12.49-50. Because of his self-consciousness as God-sent prophet, Jesus does not speak of himself, but speaks what he receives from the Father, who gives his commandment. In this respect, Jesus' prophetic role as God's spokesman is clearly described in the pericope.

évangile', *RB* 66 (1959), pp. 376-78; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 218; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 424-25; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 491-93; P. Borgen, 'The Use of Tradition in John 12:44-50', *NTS* 26 (1979), pp. 18-35; M.J. O'Connell, 'The Concept of Commandment in the Old Testament', *TS* 21 (1960), pp. 351-403, see esp. p. 352.

78. O'Connell, 'Concept of Commandment', p. 364; see also Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 504-505.

79. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 424.

Finally, along with Jn 8.26, 28 and 12.49-50, Jesus' prophetic role as God's mouthpiece appears in Jn 14.10, 'the words that I say to you I do not speak on my own; but the Father who dwells in me does his works'. In the expression, 'I do not speak on my own' (ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν ἅπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐ λαλῶ), Jesus' prophetic function as God's spokesman and his self-awareness at undertaking the role of God's mouthpiece are clearly revealed. In particular, the use of the Greek verb λαλέω in Jn 8.26, 28, 12.49-50, and 14.10 indicates Jesus' prophetic speaking.<sup>80</sup> According to de la Potterie:

in religious language the word *lalein* [λαλεῖν] has acquired a higher significance: in biblical Greek it is one of the terms signifying divine revelation: the revelatory word of God through the mediation of angels, prophets, men of God, visions, etc.: it is par excellence the word of him who is himself the Word of God.<sup>81</sup>

Furthermore, Jesus' dependency on God with respect to his messages as the words of God is also clearly expressed in Jn 14.10, in which an intimate relationship between Jesus and God is depicted. A picture of an intimate relationship between God and the Old Testament prophets, who totally rely on God who sent them as his messenger, is found in Moses' intimate relationship to God. Moses' intimate relationship to God, as God's true prophet, is explicitly expressed by the idioms, פֶּה אֶל־פֶּה (mouth to mouth) in Num. 12.8 and אֶל־פָּנִים אֶל־פָּנִים (face to face) in Deut. 34.10; Exod. 33.11 (cf. Gen. 32.31; Judg. 6.22; Ezek. 20.35). Jesus' relationship to God in connection with the words of God implies his image as God's spokesman like Moses, who had an intimate relationship to God. It should be noted that the Old Testament prophets did not identify themselves with the one who sent them; 'there is no "mystic union" with the divine'.<sup>82</sup> In this respect, Jesus is not only a prophet, but also more than a prophet, the prophet *par excellence*. Ernst Haenchen implicitly notes on Jesus' prophetic role as God's spokesman that:

80. See J.P. Heil, 'Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John', *CBQ* 57 (1995), pp. 729-45, esp. p. 739.

81. I. de la Potterie, *The Hour of Jesus: The Passion and the Resurrection of Jesus According to John* (trans. D.G. Murray; New York: Alba House, 1989), p. 44, italics in the original; see also A. Debrunner, H. Kleinknecht, O. Procksch, G. Kittel, G. Quell and G. Schrenk, 'λέγω, λόγος, ῥῆμα, κτλ', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 69-192, esp. pp. 76-77; H. Hübner, 'λαλέω', *EDNT*, II, pp. 335-36.

82. J.F. Ross, 'The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger' in D.L. Petersen (ed.), *Prophecy in Israel: Search for an Identity* (Issues in Religion and Theology, 10; Philadelphia: Fortress Press; London: SPCK, 1987), pp. 112-21 (118).

If we might formulate pointedly what is being said, we could say: according to the Gospel of John, all significance attaches to Jesus precisely because he does not want to be anything else and is the voice and the hands of his Father.<sup>83</sup>

In sum, the Johannine Jesus totally depends on what God speaks and reveals to him; in other words, it is indicated that he clearly knows his prophetic function as spokesman for God. Jesus' dependency on God in terms of his message implicitly points to the prophetic figure and to Jesus' self-awareness as God's spokesman, like the Old Testament prophets. Jesus' prophetic role as God's spokesman indicates his prophetic identity.

### *Conclusions*

In this chapter, Jesus' prophetic words have been examined in order to continue to build towards a reliable picture of his prophetic identity. First, Jesus' prayer recorded in John 17 can be understood as prophetic intercession for demonstrating his prophetic identity in the Gospel on the following grounds: (1) according to the distinctive function of priests and prophets in the Old Testament, prophets were intercessors, but priests were involved in cultic sacrifice; (2) Jesus intercedes for his eleven disciples, so the character of the prayer in John 17 should be understood as prophetic intercession; (3) the frequent use of the word ἀποστέλλω in the prayer can be an indication of his self-awareness as prophet, in which his prayer is understood as prophetic intercession. Jesus' prophetic intercession in John 17, therefore, implicitly illuminates his prophetic identity.

Second, the ability of the Johannine Jesus to pronounce future events as predictions clearly shows his prophetic identity in line with the Old Testament prophets. The various sayings of Jesus in the form of predictions in the Gospel indicate his prophetic identity. Jesus' sayings in the manner of predictions characterize him as a prophet sent from God. Jesus' prophetic figure is clearly portrayed in his predictions of the future found in the Gospel. Jesus' predictions fulfilled precisely in the Gospel actually reveal his prophetic identity, so he is a prophet, like one of the prophets in the Old Testament; however, he is not only a prophet, but also more than a prophet, the prophet *par excellence* in terms of the most accurate prophecies and their fulfilment.

Finally, Jesus' prophetic role as spokesman for God has been identified in John's Gospel, in which he expresses his self-awareness as mouthpiece of God. The prophetic role as spokesman for God is very significant for recognizing prophetic identity. The Johannine Jesus totally depends on

83. Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, I, p. 212.



what God speaks and reveals to him, in other words, he is clearly aware of his prophetic function as spokesman for God. Jesus' dependency on God in terms of his message implicitly demonstrates his prophetic identity as God's spokesman, like the Old Testament prophets. Jesus' self-awareness as spokesman for God clearly indicates his prophetic identity.

## 6

### JESUS' SELF-AWARENESS AS PROPHET

So far in the preceding chapters, Jesus' prophetic actions and his prophetic words have been examined as to whether John makes use of prophetic images in his portrait of Jesus. Increasingly the prophetic colours of John's portrayal of Jesus have emerged from a consideration of his prophetic actions and words in the Gospel. At various points, but especially in the consideration of texts in which Jesus asserts his role as spokesman for God, a self-consciousness of the Johannine Jesus as a prophetic figure has begun to emerge. This chapter will focus explicitly on Jesus' self-awareness in pursuit of additional indications of the prophetic identity that John intends for Jesus.

There is no explicit self-designation of Jesus employing the word *προφήτης* in the Fourth Gospel. In the Gospel, however, the Johannine Jesus seems to be aware of himself as prophet in the following respects: (1) Jn 4.44 seems to demonstrate implicitly that Jesus applies the term *προφήτης* to himself;<sup>1</sup> (2) Jesus very often uses the phrase *ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ* and *ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν* in the Fourth Gospel,<sup>2</sup> and this seems to imply that Jesus knows himself as prophet sent by God, his Father; (3) Jesus' self-awareness of his death in the Gospel seems to indicate his self-consciousness as prophet in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition;<sup>3</sup> (4) the double Amen formula in the Gospel seems to

1. In the Synoptics there are two *logia* explicitly using the term *προφήτης* (Mk 6.4 [= Lk. 4.24; Mt. 13.57] and Lk. 13.33) in relation to his self-awareness as prophet.

2. The phrase appears in Jn 3.17; 4.34; 5.23, 24, 30, 37, 38; 6.29, 38, 39, 44, 57; 7.16, 18, 28, 29, 33; 8.16, 18, 26, 29, 42; 9.4; 10.36; 11.42; 12.44, 45, 49; 13.16, 20; 14.24; 15.21; 16.5; 17.3, 8, 18, 21, 23, 25.

3. The rejected-prophet tradition means that true prophets are apparently the objects of persecution and victims of suffering, and put to death by the disobedient people. The notion of the rejected-prophet is a well-established tradition in the Old Testament. The most obvious and significant passages concerning the rejected-prophet

show Jesus' self-awareness as prophet.<sup>4</sup> The Johannine Jesus' self-awareness as prophet, therefore, will be investigated in relation to these matters.

Before starting our investigation, once again it needs to be noted that this study will use *historical narrative analysis*, in which the focus will be on the character of Jesus as this appears in the text, because the self-awareness of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel is simply an aspect of his characterization.<sup>5</sup> Although Bultmann states that 'we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus',<sup>6</sup> it seems to be quite possible to demonstrate from the text that Jesus as the main character in the Fourth Gospel recognizes himself as a prophet. Leland Ryken offers useful advice on 'how we know what a character is like' in which he

tradition are Neh. 9.26-30; 1 Kgs 18.4, 13 (cf. 2 Kgs 9.7); 19.10, 14; 22.26-27; 2 Chron. 16.10; 24.20-22; Jer. 2.30; 26.20-23; 11.21; 20.1-2; 26.7-19; 32.2; 37.15-16; 38.6. In particular, the rejected-prophet tradition is properly reflected in Neh. 9.26: 'Nevertheless they were disobedient and rebelled against you and cast your law behind their backs and killed your prophets, who had warned them in order to turn them back to you, and they committed great blasphemies'; see H.A. Fischel, 'Martyr and Prophet (A Study in Jewish Literature)', *JQR* 37 (1946-47), pp. 265-80, 363-86; B.H. Amaru, 'The Killing of the Prophets: Unravelling a Midrash', *HUCA* 54 (1983), pp. 153-80. The link between prophet and martyrdom appears as almost a fixed picture in intertestamental sources where the fate of prophets is typically depicted in a violent death. For example, (1) in *1 En.* 89.51-56, the growing disobedience of Israel and the slaying of the prophets, which led to the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile, are clearly portrayed; (2) the book of *Jubilees* (*Jub.* 1.12-13) contains all of these same elements; (3) in *Apoc. Elij.* 4.7-19, the martyrdom of Elijah and Enoch is described; (4) in the *Lives of the Prophets*, Jeremiah was stoned (2.1) and Isaiah 'died under Manasseh by being sawn in two' (1.1). For the intertestamental sources, see J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983-85). The prediction of Jesus' death is implicitly or explicitly expressed, for example, in Jn 3.14; 6.51, 70; 7.30, 33-34; 8.14, 20, 21-22, 28; 10.11, 15, 17, 18; 12.7-8, 23-24, 32; 13.1, 33, 36; 14.2-4, 19, 28-30; 16.5-6, 10, 16-20, 25, 32; 17.1.

4. The double Amen formula occurs 25 times in the Gospel (Jn 1.51; 3.3, 5, 11; 5.19, 24, 25; 6.26, 32, 47, 53; 8.34, 51, 58; 10.1, 7; 12.24; 13.16, 20, 21, 38; 14.12; 16.20, 23; 21.18).

5. For a theory of characterization, see R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (London: George Allen & Unwin: 1981), pp. 114-30; S. Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), pp. 47-92; J. Fokkeman, *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide* (trans. Ineke Smit, Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999), pp. 55-72; Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 99-148.

6. R. Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word* (trans. L.P. Smith and E.H. Lantero; London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1934), p. 8; see also J.A.T. Robinson, 'The Last Tabu? The Self-Consciousness of Jesus', in Robinson, *Twelve More New Testament Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1984), pp. 155-70.

suggests that a character is known to readers in one or more of the following ways: (1) actions, including a character's verbal actions (speech and language); (2) personal traits and abilities, in which an interpretation is given to a character's actions; (3) thoughts and feelings, including motivations and goals; (4) relationships and roles; (5) responses to events or people; (6) archetypal character types.<sup>7</sup> Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet, therefore, will be examined by means of *historical narrative analysis*.

### *The Proverbial Saying in John 4.44*

The proverbial saying quoted in Jn 4.44, προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει, appears not only in John, but also in other forms of the Synoptics (Mt. 13.57; Mk 6.4; Lk. 4.24). The maxim as an isolated saying also occurs in *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* 1.6 and the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* 31.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, similar related aphorisms are also found in profane literature.<sup>9</sup> In this section the aphorism in John will be investigated as to whether it demonstrates Jesus' self-awareness as prophet. In order to do this, the proverb in the Synoptics will briefly be examined as to whether it shows Jesus' self-awareness as prophet, and then, building on the examination of the maxim in the Synoptics, the aphorism in Jn 4.44 will be investigated in relation to Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet.

Does the maxim in the Synoptics (Mt. 13.57; Mk 6.4; Lk. 4.24) demonstrate Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet? The reason for investigating the adage in the Synoptics is to understand that of John. The relationship between John and the Synoptics concerning the maxim is

7. Ryken, *Words of Delight*, p. 74; see also M. Kreplin, *Das Selbstverständnis Jesu. Hermeneutische und christologische Reflexion* (WUNT, 2.141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), who explores the theological relevance of the quest for the historical Jesus and Jesus' self-awareness.

8. *Papyrus Oxyrhynchus* 1.6, οὐκ ἔστιν δεκτὸς προφήτης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἱατρὸς ποιεῖ θεραπείας εἰς τοὺς γινώσκοντας αὐτόν; *Gos. Thom.* 31, 'No prophet is accepted in his own village, no doctor heals those who know him', the text quoted from Schneemelcher and Wilson (eds.), *New Testament Apocrypha*, I, p. 122.

9. See BDAG, p. 789; Dio Chrysostom, 30 [47].6, 'all the philosophers held life to be difficult in the πατρίδι'; Apollonius of Tyana, *Epistulae*, 44, 'until now my own country [πατρίς] alone ignores me'; Epictetus, *Discourses*, III, 16.11-12, 'the philosophers advise us to leave our country', 'we cannot bear that those who meet us should say, "Hey-day! such a one is turned philosopher, who was formerly so and so"', 'physicians send patients with chronic disorders to another place and air'.

extremely hard to determine with certainty.<sup>10</sup> In particular, to find the most primitive version of the proverb in the Gospels is almost impossible. It is, however, commonly acknowledged that the aphorism in John and the Synoptics has a common tradition in terms of the similarity of order and arrangement of the proverb. On this ground, the proverb in the Synoptics will be examined first in relation to Jesus' self-awareness as prophet.

Table 6.1 *The maxim in Mk 6.4, Mt. 13.57 and Lk. 4.24*

<i>Mk 6.4</i>	<i>Mt. 13.57</i>	<i>Lk. 4.24</i>
καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι <b>οὐκ</b> ἔστιν προφήτης <b>ἄτιμος</b> εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν αὐτοῦ <b>καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ</b> .	καὶ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο ἐν αὐτῷ. ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· <b>οὐκ</b> ἔστιν προφήτης <b>ἄτιμος</b> εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι <b>καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ</b> .	εἶπεν δέ· <b>ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν</b> ὅτι οὐδεὶς προφήτης <b>δεκτός</b> ἔστιν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.

In Mk 6.4 Jesus responds in the proverb to the doubts raised about the legitimacy of his teaching and his miracles. Jesus' response to the doubts by quoting the aphorism clearly makes a link between Jesus himself and the role and experience of a prophet. Popular opinions as reported in Mk 6.14-15 also made a link, considering Jesus to be some kind of prophet.<sup>11</sup> In Mt. 13.57 the adage is very similar to the Marcan form in terms of the appearance of the kernel of the maxim, **οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι** and the phrase, **καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ**. Matthew, however, seems to abbreviate freely and rephrase the Marcan material as he does elsewhere in his Gospel, so the phrase, **τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν αὐτοῦ**, is omitted. This feature suggests that Matthew depends on Mk 6.4.<sup>12</sup> The maxim in Mark and Matthew is expressed in a positive sense by using the double negative, **οὐκ ἔστιν προφήτης ἄτιμος εἰ μὴ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι**.

10. The question whether the maxim in Jn 4.44 comes from a common tradition with that of the Synoptics is very tricky and an unanswerable conundrum. In spite of this, it may be possible to compare the literary form of the adage quoted in John and the Synoptics, even if the authentic common tradition cannot be identified with the maxim.

11. See R.A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26* (WBC; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989), pp. 305-13.

12. See W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991), II, pp. 459-60; D.A. Hagner, *Matthew* (WBC; 2 vols.; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1993), I, pp. 403-407, esp. p. 404; F. van Segbroeck, 'Jésus rejeté par sa patrie (Mt 13,54-58)', *Bib* 48 (1968), pp. 167-98; P.J. Temple, 'The Rejection at Nazareth', *CBQ* 17 (1955), pp. 229-42.

In Lk. 4.24, however, the literary form of the maxim is quite different from Mark and Matthew in terms of its language and structure. Luke employs the word δεκτός instead of ἄτιμος, and the word οἰκία, which appears in Mark and Matthew, is omitted. The literary form of the proverb in Luke is shorter than the Marcan form. The Lucan form is used with Jesus' prophetic authority expression, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, which is not found in Mark and Matthew. The Lucan form of the maxim is more similar to John than that of the other two Gospels.

Table 6.2 The maxim in Jn 4.44 and Lk. 4.24

Lk. 4.24	Jn 4.44
εἶπεν δέ· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι <b>οὐδεὶς</b> προφήτης <b>δεκτός</b> ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ.	αὐτὸς γὰρ Ἰησοῦς ἐμαρτύρησεν ὅτι προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι <b>τιμὴν</b> <b>οὐκ</b> ἔχει.

In contrast to Mark and Matthew, the Lucan form of the maxim has a negative sense using οὐδεὶς and concentrates 'exclusively on rejection'.<sup>13</sup> In John the negative sense of the maxim is also clearly expressed by using the phrase **τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει**. The Greek word used for expressing people's attitude towards a prophet is, however, different between Luke and John. In Luke the word δεκτός is employed instead of the **τιμή** found in John. Although a different word is used in Luke and John, the cardinal idea of rejection is the same. Furthermore, the use of the Amen formula in the Lucan form of the maxim seems to suggest an influence of the Johannine tradition.<sup>14</sup>

In the Synoptics, although the literary form is slightly altered in each Gospel, the maxim undoubtedly shows that Jesus is aware of his identity as prophet: (1) the proverb is quoted as *ipsissima verba Jesu*; (2) in the aphorism Jesus employs the word 'prophet' that has not been found in any preserved maxim of Jewish or Hellenistic literature, which suggests that the use of the maxim by Jesus is unique and increases the likelihood that

13. Nolland, *Luke*, I, p. 200, who comments that 'the rejection in Nazareth is a "dress-rehearsal" for the passion, and sets up theological categories which prepare the reader for *Jesus' prophetic destiny* in Jerusalem' (italics are mine); see also I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), p. 188; J.B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), pp. 216-17; J.A. Sanders, 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), pp. 75-106, esp. p. 104.

14. See Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 188.

the maxim reflects his self-awareness as prophet.<sup>15</sup> Does Jesus apply the maxim to himself literally as a prophet or only metaphorically as one who is being treated as prophets get treated? Generally speaking, a proverb is usually used for its metaphorical significance, rather than its literal meaning. In the maxim used by Jesus in the Synoptics, however, he seems to apply its meaning literally to himself. The use of the word *προφήτης* in the aphorism seems to be very significant. If Jesus intended the maxim in its metaphorical implication, the term *προφήτης* would not be needed in the proverb because the maxim itself already has a generic metaphorical meaning. The reason for introducing the word *προφήτης* into the maxim, instead of a term such as 'philosopher' or 'physician', used in the conventional proverb, is therefore that such terms are not appropriate for Jesus' identity.<sup>16</sup> The word *προφήτης* in an aphorism coined by Jesus suggests that the literal meaning of the proverb is correlated to his identity. In his comment on Mt. 13.57, R.T. France says that 'the *prophet* of Jesus' saying was not a purely hypothetical illustration, for Jesus' own role as prophet was already a matter of public discussion (16:14; cf. 21:11, 46)'.<sup>17</sup> For Mk 6.4, J. Painter notes that 'Jesus' use of it [a prophet], with reference to himself, implies that he perceived himself *to be a prophet*',<sup>18</sup> and J.P. Heil comments that 'with a rhetorically potent progression Jesus intensifies his rejection *as a prophet*'.<sup>19</sup> In his commentary on Luke, J.B. Green notes that the 'second aphorism in 4:24 ... highlights Jesus' claim to be a prophet and thus prepares for the eventual response his words will precipitate at Nazareth'.<sup>20</sup> In this respect, a conclusion can be made that

15. G. Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels* (trans. P.P. Levertoff; London: SPCK, 1929), p. 231, who classifies the aphorism in the group of proverbs and maxims used by our Lord, but not found in Jewish literature; W.W. Wessel, 'Mark', in F.E. Gaebelin (ed.), *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (12 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), VIII, pp. 603-793, who claims that 'this word [prophet] is not found in any of the Jewish or pagan proverbs' (p. 665).

16. See Dio Chrysostom, 47.6; Epictetus, *Discourses*, III, 16.11-12; *Gos. Thom.* 31b.

17. R.T. France, *The Gospel according to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985), pp. 232-33, italics in the original.

18. J. Painter, *Mark's Gospel: Worlds in Conflict* (London: Routledge, 1997), p. 97, italics are mine.

19. J.P. Heil, *The Gospel of Mark as Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992), p. 133, italics are mine; Guelich, *Mark 1:1-8:26*, p. 311, who comments on Mk 6.4 that 'one takes the aphorism far too literally should one deduce from it that Jesus saw himself a "prophet"', because he considers that Jesus is more than a prophet, even more than the eschatological prophet.

20. Green, *Gospel of Luke*, p. 217.

Jesus intentionally introduces the word *προφήτης* into the proverb in order to apply its literal meaning to himself. G. Friedrich remarks that:

Jesus is not describing Himself as a prophet but *quoting a common view*. Nevertheless, by not merely adopting the view but also *preparing to exemplify it*, Jesus numbers Himself among the prophets.<sup>21</sup>

By using the aphorism Jesus points to his prophetic character and his self-awareness as prophet. If the proverb in the Synoptics shows Jesus' prophetic image and his self-consciousness as prophet, the maxim in John probably would have the same implication as that of the Synoptics.

In what ways, then, does the maxim in John demonstrate Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet? In contrast to the proverb quoted in the Synoptics, the context of Jn 4.44 seems to explain why it is employed in its present place. The movement of Jesus from Samaria to Galilee is mentioned in Jn 4.43, *μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας ἐξῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν*. In particular, the definite article *τάς* and the adverb *ἐκεῖθεν* in the verse clearly point back to Jn 4.40. The phrase *μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας* in Jn 4.43 is perfectly matched with *ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ δύο ἡμέρας* in Jn 4.40.

The reason for Jesus' moving into Galilee from Samaria in Jn 4.43 is offered in Jn 4.44 in connection with the conjunction *γάρ*. The reason is that Jesus tests himself as prophet in relation to the maxim *προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει* in Jn 4.44.<sup>22</sup> This context evidently shows that Jesus identifies himself as a prophet in relation to the proverb. In Samaria Jesus is honoured by the people of Samaria, so they ask him to stay in their home, and he stays there for two days (Jn 4.40). In the context of first-century social circumstances, providing accommodation was the most respectable welcome.<sup>23</sup> Samaria is obviously not Jesus' own country, but he is welcomed without misgivings despite the relationship between Jews and Samaritans, which is already described in Jn 4.9b, *οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις*. Furthermore, the Samaritan woman has perceived Jesus as prophet in Jn 4.19, *κύριε, θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ*, and the Samaritans also recognize that Jesus is the saviour of the world (*ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου*) in Jn 4.42. So Jesus is understood as a prophet in Samaria.

Now is the time to examine whether Jesus is accepted as a prophet in his own country in relation to the maxim in Jn 4.44. According to the proverb, if Jesus is honoured in his own country, he would not be a prophet.

21. Krämer *et al.*, 'προφήτης, προφήτις, κτλ', p. 841; italics are mine.

22. See Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 73.

23. See Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary*, pp. 102-105.



Jesus moves from Samaria into Galilee in order to apply the principle of the aphorism to himself whether he is honoured in his own country. The particle οὖν in Jn 4.45 indicates that Jesus' movement from Samaria into Galilee is to show the applicability of the maxim to his prophetic identity; therefore, when he arrives, the Galileans do not honour, but accept him, because they had seen all that he had done in Jerusalem (Jn 4.48; cf. Jn 2.23-25): this will be discussed below. In this context, the function of the maxim is quite clear: it is used for the applicability of the aphorism to Jesus' identity as prophet. From the above discussion a conclusion can be made as follows: (1) the reason for Jesus' moving into Galilee from Samaria offered by the linking word γάρ in Jn 4.44 undoubtedly implies that Jesus understands himself as prophet; (2) the use of the term μαρτυρεῖν in Jn 4.44 evidently shows Jesus' intention in relation to the proverb: he applies the literal meaning of the maxim to himself rather than the metaphorical significance of the proverb for demonstrating his self-awareness as prophet.

Why, then, is the adage in Jn 4.44 not quoted as *ipsissima verba Jesu*,<sup>24</sup> but employed by John in his explanatory aside? The maxim used in the Johannine explanatory aside implies that John intentionally employs the proverb in the present context for demonstrating Jesus' identity as prophet. The Johannine aside is one of the Johannine literary techniques. The use of narrator's asides in John is one of the features most distinct in comparison with the Synoptics. The function of the Johannine asides is to explain names (Jn 1.38, 42) and symbols (Jn 2.21; 12.33; 18.9), and to correct possible misunderstandings (Jn 4.2; 6.6), and to re-identify the characters of the story (Jn 7.50; 21.20).<sup>25</sup> This literary technique is more efficient than the use of direct quotations by characters for describing the characters in narratives. The direct quotations in the narratives can be more credible for understanding a stream of consciousness of the characters of the narratives, but it does not always guarantee a correct understanding of the characters because of the ambiguity of the meaning of the quotations. In Jn 4.43-44 the narrator, who is omnipresent and omniscient in narratives,<sup>26</sup> provides by means of his explanatory asides a very precise com-

24. Even if the adage in Jn 4.44 is not quoted as *ipsissima verba Jesu*, there seems to be a strong possibility that John could report the maxim from *ipsissima verba Jesu* in relation to its context and the manner of the account.

25. On the Johannine asides, see M.C. Tenney, 'The Footnotes of John's Gospel', *BSac* 117 (1960), pp. 350-64; J.J. O'Rourke, 'Asides in the Gospel of John', *NovT* 21 (1979), pp. 210-19; G. van Belle, *Les parenthèses dans l'Évangile de Jean. Aperçu historique et classification. Texte grec de Jean* (SNTA, 11; Leuven: Peeters, 1985); T. Thatcher, 'A New Look at Asides in the Fourth Gospel', *BSac* 151 (1994), pp. 428-39.

26. See Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, pp. 31-37.

mentary on Jesus' thoughts and motives for his moving from Samaria to Galilee, so readers are given the privilege of entering into an aspect of Jesus' consciousness.<sup>27</sup> Readers of John, therefore, can clearly understand why Jesus moves from Samaria to Galilee and who Jesus is by the Johannine asides. The narrator of John more clearly shows Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet in respect of the maxim in Jn 4.44 than do the Synoptics.

Now we need to move on to Jn 4.45 in relation to the maxim. In Jn 4.45, 'when he [Jesus] came into Galilee, the Galileans received him (ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι), [because] they had seen all things that he had done in Jerusalem during the feast because they also went to the feast' shows a clear picture that Jesus has been welcomed by the Galileans. If Jesus is a prophet, he should not be honoured in his own country according to the proverb in Jn 4.44. Jesus is, however, received by the Galileans who had seen his signs in Jerusalem (Jn 2.23-25). Many commentators, therefore, puzzle about the attitude of the Galileans towards Jesus in Jn 4.45.<sup>28</sup> Many suggestions have been made that can be summarized as follows: (1) Jn 4.44 is accidentally placed in its present location, so it should be regarded as an interpolation or dislocation;<sup>29</sup> (2) Galilee is not the πατρίς of Jesus in relation to Jn 4.44 and 45;<sup>30</sup> (3) the connotation of the Greek word ἐδέξαντο used in Jn 4.45 is quite different from the meaning of τιμή in the maxim in Jn 4.44.<sup>31</sup>

The proposals will briefly be discussed here. First, the suggestion that Jn 4.44 is an interpolation or dislocation is not satisfactory because the link between Jn 4.43 and the maxim in Jn 4.44 is marked by the use of the

27. For example, Jn 2.24; 5.6; 6.6, 15, 61; 7.1, 39; 11.5, 33, 38; 12.33; 13.1, 3, 11, 21; 16.19; 18.4; 19.28; 21.19.

28. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 186-89, who notes that 'three verses [Jn 4.43-45] constitutes a notorious crux in Fourth Gospel' (p. 186, italics are mine); Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, pp. 244-46; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 233-38; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, pp. 461-64; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 204.

29. See Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 204 n. 2; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 200; Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, I, p. 164; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 187.

30. For the detailed discussion on the πατρίς of Jesus, see G. Reim, 'John IV.44: Crux or Clue? The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth in Johannine Composition', *NTS* 22 (1976), pp. 476-80, reprinted in Reim, *Jochanan: Erweiterte Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (Erlangen: Verlag der Ev.-Luther Mission, 1995), pp. 397-401; J.W. Pryor, 'John 4:44 and the Patris of Jesus', *CBQ* 49 (1987), pp. 254-63; see also Carson, 'Current Source Criticism', *JBL* 97 (1978), pp. 411-29, see esp. p. 424 n. 50.

31. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 464; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 186-87.

conjunction γάρ in Jn 4.44. If Jn 4.44 is an interpolation or dislocation, it should be totally isolated in the present context, but it makes good sense in relation to Jn 4.43. Furthermore, the word τιμή in Jn 4.44 appears elsewhere in the Gospel (Jn 5.23; 8.49; 12.26), but the use of the term ἐδέξαντο in Jn 4.45, is a *hapax legomenon* in John. In this respect, Jn 4.44 does not look like an interpolation or dislocation; rather Jn 4.45 would be more so in terms of the *hapax legomenon*. The only difficulty is that Jesus is welcomed by the Galileans in Jn 4.45. If Jesus were not welcomed in Galilee, there would not be any problem between Jn 4.44 and 45. Second, the proposal that the πατρίς of Jesus is not Galilee is doubtful because it is quite clearly shown that Nazareth or Galilee is the place of Jesus' πατρίς in Jn 1.45-46, and 7.41, 52. Finally, the suggestion that the term ἐδέξαντο used in Jn 4.45 does not have the same connotation of the word τιμή seems to be plausible. This proposal could be a good way of elucidating the relationship between Jn 4.44 and 45. In fact, the meaning of the word ἐδέξαντο used in Jn 4.45 is quite different from τιμή in Jn 4.44. The word ἐδέξαντο, which is an aorist form of δέχομαι, is a *hapax legomenon* in John. The term δέχομαι means 'welcome', 'receive', 'accept', and 'have a guest'.<sup>32</sup> On the other hand, the word τιμή renders 'honour as an element in the assignment of status to a person'.<sup>33</sup> The choice of the terms δέχομαι and τιμή in John makes a clear distinction.

The use of the word ἐδέξαντο in Jn 4.45 instead of the term τιμή seems to be a mark of the author's intention to employ irony about the attitude of the Galileans towards Jesus. Readers have already recognized Jesus as prophet in connection with the proverb in Jn 4.44, so they expect him to be rejected by the Galileans. Jesus is, however, received by the Galileans. The word ἐδέξαντο used in Jn 4.45 is, therefore, irony as a Johannine literary technique in relation to the maxim.<sup>34</sup> The use of irony is one of the Johannine literary tools.<sup>35</sup> Irony, simply defined, 'consists in saying one thing and intending the opposite',<sup>36</sup> and it is 'the disparity between the meaning conveyed and the literal meanings of the words'.<sup>37</sup>

32. See Louw and Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon*, I, pp. 453, 572.

33. Louw and Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon*, I, p. 734, see also pp. 620, 576.

34. Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 236, who also thinks that 'what this means is that when John tells us that *the Galileans welcomed him* [italics in the original], the context he develops shows that here, as so often, *he is writing with deep irony* [italics are mine]'.

35. On the Johannine irony, see Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*; Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*; Wead, *Literary Devices*, pp. 47-68.

36. G.B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980), p. 134.

37. Wead, *Literary Devices*, p. 47.

In order to understand the real meaning within the use of irony, Culpepper suggests that:

the reader must take four steps: (1) reject the literal meaning, (2) recognize alternative interpretations, (3) decide about the author's knowledge or beliefs, and (4) choose a new meaning which is in harmony with the (implied) author's position.<sup>38</sup>

If we follow these steps, the literal meaning of ἐδέξαντο in Jn 4.45 should be rejected, and the conclusion that the real meaning of ἐδέξαντο is not the same as τιμή should be made. In this respect, Jesus is not fully honoured, but tumultuously welcomed by the Galileans, because they had seen his signs in Jerusalem (Jn 4.45b, cf. Jn 2.23-25; 3.2-3; 4.48; 11.7-8).<sup>39</sup> The door to the irony is opened by the imprecision of ἐδέξαντο. In John for 'receive' the word λαμβάνειν is generally used,<sup>40</sup> and for 'honour' the term τιμή or its cognate verb τιμᾶν is employed.<sup>41</sup> The use of the term δέχομαι in Jn 4.45 is, therefore, unusual and points to John's intention to employ the term δέχομαι for producing an irony: readers puzzle over its literal meaning because they already recognize Jesus as prophet in relation to Jn 4.44. By the use of the term δέχομαι in Jn 4.45, the author creates a window to the readers in order to see the figure of Jesus as prophet and to recognize his self-awareness as prophet in relation to the proverb in Jn 4.44. The maxim in Jn 4.44 is, therefore, neither interpolation nor dislocation, and it does not contradict Jn 4.45. The location of the maxim is properly fitted in its present context, and it shows Jesus' self-awareness as prophet.

In sum, the proverbial saying of Jesus in the Synoptics shows Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet by the use of *ipsissima verba Jesu* and taking its literal meaning. Likewise the aphorism in Jn 4.44 more effectively indicates Jesus' self-awareness as prophet by means of the Johannine

38. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 167, here he uses the idea of W.C. Booth, *A Rhetoric of Irony* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974), pp. 10-12.

39. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 464, who notes that "receive" [in v. 45] only means a welcome of a superficial type, not that "acceptance" (λαμβάνειν τινά) which designates genuine faith (1:12; 5:43; cf. 3:11, 32f.; 12:48; 13:20; 17:8); Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 187, who comments that 'Jesus was not properly appreciated in Galilee ... the welcome given to Jesus in Galilee (vs. 45) is just as shallow as the reaction that greeted Jesus in Jerusalem (ii 23-25)'.

40. The term λαμβάνω is employed 41 times throughout John's Gospel.

41. The word τιμή is employed several times in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 5.23 [4 times]; 8.49; 12.26).

asides as a literary technique in which the author opens a door for entering into an aspect of Jesus' consciousness.<sup>42</sup>

### *The Sending Formula*

The use of the sending formula in John seems to be the key to Jesus' self-understanding as prophet.<sup>43</sup> In order to explore this, the focus will mainly be on the two terms, ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω, used in the sending formula, because other terms such as ἔρχομαι, καταβαίνω, φανερώω, φωτίζω, φαίνω and δίδωμι are not very significant for this study.<sup>44</sup> In connection with the sending of Jesus by God the word ἀποστέλλω is employed 17 times,<sup>45</sup> and πέμπω 24 times<sup>46</sup> in the Fourth Gospel in which the formulaic expressions ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ or ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν are employed.

The terms ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω are basically used for the sending of persons and things in secular Greek.<sup>47</sup> In John's Gospel the two words are always employed for the sending of persons, and never used for things. Some think that there may be a discernable difference in the usage of the two terms,<sup>48</sup> whereas others argue that the two words are used as synonyms

42. Along with the maxim in Jn 4.44, Jesus' consciousness is also clearly expressed in Jn 6.15.

43. Under the heading, 'The Sending Formula', I will briefly demonstrate Jesus' self-awareness as the prophet in relation to the 'sending formula' in the Gospel. For a detailed discussion on the subject of sending formula, see J.-A. Bühner, *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium: Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Grundlagen der johanneischen Sendungschristologie sowie ihre traditionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung* (WUNT, 2.2; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1977); Miranda, *Der Vater*; *idem*, *Die Sendung Jesu*; J. Kuhl, *Die Sendung Jesu und der Kirche nach dem Johannesevangelium* (Studia Instituti Missiologicae Societatis Verbi Domini, 11; St Augustin: Styler, 1967), see esp. pp. 58-129; Okure, *Johannine Approach*, pp. 16-22.

44. For a discussion of such terms, see Miranda, *Der Vater*, pp. 39-128.

45. Jn 3.17, 34; 5.36, 38; 6.29, 57; 7.29; 8.42; 10.36; 11.42; 17.3, 8, 18a, 21, 23, 25; 20.21a.

46. Jn 4.34; 5.23, 24, 30, 37; 6.38, 39, 44; 7.16, 18, 28, 33; 8.16, 18, 26, 29; 9.4; 12.44, 45, 49; 13.20b; 14.24; 15.21; 16.5.

47. See Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, pp. 219, 1359; BDAG, pp. 120-21, 794-95; E. von Eicken, H. Lindner, D. Müller and C. Brown, 'Apostle', *NIDNTT*, I, pp. 126-37.

48. For example, E.A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1905), p. 226, who comments that 'it cannot be doubted that John intends a difference of meaning by the different words [ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω]'; Westcott, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 298.

in John, and so there is no significant difference between the two words.<sup>49</sup> The discussion whether or not the two terms are used in a different way and in distinctive meanings has been continued since K.H. Rengstorf's essay appeared in *TWNT* (1933),<sup>50</sup> in which he considers that there is an important semantic difference between John's use of ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω.<sup>51</sup> Thus, he argues that the word ἀποστέλλω emphasizes the sender and his relationship with the one sent, while the term πέμπω is focused on the fact and the task of sending,<sup>52</sup> and concludes that:

In John's Gospel ἀποστέλλειν is used by Jesus when his concern is to ground His authority in that of God as the One who is responsible for His words and works and who guarantees their right and truth. On the other hand, He uses the formula ὁ πέμψας με (πατήρ) to affirm the participation of God in His work in the *actio* of His sending.<sup>53</sup>

This view, however, has been challenged by many such as E.D. Freed, J.P. Louw and C. Mercer.<sup>54</sup> Recently Köstenberger has examined the terms ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω as to whether there is a significant distinction in meaning and concludes that 'John's use of ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω is best explained by John's preference for a word in a certain grammatical form or by stylistic variation'.<sup>55</sup> In this respect, the two words are used synonymously and interchangeably in John. In particular, Jn 5.36-38; 7.28-29, 32-33; 20.21 quite clearly show that the two terms as synonyms are used

49. For example, C.C. Tarelli, 'Johannine Synonyms', *JTS* 47 (1946), pp. 175-77; Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, I, p. 118; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, pp. 569-70.

50. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (11 vols.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933-79). For this study, I will use the edition of the English translation, *TDNT*.

51. See K.H. Rengstorf, 'ἀποστέλλω (πέμπω), κτλ', *TDNT*, I, pp. 398-447, see esp. pp. 398-406.

52. Rengstorf, 'ἀποστέλλω, κτλ', p. 404.

53. Rengstorf, 'ἀποστέλλω, κτλ', p. 405, italics in the original.

54. See J. Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 206-62; E.D. Freed, 'Variations in the Language and Thought of John', *ZNW* 55 (1964), pp. 167-97, esp. p. 167; J.P. Louw, 'On Johannine Style', *Neot* 20 (1986), pp. 5-12, esp. p. 7; C. Mercer, 'Αποστέλλειν and Πέμπειν in John', *NTS* 36 (1990), pp. 619-24; I will not exhaustively investigate the differences between the terms ἀποστέλλειν and πέμπειν, because a considerable amount of work about the subject has already been done, and the subject is beyond this study; for a detailed discussion on the issue, see Köstenberger, *Missions of Jesus*, pp. 97-111; J. Seynaeve, 'Les verbes ἀποστέλλω et πέμπω dans le vocabulaire théologique de Saint Jean', in de Jonge, *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 385-89.

55. Köstenberger, *Missions of Jesus*, p. 106.

interchangeably.<sup>56</sup> The use of the sending terminology either ἀποστέλλω or πέμπω in the sending formula, therefore, basically does not make any significant distinction.

In what ways does Jesus recognize himself as prophet in relation to the sending formula? First, the use of the sending formula for the prophetic figure of John the Baptist<sup>57</sup> suggests the prophetic image of Jesus when the same sending formula is applied to Jesus. In Jn 1.6, 33, before being applied to Jesus the sending formula is used for John the Baptist, apparently identifying him as a God-sent prophet, like the prophets in the Old Testament. In his commentary on John, D.M. Smith says that John the Baptist is 'a prophetic figure whose sole mission is to bear witness or testimony ... to the light, that is to Jesus'.<sup>58</sup> Thus, people in the times of John the Baptist wondered as to whether he is 'the prophet' appointed in Deut. 18.18 or Elijah or Christ (Jn 1.19-28). John the Baptist, however, clearly denies he is the Christ, or Elijah, or the prophet. In the Synoptics John the Baptist is clearly viewed as a prophet (Mt. 11.9-14; Mk 9.11-13; Lk. 7.26-28),<sup>59</sup> whereas in John he is not straightforwardly introduced as prophet. The prophetic figure of John the Baptist in Jn 1.6, 33 is, however, characterized by the use of the sending formula. In Jn 1.6, 'there was a man, who has been sent from God (ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ), his name [was] John', the sending formula is used by the narrator of the Gospel for drawing the prophetic figure of John the Baptist, but in Jn 1.33, 'I did not know him, but the one who has sent me (ὁ πέμψας με) to baptize with water', the formula is employed by John the Baptist for himself. Furthermore, the identity of John the Baptist as the Isaianic voice in the wilderness in Jn 1.23 reflects his prophetic identity in connection with the sending formula in Jn 3.28, although he rejects the image of Elijah-*redivivus*.<sup>60</sup> Although John the Baptist in the Fourth Gospel is not explicitly identified as a prophet by the use of the term 'prophet', the use of the sending formula by the narrator of the Gospel and John the Baptist himself implies the prophetic figure of John the Baptist. After the use of the sending formula by the narrator of the Gospel and John the Baptist for the prophetic figure of John the Baptist, Jesus portrays himself as prophet like

56. See Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 569.

57. In the Fourth Gospel the appellation *the Baptist* (ὁ βαπτιστής) is never used for John, but the epithet will be employed in this study in order to distinguish from John, as used for the unknown author of the Gospel.

58. D.M. Smith, *John* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999), p. 54.

59. See Webb, *John the Baptizer*, pp. 51-70.

60. See W. Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (SNTSMS, 7; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), pp. 89-95; Webb, *John the Baptizer*, pp. 70-77.

John the Baptist.<sup>61</sup> The use of the sending formula by Jesus illuminates that he stands in the same line as John the Baptist: Jesus is depicted as God-sent prophet. The reason for allowing John the Baptist to initiate the sending formula is that both he and Jesus come from the same sender. The sending formula used by Jesus after applying it to John the Baptist implies that Jesus portrays himself as a prophet like John the Baptist in which his self-consciousness as God-sent prophet is indicated.<sup>62</sup>

Second, the sending formula used by Jesus seems to imply his prophetic calling in which he shows his self-consciousness as prophet. The sending formula is frequently found in the call narrative of prophets, for example, Moses (Exod. 3.1-15), Isaiah (Isa. 6.1-13) and Jeremiah (Jer. 1.1-10). The frequent use of the verb *שָׁלַח* in the call narrative of the Old Testament prophets indicates that the prophets are sent by God.<sup>63</sup> In the sense of the Old Testament, therefore, if being 'sent' is at issue, it is usually related to a prophet.<sup>64</sup> A primary characteristic of prophetic self-consciousness is an awareness of a call, which is regarded as the prophet's legitimization. In the Old Testament this call is viewed as ultimately coming from God and by means of a dream, a vision, an audition, or through the mediation of another prophet. In this respect, the sending formula is used to point to the prophetic calling as a mark of the prophet's self-consciousness in the Old Testament.<sup>65</sup> In John a prophetic calling is not found in relation to Jesus' calling as prophet, but the sending formula can be considered a mark of Jesus' self-characterization as prophet.<sup>66</sup> In the sending formula

61. See Painter, *Quest for the Messiah*, p. 238.

62. See Hill, *New Testament Prophecy*, p. 67, who notes that the sending formula in John 'do[es] bear witness to Jesus' prophetic self-consciousness'.

63. See Collins, '*שָׁלַח*', pp. 119-23.

64. See Jer. 14.14, 15; 23.21, 32; 27.15; 28.9, 15; 29.9, 31; 3.2; Ezek. 13.6; Neh. 6.12; cf. in relation to Moses, Num. 16.28-29; Exod. 4.13.

65. See Miranda, *Der Vater*, pp. 295-304, who comes to the conclusion that the Old Testament-prophetic model is used by John. The same position is held by B. Vawter, 'Ezekiel and John', *CBQ* 26 (1964), pp. 450-58; F.M. Braun, *Jean le théologien*. II. *Les grandes traditions d'Israël et l'accord des écritures selon le quatrième évangile* (Paris: Gabalda, 1964), pp. 49-152; E. Fascher, 'Christologie und Gnosis im vierten Evangelium', *TLZ* 93 (1968), pp. 721-30, esp. p. 729, who makes the important observation that Jesus is fundamentally different from the prophets since he demands not only belief in his words but also in himself; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. lix-lx, who focuses on the missions of Moses and of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah; Kuhl, *Die Sendung Jesu*, pp. 14-16; H.A. Guy, *New Testament Prophecy: Its Origin and Significance* (London: Epworth Press, 1947), pp. 84-85; Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, p. 161.

66. The baptism of Jesus in the Synoptics has been considered as a ritual of status transformation for Jesus as prophet, see McVann, 'Rituals of Status Transforma-



in John, Jesus shows his relationship to God, the Father who is the sender, in which he is self-portrayed as the one who is sent by God. In the sending formula, in particular, Jesus uses 'father' language and 'son' language. The use of 'father' language in the sending formula found in John's Gospel implies Jesus' self-awareness as his son.<sup>67</sup> In the sending formula found in Jn 3.17; 5.23; 10.36 'son' language is explicitly employed. The use of 'son' language in conjunction with the sending formula indicates Jesus' self-knowledge about his identity as the God-sent son. In particular, both 'father' language and 'son' language are used in Jn 5.23 and 10.36, in which Jesus regards his relationship with the Father as especially intimate. Jesus' intimate relationship with his Father can be related to the prophetic image in the Old Testament, in which a certain intimate relationship between the prophets in the Old Testament and God is also found, but more is involved in the case of Jesus: ultimately the relationship between Jesus and God transcends the relationship between the prophets in the Old Testament and God.<sup>68</sup> The degree of the relationship between Jesus and God is captured by the family language of the 'father' and the 'son'. Although Jesus identifies himself as the one who is sent by God, he was with God (Jn 1.1, 14; 8.42, 58; 17.5) and he and God are one (Jn 10.30, 38; 14.10, 11; 17.21, 22). In this respect, the figure of Jesus is not only a prophet, but also more than a prophet, even more than the eschatological prophet. The use of the sending formula in John is employed for an indication of Jesus' prophetic calling in which his self-consciousness as prophet is recognized, but it also goes further with the use of 'father' and 'son' language.

Finally, the use of the sending formula in relation to the prophetic office in Jn 12.44-50 and 14.24, in particular, seems to indicate that Jesus understands his prophetic role in terms of being God's mouthpiece, of his subordination to God, and of prophetic judgment. In Jn 12.44-50 the sending formula appears three times in connection with the word πέμπω in vv. 44, 45 and 49, and a related 'coming' formula using the word ἔρχομαι

tion', pp. 333-60. The episode of the baptism of Jesus in John appears in a condensed form, but Jesus' prophetic calling is hard to find in the episode. For Jesus' prophetic calling, John seems to use the sending formula rather than the episode of Jesus' baptism.

67. See Jn 5.23, 36, 37; 6.44, 57; 8.16, 18; 10.36; 12.49; 14.24; 17.21, 25; 20.21.

68. See E.P. Sanders, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin Press, 1993), pp. 238-39; Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, p. 69; Miranda, *Der Vater*, pp. 305-307, however, concludes that the Father-Son relationship in John is not strictly derived from the Old Testament conception of the relationship of prophetic figures to Yahweh, but rather is primarily anchored in the wisdom Christology of early Christianity. This suggestion is not convincing.

appears twice in vv. 46 and 47.<sup>69</sup> In Jn 12.44 the term ἔκραξεν indicates Jesus' prophetic authoritative speech. The use of the word κράζω refers to proclamation.<sup>70</sup> The same Greek verb is used in the proclamation of John the Baptist in Jn 1.15 and of Jesus in Jn 7.28, 37. The term λαμβάνων in Jn 12.48 is closely linked to Jesus' prophetic activity of speaking God's words. When Jesus as God-sent prophet speaks God's words, people should believe or accept it, then they will be saved and have life, but if not, they will be judged by the same words (Jn 12.47-48). Jn 12.44-50 clearly shows that Jesus knows his prophetic function as the mouthpiece of God. Because of Jesus' self-consciousness as God-sent prophet he does not speak of himself, but speaks what he receives from the Father, who gives his commandment (Jn 12.49-50). In Jn 12.44-50, the word ἐγώ is used four times in vv. 46, 47, 49 and 50; however, Jesus is subordinated to the Father and to his role as the God-sent Son making the Father known.<sup>71</sup> In Jn 14.24, the sending formula is also closely related to the prophetic function, 'to speak God's words' (Jn 3.34; 7.16; 12.48-50). Jesus apparently says that his words are not his own, but are from the Father. Such a prophetic role is well attested in Deut. 18.18. The language of 'judgment' (κρίνω) appears in Jn 12.47 (twice) and 48 (twice). An image of judgment is implied by the term 'darkness' (σκοτία), which is used in the metaphorical sense of judgment, in relation to a similar sending formula using the word ἔρχομαι in Jn 12.46. The theme of judgment is characteristic in the message of the prophets in the Old Testament.<sup>72</sup> Although Jesus does not come to judge the world but to save the world (Jn 12.47; cf. Jn 3.17), his words, which he has spoken, will judge those who reject him and his sayings (Jn 12.48; cf. Jn 3.19). Here Jesus is portrayed as prophet in relation to the theme of judgment. Moreover, the use of the term ἀποστέλλω in John 17 seems to be a clear indication of Jesus' self-awareness as prophet. It is noticeable that in the prayer of Jesus the word ἀποστέλλω occurs seven times (Jn 17.3, 8, 18 [twice], 21, 23, 25), but πέμπω is never used (cf. Jn 13.20). In the prayer Jesus clearly mentions that he has been sent by God, the Father, using the word ἀποστέλλω. What, then, is the significance of the use of the term ἀποστέλλω in John 17? The frequency of the use of the word ἀποστέλλω in the prayer indicates that 'the sending theme' is the focal point in John

69. See Miranda, *Der Vater*, pp. 39-52.

70. See Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 382 n. 1; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 217.

71. See Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, p. 199.

72. See M. Reiser, *Jesus and Judgment: The Eschatological Proclamation in its Jewish Context* (trans. M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), pp. 26-42.

17, as it is in the Gospel as a whole. In the sending theme of the prayer in John 17, Jesus' prophetic identity is implicitly revealed, in which the prayer of Jesus can be seen as prophetic intercession rather than priestly prayer. The frequent use of the word ἀποστέλλω in the prayer, therefore, can be a reliable sign for demonstrating Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet.<sup>73</sup> In this respect, the sending formula related to the prophetic functions shows that Jesus evidently has self-consciousness as the God-sent prophet.

In sum, the sending formula used by Jesus after being used by John the Baptist indicates that he is aware of his prophetic identity. The Father–Son relationship between God and Jesus in the sending formula reflects the intimacy with God of the prophetic calling, although the family relationship implies that Jesus is not only a prophet, but also more than a prophet. The frequent use of the sending formula in the Gospel by Jesus in relation to the prophetic functions implicitly implies that the Johannine Jesus is aware of his prophetic identity.

*Jesus' Self-consciousness of his Coming Violent Death  
as the Figure of a Rejected Prophet*

Jesus' self-consciousness of his fatal destiny is expressed several times in the Fourth Gospel. Jesus' disciples and the Jews, however, have some difficulties in understanding them, because he uses various forms of figurative language (Jn 16.25) and parabolic sayings, with the exception of Jn 12.7. Jesus' self-awareness of his coming violent death seems to be a mark of the indication that he knows himself as prophet in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition.

In what ways can the Johannine Jesus' self-consciousness of his coming violent death be seen as the figure of a rejected prophet in the Gospel? First, the negative expressions about people's attitude towards Jesus in Jn 1.11; 2.23-25; 4.48 seem to imply that he stands in the rejected-prophet tradition. The terms in which the negative attitude to Jesus is expressed in Jn 1.11 are related to those used to introduce the rejected-prophet motif in Jn 4.44, as discussed above. The phrase εἰς τὰ ἴδια ... οἱ ἴδιοι in Jn 1.11 is matched by the expression ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ in Jn 4.44. The concept of rejection is expressed by αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον in Jn 1.11 and τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει in Jn 4.44. In this respect, readers can set the picture of Jesus' fatal destiny into the frame of the rejected-prophet tradition. In Jn 2.23-25 the narrator illustrates that Jesus already knows his fatal destiny; therefore,

73. The frequent use of the word ἀποστέλλω in the prayer of John 17 as indicating Jesus' self-awareness as prophet also points to the prayer of Jesus as prophetic intercession for his disciples, like those of prophets in the Old Testament.

although many people believed in his name when they saw the signs that Jesus did in Jerusalem at the Passover feast, he does not accept their believing. The rejecting attitude to Jesus in Jerusalem (Jn 2.23-25) is similarly expressed in Jn 4.48, which we have already seen is to be linked back to Jn 4.44, the place where the rejected-prophet motif becomes explicit. These negative attitudes towards Jesus are closely related to the idea of the rejected-prophet tradition in John. In this respect, Jesus stands on the line of the rejected-prophet tradition, in which the prophetic figure of Jesus is portrayed.

Second, the expression *με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι* in Jn 7.19; 8.37, 40, seems to draw a picture of the violent death of Jesus in which the rejected-prophet tradition is implied. In Jn 7.19, Jesus is talking about people trying to kill him while those people themselves seem not to be yet aware of their murderous intentions. This may be explicable in terms of an appeal to the rejected-prophet tradition. On the basis of his awareness of this tradition and its relevance to himself Jesus flushes out a hostility that has yet only barely surfaced. Jesus clearly recognizes that he will be killed as a rejected prophet by his own people. During the conversation between Jesus and the Jews, some perceive Jesus to be the prophet in Jn 7.40 and thus explicitly introduce the prophetic category into the discussion. In Jn 7.19 the use of the word *ἀποκτεῖναι* is probably, then, intended to indicate the violent death of rejected prophets, and the verb *ζητεῖτε* in connection with the word *ἀποκτεῖναι* implies that thus far we have violent intentions and not yet violent action.<sup>74</sup> Readers can understand that Jesus knows his fatal destiny as a rejected prophet. Jesus recognizes that the descendants of Abraham seek to kill him in Jn 8.37 and 40. The repetition of the language of Jn 7.19 suggests that it is the rejected-prophet tradition that is vividly portrayed. The reason for killing Jesus is not because he is a false prophet, but because those who would kill him do not accept his words, which are God's words and given to Jesus (Jn 8.37, 40). Here readers can easily envisage Jesus as an innocent victim in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition. In this respect, the phrase 'you seek to kill me' as Jesus' direct speech shows his prophetic image in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition.

Third, the pictures of stoning, arresting and the plotting of Jesus' death seem to demonstrate that he stands in the rejected-prophet tradition. 'Pelting stones was a common expression of mob anger and hatred (1 Sam.

74. The word *ζητεῖν* is used for a sense of seeking the life of someone in Mt. 2.20 (cf. Exod. 4.19); Rom. 11.3 (1 Kgs 19.10); cf. 1 Kgs 19.14; Sir. 51.3; Pss. 34.4; 37.13; 39.15; 53.5; 62.10; 85.14; see BDAG, p. 428.

30.6; 1 Kgs 2.18).<sup>75</sup> In the Old Testament, stoning is a capital punishment for the following offences: being a false prophet (Deut. 13.2-6), blasphemy (Lev. 24.15-16), spirit-divination (Lev. 20.27), and worship of other gods (Deut. 17.2-7). Rejected prophets are very often treated as false prophets or blasphemers, so they are stoned. Stoning also appears several times in the New Testament.<sup>76</sup> In particular, Heb. 11.37 implies that prophets in the Old Testament were stoned. The picture of stoning is found in Jn 8.59 and 10.31 in which the Jewish people pick up stones in order to throw them at Jesus, but they do not throw the stones. In this picture, readers can see that Jesus faces a standard prophet's fate. Along with the picture of stoning, the scene of Jesus' arrest or attempted arrest indicates that he is in a similar situation to rejected prophets. In Jn 7.30 the narrator says that the Jews try to arrest Jesus. The Jews perhaps intend to hand Jesus over to the Sanhedrin. The chief priests and the Pharisees send temple police to arrest Jesus in Jn 7.32; however, the appointed hour of the death of Jesus has not yet come (Jn 7.30), so they cannot get rid of him. After Judas's betrayal, Jesus is eventually arrested and bound by the soldiers, their officers, and the Jewish temple police (Jn 18.1-14). In the picture of Jesus' arrest, the figure of Jesus as a rejected prophet is implied. Moreover, the plotting of Jesus' death as the climax of the whole story of Jesus' rejection in connection with the rejected-prophet tradition demonstrates that he walks the final path of the rejected prophets. The finale of the rejected prophets is to be killed by their own people. Jesus is eventually killed on the cross, and so the death of Jesus is understood in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition.

Fourth, Jesus' self-consciousness of his death in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition is implicitly expressed in the prophecy of his betrayer. This is more comprehensible than other metaphorical expressions, although it is not a direct statement about his death. Jesus already knows the identity of the betrayer before the footwashing (Jn 13.1-38). In Jn 6.70, Jesus has implicitly mentioned his betrayer by using the phrase ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς διάβολός ἐστιν in the discourse of the bread of life. After Jesus' saying in Jn 6.70, the narrator interprets his words in the Johannine explanation that 'He [Jesus] was speaking of Judas son of Simon Iscariot, for he [Judas], though one of the twelve, was going to betray him [Jesus]' (Jn 6.71). In the footwashing, once again Jesus imprecisely implies the identity of his betrayer by using the metaphorical expression in Jn 13.10, 'you are clean, but not all of you'. The narrator also offers his interpretation about the

75. M. Greenberg, 'Stoning', *IDB*, IV, p. 447.

76. For example, Mt. 21.35; 23.37; Acts 7.54-60; 14.5; Heb. 11.37; 12.20; see W. Michaelis, 'λιθάζω, καταλιθάζω, λιθοβολέω', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 267-68.

figurative expression by using the Johannine aside in Jn 13.11. By the Johannine aside, readers are aware that Jesus knows his betrayer, who will eventually lead him to death. Jesus' prediction about his betrayer is continued in Jn 13.18 and 21. In Jn 13.18, the scripture is cited from Ps. 41.9b, and indicates that a close friend will hand his companion over to his enemies, so 'such betrayal signified the depth of depravity'.<sup>77</sup> Jesus apparently knows his fatal destiny, which will follow the betrayal. After identifying his betrayer, 'Jesus was troubled in spirit' (Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι) as the narrator aptly noted in v. 21a. The use of the phrase in v. 21a clearly shows Jesus' consciousness of his death.<sup>78</sup> Now Jesus clearly declares that 'one of you will betray me' in v. 21b by using the double Amen formula, which indicates his prophetic authority and self-awareness as prophet. Jesus' knowledge about the identity of his betrayer is more clearly demonstrated by his action in v. 26 where the Johannine aside gives the name of the betrayer, Judas Iscariot. In this respect, readers are able to recognize that Jesus undoubtedly perceives his imminent violent death in connection with the rejected-prophet tradition.

Finally, Jesus explicitly indicates his death using the phrase τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου in Jn 12.7. This is the most explicit expression for the death of the Johannine Jesus in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition. A parallel episode of the anointing of Jesus is reported in the Synoptic tradition (Mt. 26.6-13; Mk 14.3-9; Lk. 7.36-50), however, the Johannine narrative of the anointing of Jesus should be interpreted in its own context. In the episode, Mary takes a pound of costly perfume made of pure nard, and anoints Jesus' feet, and wipes them with her hair (Jn 12.3).<sup>79</sup> Judas Iscariot immediately condemns her behaviour (Jn 12.4). In this situation, Jesus says, ἄφες αὐτήν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό (Jn 12.7), which are notoriously difficult words in relation to the context of the anointing narrative as a whole. It would

77. Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 236.

78. Similar expressions of Jesus' consciousness are also found in Jn 11.33 and 38, so H.C. Orchard, *Courting Betrayal: Jesus as Victim in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup, 161; GCT, 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 143-47, who argues that the phrase in Jn 11.33, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν (he [Jesus] was greatly disturbed in spirit and deeply moved) and in Jn 11.38, Ἰησοῦς οὖν πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ (then Jesus again greatly disturbed) indicate that Jesus knows his death, so he was troubled in spirit. On this ground, she also argues that in Jn 11.35, ἐδάκρυσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς (Jesus began to weep), the reason for Jesus' weeping is for his own death, which will come to him, not for the death of Lazarus. Her argument is plausible in terms of the use of similar expressions between Jn 13.21 and 11.33, 38.

79. Mary's action has already been noticed in Jn 11.2 as a prolepsis.

simply be translated, 'let her alone, in order that she may keep it for the day of preparation for my burial', but Jn 12.3 and 12.5 imply Mary had already used the ointment, therefore the use of an aorist imperative of ἀφίημι with the ἵνα clause may be translated, 'leave her alone; she was going to keep it for the day of preparation for my burial'.<sup>80</sup> The imperative sentence ἄφες αὐτήν with the ἵνα clause is ambiguous, but the expression 'the day of preparation for my burial' is crystal clear in the sentence. The use of the term, ἐνταφιασμός, does not directly mean 'burial', but 'an embalming for burial'.<sup>81</sup> The phrase ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου explicitly points to Jesus' death. In contrast to the tradition of Matthew and Mark, Mary anoints the feet of Jesus, not his head. This indicates the uniqueness of the Johannine episode that 'is not a royal anointing, nor a welcome for an honoured guest'.<sup>82</sup> The anointing of Jesus' feet indicates Mary's symbolic act as preparing for the death of Jesus,<sup>83</sup> since an expensive perfume in an alabaster jar was customarily used for anointing a dead body for burial.<sup>84</sup> Lightfoot notes that 'the reader is invited to see in Mary's action a symbolic embalming of His [Jesus'] body for burial'.<sup>85</sup> Along with the expression 'the day of preparation for my burial', the phrase in Jn 12.8, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε,<sup>86</sup> implicitly indicates the death of Jesus. In Jn 12.7 Jesus apparently interprets Mary's anointing of his feet as to prepare for his death. Here the death of Jesus is explicitly predicted in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition.

In sum, Jesus' self-awareness of his death in the Gospel is frequently expressed explicitly or implicitly. Readers clearly see that Jesus knows his fatal destiny. The rejected-prophet tradition is evidently indicated by the narrator and Jesus in the Gospel. The death of Jesus is always a

80. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 368-69; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 202; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 447.

81. See Liddell and Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 575; BDAG, p. 339.

82. Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, p. 180; see also J.E. Bruns, 'A Note on Jn 12,3', *CBQ* 28 (1966), pp. 219-22; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, 409; cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 208, who comments that 'John wishes to show that Jesus enters Jerusalem as the king who has been anointed for burial' (italics are mine).

83. It is difficult to understand whether Mary's anointing is consciously undertaken for Jesus' death. If Mary anoints Jesus' feet for preparing his body for burial, her action could be interpreted as a prophetic anointing, since it is Nicodemus, not Mary, who later brings spices to anoint Jesus' body (Jn 19.39-40); see J.B. Green and H.E. Hearon, 'Anointing', *DJG*, pp. 11-13; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 209.

84. See V.H. Matthews, 'Perfumes and Spices', *ABD*, V, pp. 226-28.

85. Lightfoot, *John's Gospel*, p. 236.

86. See the expression, μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι in Jn 7.33 and 13.33, which also implicitly indicates the death of Jesus.

central theme in the rejected-prophet tradition, in which death is the final destiny of rejected prophets. On these bases, a conclusion can be made as follows: (1) the negative expressions about people's attitude towards the Johannine Jesus in the Gospel implies that he stands in the rejected-prophet tradition; (2) The expression με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι in Jn 7.19; 8.37, 40 shows a picture of the violent death of Jesus in which the rejected-prophet tradition is implied; (3) The pictures of stoning, arresting and the plotting of Jesus' death demonstrate that Jesus stands in the rejected-prophet tradition; (4) Jesus' self-awareness of his imminent violent death expressed in Jn 6.70 and 12.7 is closely related to the rejected-prophet tradition.

### *The Double Amen Formula*

The expression ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι occurs 25 times in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>87</sup> The Amen formula always appears in the double mode in John, and never occurs so elsewhere in the New Testament. The double Amen formula is, however, found five times in the Old Testament (Num. 5.22; Neh. 8.6; Pss. 41.14; 72.19; 89.53), twice in the Septuagint (1 Esd. 9.47 in codex B; Tob. 8.8 in codex S), and 21 times in the Dead Sea Scrolls (including seven probable reconstructions).<sup>88</sup> In this section the double Amen formula of the Gospel, as has partially emerged in relation to the predictions of the Johannine Jesus, will be examined in detail as to whether it implies Jesus' self-awareness as prophet.

The Greek term ἀμήν is a transliteration of the Hebrew word אָמֵן which means 'verily' or 'truly' or 'solemnly'.<sup>89</sup> The Hebrew term אָמֵן is frequently used in the Old Testament as the response of an individual or the congregation to corroborate or affirm a word spoken by another. Thus it is used in doxologies (Pss. 41.13; 72.19), prayers (1 Chron. 16.36),

87. The formula of ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν appears in Jn 1.51; 5.19, 24, 25; 6.26, 32, 47, 53; 8.34, 51, 58; 10.1, 7; 12.24; 13.16, 20, 21; 14.12; 16.20, 23 (20 times), and ἀμήν ἀμήν λέγω σοι in Jn 3.3, 5, 11; 13.38; 21.18 (5 times); see R. Morgenthau, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1958), p. 71.

88. 1QS col. I. 20; II. 10, 18; 4Q286 frag. 5.8; frag. 7, I. 7; frag. 7, II. 1, 5, 6 (probable), 10 (probable); 4Q287 frag. 1.4; frag. 4.3; frag. 5.11 (probable); 4Q289 frag. 2.4 (probable); 4Q293 frag. 2.2; 4Q504 frag. 4.15; frags. 1-2, col. I. 7; frags. 1-2, VII. 2 (probable), 9 (probable); 4Q507 frag. 3.2; 4Q509 + 4Q505 frags. 131-132, II. 3 (probable); 4Q511 frags. 63-64, IV. 3. For the text of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, is used.

89. See BDAG, pp. 53-54; BDB, p. 53; A. Jepsen, 'אָמֵן', *TDOT*, I, pp. 292-323, esp. pp. 320-23.



blessings and curses (Deut. 27.14-26).<sup>90</sup> In the New Testament and early Christianity, ἀμήν is used in a way similar to that of the Old Testament, for example, being placed at the end of a doxology (Rom. 1.25), the response of the people to a prayer (1 Cor. 14.16). In the Synoptics, however, the situation is quite different. Amen is never found at the end of a saying as a response of the people but only at the beginning of a saying. It is always the first word of the formulaic expression ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν, and is always and only spoken by Jesus.<sup>91</sup> The Synoptic manner of using 'Amen' is not found in Jewish religious practice.<sup>92</sup> In this respect, Jesus in the Synoptics quite characteristically uses 'Amen' in a new way in comparison to the Old Testament and Jewish religious practice. The use of Amen in John is similar to that of the Synoptics except for the appearance of the double mode. So it should be asked whether the double Amen in John has a different function and meaning from the Synoptic usage. The Amen formula in the Synoptics as in John is always used by Jesus, and is always placed at the beginning of Jesus' important sayings. The Amen formula is used only by Jesus. J. Jeremias convincingly argues that 'the peculiar speech-form of Amen was first introduced by Jesus himself as a characteristic mark of the *ipsissima vox Jesus*'.<sup>93</sup> This feature indicates that the fundamental function and meaning of the Amen formula is the same in all the Gospels. J.R. Michaels says that the double Amen in John has 'the same meaning as the single "amen" of the Synoptics'.<sup>94</sup> Although the Amen in John appears in a double mode, its meaning is not very different from the single Amen in the Synoptics.

Why, then, does Amen in John appear in a double mode? In his commentary on John, L. Morris remarks that 'no satisfactory explanation [of the double Amen formula in John] ... has been put forward'.<sup>95</sup> As we shall see, however, a plausible explanation is that the double Amen is coloured by liturgical usage from which an element has been drawn to

90. See H. Schlier, 'ἀμήν', *TDNT*, I, pp. 335-38; G.F. Hawthorne, 'Amen', *DJG*, pp. 7-8; J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology: Part One, The Proclamation of Jesus* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1971), pp. 35-36.

91. See Morris, *Gospel according to John*, p. 169.

92. See D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1956), pp. 388-93; 'Amen', *EncJud*, I, p. 803; Jepsen, 'אָמֵן', pp. 320-22; H. Wildberger, 'אָמֵן', *TLOT*, I, pp. 134-57, esp. pp. 146-47; R.W.L. Moberly, 'אָמֵן', *NIDOTTE*, I, pp. 427-33; Schlier, 'ἀμήν', pp. 335-38; H. Bietenhard, 'ἀμήν', *NIDNTT*, I, pp. 97-99; Hawthorne, 'Amen', pp. 7-8.

93. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, p. 36; see also *idem.*, 'Zum nicht-responsorischen Amen', *ZNW* 64 (1973), pp. 122-23.

94. J.R. Michaels, *John* (NIBC, 4; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989), p. 44.

95. Morris, *Gospel according to John*, p. 170.

emphasize Jesus' authority. The feature of the double Amen looks similar to that of liturgical usage appearing in the Old Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The double Amen in John is, however, never found in anything resembling a liturgical context. R. Schnackenburg comments that the double Amen formula in John 'is due, no doubt, to *liturgical usage*'.<sup>96</sup> He does not, however, offer any adequate explanation of the derivation from liturgical usage. J. Jeremias also similarly claims that:

the duplication [of Amen] derives from *Jewish liturgical usage*; [noting that] it is attested ... in the Old Testament, in Qumran, in Pseudo-Philo, in Talmud, in prayers, on inscriptions and in magical texts.<sup>97</sup>

The difficulty, however, is that though the form of the double Amen is shared by the liturgical usage and John's, its function seems to be very different. In liturgical contexts 'Amen' is used responsively, and normally appears at the close of blessings, curses, doxologies and prayers (e.g., Deut. 27.14-26; Neh. 8.6; Pss. 41.13; 72.19; 89.52; 106.48).<sup>98</sup> Instead of a responsive, liturgical usage, Jesus *always* uses the double Amen as introductory, and it is used only by him in the Fourth Gospel. This is the distinctiveness of the use of the double Amen in John from liturgical usage. That the use of the double Amen in John demonstrates Jesus' authority<sup>99</sup> can be seen from its concentration in his prophetic sayings in the Gospel,<sup>100</sup> and also in his significant assertions.<sup>101</sup> C.K. Barrett thinks that 'John ... employs it [the double Amen] to give emphasis to a solemn pronouncement'.<sup>102</sup> Similarly, Robert Kysar says that 'the effect of the doubling of the Amen is to reinforce the importance of the saying that follows'.<sup>103</sup> It is quite clear that the double Amen formula in John is not a merely stylistic device, but adds solemnity to Jesus' authoritative sayings.<sup>104</sup> The use of the double Amen coloured by liturgical usage in John, therefore, seems to highlight Jesus' authority yet further than the use of the single Amen in the Synoptics.

96. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 320, italics are mine.

97. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, p. 35 n. 8, italics are mine. For a similar opinion, see B. Chilton, 'Amen', *ABD*, I, pp. 184-86, esp. p. 185; Bietenhard, 'ἀμήν', p. 98.

98. See Chilton, 'Amen', pp. 184-86; Moberly, 'אָמֵן', p. 428.

99. Bietenhard, 'ἀμήν', p. 99, who notes that Amen is 'an expression of his [Jesus'] majesty and authority'.

100. See Jn 1.51; 5.25; 8.51; 13.21, 38; 14.12; 16.20, 23; 21.18.

101. See Jn 3.3, 5, 11; 5.19, 24; 6.26, 32, 47, 53; 8.34, 58; 10.1, 7; 12.24; 13.16, 20.

102. Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 186, italics are mine.

103. R. Kysar, *John* (ACNT; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), p. 42.

104. See Lindars, *Gospel of John*, pp. 48.

What, then, is the function of the double Amen in John? The double Amen formula in John is quite similar to the prophetic speech formula, 'thus says the Lord' (יְהוָה אָמַר כֹּה), in the Old Testament.<sup>105</sup> The prophetic speech formula in the Old Testament is used for an authoritative prophetic introductory saying with a prophetic message. David E. Aune comments that the use of the prophetic speech formula in the Old Testament indicates 'a consciousness of the divine origin and authority of the message'.<sup>106</sup> The double Amen formula in John is also used in a similar way as an introductory saying for Jesus' prophecies and prophetic statements. The formula ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι in John, therefore, parallels the prophetic speech formula, יְהוָה אָמַר כֹּה in the Old Testament. In this respect, the double Amen formula used by Jesus corroborates his prophetic status. J. Jeremias considers that:

the only substantial analogy to ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν that can be produced is the messenger-formula 'Thus says the Lord', which is *used by the prophets to show that their words are not their own wisdom, but a divine message*. In a similar way, the phrase ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν that introduces the sayings of Jesus expresses his authority.<sup>107</sup>

There are, however, some dissimilarities between the formula ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι in John and the prophetic speech formula, יְהוָה אָמַר כֹּה in the Old Testament. (1) The formula יְהוָה אָמַר כֹּה in the Old Testament is not always used at the beginning of prophetic speeches. The phrase יְהוָה אָמַר כֹּה is sometimes employed at the end of prophetic speeches, but the formula ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι in John is *always* placed at the beginning of Jesus' speeches. In this respect, Aune notes that although the Amen formula is a legitimate prophetic formula, 'it is not a functional equivalent of the OT messenger formula'.<sup>108</sup> (2) The double Amen formula in John always emphasizes the 'I' statement (λέγω), but the prophetic speech formula in the Old Testament always mentions the name of Yahweh rather than the first person singular for proving prophetic authority.

These dissimilarities clearly have the following implications. (1) The use of ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι at the beginning of Jesus' speeches

105. On forms of prophetic speech, see C. Westermann, *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (trans. H.C. White; London: Lutterworth Press, 1967), pp. 90-128; J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), pp. 103-104; Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, pp. 88-101.

106. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, p. 89.

107. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, p. 36; see Hill, *New Testament Prophecy*, pp. 64-66.

108. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, p. 165.

suggests that Jesus is a more authoritative figure than the prophets in their use of יהוה אֱמֶר כֹּה. Schlier notes that:

the point of the Amen before Jesus' own sayings is ... to show that as such they are *reliable and true*, and that they are so as and because Jesus Himself in His Amen acknowledges them to be His own sayings and thus makes them *valid*.<sup>109</sup>

(2) The use of the 'I' statement (λέγω) with the double Amen formula implicitly indicates that Jesus is aware of his prophetic identity, since the formula ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι is directly related to Jesus' prophecies in John's Gospel.<sup>110</sup> These prophecies are very similar to those of prophets in the Old Testament in terms of the use of complex imagery, in particular, in Jn 1.51; 5.25; 14.12; 16.20. Some prophecies are applied to individual persons, for example, Judas Iscariot (Jn 13.21) and Simon Peter (Jn 13.38; 21.18). The use of the double Amen formula and Jesus' prophetic sayings in John, therefore, seems to portray Jesus as wearing the mantle of a prophet. In this respect, Jesus' authority, demonstrated by means of using the double Amen, as argued above, points to his *prophetic authority*. (3) Furthermore, the use of 'I' with the double Amen formula in Jesus' prophetic sayings apparently shows not only that Jesus is always conscious of his identity as prophet, in which a stream of Jesus' self-consciousness is revealed, but also that he is more than a prophet of the Old Testament, the prophet *par excellence*, even more that he is the Son of God, who is in the Father and the Father is in him (Jn 1.30; 17.11, 21-23), since the prophets of the Old Testament always mention the name of Yahweh in the prophetic speech formula but Jesus has never used it. Despite the differences, the similarity of the prophetic speech formula of the prophets in the Old Testament and Jesus' formula shows that Jesus stands on the line of the same prophetic tradition, but it should be noted that he is more than a prophet of the Old Testament in connection with the differences. The relationship between the prophetic speech formula of the Old Testament and that of John is rather like it was in the case of the use of sending formula as discussed above. The double Amen formula in John is, therefore, used for Jesus' authoritative prophetic speech, in which his prophetic identity and his self-awareness as prophet are indicated, and also for his transcending of the prophetic identity.

109. Schlier, 'ἀμὴν', p. 338; italics are mine.

110. See Jn 1.51; 5.25; 8.51; 13.21, 38; 14.12; 16.20, 23; 21.18. The use of the double Amen in connection with Jesus' prophetic assertions or teachings in Jn 3.3, 5, 11; 5.19, 24; 6.26, 32, 47, 53; 8.34, 58; 10.1, 7; 12.24; 13.16, 20 seem to be related to Jesus' prophetic character.

In sum, the Amen formula appearing in the Synoptics and John is basically the same in terms of its function and meaning, but the double Amen in John emphasizes Jesus' authority more than the single Amen in the Synoptics. The double Amen formula in John should be regarded not simply as liturgical usage, but as a mark of Jesus' authority, more precisely his prophetic authority. The similarity of the prophetic speech formula of the prophets in the Old Testament and that of Jesus in John shows Jesus' prophetic image and his self-awareness as prophet, but at the same time it should be noted that Jesus is not only a prophet of the Old Testament type, but also more than a prophet, *the prophet par excellence*, in relation to the differences of the prophetic speech formula in the Old Testament and that of John.

### *Conclusions*

So far Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet has been examined. The Johannine Jesus does not use the term 'prophet' as a direct self-designation, but he clearly indicates that he understands himself as prophet. (1) The aphorism in Jn 4.44 is used in a Johannine aside as a literary technique in which Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet is clearly indicated. (2) The sending formula as Jesus' self-expression used throughout the Gospel shows him as a prophetic figure, and reveals his self-awareness as prophet. (3) Jesus has characteristically been rejected by his own people throughout the Gospel of John; Jesus' self-consciousness of his death demonstrates his self-awareness as prophet in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition in which violent death indicates the final destiny of rejected prophets. (4) The double Amen formula in John is similar to the prophetic speech formula of the prophets in the Old Testament. The use of the double Amen formula as Jesus' authoritative prophetic speech style shows that he consciously understands his role to be that of prophet. At the same time it is to be noted that some of the features explored point at one and the same time to Jesus' prophetic identity and to his transcending of this identity.



## PART III

### JESUS AS PROPHET

In Part II, exploring Jesus' prophetic actions, his prophetic words and other indications of his self-awareness as a prophet have made it clear that the Johannine Jesus is implicitly depicted as prophet in the Fourth Gospel, despite there being no explicit self-designation of Jesus as προφήτης. The term προφήτης is explicitly used of Jesus in Jn 4.19; 9.17; 6.14; 7.40, and in Jn 1.21, 23; 4.44; 7.52 the word προφήτης is used in relation to Jesus, implicitly. In Part III, therefore, these passages will be examined in connection with Jesus' prophetic identity.

## JESUS AS THE EXPECTED ESCHATOLOGICAL PROPHET (I)

Both the Samaritan woman in Jn 4.19 and the man born blind in Jn 9.17 clearly recognize Jesus as prophet and use the term *προφήτης* in connection with him. In this chapter, therefore, Jn 4.4-42 will be analysed first, and then an investigation of Jn 9.1-10.21 will follow.

### *Jesus as the Expected Samaritan Prophet (John 4.4-42)*

Although there are many painstaking analyses of the narrative of the Samaritan woman,<sup>1</sup> the main focus of those studies is not on the matter of whether or not the Johannine Jesus is introduced as the expected Samaritan

1. See C.M. Conway, *Men and Women in the Fourth Gospel: Gender and Johannine Characterization* (SBLDS, 167; Atlanta: SBL, 1999), pp. 103-25; Jones, *Symbol of Water*, pp. 89-115; R.G. Maccini, *Her Testimony Is True: Women as Witnesses according to John* (JSNTSup, 125; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), pp. 118-44; *idem*, 'A Reassessment of the Woman at the Well in John 4 in Light of the Samaritan Context', *JSNT* 53 (1994), pp. 35-46; Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, pp. 64-97; A. Link, "Was redest du mit ihr?" *Eine Studie zur Exegese-, Redaktions- und Theologiegeschichte von Joh 4,1-42* (BU, 24; Regensburg: Pustet, 1992); J.E. Botha, *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman: A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1-42* (NovTSup, 65; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991); Okure, *Johannine Approach*; Boers, *Neither on this Mountain*; Eslinger, 'Wooing of the Woman'; D.S. Dockery, 'Reading John 4:1-45: Some Diverse Hermeneutical Perspectives', *CTR* 3 (1988), pp. 127-40; O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 49-92; J.M. Poffet, *La méthode exégétique d'Héradéon et d'Origène: Commentateurs de Jn 4: Jésus, la Samaritaine et les Samaritains* (Paradosis, 78; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1985); C.M. Carmichael, 'Marriage and the Samaritan Woman', *NTS* 26 (1980), pp. 332-46; E. Leidig, *Jesu Gespräch mit der Samaritanerin und weitere Gespräche im Johannevangelium* (Theologischen Dissertationen, 15; Basel: Reinhardt, 1979); J.H. Neyrey, 'Jacob Traditions and the Interpretation of John 4.10-26', *CBQ* 41 (1979), pp. 419-37; Olsson, *Structure and Meaning*, pp. 115-257.



prophet, the *Taheb*.<sup>2</sup> In this section I will concentrate on the issue in connection with the following questions: on what grounds does the Samaritan woman perceive Jesus as prophet? In what sense does the Samaritan woman understand Jesus as prophet?

Before answering these questions, a brief analysis of the narrative of the Samaritan woman will be offered. The narrative of the Samaritan woman in Jn 4.4-42 lies within the large frame of Jn 2.1-4.54, in which two miracle stories are performed by Jesus in Cana. The reason for locating the beginning of the narrative of the Samaritan woman at v. 4 rather than v. 1 is that Jn 4.1-3 form a transitional section, where the story of John the Baptist is continued from the preceding chapter, so it should not be included as an element of the narrative.<sup>3</sup> The structure of Jn 4.4-42 can be analysed as follows. First, Jn 4.4-6 form the introduction of the narrative of the Samaritan woman in identifying the particular setting, a Samaritan city called Sychar and the time as about the sixth hour. Second, the dialogue of Jesus with the Samaritan woman is introduced in Jn 4.7-26, in which the first theme in vv. 7-15 is the living water, which it will be argued is related to the prophetic figure, and the second in vv. 16-26 is the theme of Jesus as prophet. Many agree that Jn 4.7-26 are a coherent unified dialogue unit.<sup>4</sup> Third, Jn 4.27-30 as a separate unit form a transitional section, in which new dialogue partners are described (Jn 4.27). In this unit the Samaritan woman disappears for a while and the disciples of Jesus are introduced as new partners, but the woman is not totally out of this scene (Jn 4.28-30). Fourth, a new section begins with Jn 4.31, and ends in Jn 4.38 with the completion of Jesus' words. In Jn 4.31-38 the conversation of Jesus with his disciples forms a separate unit. Finally, the people of Sychar discussed in Jn 4.27-30 come into focus again in Jn 4.39 and are the subject of the final unit to Jn 4.42. It is quite clear that a new story is introduced in Jn 4.43 where a fresh temporal and spatial setting is described. The majority of commentators and studies on the narrative of the Samaritan woman agree that Jn 4.42 is the end of the narrative. The structure of the narrative of the Samaritan woman is, therefore, summarized as follows:

2. The term *Taheb* refers to the returning one as Moses *redivivus*, who is a restorer in the Samaritan concept; see Chapter 3, 'The Samaritan Literature'; A. Oepke, 'ἀποκαθίστημι, ἀποκατάτασις', *TDNT*, I, pp. 387-93, esp. pp. 388-89; Bowman, *Samaritan Documents*, pp. 263-83; Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, pp. 362-71.

3. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 164-65; Boers, *Neither on this Mountain*, p. 153; Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, I, p. 217; Maccini, *Her Testimony Is True*, pp. 118-19.

4. See Botha, *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman*, p. 96; Olsson, *Structure and Meaning*, pp. 173-218.

1. 4.4-6: the introduction of the narrative.
2. 4.7-26: the dialogue of Jesus with the Samaritan woman.
  - (a) 4.7-15: the theme of the living water.
  - (b) 4.16-26: the theme of Jesus as prophet.
3. 4.27-30: a transitional section.
4. 4.31-38: the conversation of Jesus with his disciples.
5. 4.39-42: the conclusion of the narrative.

*Perception of the Samaritan Woman of Jesus as Prophet*

The Samaritan woman calls Jesus prophet (προφήτης) in Jn 4.19. She initially recognizes Jesus simply as ‘a Jew’ in Jn 4.9, but soon after she seems to realize that his behaviour towards herself is unusual for a Jew, because in Jewish custom no one asks for drinking water from a Samaritan woman (Jn 4.7). The explanatory comment in Jn 4.9 is that οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις.<sup>5</sup> The Samaritan woman seems to be puzzled why Jesus as a Jew should be asking for drinking water from a Samaritan woman. Instead of giving an answer to the woman’s question, Jesus suddenly introduces ὕδωρ ζῶν<sup>6</sup> as the gift of God on offer to the woman in Jn 4.10. The woman misunderstands Jesus’ saying, ‘living water’, and so asks whether Jesus is greater than her ancestor Jacob in relation to the living water (Jn 4.11-12). The woman begins to ponder whether Jesus might be something more than just any Jew, so she calls him κύριε (Jn 4.11). The use of the designation for Jesus appears again in Jn 4.15, where the woman eventually understands him as the giver of living water. The appellation κύριε is used again just before the Samaritan woman identifies Jesus as ‘prophet’ in Jn 4.19. The word κύριε seems to be used by the woman at least initially in a general sense, ‘Sir’, rather than ‘Lord’.<sup>7</sup> There is, however, most likely a progression from one to the

5. The meaning of συγχρῶνται in Jn 4.9 is ambiguous because the word can refer to either ‘make use of’ or ‘have dealings with’; see BDAG, pp. 953-54; see also D. Daube, ‘Jesus and the Samaritan Woman: The Meaning of συγχράομαι’, *JBL* 69 (1950), pp. 137-47; D.R. Hall, ‘The Meaning of συγχράομαι in John 4,9’, *ExpTim* 83 (1971-72), pp. 56-57; J. Lightfoot, *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* (4 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995 [1859]), III, pp. 276-78.

6. The meaning of ὕδωρ ζῶν can be either ‘living water’ or ‘spring water’, so the Samaritan woman misunderstands it in Jn 4.11. The phrase seems to refer to ‘living water’ in connection with Jesus’ saying in Jn 4.13-14. See Okure, *Johannine Approach*, pp. 96-104; Botha, *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman*, pp. 122-38; Olsson, *Structure and Meaning*, pp. 178-82.

7. The term κύριος means both ‘Sir’ and ‘Lord’; see BDAG, pp. 576-79. The Greek word also appears in v. 1, but there is textual variant between κύριος (in P<sup>66,75</sup>, A, B, C, L, W<sup>s</sup>, Ψ, 083, f<sup>13</sup>, 33, etc.) and Ἰησοῦς (in 8, D, Θ, 086, f<sup>1</sup>, 565,

other meaning as the woman uses it with increasing respect in Jn 4.19. After the Samaritan woman requests the living water, Jesus commands her to bring her husband (Jn 4.16). The Samaritan woman answers that she has no husband (Jn 4.17). Then, Jesus demonstrates his supernatural knowledge (Jn 4.18): ‘you have had five husbands, and the one you have now is not your husband’. When Jesus shows his supernatural knowledge of the Samaritan woman’s personal life, she suddenly perceives Jesus as prophet (Jn 4.19). There are, thus, several stages in the Samaritan woman’s recognition of Jesus’ identity.

On what grounds, then, does the woman eventually perceive Jesus as prophet? Jesus’ asking for drinking water from the Samaritan woman and introducing ὕδωρ ζῶν (living water), which is the ‘gift’ of God, to the woman (Jn 4.10) seem to be an indication of his identity as prophet.<sup>8</sup> Prophetic identity related to water is quite clear in the figure of the prophet Moses, who miraculously provided water for Israel in the desert.<sup>9</sup> He turned the bitter water into sweet water by throwing a piece of wood into the water at Marah (Exod. 15.22-25), and later struck a rock that released a stream of water for the people of Israel to drink (Exod. 17.1-7; Num. 20.1-11). He was commanded by God, ‘Gather the people together, and I will give them water’ (Num. 21.16). When Israel assembled, they sang, ‘Spring up, O well!—Sing to it!’ (Num. 21.17). The place where God gave the people of Israel water was called Mattanah (מַתָּנָה), which means ‘gift’ (Num. 21.18).<sup>10</sup> Samaritan sources focus on the water Moses gave.<sup>11</sup> The prophet Elisha offers another case of one whose prophetic identity is related to water. He transformed the polluted water into pure and wholesome water (2 Kgs 2.19-22). In Jesus’ saying, the living water in relation to his identity is, therefore, reminiscent of the prophetic image, like Moses and Elisha. Further, ὕδωρ ζῶν is a symbol of God’s eschato-

etc.); see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 176. In v. 1, the term is used with the article, and so clearly shows it has a special sense, ‘the Lord’, but the other three cases uttered by the Samaritan woman are used in a general sense.

8. The prophecy of living streams flowing from Jerusalem and dispensing life is related to the figure of prophet in the Old Testament, for example, Ezek. 47.1-12; Zech. 14.8; Joel 3.18; see L. Goppelt, ‘ὕδωρ’, *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 314-33.

9. See C.R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995), pp. 169-70.

10. See M.C. Fisher, ‘מַתָּנָה’, in R.L. Harris, G.L. Archer and B. Waltke (eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), II, pp. 608-10; see also Olsson, *Structure and Meaning*, pp. 163-66.

11. See *Memar Marqah* 4.4, 8; 5.3; 6.3; For the text and translation of *Memar Marqah*, see J. Macdonald (ed. and trans.), *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah* (BZAW, 84; 2 vols.; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1963).

logical salvation found in the prophetic messages of the Old Testament prophets, such as Isa. 55.1, Jer. 17.13 (cf. Jer. 2.13), Zech. 14.8 and Ezek. 47.1-12. The use of the reference to 'living water' by Jesus, therefore, probably leads the Samaritan woman to consider the identity of Jesus as one of the Old Testament prophets.

In his book, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*, L.P. Jones has examined the meaning and function of water in John's Gospel.<sup>12</sup> Disappointingly, however, he has not discovered the fact that the symbol of water, in particular the living water, can be related to Jesus' prophetic identity in Jn 4.4-42 and 7.37-52.<sup>13</sup> C.R. Koester, however, correctly notes that 'a second level of meaning [of the living water] emerges in connection with the disclosure that Jesus was a prophet and Messiah', and concludes that 'he is the prophet-Messiah'.<sup>14</sup> The 'living water' appears again in Jn 7.38. When Jesus has spoken to the crowd and more specifically to them concerning the 'living water' in relation to his identity (Jn 7.37-38), some members of the crowd declare him either the prophet or the Messiah (Jn 7.40-41), and others remain sceptical, noting that the Messiah does not come from Galilee, and is descended from David and will come from Bethlehem (Jn 7.41-42). It is clear that Jesus' speaking of the living water led people to consider his identity as prophet. This is clearly indicated in Jn 7.40, 'when they heard these words, some in the crowd said', οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης. Jesus' prophetic identity is, therefore, obviously related to the living water. In this respect, the Samaritan woman can easily envisage Jesus' prophetic identity in relation to the living water. Moreover, the woman seems to have already considered the possibility of Jesus' prophetic identity in comparison with her ancestor Jacob, because after the introduction of the living water (Jn 4.11-12) she asks whether Jesus is greater than her ancestor Jacob.<sup>15</sup> Despite the woman's initial scepticism, readers would know that Jesus is indeed greater than Jacob. Some Jewish sources say that Jacob actually did make water spring

12. Jones, *Symbol of Water*.

13. See Jones, *Symbol of Water*, pp. 89-115, 147-61; Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, pp. 64-97, who also does not consider 'the living water' as the symbol of Jesus' prophetic identity.

14. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*, p. 169; In his book, Koester comments on three levels of the conversation about water in Jn 4.4-42, among them the first level of talking about water deals with disputes stemming from national identity (p. 168) and the third level of meaning concerns the divine and universal significance of Jesus and the living water (pp. 171-72).

15. The reference to 'greater than Jacob' is also related to the place of worship, so it appears in the question of the woman in v. 20 'our ancestors'. See Neyrey, 'Jacob Traditions', pp. 426-32.

up in a well.<sup>16</sup> In the Samaritan traditions, Jacob holds a pre-eminent position, and is the progenitor of the elect, the Hebrew tribes.<sup>17</sup> 'Thus, Jacob Israel represents the last of a line, the line of the Patriarchs, and the beginning of a new line, the line of the elect'.<sup>18</sup> In *Memar Marqah* 4.12, the figure of Jacob is closely related to the *Taheb*, the Samaritan prophet who is Moses *redivivus*.<sup>19</sup> J. Macdonald notes that 'Markah [Marqah] places the *Taheb* at the end of a line of succession from the progenitor of the new human race (after the flood) through the progenitor of Israel'.<sup>20</sup> In this respect, the Samaritan woman begins to ponder Jesus' prophetic identity in comparison with her ancestor Jacob, and so she is at least ready to perceive Jesus as prophet in relation to the 'living water'.

The most explicit ground offered is Jesus' supernatural knowledge about the woman's private sexual and marital life (Jn 4.18). Before I consider how the Samaritan woman can understand Jesus as prophet by means of his supernatural knowledge about her private life, the debatable issue whether Jesus' saying 'five husbands' (Jn 4.18) is literal or figurative needs to be discussed. Some argue that 'five husbands' symbolically refers to the five false gods of the Samaritans and they offer the following reasons. (1) The high improbability that any Jew or Samaritan man would marry a woman who had been divorced several times suggests that the 'five husbands' is used in a symbolic sense. (2) The saying of Jesus in Jn 4.18 seems to be a prophetic judgment on the Samaritan woman's religious life and the Samaritan religious life in general rather than the woman's private marital life, because it seems to be related to the condemnation of Samaritan piety in Jn 4.22.<sup>21</sup> However, the majority are critical of the symbolic interpretation for the following reasons.<sup>22</sup> (1) Five false gods of

16. See Olsson, *Structure and Meaning*, pp. 169-70.

17. See Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 16.

18. Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 448.

19. *Memar Marqah* 4.12, 'Jacob, a descendant himself and yet a chief root, and descendants from fathers to sons, right from Noah the origin to the Taheb his descendant'; see also Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, pp. 362-71.

20. Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 362.

21. See Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 242-44; For a survey of the symbolic/allegorical interpretation of John 4, see Olsson, *Structure and Meaning*, pp. 120-21; cf. Neyrey, 'Jacob Tradition'; Eslinger, 'Wooing of the Woman'; Carmichael, 'Marriage'.

22. See Howard, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 182-83; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 188 n. 3; Kysar, *John*, pp. 65-66; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 221, 232-33; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, pp. 235-36; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 433; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 171, notes that such an allegorical purpose is indeed possible, but there is no evidence that John intended such; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 61, who comments that the symbolic interpretation is

the Samaritans is not exactly what we find in 2 Kgs 17.29-34, where five foreign people and seven gods are mentioned.<sup>23</sup> The seven gods were all worshipped together, and Yahweh along with them; among them the worship of Yahweh alone survived in the time of Jesus.<sup>24</sup> (2) According to H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck,<sup>25</sup> it is true that a woman was permitted to remarry three times at most, but the reasons supporting this are from a later date and Jewish not Samaritan. The question of the Sadducees in Mk 12.18-27 presupposes the remarriage of a woman six times as commanded by the law of levirate marriage (Deut. 25.5-10), although this is a hypothetical case presented by the Sadducees. Thus, the case of the remarriage of the Samaritan woman is not totally impossible. 'Five husbands', therefore, seems to be literal, and so it refers to the woman's private sexual and marital life.

When the woman was subsequently commanded, 'Go, call your husband, and come back', and she answers, 'I have no husband' (vv. 16-17), it is most likely that it is her private sexual and marital life that is exposed as immoral by Jesus. When the Samaritan woman introduces Jesus in Jn 4.29 and 39 as the one who clearly knows 'everything that I have done' (πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα), the obvious reference is to Jesus having said that she is now living with a man who is not her husband (Jn 4.18). Schnackenburg comments on Jn 4.29 that 'the woman is aware of her guilt and of the low opinion which her fellow-citizens have of her'.<sup>26</sup> What the woman has done means her past private sexual and marital life, which was perhaps partly known by the people in the town. This implication also can be found in the reference to the time, 'the sixth hour' (Jn 4.6). The time given, about midday, implies not only that Jesus was tired and thirsty, but also that the Samaritan woman seems to be ashamed of her private marital life, since her choice of time for coming to the well is unusual and such a task was done in the morning and evening.<sup>27</sup> Jesus' supernatural knowledge about the woman's private sexual and marital life, therefore, can be understood as his prophetic judgment on her immoral life style, like Elijah's judgment on the responsibility of Jezebel and Ahab for Naboth's death (1 Kgs 21.1-24) and Nathan's judgment on David's adultery and responsibility for Uriah's death (2 Sam. 12.1-12). In connection with the five false

'not to be countenanced'; Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, pp. 204-206; Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, I, p. 221; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 127.

23. Since Josephus, *Ant.* 9.288, reckoned five gods, many interpret 'five husbands' as five gods, symbolically.

24. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 433.

25. See *KNTTM*, II, p. 437.

26. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 433.

27. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 169.

gods, however, it would be possible to understand the term ἄνθρωπος as being used to label the woman as irreligious (cf. Jn 4.22).<sup>28</sup> And even without this, a ‘double entendre’ might be possible, given the Johannine use of this literary device: the word ἄνθρωπος could be both husband and god.<sup>29</sup> But without the five false gods this can only be a remote possibility. The Samaritan woman clearly understands what Jesus says about her past and present private life, and so she calls him prophet in terms of his supernatural knowledge.

Is the Samaritan woman likening Jesus to one of the prophets in the Old Testament? Probably. For a prophet to have supernatural knowledge is not unusual in the Old Testament, for example, Elisha’s supernatural knowledge about Gehazi’s deceptive behaviour to Naaman (2 Kgs 5.25-27) and Elijah’s departure, which is also known to the company of the prophets at Bethel and Jericho (2 Kgs 2.3-6). Similarly, the expected eschatological prophet, the *Taheb* in the Samaritan traditions, has power to know everything. If one shows supernatural knowledge, that one must be the *Taheb* in the Samaritan traditions. The woman, therefore, *potentially* recognizes Jesus as the expected prophet of the Samaritan traditions, when he reveals his supernatural knowledge about her private life.<sup>30</sup>

Bultmann, however, argues against this that:

the story [of the Samaritan woman] represents Jesus as the προφήτης, as the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος [or θεῖος ἄνθρωπος] who knows the secret things which are hidden from other men, and who knows the strangers whom he meets.<sup>31</sup>

He considers that the idea of the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος was widespread in pagan and Christian Hellenism, and that the same motif is undoubtedly found in Jn 1.47-51; 2.24-25; 4.17-19; 11.11-14, although it is not a decisive element in the Gospel.<sup>32</sup> His idea of the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, however, has some difficulties. (1) The typical Greek notion of the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος is not found in the narrative of the Samaritan woman.<sup>33</sup> E. Koskenniemi argues that ‘the entire θεῖος ἄνθρωπος [or θεῖος ἄνθρωπος] hypothesis has

28. Jesus’ saying that ‘you worship what you do not know’ in Jn 4.22 can be interpreted as his judgment on the Samaritans’ idolatrous tendencies. See C.R. Koester, “‘The Savior of the World’ (John 4:42)”, *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 665-80 (674).

29. See A. Oepke, ‘ἄνθρωπος, ἀνδρίζομαι’, *TDNT*, I, pp. 360-63; *BDAG*, pp. 79-80.

30. The Samaritan woman’s *potential understanding of Jesus as the expected Samaritan prophet* is related to her question about the place of worship in Jn 4.20, which will be discussed in the following section.

31. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 187-88.

32. Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 102 n. 1.

33. See H. Kleinknecht, ‘θεῖος, θεϊότης’, *TDNT*, III, pp. 122-23.

failed to aid us in understanding the miracles of the NT'.<sup>34</sup> (2) The analogy between Jesus and the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος in connection with the supernatural knowledge of Jesus is arbitrarily alleged, because the figure of Jesus in this respect is more closely related to prophets in the Old Testament and/or the *Taheb* in the Samaritan traditions, than to the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος.<sup>35</sup> Bultmann's assertion, therefore, is not satisfactory.<sup>36</sup> The Samaritan woman eventually recognizes Jesus as prophet by means of his supernatural knowledge about her private marital and religious life.<sup>37</sup>

In sum, the Samaritan woman's pondering about Jesus' prophetic identity in relation to the living water and Jesus' supernatural knowledge about her private sexual and marital life triggers her to declare him to be the expected Samaritan prophet.

### *Understanding Jesus as the Expected Samaritan Prophet*

It has already been suggested that in recognizing Jesus as 'prophet' the Samaritan woman is identifying him as the *Taheb*, but there are several ways in which this matter needs further exploration. In particular, the thought development of her understanding of Jesus' prophetic identity through the passage must be clarified in relation to this identification.

34. E. Koskenniemi, 'Apollonius of Tyana: A Typical θεῖος ἀνὴρ?', *JBL* 117 (1998), pp. 455-67 (p. 467).

35. See Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, pp. 116-17.

36. For θεῖος ἄνθρωπος or θεῖος ἀνὴρ (divine man), see Koskenniemi, 'Apollonius of Tyana', pp. 455-67; P. Herczeg, 'θεῖος ἀνὴρ Traits in the Apocryphal Acts of Peter', in J.N. Bremmer (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism* (Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of Apostles, 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), pp. 29-38; D.L. Tiede, 'Aretalogy', *ABD*, I, pp. 372-73; G.P. Corrington, *The 'Divine Man': His Origin and Function in Hellenistic Popular Religion* (American University Studies 7; Theology and Religion 17; Berlin: Lang, 1986); E.V. Gallagher, *Divine Man or Magician? Celsus and Origen on Jesus* (SBLDS, 64; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).

37. The Samaritan woman's thought is not totally out of the blue in relation to Jn 8.48, where Jesus' identity as a Samaritan is proposed by the Jews: 'Are we not right in saying that you are a Samaritan and have a demon?' Jesus answers the second part of the question, 'I do not have a demon' (8.49). However, the first part of the question seems to be ignored and/or avoided. Readers may be puzzled why Jesus does not answer; see J. Bowman, 'Samaritan Studies', *BJRL* 40 (1958), pp. 298-327, esp. pp. 306-308; G.W. Buchanan, 'The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Religious in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (Studies in the History of Religions [Supplement to Numen], 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968), pp. 149-75; Freed, 'Did John Write his Gospel', pp. 241-56; *idem*, 'Samaritan Influences in the Gospel of John', *CBQ* 30 (1968), pp. 580-87.



First, the use of the anarthrous noun προφήτης in Jn 4.19 seems to reflect a deliberate Johannine ambiguity about the nature of Jesus' prophetic identity. Schnackenburg comments on Jn 4.19 that:

to judge by the absence of the article, the Samaritan is not thinking of *the* (Messianic) prophet (like 6:14; 7:40, 52 *var. lect.*), though the Messiah as expected by the Samaritans had prophetic traits, after Deut 18:15, 18.<sup>38</sup>

Teresa Okure also claims that 'in verse 19, the woman simply recognizes Jesus as *a* Jewish prophet'<sup>39</sup> because of her response in Jn 4.20 and Jesus' own remark in Jn 4.22. In contrast, Barrett considers that in Jn 4.19, 'perhaps, although προφήτης is anarthrous, the woman is thinking of "*the* prophet" (cf. Jn 1.21), giving a messianic interpretation to Deut. 18.15'.<sup>40</sup> Barrett is drawing on the recognition that in Jn 4.19, προφήτης εἶ σὺ, the lack of the article of the predicate noun προφήτης is not a decisive indication of indefiniteness because the omission is expected according to Colwell's rule: 'definite predicate nouns which precede the verb usually lack the article'.<sup>41</sup> The question is, should I appeal here to Colwell's rule? The Samaritans only have 'the prophet' pointing to the one like *the great prophet* Moses,<sup>42</sup> therefore, they recognize 'no prophets other than Moses and in a secondary way *through Moses*, Aaron and Miriam'.<sup>43</sup> Macdonald notes that 'if we were to write a history of the Samaritans' understanding of prophecy, we would be writing entirely about Moses' prophethood'.<sup>44</sup> Only the Samaritan religion, among the religions from the Near Eastern origin such as Judaism, Islam and Christianity, restricts the aspect of divine revelation to one person. Thus the *Taheb* in the Samaritan traditions is regarded as Moses *redivivus*.<sup>45</sup>

38. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 434, italics in the original.

39. Okure, *Johannine Approach*, p. 114, italics in the original.

40. Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 236, italics in the original. He, however, thinks that 'in view of verse 25 this is not likely, unless John is alluding to the fact that the Samaritans gave a messianic interpretation to Deut. 18.15 and saw their Messiah (*Taheb*) as a prophet'. Cf. Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 187, who says that 'if Jesus is *a* prophet, it opens the possibility that he is *the* prophet (cf. 1.21)', italics in the original.

41. Colwell, 'A Definite Rule', p. 20; P.B. Harner, 'Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1', *JBL* 92 (1973), 75-87; Kim, 'The Anarthrous οὐδὲ θεοῦ', see esp. pp. 221-22; Blass and Debrunner, *Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, pp. 131-32, 143.

42. In *Memar Marqah*, Moses is almost always called the great prophet.

43. Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 205, italics in the original.

44. Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 204.

45. See *Memar Marqah* 2.9, 'When the *Taheb* comes he will reveal the truth and God will glorify the dead'; 3.3; 4.7-9; Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 363.

Marqah identifies the *Taheb* with Moses in his teaching.<sup>46</sup> The role of the woman's Samaritan faith is clear in the context. Her religious identity as Samaritan is probably implied in Jn 4.9, but becomes clear in Jn 4.12 with 'our ancestor Jacob',<sup>47</sup> and in Jn 4.20 where the use of terms ἡμῶν and ὑμεῖς and ἐν τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ points to the place of Mt Gerizim in the Samaritan religion which sets Samaritans and Jews over against each other.<sup>48</sup> Nonetheless the continuing conversation does not take its point of reference from a confident affirmation of Jesus as the *Taheb*. The best solution would seem to be a deliberate Johannine ambiguity. The woman's identification of Jesus as 'prophet', if he is a genuine prophet, should mean 'the prophet', that is, the *Taheb*, but the matter is not fully settled yet. The ambiguity allowed for by Colwell's rule allows for further explanation against the background of the possibility that the woman in encountering one who is surely *a* prophet must in fact be in the presence of *the* prophet, that is, the *Taheb*. The anarthrous noun προφήτης (Jn 4.19), therefore, can mean both 'the prophet' as the expected Samaritan eschatological prophet, the *Taheb*, and/or 'a prophet' as a Jewish prophet. The Samaritan woman's perception of Jesus' identity using the anarthrous noun προφήτης is, therefore, perhaps deliberately expressed hesitantly by means of the Johannine ambiguity.

Second, the issue of worship in the Samaritan woman's immediate response in Jn 4.20 seems to indicate that she potentially recognizes Jesus as the Samaritan eschatological prophet, the *Taheb*. In the Samaritan traditions, the figure of the *Taheb* is the restorer of the true worship, so Marqah declares that the *Taheb* will reveal the truth including the right place of worship.<sup>49</sup> M.F. Collins shows that in the first century there was

46. See *Memar Marqah* 3.3, 'The great prophet Moses ... spoke concerning Israel words of blessing ... He will come ... and seek out their enemy and deliver Israel ...'.

47. Jacob holds a superlative position in the Samaritan sources; see Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, pp. 227, 448; Bowman, 'Exegesis of the Pentateuch'; Josephus, *Ant.* 9.291; 11.341; Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, pp. 228-31.

48. See Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 61, who notes that 'in the Samaritan Pentateuch of Deut. 27.3 the place where an altar is to be built on arrival in the promised land is Gerizim, not Ebal as in the MT ... in the Persian period a temple was built on Gerizim; it was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 128 B.C., but the Samaritans continued to worship on the sacred site'; R.J. Bull, 'An Archaeological Footnote to "Our Fathers Worshipped on This Mountain", John IV.20', *NTS* 23 (1977), pp. 460-62, who notes that 'when the Samaritan woman exclaimed to Jesus that her forebears "worshipped on this mountain" ... the remains of the Samaritan temple were clearly visible on Mt Gerizim' (p. 462).

49. See Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, pp. 362, 364-65; *Memar Marqah* 4.12.

strong expectation that the eschatological prophet, the *Taheb*, would recover the hidden vessels on Mt Gerizim and thus restore true worship there as the right place of worship.<sup>50</sup> Thus, the woman raises the burning issue between Jews and Samaritans of the place of worship in order to deepen her confidence whether her perception of Jesus' identity is correct or not.<sup>51</sup> In v. 20, in the woman's mind, the precise nature of Jesus' prophetic identity seems to be still in doubt: a Jewish prophet or the expected Samaritan prophet. Thus it is implied in Jn 4.20 that the woman does not have full confidence about Jesus' prophetic identity as the *Taheb*. In this respect, the woman's issue of the right place of worship can be a test of Jesus' prophetic identity as the *Taheb*.

What about the woman's use of the second person pronoun plural 'you' (ὤμεῖς) in Jn 4.20 and Jesus' use of the first person plural 'we' (ἡμεῖς) in Jn 4.22 which seem to make Jesus a representative of the Jewish religion? Teresa Okure comments that in Jn 4.20 'the juxtaposition of "our fathers" and "you" shows that in the woman's mind, Jesus remains essentially a Jew, a Jewish prophet, no doubt, but a Jew nonetheless'.<sup>52</sup> This reading is understandable, but an alternative is preferable. The woman's tentative perception of Jesus as the expected Samaritan prophet is well tuned in relation to her question about the issue of the place of worship to God.<sup>53</sup> Jesus answers the Samaritan woman's question in a prophetic manner in Jn 4.21, 23 and 24, and thus substantiates her judgment that he is the expected eschatological prophet, more precisely, the *Taheb* of her mind. Botha notes that the Samaritan woman's acknowledgment of Jesus as prophet can be connected 'both textually and semantically to the question of worship'.<sup>54</sup> In this reading, the theme of Jesus as prophet in Jn 4.7-19 flows reasonably well into the big issue, the place of worship to God, in Jn 4.20-24, so the character of Jesus as a representative of the Jewish religion is a temporary role in the discussion of the place of worship.

50. See Collins, 'Hidden Vessels'; I. Kalimi and J.D. Purvis, 'The Hiding of the Temple Vessels in Jewish and Samaritan Literature', *CBQ* 56 (1994), pp. 679-85; Josephus, *Ant.* 18.85-89; see also Krämer *et al.*, 'προφήτης, προφήτις, κτλ', pp. 826-27; Gaster, *The Samaritans*, pp. 90-91.

51. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 129, who notes that 'Jesus' identity ... is still to be discovered, so she hesitatingly falls back on another of her traditions [on the right place of worship]'.<sup>52</sup>

52. Okure, *Johannine Approach*, p. 114.

53. See Neyrey, 'Jacob Traditions', p. 427; T. Thornton, 'Anti-Samaritan Exegesis Reflected in Josephus' Retelling of Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges', *JTS* 47 (1996), pp. 125-30.

54. Botha, *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman*, p. 144.

During the discussion of the right place of worship, the woman demonstrates in Jn 4.25 her own knowledge of the eschatological figure. She has been aware that a Messiah (Μεσσίας) is coming in relation to the Samaritan traditions, a Messiah who was the prophet predicted by Moses in Deut. 18.15-18, and that the Messiah is called Christ (χριστός). The use of the phrase ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα in relation to the function of the Messiah in Jn 4.25 is 'reminiscent of prophetic activity'.<sup>55</sup> The Samaritan figure of the *Taheb* stands behind the woman's use of the terms 'Messiah' and 'Christ'. In Jn 4.25 the woman seems to borrow the Jewish terminology, 'Messiah' and 'Christ', in a sense of the interrelation of religious cultures for the conversation with Jesus. After discussing the issue of the right place of worship, the Samaritan woman eventually has some confidence about her understanding of Jesus' identity as the expected Samaritan prophet, therefore she introduces Jesus to the people in Sychar (Jn 4.28-29, 39).

Finally, the Samaritan woman seems to introduce Jesus as the *Taheb* in her rhetorical question (Jn 4.29). The woman's rhetorical question in Jn 4.29, μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός, with its use of μήτι may indicate either expecting a negative answer or a hesitant question.<sup>56</sup> The woman starts from what she is most confident in and moves on to what is more tentative. Thus the woman, first of all, introduces Jesus as a man, who told her everything that she did, and then as possibly the anointed (ὁ χριστός). This scene is often regarded as the climax of the encounter between Jesus and the Samaritan woman, in which she proclaims her faith in Jesus as the Messiah. However, the woman's description of Jesus as 'a man who told me everything I have done' probably indicates (as discussed above) that he is a prophet, more precisely the expected Samaritan prophet, the *Taheb*.<sup>57</sup> The woman's depiction of Jesus is undoubtedly based on Jesus' supernatural knowledge about her private sexual and marital life (Jn 4.18-19). In this respect, the Samaritan woman probably intends this as evidence for the people of Sychar that Jesus is the *Taheb*.

55. Appold, *Oneness Motif*, p. 69; see H. Odeberg, *The Fourth Gospel: Interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1929), p. 187, who conjectures that 'the real intention is perhaps the identification even of the Samaritan Messiah [*Taheb*] with the historical Χριστός of the Christians'; see also J.P. Meier, 'The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What Can Be Said?', *Bib* 81 (2000), pp. 202-32.

56. See E. Danna, 'A Note on John 4:29', *RB* 106 (1999), pp. 222-23; Turner, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, pp. 282-83; O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*, p. 76; Morris, *Gospel according to John*, p. 275; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 193. For some positive views, see Blass and Debrunner, *Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, p. 221; Boers, *Neither on this Mountain*, pp. 183-84.

57. See Danna, 'John 4:29', who also has the same position.

Does the woman's tentativeness about 'Christ' relate to her anxiety about her reception (as I have indicated she behaved as something of an outsider in relation to her own people) or was it related to the need involved to make a decision from her experience? It is doubtful whether she can be taken as meaning something different by 'Christ' here than the *Taheb* (see Jn 4.25 discussed above).

After hearing about Jesus from the Samaritan woman, the Samaritans come to him (Jn 4.30). Eventually, many of them believe in Jesus because of the woman's witness (Jn 4.39) about how he told her everything that she ever did. At this stage it is not very clear whether they believe in Jesus as the Samaritan eschatological prophet, the *Taheb*. Many seem to be in doubt as to whether Jesus is a *true* prophet, so they ask him to stay with them, and he stayed there *two days* (δύο ἡμέρας) in Jn 4.40. The length of a prophet's stay could be a sign of a true or false prophet, according to *Did.* 11.5, τρεῖς δὲ ἂν μείνῃ, ψευδοπροφήτης ἐστὶν ('if he stays three days, he is a false prophet').<sup>58</sup> Bultmann considers that the reason for Jesus' staying in Samaria for two days may be that John perhaps had in mind the rule, attested in *Did.* 11.5.<sup>59</sup> Schnackenburg, however, thinks that 'it is unlikely that the evangelist would try to show Jesus troubling himself about such a point of discipline'.<sup>60</sup> The reference to staying in Samaria for two days reappears in Jn 4.43, and relates to the proverb in Jn 4.44. Although it is not certain that John intends to stress two days in confirmation of Jesus' prophetic identity, the reappearance of the reference to two days in Jn 4.43 in relation to the maxim in Jn 4.44 tends to confirm Bultmann's view. After testing Jesus' identity, the Samaritans recognize him as the true *Taheb*, who turns out to be the Messiah, and they call him 'the Saviour of the world' (ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου).<sup>61</sup>

58. See K. Lake (trans.), *The Apostolic Fathers: I Clement, II Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache, Barnabas* (LCL; 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912), I, p. 327; K. Niederwimmer, *The Didache: A Commentary* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), p. 176.

59. See Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 200 n. 3.

60. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 456 n. 107.

61. See S.T. Davis, "'This Is Truly the Savior of the World": The Theological Significance of the Earthly Jesus', *ExAud* 14 (1998), pp. 97-103, who thinks that 'Samaritans viewed the Messiah as the prophet like Moses promised in the Pentateuch (Deut. 18:15-18)' (p. 102). If so, the Samaritans might consider Jesus as the *Taheb* in relation to their Samaritan religious background. Moreover neither Jews nor Samaritans believed Jesus as the Messiah. Thus, the Samaritans perhaps believed Jesus as the true *Taheb*, who turns out to be 'the Saviour of the world'; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 172-75, who notes that 'the Samaritans did not expect a Messiah in the sense of an

Why, then, do the Samaritans use the epithet, the Saviour of the world', rather than the *Taheb*? After hearing from Jesus directly, the Samaritans seem to realize that he is not only the *Taheb*, but also more than the figure of the *Taheb*, so they declare him to be 'the Saviour of the world' (Jn 4.42). The title 'the Saviour of the world' occurs only here in John and in 1 Jn 4.14, and does not appear in the Old Testament. It is not a title derived from the Samaritan expectations.<sup>62</sup> The title 'Saviour' is only infrequently used for Jesus in the earlier New Testament writings.<sup>63</sup> It occurs in connection with the Roman Emperor<sup>64</sup> and with the Asclepius cult,<sup>65</sup> but nothing in John's text suggests either of these are in view. C.R. Koester argues that 'in the first century the title "Saviour of the world" had striking imperial connotations'.<sup>66</sup> The phrase 'the Saviour of the world' is often regarded as a messianic title. The Samaritans understand that they will be saved by the Saviour of the world. By using the phrase, the Samaritan people in the city seem to declare the inclusive salvation brought by Jesus not only to Jews and Samaritans, but also Gentiles. The Samaritans use the title for Jesus' identity that was associated not with Samaritan or Jewish messianic expectations but with worldwide dominion. The Samaritans recognize that Jesus transcended national boundaries, so he is the prophet not only for an ethnic or religious group, but also for the whole world.<sup>67</sup> This universalism is clearly expressed in Jn 20.31 where the purpose of the Gospel is expressed. Is, then, the expression 'the saviour of the world' in Jn 4.42 a formula Samaritans would use, or did John place it on their lips? It seems that John places the phrase on the Samaritans' lips, because of the universalism expressed in the Fourth Gospel and the absence of the title in the Samaritan expectations.<sup>68</sup>

anointed king of the Davidic house. They expected a Taheb ... seemingly the Prophet-like-Moses' (p. 172).

62. See K. Haacker, 'Samaritan, Samaria', *NIDNTT*, III, pp. 449-67, esp. p. 462.

63. The title appears in the infancy narrative of Lk. 2.11 and in reference to the exalted Lord as 'Saviour' in Acts 5.31 and 13.23.

64. Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, I, p. 226, notes that 'the designation of the Roman Emperor as "saviour of the world" (σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου) was quite common from Hadrian on'; see Koester, 'Savior of the World'; R. Loewe, "'Salvation" Is not of the Jews', *JTS* 32 (1981), pp. 341-68.

65. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 458; H.C. Kee, 'Self-Definition in the Asclepius Cult', in B.F. Meyer and E.P. Sanders (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (3 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), III, pp. 118-36, 211-13.

66. Koester, 'Savior of the World', p. 666.

67. See Macdonald, *Theology of the Samaritans*, p. 280.

68. See Koester, 'Savior of the World', pp. 668-74.

*Summary*

So far, the issue whether the Johannine Jesus is portrayed as the expected Samaritan prophet, the *Taheb*, in the narrative of the Samaritan woman has been examined. Findings are as follows. (1) The Samaritan woman initially recognizes Jesus as the Messiah-like prophet, the *Taheb*, who has long been expected by the Samaritans. (2) The woman's recognition of Jesus as the expected Samaritan prophet, the *Taheb*, is based on Jesus' remark on the living water and his supernatural knowledge about her private sexual and marital life, which are related to the figure of prophet. (3) The woman's appreciation of Jesus as the Samaritan eschatological prophet, the *Taheb*, is initially uncertain as expressed by the use of the anarthrous noun προφήτης (Jn 4.19). (4) The woman's understanding of Jesus as the Samaritan eschatological prophet, which remains tentative in her question (Jn 4.20), is substantiated by means of the burning issue of the place of worship, which is related to one of the prophetic functions in the Samaritan traditions. (5) The woman introduces Jesus as the *Taheb* to the people of Sychar, and they declare him to be 'the Saviour of the world', because he is not only the *Taheb*, but also more than the figure of the *Taheb*. It can be said that the Johannine Jesus is initially introduced as the expected Samaritan prophet, the *Taheb*, in the narrative of the Samaritan woman. The Johannine Jesus as the figure of the *Taheb* turns out to be the Messiah, and the Samaritans call him 'the Saviour of the world'.

*Jesus as the Expected Jewish Prophet (John 9.1–10.21)*

There have been a number of studies from different points of view devoted to the story of the man born blind (Jn 9.1–41).<sup>69</sup> None of them, however, focus on the significance of Jesus as prophet.<sup>70</sup> In the story of the man

69. For the study of John 9, see Asiedu-Pepurah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts*, pp. 117–57, 197–211; J. Alison, 'The Man Blind from Birth and the Subversion of Sin: Some Questions about Fundamental Morals', *T&S* 7 (1997), pp. 83–102; M. Rein, *Die Heilung des Blindgeborenen (Joh 9). Tradition und Redaktion* (WUNT, 2.73; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995); J.D.M. Derrett, 'Miracles, Pools, and Sight: John 9:1–41: Genesis 2:6–7; Isaiah 6:10; 30:20; 35:5–7', *Bibbia e oriente* 36 (1994), 71–85; J.W. Holleran, 'Seeing the Light: A Narrative Reading of John 9', *ETL* 49 (1993), pp. 5–26, 354–82, (p. 5 n. 1 offers some useful references regarding the study of John 9); A. Stimpfle, *Blinde sehen: Die Eschatologie im traditionsgeschichtlichen Prozeß des Johannesevangeliums* (BZNW, 57; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990).

70. The unity of the narrative of the man born blind is a controversial issue. Some would see Jn 10.1–21 as an intrusion, and others would trace its insertion to a later stage in the development of the Johannine tradition. However, I will argue that Jn 10.1–21 is essential to the argument of Jn 9.1–41.

born blind, like that of the Samaritan woman, the man clearly recognizes Jesus as prophet (προφήτης) in Jn 9.17, after having his sight restored by Jesus. In this section, I will examine whether Jesus is portrayed as the expected Jewish prophet in the narrative of the man born blind. In order to do this some exegetical issues will be investigated in connection with the following questions: on what basis does the man born blind recognize Jesus as prophet? In what sense does the man understand Jesus as prophet?

Before answering these questions, an overall view of the literary structure of the narrative of the man born blind will be offered. A number of Johannine scholars have indicated that John 5–10 can stand as a literary unit in relation to the trial and judgment of Jesus.<sup>71</sup> The most obvious connection between John 5 and 9 is related to healing on a Sabbath. In this context, the narrative of the man born blind as an independent unit forms a dramatic episode. It is widely recognized that the imagery, the structure, the movement of the plot and the characterization in the story of the man born blind work together to form a tightly knit narrative. Many have attempted to show where tradition and redaction combine to form the narrative of the man born blind, but this has not been a fruitful field of investigation.<sup>72</sup> The ‘Johannine dramatic skill at its best’<sup>73</sup> can be seen in the present text of the narrative. For analysing the literary structure of the narrative, scholars adopt a similar division into scenes. The major difference is between those who argue for six divisions<sup>74</sup> and those who argue for seven.<sup>75</sup> The crucial section of the narrative is the final one (Jn 9.35–41).<sup>76</sup>

71. In this respect, some recent works are focused on the trial motif in the narrative of the man born blind, for example, Asiedu-Pepurah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts*; A.T. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000), pp. 96–105.

72. See Painter, *Quest for the Messiah*, pp. 308–18.

73. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 376.

74. For example, Brodie, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 343–45; M.J.J. Menken, *Numerical Literary Techniques in John: The Fourth Evangelist's Use of Numbers of Words and Syllables* (NovTSup, 55; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985), pp. 192–93; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, pp. 339–352; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 239; cf. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 203.

75. For example, R.A. Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (IBT; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), p. 174; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 152; D.S. Dockery, ‘John 9:1–41: A Narrative Discourse Study’, *OPTAT* 2 (1988), pp. 14–26; Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Literary Structure*, pp. 115–17, 205–208; Grob, *Faire l'œuvre de Dieu*, pp. 30–45; Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 117–26; Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, II, p. 41; Kysar, *John's Story of Jesus*, pp. 49–51; J.L. Resseguie, ‘John 9: A Literary-Critical Analysis’, in K.R.R.G. Louis and J.S. Ackerman (eds.), *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives* (2 vols.; Nashville:



For this study, the sevenfold division will be adopted, including Jn 10.1-21. G. Mlakuzhyil notes that the literary unity of John 9 is 'highlighted by the dramatic development of the episode in seven scenes'<sup>77</sup> but his analysis does not include Jn 10.1-21. The discourse on the shepherd in Jn 10.1-21 is indispensable for the whole structure of the narrative of the man born blind, because Jn 9.1-41 and 10.1-21 are linked to one another without a significant break and the reference to the man born blind explicitly appears in Jn 10.21.<sup>78</sup> J.A.T. Robinson considers that 'the whole narrative [of the man born blind] down to 10.21, with its reference back to the healing of the blind man in ch. 9, appears to belong to the same Tabernacles visit'.<sup>79</sup> Asiedu-Pepurah emphasizes 'the merit of highlighting the fundamental unity between 9:1-41 and 10:1-21'.<sup>80</sup> In each scene of the sevenfold division, two active characters normally appear on stage at one time,<sup>81</sup> except the first section (Jn 9.1-7) where Jesus, his disciples and the blind man appear. The reference to 'the blind man' as *inclusio* appears in the first (Jn 9.1) and the final section (Jn 10.21). The final section begins with the reference to 'judgment' in Jn 9.39, and the theme of judgment in Jn 9.39-41 is regarded as an introduction to the shepherd discourse in Jn 10.1-21: this will be discussed below.<sup>82</sup> The following sevenfold division of the narrative of the man born blind is offered for this study.

Abingdon Press, 1982), II, pp. 295-303, 320; Martyn, *History and Theology*, pp. 26-27; Nicol, *Sêmeia in the Fourth Gospel*, p. 36; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 329-42.

76. In his book, *Signs and Shadows*, pp. 118-19, F.J. Moloney suggests an eightfold division, which is based on Martyn's sevenfold division, and his first section (vv. 1-5) is different from others, who identify the first scene as vv. 1-7.

77. Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Literary Structure*, p. 205.

78. See Asiedu-Pepurah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts*, pp. 44-47, 116-20; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 148-49; Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, pp. 117-42; Ensor, *Jesus and his 'Work'*, pp. 98-101; J. Painter, 'Tradition, History and Interpretation in John 10', in Beutler and Fortna (eds.), *Shepherd Discourse of John 10*, pp. 53-74, 150-56; J.A. du Rand, 'A Syntactical and Narratological Reading of John 10 in Coherence with Chapter 9', in Beutler and Fortna (eds.), *Shepherd Discourse of John 10*, pp. 94-115, 161-63; H. Thyen, 'Johannes 10 im Kontext des vierten Evangeliums', in Beutler and Fortna (eds.), *Shepherd Discourse of John 10*, pp. 116-134, 163-68; cf. Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, pp. 365-78; Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 354-57; Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, I, p. 323.

79. Robinson, *Priority of John*, p. 217.

80. Asiedu-Pepurah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts*, p. 119.

81. See Martyn, *History and Theology*, p. 26.

82. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 358, who also regards Jn 9.39-41 as an introduction to Jn 10.1-21; see Asiedu-Pepurah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts*, p. 119.

1. 9.1-7: Jesus and the man born blind.
2. 9.8-12: The blind man and his neighbours.
3. 9.13-17: The blind man and the Pharisees.
4. 9.18-23: The Pharisees and the blind man's parents.
5. 9.24-34: The Pharisees and the blind man.
6. 9.35-38: Jesus and the blind man.
7. 9.39-10.21: Jesus and the Pharisees.

*Recognition by the Blind Man of Jesus as Prophet*

On what basis does the man born blind recognize Jesus as prophet? The most explicit evidence is Jesus' miraculous power to open the blind man's eyes (Jn 9.17). During the judicial controversies, therefore, the blind man clearly and repeatedly witnesses in detail to the miraculous healing performed by Jesus. The narrative begins with the physical situation of the man, who was blind from his birth (ἐκ γενετῆς). The man's physical disability regarding his eyesight is confirmed by the question of Jesus' disciples (Jn 9.2), in which the cause of suffering from his blindness is related to the traditional Jewish concept of sin.<sup>83</sup> Jesus, who is called ῥαββί by his disciples,<sup>84</sup> rejects his disciples' notion of sin in relation to the blind man, and answers in a prophetic manner that the reason for his physical blindness is to manifest the works of God in him (Jn 9.3). Some careful readers can see the theme of judgment, which will be dominant in the narrative, as being pregnant here. In Jesus' response to the question of his disciples, he implicitly reveals his prophetic identity using the Johannine sending formula (Jn 9.4). Jesus proclaims that ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου in Jn 9.5, which has already appeared in Jn 8.12. Readers can understand that the theme of 'Jesus as the light of the world' in John 8 is continually developed and embodied in the narrative of the man born blind.

The procedure of Jesus' healing miracle, at first, seems to be bizarre, because Jesus uses his saliva (πτύσμα) and mud (πηλός) for making clay with the spittle, and anoints (ἐπέχρισεν) the man's eyes with the clay (Jn

83. On the Old Testament background to the relationship between sin and suffering, see J.P. Comiskey, "'Rabbi, who has sinned...?' (John 9:2)", *TBT* 26 (1966), pp. 1808-14.

84. The term ῥαββί means 'teacher', and has occurred in Jn 1.38, 49; 3.2, 26. John the Baptist is called ῥαββί by his disciples (1.38; 3.26), and it is used by the crowd (6.25) and Jesus' disciples (4.31; 11.8). This feature shows that the term is used for calling someone to pay respect and obedience; see E. Lohse, 'ῥαββί, ῥαββουνί', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 961-65; Asiedu-Pepurah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts*, p. 121.

9.6).<sup>85</sup> Jesus' healing gesture is paradoxical and symbolic because the clay made with the spittle should have blinded the man's eyes, but it will make him see.<sup>86</sup> Jesus' use of the clay symbolically indicates his creative act in relation to his own remark on τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ in Jn 9.3 and his saying that ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με in Jn 9.4.<sup>87</sup> The detailed description of Jesus' preparation for the healing sets the stage for the later accusation of breaking the Sabbath.<sup>88</sup> The full depiction remains important to the narrator for establishing in the subsequent debates that the healing is due to Jesus' action, not just to washing in the pool of Siloam. After smearing the clay made with the spittle, Jesus commands the man in Jn 9.7, ὕπαγε νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ. The Johannine aside in Jn 9.7 explains the meaning of the name of the pool, Siloam, which is translated ἀπεσταλμένος ('the one who has been sent'). The name of the pool, Siloam, is symbolic, and so it seems to point back to the reference to Jesus in Jn 9.4, τοῦ πέμψαντός με.<sup>89</sup> The blind man went (ἀπῆλθεν) and washed (ἐνίψατο), and he came back seeing (ἦλθεν βλέπων). In the first scene (Jn 9.1-7), the blind man does not recognize who Jesus is, but the narrator implicitly shows Jesus' identity with the epithet, ῥαββί, used by his disciples (v. 2), Jesus' own remark about being sent by God (v. 4), his assertion 'I am the light of the world' (v. 5) and the meaning of Siloam offered by the narrator (v. 7).

85. The term ἐπέχρισεν rendered as 'anoint' or 'smear' is the best attested reading; see P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, 8, A, C, D, L, W, etc.

86. In the Synoptics, the healing of the blind is found in Mk 8.22-26; 10.46-52 (par. Mt. 9.27-31; 12.22-23; 15.30-31; 21.14; Lk. 7.21-22). In Mk 8.23 Jesus uses his saliva for performing the healing miracle (cf. 7.33).

87. See Asiedu-Peprah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts*, pp. 124-25. The symbolic interpretation of Jn 9.6 goes back to Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, V, 15.2-4. For the adoption of this interpretation by modern scholars, see Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 343, who also says that 'the healing is a creative act'; Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 354; Lightfoot, *St John's Gospel*, p. 202; see also J.D.M. Derrett, 'John 9:6 Read with Isaiah 6:10; 20:9', *EQ* 66 (1994), pp. 251-54, who considers that Jn 9.6 is to be explained in the light of Isa. 6.10 and 20.9.

88. Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 343, who thinks that the author inserted the clay made with Jesus' spittle to bring out a creation motif on the basis of Gen. 2.6-7; however, A.E. Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982), p. 38, thinks that the author inserted the clay made with Jesus' spittle for portraying Jesus as one who breaks the Sabbath law.

89. See Asiedu-Peprah, *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts*, p. 125, who thinks that the waters of Siloam symbolically represent Jesus himself (cf. 3.17, 34; 5.36). The name of the pool, Siloam, can also symbolically point to the blind man himself; see B. Grigsby, 'Washing in the Pool of Siloam: A Thematic Anticipation of the Johannine Cross', *NovT* 27 (1985), pp. 227-35.

The miraculous healing of the blind man is queried by the mixed group of neighbours and onlookers, so the second scene (Jn 9.8-12) of the narrative forms a type of judicial controversy between the man and the mixed group. Readers are given an implicit confirmation by the crowds of the healing: 'the neighbours, therefore, and those who had seen him before as a beggar' in Jn 9.8. The crowds ask who the blind man is (Jn 9.8-9), how he has been healed (Jn 9.10), and where his healer is (Jn 9.12). Regarding the issue of the man's identity, whether he was blind from birth or not, there is a division between the crowds, which implicitly indicates a further division concerning the identity of Jesus (Jn 9.16; 10.19). A similar question in relation to Jesus' identity has already arisen (Jn 7.12, 25-26, 31; 8.25, 48, 53; 10.24), and similarly the crowds have been divided regarding his identity (Jn 7.40-43, 47-52; 10.19-21). The man's identity, as the one who was blind from birth, is important to verify Jesus' healing miracle, so the crowds ask such a question first. The man clearly answers he is the one who was born blind (Jn 9.9). Immediately the mixed group of neighbours and onlookers ask *how* the man has had his eyes opened (Jn 9.10). Readers can understand that this question implicitly shows that they admit the healing miracle happened to him. The man plainly gives an answer where he introduces Jesus as his benefactor, but his way of identifying, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς in Jn 9.11, shows his uncertainty about Jesus' identity. What the man evidently knows, however, is the use by Jesus of the clay made with the spittle to anoint on his eyes, and his command, 'Go, wash in the pool of Siloam', and then the receiving of his sight (Jn 9.11). Although the man does not know where Jesus is, he recognizes that the healing miracle was performed by Jesus, and that he now has full use of the eyes which have been useless since birth.

The healed man is brought to the Pharisees after the judicial controversy between the man and the mixed group of neighbours and onlookers, and this meeting forms another scene of judicial controversy, now between the man and the Pharisees (Jn 9.13-17). The narrator offers at this point the fact that the day when Jesus made the clay and opened the man's eyes was on a Sabbath (Jn 9.14).<sup>90</sup> The same interrogation about *how* is given to the man, and he witnesses to how the miraculous healing had taken place (Jn 9.15). Some of the Pharisees reject Jesus' origin from God (παρὰ θεοῦ) because of the breaking of the Sabbath law, but others wonder whether his origin is from God because of the healing miracle.

90. The reference to the Sabbath will be the major controversial issue between the Pharisees and Jesus in the narrative, because what Jesus did to the man born blind is an offence against the Sabbath law. According to *m. Šab.* 7.2, kneading is clearly illegal, so it is expressly forbidden.

Thus there is a division between the Pharisees concerning Jesus' identity (Jn 9.16). Eventually, the Pharisees ask the healed man about the identity of Jesus, and his answer is straightforwardly that he is *προφήτης* (Jn 9.17) in relation to the healing miracle which has happened to him.

It is quite clear that the healed man's understanding of Jesus' identity as prophet is solely based on his healing miracle.<sup>91</sup> The man's witness in the judicial controversies between himself and the crowds (Jn 9.8-12), and between himself and the Pharisees (Jn 9.13-17) is, therefore, focused on what Jesus has done in restoring his sight miraculously.<sup>92</sup> It is highly probable that the healed man recalls Elisha's healing of Naaman from leprosy (2 Kgs 5.1-27) in relation to Jesus' command 'Go, wash' and the use of the pool of Siloam for the miraculous healing, because the same command and the use of water in the Jordan river have been used by the prophet Elisha for the miraculous healing of Naaman's leprosy (עֲלֵךְ בַּיַּרְדֵּן, LXX: πορευθεὶς λοῦσαι, 2 Kgs 5.10), although there is the obvious difference between the two miracles, leprosy and blindness. D.G. Bostock has argued that Jesus saw himself as a new Elisha,<sup>93</sup> and T.L. Brodie develops Bostock's consideration about Jesus as the new Elisha.<sup>94</sup> Moreover, in the Old Testament, it is generally recognized that miracles are performed by prophets, for example, Moses' healing of Miriam from her leprosy (Num. 12.13), Elijah's raising of the son of the widow at Zarephath (1 Kgs 17.17-24) and Elisha's reviving the son of the Shunammite woman (2 Kgs 4.8-37). In this respect, it is not very difficult to see how the man recognizes Jesus' prophetic identity in relation to the healing miracle that has happened to him. It is true that the man did not clearly recognize Jesus' identity the first time. This is indicated in the first judicial controversy, in which the former blind man's witness to Jesus' identity is *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* ('the man') in Jn 9.11. This shows that the man's understanding of Jesus is developed from 'the man' to 'prophet' through the ongoing judicial controversies.<sup>95</sup>

In sum, the man born blind has had his sight restored miraculously by Jesus. The former blind man fully recognizes Jesus' prophetic identity by

91. See Barnett, 'Jewish Sign Prophets'.

92. In Jn 9.24-34 as the fifth scene of the narrative, a second time the man is called to witness to the healing miracle in the judicial controversy between the man and the Pharisees, and he gives the same witness (v. 25).

93. Bostock, 'Jesus as the New Elisha'.

94. T.L. Brodie, 'Jesus as the New Elisha: Cracking the Code', *ExpTim* 93 (1981), pp. 39-42.

95. A similar progression of the belief in Jesus is found in the Fourth Gospel, for example, the faith of the Samaritan woman and that of Martha in the Lazarus story.

means of his healing miracle. The man's perception of Jesus as prophet is simply related to his extraordinary God-given power, which is an echo of the impression made on the Samaritan woman (Jn 4.19).

*Understanding Jesus as the Expected Jewish Prophet*

In what sense, then, does the man born blind understand the figure of Jesus as prophet? The man seems to understand Jesus as the expected Jewish eschatological prophet. The following is offered in support. First, the formerly blind man recognizes Jesus as prophet in relation to his intercessory prayer for the healing miracle (Jn 9.31-33). In the fifth scene of the narrative (Jn 9.24-34), the cured man is once again called for the judicial controversy between the authorities and himself, and explains that οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει, ἀλλ' ἐάν τις θεοσεβῆς ᾖ καὶ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῇ τούτου ἀκούει (we know that God does not listen to sinners, but if anyone is a god-fearer and does his will, God listens to this man) in Jn 9.31. The expression, ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει, implicitly refers to a prayer of the unrighteous, and in particular the phrase 'God hears this man [Jesus]' (τούτου ἀκούει) implies that God responds to Jesus' prayer. In the Fourth Gospel, since Jesus has prayed before performing miracles (Jn 6.11; 11.41), the former blind man's remark can be regarded as pointing implicitly to Jesus' intercessory prayer. The idea that ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἀκούει occurs frequently in Scripture<sup>96</sup> and also in Jewish writing.<sup>97</sup> There is a rabbinic saying that coincides almost exactly with the idea expressed by the cured man: 'The words of any man in whom fear of God dwells are heard'.<sup>98</sup> D.A. Carson and C.K. Barrett consider that the man's argument in Jn 9.31 about Jesus' origin, which is developed in Jn 9.16, refers to Jesus' prayer for the healing miracle.<sup>99</sup> Similarly, Schnackenburg comments on Jn 9.31 that 'a plausible reply was that God only hears a person when they fear God and do his will, since in Judaism miracles were regarded as answers to prayer'.<sup>100</sup> Moreover, the cured man strongly claims Jesus' intercessory

96. For example, Job 27.9; 35.13; Pss. 66.18; 19.7; Prov. 15.29; Isa. 1.15; cf. Jn 14.13-14; 16.23-27; 1 Jn 3.21-22.

97. See *Sanh.* 90a Bar: 'Rabbi Aqiba said, "May it never come to pass that God makes the sun stand still for those who transgress his will"' (see *KNTTM*, I, p. 465); *Ber.* 58a: 'Does the All-merciful do a miracle for liars?'; see also *KNTTM*, II, p. 534 on 9.16B.

98. See *KNTTM*, II, p. 535, *Ber.* 6b.

99. Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 374; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, pp. 363-64.

100. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 252.

prayer in relation to his healing miracle; this is clearly expressed in Jn 9.32-33. In Jn 9.32, 'Never since the world began (ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος) has it been heard that any one opened the eyes of a man born blind', the cured man implicitly demonstrates Jesus' prophetic identity in relation to his healing miracle, and at the same time the superiority of his prophetic identity over the prophets of the Old Testament since the healing miracle was without parallel 'since the world began' (ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος).<sup>101</sup> The former blind man eventually concludes that Jesus is *from God* (παρὰ θεοῦ) in Jn 9.33.<sup>102</sup> Jesus' intercessory prayer for the healing miracle is, therefore, implicitly indicated in the former blind man's remark on the origin of Jesus.<sup>103</sup> Intercessory prayer is one of the significant prophetic functions of the prophets in the Old Testament, as I have noted earlier. Thus, Jesus' prophetic identity is implicitly indicated in his intercessory prayer for the healing miracle.

Second, the use of τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Jn 9.35 seems to be related to Jesus' prophetic identity. The use of 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 is quite distinctive from the other Johannine Son of Man sayings.<sup>104</sup> In the sixth scene of the narrative, which forms a conversation between Jesus and the former blind man (Jn 9.35-38), Jesus finds the man, and asks him the question, σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Jn 9.35. The man probably does not understand the significance of the title, 'the Son of Man',<sup>105</sup> because his response to the question of Jesus makes no

101. Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 358, who has observed: 'If once it be assumed that a miracle proclaims the presence of a prophet, a miracle without parallel since the world began proclaims the presence of the Christ'.

102. See J.M. Lieu, 'Blindness in the Johannine Tradition', *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 83-95, who notes that the blind man is 'the only person in the Gospel other than Jesus himself to describe Jesus as "from God"' (p. 83).

103. Along with Jesus' intercessory prayer, the cured man explains the origin of Jesus on the basis of his own experience of the healing miracle (v. 25), and strongly claims that Jesus is from God (vv. 30-33). The authorities do not know 'from where he is' (πόθεν ἐστίν, v. 29), but the former blind man does.

104. For more detailed discussion on the Johannine Son of Man, see Chapter 10, 'Son of Man and Prophet'; Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*; D. Burkett, *The Son of the Man in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup, 56; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991). For comprehensive understanding of the Son of Man in relation to the Gospels as a whole and Acts, see D. Burkett, *The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (SNTSMS, 107; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000); D.R.A. Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).

105. See Smith, *John* (1999), pp. 198-99; Wilckens, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, p. 160; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 295; Burkett, *Son of the Man*, p. 165; Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, p. 104; Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, II, p. 338, Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 253. Contra Hoskyns,

sense at all in Jn 9.36, τίς ἐστίν, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν; ('Who is he, Sir, that I might believe in him?'). The man shows himself willing to believe in anyone Jesus recommends, and asks to know who this person is. This indicates that the initial question of the former blind man has to do with the expected Jewish eschatological figure whose identity can be a matter of inquiry. If the man hears Jesus saying, 'Do you believe in the Messiah?', instead of 'Do you believe in the Son of Man?', the answer should be a simple 'yes' or 'no', not the question 'who is he, Sir?' (τίς ἐστίν, κύριε). Thus, 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 cannot be substituted by either 'me' or 'the Messiah'. As R. Leivestad and Bernard argued,<sup>106</sup> it is highly likely that the term the Son of Man in Jn 9.35 is not used messianically at all.

Furthermore, the problem of 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 is related to John's particular use of the verb πιστεύω. In the Fourth Gospel elsewhere, 'the Son of Man' has never been the object of the faith. Robert Rhea notes that:

Nowhere else in the New Testament is the verb πιστεύειν used with reference to the title, the Son of Man, and no other recorded episode indicates Jesus' eagerness to identify himself in such a direct manner as the Son of Man.<sup>107</sup>

Because of the idiosyncratic use of the verb πιστεύω here in connection with 'the Son of Man' as object of faith many later copyists attempt to change 'Son of Man' to 'Son of God'.<sup>108</sup> It is, however, almost universally acknowledged that 'the Son of Man' is original, not only because the earliest manuscripts support this reading, but also because it is hard to see why in this instance copyists would have introduced a harder reading.<sup>109</sup> S.S. Smalley comments on the term 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 that:

*Fourth Gospel*, p. 359; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 338; Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, II, p. 40.

106. R. Leivestad, 'Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man', *NTS* 18 (1972), pp. 243-267, see esp. p. 251; Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, I, pp. cxxx-cxxxi, who also claims that at the time of Jesus 'the Son of Man' was not a messianic title, but it referred to the role of Jesus as the deliverer of humanity.

107. Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 44.

108. Some minimize the difference between 'the Son of Man' and 'the Son of God', claiming that it makes little difference as they both point to the divine sonship of Jesus; see S. Kim, *The "Son of Man" as the Son of God* (WUNT, 30; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983), pp. 5-6. If there is no difference between the titles in this context, why is 'the Son of Man' used at all?

109. Many manuscripts read 'the Son of God' in place of 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35, however, 'the Son of Man' is the correct reading in view of the external evidence of P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Bezae; see Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 376; Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 149.



it is certainly an unusual type of Son of man saying, uniquely involving the verb πιστεύειν, and does not belong to any of the patterns so far isolated; even the theme of judgement which follows closely (v. 39) is not really connected.<sup>110</sup>

In this respect, 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 is an idiosyncratic type in comparison with other Johannine Son of Man sayings.

On first impression 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 seems to offer evidence of a primitive Christology in relation to the man's confession in Jn 9.38, πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ ('I believe, Lord! and he prostrated himself before him').<sup>111</sup> There is, however, no conclusive proof that the man even understood the significance of the title, 'the Son of Man' (cf. Jn 12.34). Moreover, the man's attitude whether he intends worship or simply honour, is not clear.<sup>112</sup> The behaviour of the former blind man can be regarded as an act of worship, but the verb simply means to prostrate oneself to the one who has a high authority.<sup>113</sup> Thus, it may be possible that the former blind man bows down before Jesus as God's agent, like prophets of the Old Testament, for performing the healing miracle, since the verb has been used for expressing an act of recognition that the one is honoured as God's instrument.<sup>114</sup> In the Old Testament, Saul bows down before the shade of the prophet Samuel (1 Sam. 28.14), the sons of the prophets and the Shunammite woman do the same before the prophet Elisha (2 Kgs 2.15; 4.37). In this respect, it may be possible to conjecture that the man bows down before Jesus as prophet in relation to his healing miracle.

The title 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 seems to be related to the 'son of man' (בֶּן-אָדָם) in Ezekiel (e.g. Ezek. 2.1; 3.1; 8.5) and to be used for identifying Jesus' prophetic character.<sup>115</sup> The title 'son of man' (בֶּן-אָדָם),

110. S.S. Smalley, 'The Johannine Son of Man Sayings', *NTS* 15 (1969), pp. 278-301 (296); J.W. Pryor, 'The Johannine Son of Man and the Descent-Ascent Motif', *JETS* 34 (1991), pp. 341-51, who also mentions that 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 is 'the most intriguing of the Johannine Son of Man references' (p. 345).

111. Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, p. 106, who strongly disagrees that Jn 9.35 is the relic of an early Christian practice of confessing Jesus as the Son of Man.

112. See Burkett, *Son of the Man*, p. 166.

113. See BDAG, pp. 882-83, the verb προσκυνέω means 'to express in attitude or gesture one's complete dependence on or submission to a high authority figure' (p. 882); see also H. Greeven, 'προσκυνέω, προσκυνητής', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 758-66.

114. Greeven, 'προσκυνέω', p. 761.

115. See; Burkett, *Son of Man Debate*, pp. 57-60; *idem*, *Son of the Man*, pp. 20-21; Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 43-48; I.H. Marshall, *The Origins of New Testament Christology* (Leicester: Apollos, 2nd edn, 1990), p. 75; Vawter, 'Ezekiel and John'; E. Schweizer, 'Der Menschensohn', *ZNW* 50 (1959), pp. 185-209; *idem*, 'The Son of Man', *JBL* 79 (1960), pp. 119-29; *idem*, 'The Son of Man Again', *NTS* 9 (1962), pp. 256-61.

by which the prophet Ezekiel is addressed, is frequently employed in the book of Ezekiel.<sup>116</sup> The title 'son of man' in Ezekiel refers to *human* beings in contrast to God or angels, but it could also highlight the prophet's role as a special *representative* of the people.<sup>117</sup> In the Fourth Gospel, Robert Rhea considers 'the Son of Man' as a prophetic designation, and argues that the title refers to Jesus' prophetic character on the basis of the fact that Ezekiel is addressed as 'son of man' by God.<sup>118</sup> He says that:

It is ... highly probable that the term Son of Man was a somewhat obscure yet significant phrase which provided a means of referring to prophetic office. It served to indicate the divine presence which had made itself manifest to the human prophet.<sup>119</sup>

Rhea concludes that 'the confession of the blind man points to a Son of Man tradition related to the messianic expectation of the Mosaic-Prophet-Messiah'.<sup>120</sup> Rhea's conclusion is not totally out of the blue, because of the reference to Moses as the supreme prophet in Jn 9.29, in which a discussion about the Mosaic-Prophet-Messiah begins. W.A. Meeks sees Jn 9.29 as evidence for a discussion concerning a Mosaic prophet.<sup>121</sup> 'The Son of Man' saying in Jn 9.35 is, therefore, *probably* related to Jesus' prophetic identity.

Third, the shepherd discourse (Jn 10.1-18) should be seen as implicitly showing Jesus' prophetic character for the following reasons. (1) The shepherd discourse is presented as a prophetic warning given by Jesus to the authorities in Jerusalem. The shepherd image is not only one of pro-

116. The term 'son of man' (בן־אדם) is used 93 times in Ezekiel, emphasizing the prophet's humanity as he was addressed by God. It should be admitted that the use of 'son of man' in Ezekiel is in fact different from that of Jesus in Jn 9.35, but somehow the emphasis on the prophet's humanity seems to be related to the nature of Jesus' humanity as being sent by God in the Fourth Gospel.

117. See L.C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1-19* (WBC; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1994), p. 38; W. Eichrodt, *Ezekiel* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1970), p. 61.

118. Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 55-57. It should be noted that Rhea's argument on the Johannine Son of Man sayings is limited in only four cases (Jn 5.27; 6.62, 53; 9.35), although his argument on the Son of Man in Jn 9.35 can be accepted as probable.

119. Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 70. Rhea is correct when he emphasizes the revelatory function of 'the Son of Man' in John, but he does not deal with all the passages from John's Gospel in which 'the Son of Man' occurs.

120. Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 47-48; see also Sidebottom, *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 69-83, who thinks that 'the fourth evangelist thought of his Son of Man ... in terms of the Messiah, *the prophet*, the Suffering Servant, and the Righteous One...' (p. 83), italics are mine.

121. See Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, pp. 38, 293-95; Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 155-59.

tection and comfort (e.g. Lk. 12.32), but also includes an element of judgment and discernment (e.g. Mt. 25.32-33).<sup>122</sup> The shepherd discourse is given to the Pharisees and the Jews in Jerusalem as a prophetic warning. J.A.T. Robinson thinks that the shepherd discourse is a warning to the authorities that they should fulfil their role as the watchman for God's people, a frequent Old Testament theme (e.g. Jer. 6.17; Ezek. 3.17; Isa. 62.6).<sup>123</sup> Moreover, Robinson considers that 'the advent of the Good Shepherd is the fulfilment of the eschatological prophecy of Ezek. 34 and Zech. 11'.<sup>124</sup> Lindars also considers the shepherd discourse as 'a warning to Jesus' *hearers*'.<sup>125</sup> A similar warning using the metaphor of shepherd is found in the message of prophets in the Old Testament, for example, Ezekiel (Ezek. 34.1-16, 20-23), Zechariah (Zech. 10.2-3; 11.3, 4-17; 13.7-9), Jeremiah (Jer. 23.1-4), Amos (Amos 3.12) and Nahum (Nah. 3.18-19). The theme of judgment is already introduced in Jn 9.39-41 immediately before the shepherd discourse. Before the shepherd discourse, Jesus says 'I came into this world for *judgement* so that those who do see may become blind' (Jn 9.39). Jesus' parabolic shepherd saying actually begins with the negative picture in Jn 10.1 where a judgment image is implicitly depicted. This negative feature appears again in Jn 10.8, 10, 12 and 13, using the terms thief (κλέπτης), robber (ληστής) and wolf (λύκος). Beasley-Murray notes that 'the mention of the "thief and robber" ... *prior* to the shepherd in the parable is significant, following as it does immediately on 9:40-41'.<sup>126</sup> In this respect, the metaphor of thief, robber and wolf is used for the Pharisees and the Jews.<sup>127</sup>

Moreover, in the shepherd discourse, the following expressions describe the character of the authorities in Jerusalem, and implicitly indicate that they should be under the judgment of God: ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας and ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν in Jn 10.1, τῶν ἀλλοτρίων τὴν φωνήν in Jn 10.5, κλέψῃ καὶ θύσῃ καὶ ἀπολέσῃ in Jn 10.10, ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμὴν and ὁ λύκος ἀρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει in Jn 10.12. The use of such negative terms and expressions shows that the

122. See L. Ryken, J.C. Wilhoit and T. Longman (eds.), *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998), pp. 437-51 ('Jesus, Images of'), esp. p. 439.

123. See J.A.T. Robinson, 'The Parable of the Shepherd (John 10.1-5)', *ZNW* 46 (1955), pp. 233-40, which also appears in Robinson, *Twelve New Testament Studies* (SBT, 34; London: SCM Press, 1962), pp. 67-75.

124. Robinson, 'Parable of the Shepherd', p. 239.

125. Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 356, italics in the original.

126. Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 169, italics in the original.

127. See Lindars, *Gospel of John*, pp. 356, 358-59; Haenchen, *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, II, pp. 47-48.

shepherd discourse is a prophetic warning to the authorities in Jerusalem, like prophetic warnings of the Old Testament mentioned above. Thus Jesus' prophetic identity is implicitly indicated by means of the shepherd discourse as a prophetic warning.

(2) Jesus speaks the shepherd discourse in a prophetic manner. In the parable of the shepherd,<sup>128</sup> Jesus uses the double Amen formula twice: the first is at the beginning of Jesus' parabolic saying (Jn 10.1), and the second is in Jn 10.7 for emphasizing what he has said at the beginning of his parabolic saying. As I have argued in the previous chapter, the double Amen formula is used in conscious relation to the Old Testament 'thus says the Lord', and thus points to Jesus' authority as prophetic and more than prophetic in the Gospel. Thus, the use of the double Amen formula in Jn 10.1 and 10.7 supports the prophetic identity of Jesus. This implies that Jesus understands his identity as prophet from God (παρὰ θεοῦ).

(3) The imagery of the death of Jesus as good shepherd seems to be related to the rejected-prophet tradition in terms of violent death as the final destiny of the prophet. The image of the shepherd is to protect the sheep even at the cost of his own life. In the shepherd discourse, Jesus declares that he is ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός<sup>129</sup> in Jn 10.11 and 10.14, and that ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων in Jn 10.11. The expression τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν, which is a Johannine idiom also found in Jn 13.37 and 15.13 (see also 1 Jn 3.16), appears again in Jn 10.15, 17 and 18 where Jesus is characterized as the self-sacrificing shepherd.<sup>130</sup> There is no doubt that the parabolic expression 'laying down his life' points to the death of Jesus, in other words, he

128. Whether the Shepherd discourse is a parable or an allegory is disputed. John introduces Jesus' saying as παροιμία, which refers to 'proverb' or 'parable', and is used to translate לְשׁוֹן in the Septuagint (see Prov. 1.1; 26.7; Sir. 6.35; 8.8; 18.29). The Hebrew word לְשׁוֹן covers almost all types of figurative speech. In general παροιμία and παραβολή are not greatly different in meaning (see Sir. 47.17); see BDAG, pp. 779-80; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 385-86, 390-91; *idem*, 'Parable and Allegory Reconsidered', *NovT* 5 (1962), pp. 36-45, which also appears in Brown, *New Testament Essays* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965), pp. 254-64.

129. There is no absolute distinction between καλός and ἀγαθός, so I prefer to take the meaning of καλός as 'good'; see BDAG, pp. 3-4, 504-505. For the meaning of καλός, however, see Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 386, who prefers to take it as 'noble' for v. 11 and 'model' for v. 14; J.H. Neyrey, 'The "Noble Shepherd" in John 10: Cultural and Rhetorical Background', *JBL* 120 (2001), pp. 267-91, who also claims it as 'noble' in the shepherd discourse (pp. 267-68).

130. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 386-87. Elsewhere in the Fourth Gospel, the death of Jesus is implicitly expressed, for example, Jn 3.14-15; 8.28; 12.24, 31-32; 14.1-4; 15.13-14.

offers his life voluntarily for his disciples: doing that to which God calls him is more important than his own life.<sup>131</sup> Thus, it is quite clear that Jesus is aware of his death as his final destiny. In this respect, the death of Jesus as the good shepherd is closely related to the rejected-prophet in terms of violent death as the final destiny of the prophet. It is, therefore, highly probable that Jesus understands his death as the final destiny of the rejected prophet in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition of the Old Testament. The shepherd discourse, therefore, implicitly reveals Jesus' prophetic identity.

Finally, the use of the anarthrous noun προφήτης (Jn 9.17) in the formerly blind man's witness to Jesus' identity is not a crucial sign of indefiniteness because the omission is anticipated according to Colwell's rule, as has been noted in the discussion of Jn 4.19.<sup>132</sup> In his essay, 'Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns', P.B. Harner considers the predicate προφήτης in Jn 9.17 as a definite noun.<sup>133</sup> There is clear indication of definiteness in relation to the Jewish background of the man born blind (Jn 9.18-23). Moreover, the uniqueness of the miracle of restoration of sight points to Jesus as 'the prophet' rather than 'a prophet', because no prophets in the Old Testament have performed the miracle of restoration of sight. The former blind man clearly witnesses the uniqueness of Jesus' miracle of restoration of sight in Jn 9.32, 'Never since the world began (ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος) has it been heard that anyone opened the eyes of a person born blind'. If we are to read 'the prophet' then the reference will be to the expected Jewish eschatological prophet in Deut. 18.15-18.<sup>134</sup> In connection with Deut. 18.15-18, the Jewish people in both mainstream and marginal Judaism anticipated the coming of a unique Jewish eschatological prophet, although there were a number of conflicting messianic expectations current in Jesus' day.<sup>135</sup> This expectation of the

131. See Painter, 'Tradition, History and Interpretation', pp. 64-66; Neyrey, 'Noble Shepherd', pp. 267-91, who describes the death of Jesus as good shepherd in relation to the rhetorical topos of 'noble death' in the Hellenistic world; cf. A.Y. Collins, 'From Noble Death to Crucified Messiah', *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 481-503.

132. See Colwell, 'Definite Rule', pp. 12-21; Harner, 'Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns', pp. 75-87; Kim, 'The Anarthrous υἱὸς θεοῦ', see esp. pp. 221-22; Blass and Debrunner, *Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, pp. 131-32, 143.

133. See Harner, 'Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns', p. 83 n. 21.

134. Martyn, *History and Theology*, pp. 120-21, takes 'a prophet' in v. 17 to be a reference to 'the prophet' tradition.

135. See R.A. Horsley and J.S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets and Messiahs: Popular Movement in the Time of Jesus* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999), pp. 88-189; E.W. Stegemann and W. Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of its First Century* (trans. O.C. Dean; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), pp. 162-70.

Jewish people regarding the Jewish eschatological prophet is found in Jn 1.19-28; 6.1-15; 7.37-52.<sup>136</sup> In particular, the Jewish people in Jn 1.19-28 wonder whether John the Baptist is ‘the prophet’ promised in Deut. 18.15-18, so the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem sends priests and Levites as the delegation to ask who he is. In this respect, even if the cured man seems to recognize Jesus as *a* prophet (as discussed above), his understanding of Jesus’ prophetic identity could refer to the expected Jewish eschatological prophet of the Jewish traditions because of the uniqueness of Jesus’ miracle of restoration of sight (Jn 9.32). In the expectation of the Jewish eschatological prophet and the uniqueness of Jesus’ miracle of restoration of sight, therefore, the former blind man is perhaps thinking of *the* prophet in Jn 9.17, pointing to the expected Jewish eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18, although there is the anarthrous noun προφήτης in the text.

### *Summary*

In the narrative of the man born blind, the man recognizes Jesus as prophet after his sight has been restored miraculously by Jesus. (1) The former blind man’s perception of Jesus’ prophetic identity is simply based on his extraordinary God-given power, like the prophets of the Old Testament. (2) Jesus’ intercessory prayer for the healing miracle referred to by the formerly blind man indicates Jesus’ prophetic identity, like one of the prophets in the Old Testament. (3) The title, ‘the Son of Man’, used by Jesus implicitly shows that it is related to his prophetic identity like the prophet Ezekiel. (4) The shepherd discourse (Jn 10.1-18) implicitly shows Jesus’ prophetic character as follows: (a) the discourse of shepherd as a prophetic warning given by Jesus implicitly shows his prophetic identity; (b) Jesus’ prophetic manner of speaking by means of the double Amen formula shows his identity as prophet; (c) the imagery of the death of the good shepherd applied to Jesus indicates his prophetic identity in relation to the rejected-prophet tradition. (5) The former blind man’s witness to Jesus’ prophetic identity in Jn 9.17 refers to the expected Jewish eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18, and the anarthrous noun προφήτης (Jn 9.17) should be translated as ‘the prophet’ rather than ‘a prophet’ on the basis of Colwell’s rule.

136. For Jewish expectations of the eschatological messianic prophet, see M. de Jonge, ‘Jewish Expectations about the “Messiah” according to the Fourth Gospel’, *NTS* 19 (1973), pp. 246-70.

### *Conclusions*

In this chapter, I have investigated whether the Johannine Jesus is introduced as the expected eschatological prophet in the narrative of the Samaritan woman (Jn 4.4-42) and that of the man born blind (Jn 9.1-10.21). Both the Samaritan woman and the man born blind recognize Jesus as prophet, more precisely the expected Samaritan prophet and the expected Jewish prophet, respectively. Their recognition of Jesus as the expected eschatological prophet is basically related to his supernatural power and their religious background. Jesus reveals his supernatural knowledge about the woman's sexual and private marital life. The man born blind has his sight restored by Jesus' miraculous healing. After revealing Jesus' God-given power, they immediately perceive Jesus as prophet in connection with their religious background. In both the Samaritan and the Jewish religion, the eschatological prophet is anticipated at the end in relation to Deut. 18.15-18, but the title of the expected prophet differs in each religion: the Samaritans call the one who was an eschatological messianic figure '*Taheb*' and the Jews call him 'the prophet'.

First, in the narrative of the Samaritan woman, although she has initially recognized Jesus as prophet on the basis of his own remark on the living water and his supernatural knowledge, she needs to substantiate her initial understanding of Jesus as prophet. For this, the woman uses the burning issue of the right place of worship for verifying her recognition of Jesus' prophetic identity. The proclamation of the right place of worship is one of the functions of the eschatological prophet in the Samaritan traditions. After verifying her perception of Jesus as prophet, the Samaritan woman introduces him to her own people in the town, Sychar. The Samaritans, however, test Jesus' identity whether he is a true prophet or a false prophet by having him stay in the town. Eventually, the Samaritans proclaim Jesus as 'the Saviour of the world', rather than the *Taheb*. It is, therefore, quite clear that the Johannine Jesus is initially depicted as the expected Samaritan eschatological prophet in the narrative of the Samaritan woman.

Second, in the narrative of the man born blind, the man at first identifies Jesus as prophet on the basis of the healing miracle. During the judicial controversies, the man clearly and repeatedly witnesses to what Jesus has done to him by means of the same descriptions of Jesus' miraculous healing. The man most probably is reminding them of the prophet, Elisha, who miraculously cures Naaman's leprosy, because of a similar command, 'go wash', used by both Jesus and Elisha for the miraculous healing. The formerly blind man understands Jesus as the expected Jewish prophet in connection with his intercessory prayer for the healing miracle.

Moreover, Jesus implicitly exposes his prophetic identity by means of the title, 'the Son of Man' and the shepherd discourse, which functions as a prophetic warning to the Pharisees and the Jews in Jerusalem. The cured man's understanding of Jesus' identity is as the expected Jewish eschatological prophet in relation to the Jewish traditions described in Deut. 18.15-18 and we should read the anarthrous noun προφήτης (Jn 9.17) as 'the prophet' on the basis of Colwell's rule. It is, therefore, certain that the Johannine Jesus is primarily described as the expected Jewish eschatological prophet in the narrative of the man born blind.



## JESUS AS THE EXPECTED ESCHATOLOGICAL PROPHET (II)

In the preceding chapter the identity of the Johannine Jesus has been examined in relation to Jn 4.4-42 and 9.1–10.21. The Johannine Jesus is clearly identified as the expected eschatological prophet by the Samaritan woman and the man born blind; he is not only a prophet, but also more than a prophet, the prophet *par excellence* as the final prophet. In this chapter, the term ὁ προφήτης used in Jn 1.19-28; 6.1-15; and 7.37-52 will be considered in connection with Jesus' identity.

### *Jesus as the Expected Deuteronomic Eschatological Prophet (John 1.19-28)*

In Jn 1.19-28, the term ὁ προφήτης appears twice in the questions of the emissaries from Jerusalem. The questioning of the envoys in this passage is directly addressed to whether John the Baptist is 'the prophet' (or 'the Christ' or 'Elijah'). The reference to 'the prophet' in the inquiries of the delegates implies that they already know the historical tradition of 'the prophet' in connection with Jewish eschatological expectations. First, therefore, the figure of 'the prophet' in the questions of the envoys sent by the Jews of Jerusalem will be examined, and then the significance of the use of 'the prophet' in connection with the image of John the Baptist will be considered in conjunction with Jesus' prophetic identity in which an implication that the Johannine Jesus is 'the expected deuteronomic eschatological prophet' will be discussed.

#### *Identity of 'the Prophet' in John 1.21, 25*

The narrative of John the Baptist in Jn 1.19-28 can be divided into four parts: (1) introduction of the narrative (v. 19); (2) the identity of John the Baptist in relation to the expected eschatological figure promised in the Jewish tradition is asked about by the representatives of the Jews from

Jerusalem (vv. 20-23); (3) the question as to the significance of John the Baptist's baptism in connection with the expected eschatological figures, 'the Christ', 'Elijah' and 'the prophet', is asked (vv. 24-27); (4) conclusion of the narrative (v. 28). In this literary structure of the narrative, the term 'the prophet' appears in Jn 1.21, 25 in connection with the identity of John the Baptist in the questions of the envoys from Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup>

Who is implied by the reference to 'the prophet' in Jn 1.21, 25? The identity of 'the prophet' in the passages seems to be associated with the well-known Jewish tradition of the expected deuteronomic eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15, 18. In the inquiries of the delegates from Jerusalem,<sup>2</sup> the reference to 'the prophet' clearly implies that the term has a historical background known to the envoys from Jerusalem. The delegates asked about the identity of John the Baptist, σὺ τίς εἶ; in Jn 1.19, and he answered clearly he is not 'the Christ' in Jn 1.20 (cf. Jn 3.28). In his answer, John the Baptist uses the expression, ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι that seems to be emphatic because of a negative echo of Jesus' later use of the ἐγὼ εἰμι language in the Gospel.<sup>3</sup> By means of the phrase, ἐγὼ οὐκ

1. The term ὁ προφήτης in Jn 1.23 is not relevant for this study, so it will not be discussed.

2. The reference to 'Jerusalem' seems not only to refer to the place where the delegates come from, but also to imply a certain authority. If this is correct, the authority probably points to the Sanhedrin, because that was the supreme council in Jerusalem. The council consisted of the chief priest, elders, scribes and other members, presumably leading citizens (cf. Mk 15.1), but the high priest presided over the Sanhedrin. Thus, the family of the high priest largely controlled the Sanhedrin. The priests and Levites formed a special group in the Sanhedrin. The Pharisees were not strong enough to control the Sanhedrin, although they were influential members of it. On the Sanhedrin, see S. Mason, 'Chief priests, Sadducees, Pharisees, and Sanhedrin in Acts', in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (BAFCS, 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), pp. 115-177; A. Dauer, 'Spuren der (synoptischen) Synedrums-verhandlung im 4. Evangelium. Das Verhältnis zu den Synoptikern', in Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics*, pp. 307-39; C.E. Hayes, 'Sanhedrin', in R.J. Zwi Werblowsky and G. Wigoder (eds), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), pp. 606-607; A.J. Saldarini, 'Sanhedrin', *ABD*, V, pp. 975-80; J. Blinzler, 'Das Synedrium von Jerusalem und die Strafprozessordnung der Mischna', *ZNW* 52 (1961), pp. 54-65; T.A. Burkill, 'The Competence of the Sanhedrin', *VC* 10 (1956), pp. 80-96; S. Zeitlin, 'The Political Synedron and the Religious Synedron', *JQR* 36 (1945), pp. 109-40; *idem*, 'Synedron in Greek Literature, the Gospels and the Institution of the Sanhedrin', *JQR* 37 (1946), pp. 189-98; *idem*, 'Synedron in the Judeo-Hellenistic Literature and Sanhedrin in the Tannaitic Literature', *JQR* 37 (1946), pp. 307-15.

3. The phrase ἐγὼ εἰμι used by Jesus appears in Jn 4.26; 6.20, 35, 48, 51; 7.29, 34, 36; 8.12, 18, 24, 28, 58; 10.7, 9, 11, 14; 11.25; 12.26; 13.19, 33; 14.3, 6; 15.1, 5, 17.24; 18.5, 8, 37 (cf. Jn 8.23; 17.14, 16; see also Jn 6.41; 18.6). For ἐγὼ εἰμι, see

εἰμι, John the Baptist was perhaps saying that 'I am not but another is'.<sup>4</sup> In the conversation between the representatives of the Jews from Jerusalem and John the Baptist, it is exposed that both the envoys from Jerusalem and John the Baptist were expecting ὁ χριστός. The envoys did not ask John the Baptist, 'Are you the Christ?', but he answered in relation to this potential question. The reply of John the Baptist indicates that he had already recognized the actual enquiry behind the question in connection with a figure of popular eschatological expectations.<sup>5</sup> The emissaries simply asked the identity of John the Baptist, σὺ τίς εἶ; in Jn 1.19; however, the answer is negative, straightforward and idiosyncratic, 'I am not the Christ' in Jn 1.20. Hence, the dialogue between the emissaries as representatives of the Jews from Jerusalem and John the Baptist implicitly shows that in the time of John the Baptist's appearance, at least as portrayed by John, there was widespread anticipation about the expected eschatological figure of the Messiah.<sup>6</sup> The Jewish expectation of the Messiah, therefore, seems to be seen as *the most significant expectation* in connection with popular Jewish eschatological expectations.<sup>7</sup>

After the negative answer from John the Baptist, the delegates from Jerusalem asked again about his identity in Jn 1.21, τί οὖν; σὺ Ἠλίας εἶ;<sup>8</sup> The question itself suggests that the delegates were also expecting the appearance of Elijah. The Jewish people were expecting Elijah *redivivus* as one of the popular expected eschatological figures.<sup>9</sup> The expectation of Elijah *redivivus* was evidently widespread in Palestine at the time of Jesus.<sup>10</sup> In Mal. 3.1, there is a reference to the messenger who would prepare the way of the Lord, and in Mal. 3.23 (Eng. Mal. 4.5) the messenger is identified with Elijah (see also Sir. 48.10-11). In particular, the messenger and Elijah are clearly equated in Mt. 11.10-14. Synoptic traditions identify Elijah with John the Baptist in order to make him the forerunner of

D.M. Ball, *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications* (JSNTSup, 124; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

4. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 43.

5. See de Jonge, 'Jewish Expectations'.

6. See de Jonge, *Jesus, Stranger from Heaven*, pp. 77-116, esp. pp. 85-90.

7. See de Jonge, *Jesus, Stranger from Heaven*, p. 53. It is noteworthy that Jesus did not clearly claim the epithet 'the Messiah' for himself in the Fourth Gospel as a whole.

8. There are textual variants, but our reading is supported by P<sup>66</sup> (τίς), P<sup>75</sup>, C, (W<sup>8</sup>), Ψ, 33, etc.

9. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 47-48.

10. See Mt. 11.13-14; 16.13-14; 17.10-13; Mk 1.2; 8.27-30; 9.11-13; Lk. 4.24-26; 7.11-17; see Teeple, *Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, pp. 2-11, who notes that 'a fairly common view of the eschatological Prophet was that he would be Elijah' (p. 3).

Jesus,<sup>11</sup> but not the Johannine tradition. A role of Elijah in connection with the expected eschatological figures is diminished in John's Gospel in comparison with the Synoptics.<sup>12</sup> In the Synoptics, John the Baptist is to be seen as the figure of Elijah, as discussed above, but in John's Gospel he is not, in connection with the lack of any equivalent to the apocalyptic judgment aspect of the Synoptic materials. In John's Gospel, John the Baptist prepares for Jesus, not for 'the great and terrible day of the Lord' of Mal. 3.23 (Eng. Mal. 4.5). The interrogators would have had good reason to ask John the Baptist whether he claims to be Elijah, because he wore garments like those of Elijah (see Mk 1.6; 2 Kgs 1.8; cf. Zech. 13.4). Once again John the Baptist gives a negative answer to the question whether he is 'Elijah'.

After John the Baptist's negative answer, immediately the representatives of the Jews from Jerusalem asked him, ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; and he simply said οὐ ('No') in Jn 1.21. This question implies that the reference to 'the prophet' is to represent *the well-known expected eschatological figure* promised in Deut. 18.15, 18 (cf. Jn 6.14; 7.40; Mt. 16.13-14; Acts 3.22); the Jewish people were expecting the emergence of the promised deuteronomic eschatological prophet. It is assumed that both the interrogators and John the Baptist apparently have a specific identity in mind when they refer to 'the prophet'.<sup>13</sup> John the Baptist perhaps had some lucid knowledge about 'the prophet', so he could clearly answer that he is *not* 'the prophet', and the envoys from Jerusalem would also know who 'the prophet' is. The identity of the delegates from Jerusalem are 'priests and Levites' (ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίταις), who are generally recognized to have good knowledge of the Hebrew Scripture (see Jn 1.45; 3.10; 7.52; cf. Mt. 2.4-6), so they almost certainly have in mind a figure of 'the prophet' in relation to their good knowledge of the Hebrew Scripture.

Eventually, John the Baptist clearly denied his identity with any one of the figures, 'the Christ', 'Elijah' and 'the prophet'. The representatives of the Jews from Jerusalem asked the same question to John the Baptist

11. See Mt. 17.12; Mk 9.13; cf. Lk. 1.17; 7.27; cf. *1 En.* 90.31; *4 Ezra* 6.26.

12. See Mt. 11.13-14; 16.13-14; 17.10-13; Mk 1.2; 8.27-30; 9.11-13; Lk. 4.24-26; 7.11-17; see D.C. Allison, "Elijah Must Come First", *JBL* 103 (1984), pp. 256-58; J.A. Fitzmyer, 'More About Elijah Coming First', *JBL* 104 (1985), pp. 295-96; M.M. Faierstein, 'Why Do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First', *JBL* 100 (1981), pp. 75-86; J.L. Martyn, 'We Have Found Elijah', in R. Scroggs and R. Hamerton-Kelly (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), pp. 181-219.

13. See O. Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, rev. edn, 1963), p. 16.

again, τίς εἶ; and another question, τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ; in Jn 1.22. John the Baptist plainly identified himself with the figure in the quotation from Isaiah, ἐγὼ φωνῇ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· εὐθύνετε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου in Jn 1.23,<sup>14</sup> but the delegates from Jerusalem were not satisfied with his answer. The delegates as expressed in Jn 1.24, ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων asked again from a different angle in order to identify John the Baptist in relation to his baptismal activity (Jn 1.25, cf. Jn 3.22-23, 26; 10.40).<sup>15</sup> In baptizing, John the Baptist was performing an eschatological action;<sup>16</sup> therefore, he could easily be identified with one of the expected eschatological figures: ‘the Christ’, ‘Elijah’ and ‘the prophet’. John the Baptist, however, clearly denied that he was one of the expected eschatological figures suggested by the delegates in connection with his baptismal activity. He distinguished his identity from Jesus in terms of the medium of baptismal activity: he baptized (only) with water. John the Baptist introduces Jesus: he is (1) one who stands among the Jewish people, but they do not know his identity (Jn 1.26), (2) he is the one who is coming after him (Jn 1.27), and (3) he is the one who is superior to him, so much so that John the Baptist is not worthy to untie the thong of that one’s sandal (Jn 1.27).

14. For a discussion of this quotation, see M.J.J. Menken, ‘The Quotation from Isa 40,3 in John 1,23’, *Bib* 66 (1985), pp. 190-205.

15. There are textual variants in v. 24. Before ἀπεσταλμένοι the article οἱ is omitted in P<sup>55</sup>, P<sup>66</sup>, P<sup>75</sup>,  $\aleph$ , A, B, C, L, T,  $\Psi$ , etc. and in  $\aleph^2$ , A<sup>c</sup>, C<sup>3</sup>, W<sup>s</sup>,  $\Theta$ , etc. the article is included, which offers a smooth reading; however, a more difficult reading would be creditable, as I read. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 43-44, also supports a more difficult reading, without the article; see also Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 263-64; Bernard, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 38. The reference to *Pharisees* in Jn 1.24 is ambiguous, therefore some consider it as evidence of secondary editing, for example, Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 90-91, who considers that v. 24 was added from the synoptic tradition by the ecclesiastical redactor. However, the reference to *Pharisees* in Jn 1.24 does not demonstrate the result of secondary editing, but offers further information about the Jewish interrogators. He admits that the sentence of v. 24 does not report a second deputation (p. 91); see Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 105; Brodie, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 148-51, who correctly comments that ‘the terms “Jews” and “Pharisees” are used interchangeably’ in Jn 1.19-28 (p. 148); Ridderbos, *Gospel according to John*, p. 66; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, p. 292, who comments that the reference to *Pharisees* points not to new envoys, but to the same figures, who have already been mentioned in v. 19.

16. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 52; Ridderbos, *Gospel according to John*, p. 67; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, p. 145; Robinson, *Twelve New Testament Studies*, pp. 11-27.

In this respect, there seems to be three potential answers from John the Baptist to the question about his identity asked by the representatives of the Jews from Jerusalem: 'the Christ' or 'Elijah' or 'the prophet'. The three titles obviously reflect various eschatological figures in relation to popular Jewish eschatological expectations in the time of John the Baptist's appearance. By and large the titles seem to reflect prevailing messianic expectations, and also indicate that there was no uniform Jewish expectation of a single eschatological figure at the time of John the Baptist's emergence.<sup>17</sup> Who, then, is 'the prophet' in the questions of the envoys? As most commentators have generally considered, the appropriate historical background of the identity of 'the prophet' used in Jn 1.21, 25 seems to be originally rooted in Deut. 18.15-18.<sup>18</sup> Thus, 'the prophet' is identified with *the expected deuteronomical eschatological prophet* promised in Deut. 18.15-18.

*Implication of Jesus as the Expected Deuteronomical Eschatological Prophet*

What is the implication of the negative use of 'the prophet' in Jn 1.21, 25 in relation to the identity of John the Baptist? John the Baptist had been introduced as a witness for Jesus in the prologue of John's Gospel (Jn 1.6-8, 15), and his role of witness for Jesus is also clearly noted in Jn 1.19, 23 (cf. Jn 3.28-30; 10.41). He is nothing more than a witness for Jesus and nothing less, so he denied being 'the Christ', 'Elijah' or 'the prophet'. The function of John the Baptist as a witness for Jesus indicates a close relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus. In the narrative of John the Baptist, the three potential figures, 'the Christ', 'Elijah' and 'the prophet' used in connection with the identity of John the Baptist, imply that he is closely related to the expected eschatological figures, in which readers of the Gospel may be able to see the identity of Jesus. In this respect, all three titles offer a possibility to identify the figure of Jesus as one of them, although the three epithets, which were used for asking about the identity of John the Baptist, are quite distinctive from each other.<sup>19</sup>

17. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 46-50.

18. See Ridderbos, *Gospel according to John*, p. 64.

19. See Boismard, *Moses or Jesus*, pp. 6-10, who claims that 'despite the insertion of the person Elijah, there is definitely a parallelism here [in Jn 1.21, 23] between "the Christ" and "the Prophet"' (p. 8), and considers 'there must be some equivalence between them' (p. 8); see also Meeks, *The Prophet-King*, pp. 32-41; R. Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology* (trans. O.C. Dean; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), p. 271, notes that 'when John the Baptist denies that he is "the prophet" or an eschatological figure of salvation like Elijah (1:21, 25), this indirectly reinforces the idea that Jesus is this "prophet" or "Elijah"'.

The appellation of ‘the Christ’ in the questions of the delegates from Jerusalem seems to be the most *important title* for the identity of the Johannine Jesus in relation to the three expected eschatological figures of popular Jewish eschatological expectations, as noted above. By contrast, the title, ‘Elijah’ seems to be one of *the most popular designations* in relation to Jewish popular expectations, because Jews believed that Elijah must come first.<sup>20</sup> A role of Elijah in connection with the expected eschatological figures is, however, diminished in John’s Gospel in comparison with the Synoptics.<sup>21</sup> The narrator of the Fourth Gospel does not put the figure of Elijah first in the order of the questions of the delegates. The title ‘Elijah’ appears only twice, in Jn 1.21, 25, and never occurs again throughout the Gospel.<sup>22</sup> Thus, the function of the figure of Elijah in relation to the identity of Jesus seems not to be important in the Fourth Gospel. Rather, the figure of ‘the prophet’ seems to play a more significant role than that of Elijah in relation to the identity of Jesus in the Gospel as a whole.

The use of the two titles, ‘the Christ’ and ‘the prophet’ (Jn 1.20-21, 25),<sup>23</sup> in relation to the identity of John the Baptist seems to be closely related to the identity of Jesus, although the designations do not directly point to Jesus. The question about the identity of John the Baptist turns out to have something to do with the identity of Jesus. M. de Jonge considers that John the Baptist’s negative declaration in Jn 1.20 has a double function, and says ‘his denial that he is “the Christ” ... points away from himself to Jesus who indeed may be called and is called ὁ χριστός’.<sup>24</sup> The titles ‘the Christ’ and ‘the prophet’ used for the question about the identity of John the Baptist imply the identity of Jesus in relation to popular Jewish eschatological expectations. In particular, the term ‘the prophet’ in the pericope spontaneously provokes readers of the Gospel to remember the figure of the prophet-like-Moses described in Deut. 18.15, 18. The readers can see the identity of Jesus in the question whether John the Baptist is ‘the prophet’. In this pericope, the intention of John’s

20. See Teeple, *Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, pp. 2-11; S.M. Bryan, *Jesus and Israel’s Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* (SNTSMS, 117; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pp. 88-111.

21. See Mk 1.2; 8.27-30; 9.11-13; Mt. 11.13-14; 16.13-14; 17.10-13; Lk. 4.24-26; 7.11-17.

22. The term ‘Elijah’ appears nine times in Matthew and Mark respectively, and eight times in Luke.

23. The title of ‘the Prophet’ occurs several times with the epithet of ‘the Christ’ in the context of the controversial debate on the identity of the Johannine Jesus (Jn 4.4-42; 7.40-52; 9.1-10.21; cf. 6.14; 11.27).

24. De Jonge, *Jesus, Stranger from Heaven*, p. 53.

Gospel is quite clear that the identity of Jesus is implicitly introduced by means of that of John the Baptist, that is, with the introduction of the possibility that John the Baptist might be 'the Christ' or 'the prophet'. The role of John the Baptist as the witness for Jesus is expressed most clearly in Jn 1.6-8, 15, 19. In John, John the Baptist prepares for Jesus, not for 'the great and terrible day of the Lord' of Mal. 3.23 [Eng. 4.5]. Moreover, John the Baptist identifies himself as 'a voice of one crying out in the wilderness' for the Lord (Jn 1.23). Readers clearly know the identity of John the Baptist from early in the Gospel, so the questions about the identity of John the Baptist are to be seen as absurd. This seems to be a Johannine literary strategy, in which John indirectly introduces the identity of Jesus by indicating 'the Christ' or 'the prophet' in connection with the identity of John the Baptist. Both titles, 'the Christ' and 'the prophet', are very significant for the identity of the Johannine Jesus in the Gospel. The identity of Jesus is closely related to the questions of the envoys from Jerusalem, although the questions do not directly point to him.

### *Summary*

In Jn 1.19-28, the titles 'the Christ', 'Elijah' and 'the prophet' are used in the question about the identity of John the Baptist. The identity of 'the prophet' in Jn 1.21, 25 is associated with the well-known Jewish tradition of the figure of the expected deuteronomical eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18. Both the envoys from Jerusalem and John the Baptist know the Jewish tradition of the expected deuteronomical eschatological prophet. By pointing away from himself John the Baptist as the witness for Jesus introduces the identity of Jesus as involving either 'the Christ' or 'the prophet' in the passage. In relation to the identity of Jesus, the figure of 'Elijah' as one of the popular Jewish eschatological expectations is not very important in comparison to the other two figures. The term 'Elijah' totally disappears in the Gospel after this passage (Jn 1.21, 25). It is true that the title 'the Christ' in relation to the identity of Jesus is the most important epithet in the Gospel as a whole, but the figure of 'the prophet' is used for Jesus' identity because of the well-known Jewish tradition of the expected deuteronomical eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18. In Jn 1.19-28, therefore, John the Baptist as the witness for Jesus implicitly shows the Johannine Jesus to be *the expected deuteronomical eschatological prophet*.

### *Jesus as the Expected Mosaic Eschatological Prophet (John 6.1-15)*

Jn 6.1-15 seems to be the best pericope for examining the reference to ὁ προφήτης as explicitly utilized in relation to the identity of Jesus. There



are various academic works focused on John 6,<sup>25</sup> but this investigation will be limited to exploring the following questions. What is the intention of using the reference to 'the prophet' in relation to the identity of Jesus in Jn 6.14? In what ways can the identity of Jesus be recognized as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet in the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand? In order to answer the questions, first, the intention of John's Gospel in using the term 'the prophet' will be investigated in relation to Jesus' identity, and then the identity of Jesus as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet will be discussed.

*Intention of the Use of 'the Prophet' in John 6.14*

Before undertaking our investigation, the literary context of Jn 6.1-15 will be discussed. The pericope is placed in the first part of the large context of Jn 6.1-71. Many scholars have considered that the present location of John 6 creates geographical difficulties, so they attempt to solve the problems by rearranging John 4-7.<sup>26</sup> If John 6 is placed immediately after John 4, Jesus' presence in Galilee is easily explained, and the following events described in John 5, 7, 9 and 10 all take place in Jerusalem. However, there is no evidence from textual traditions for the rearrangement of the chapters, and the consideration of displacement of the chapters is too strongly focused on geography. Moreover, the rearrangement does not solve all the alleged problems.<sup>27</sup> Thus, Jn 6.1-15 will be examined as it stands.

The pericope can be divided into three sections: an introduction (vv. 1-4); the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand (vv. 5-13); and the aftermath of the feeding of the five thousand (vv. 14-15). The introductory section describes the presence of Jesus (v. 1), the disciples of Jesus (v. 3),

25. For a full discussion of Jesus' feeding of the five thousand in relation to the literary, historical and theological problems, see Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 170-79; P. Borgen, *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (NovTSup, 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965); R.A. Culpepper (ed.), *Critical Readings of John 6* (BIS, 22; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997); Labahn, 'Between Tradition and Literary Art'; E. Bammel, 'The Feeding of the Multitude', in Bammel and Moule (eds.), *Jesus and the Politics of his Day*, pp. 211-40; E.D. Johnstone, 'The Johannine Version of the Feeding of the Five Thousand: An Independent Tradition?', *NTS* 8 (1962), pp. 151-54.

26. See Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, p. 191; Bernard, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on John*, I, pp. xvii-xix, 171; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 1-9; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, pp. 209-10.

27. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 235-36; Brodie, *Gospel according to John*, p. 257; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 193-94; *idem*, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 87-89.

and a large crowd (v. 2), as the characters of this narrative. In the introduction, the setting of the narrative is also described as 'on the other side of the Sea of Galilee, which is the Sea of Tiberias' (v. 1), 'on the mountain' (v. 3), 'the Passover, the feast of the Jews' (v. 4). In the second part, the feeding of the five thousand (vv. 5-13) can be divided into two sections: (a) a problem posed by Jesus for testing his disciples (vv. 5-9); and (b) a miracle taking place by the words and deeds of Jesus (vv. 10-13). The final section describes the aftermath of the miracle of Jesus, in which the identity of Jesus is considered to be 'the prophet' by the crowd, who have eaten the loaves and fish (vv. 14-15). The miracle of the feeding of the five thousand has been described in Jn 6.1-15, but Jesus' discourse in relation to the feeding miracle is continued in Jn 6.22-71,<sup>28</sup> which can be divided into four sections: introduction (vv. 22-24); Jesus as the bread of life (vv. 25-40); the bread as the flesh of Jesus (vv. 41-59) and the sayings of Jesus rejected and accepted (vv. 60-71).

The miracle of the feeding of the five thousand described in Jn 6.1-15 is the only one that is mentioned in all four Gospels (Mt. 14.13-21; Mk 6.32-44; Lk. 9.10b-17), so it is quite significant. The miracle accounts concerning the feeding of the five thousand in the four Gospels are in general very similar. Some essential key words and expressions in the miracle narratives such as πέντε ἄρτους κριθίνους καὶ δύο ὀψάρια (Jn 6.9; cf. Mt. 14.17; Mk 6.38; Lk. 9.13),<sup>29</sup> οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι (Jn 6.10; Mt. 14.21; Mk 6.44; Lk. 9.14); δώδεκα κοφίνους (Jn 6.13; Mt. 14.20; Mk 6.43; Lk. 9.17)<sup>30</sup> are common to all four Gospels. It is, however, indeed true that there are also many divergences between John's story of the feeding of the five thousand and that of the Synoptics. The most striking dissimilarity between John and the Synoptics, although there are many differences between them, is the reference to the response of the crowd described in Jn 6.14-15, which does not occur in the Synoptics, and in which the reference to 'the prophet' appears in relation to the identity of Jesus.<sup>31</sup> This is perhaps

28. Jn 6.16-21 is related to another miracle, Jesus' walking on the sea, which will not be considered in this study. For a detailed discussion concerning the walking on the sea, see Madden, *Jesus' Walking on the Sea*; and Heil, *Jesus Walking on the Sea*.

29. In the Synoptics the term κριθίνους does not appear, and ἰχθύας is used for 'fish' instead of ὀψάρια used in John's Gospel.

30. The term for κόφινος usually denotes a large basket, such as might be used for fish or bulky objects; see BDAG, p. 563.

31. For similarities and divergences about the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand between John and the Synoptics, see Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 21-22.

John's intention to add some information about the aftermath of the miracle performed by Jesus.

What is the intention of John's Gospel in using the term 'the prophet' in relation to Jesus' identity in the feeding miracle of the five thousand? John seems to offer a popular Jewish eschatological expectation by the use of 'the prophet' (Jn 6.14). The reaction of the crowd after the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand gives an indication of the undercurrent of popular expectations that earlier appeared in the question of the Pharisees to John the Baptist (Jn 1.21 and 25), as discussed above, and also as will be examined below in the discussion of the Feast of Tabernacles (Jn 7.40 and 52). Since Moses had provided food and water in the desert (Exod. 16.11-36; 17.1-6; Num. 11.1-33; 20.2-11), the people expected that 'the prophet-like-Moses' would do likewise. Hence, it seems clear that after Jesus' miracle of the feeding of the five thousand the crowd almost certainly had in mind Moses in relation to Deut. 18.15-18. If this is so, the use of 'the prophet' in relation to the identity of Jesus apparently points to the figure of Jesus as the prophet-like-Moses promised in Deut. 18.15-18.<sup>32</sup>

Moreover, the use of the reference to 'the prophet' in relation to the feeding miracle of the five thousand seems to offer an indication that there is a connection between prophet and sign.<sup>33</sup> It is clearly written in Jn 6.14 that 'after the people saw the miraculous sign that Jesus did, they began to say', οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον. The recognition of the crowd that Jesus is 'the prophet who is to come into the world' indicates that they already have knowledge about the Jewish eschatological tradition of the prophet-like-Moses promised in Deut. 18.15-18.<sup>34</sup> The crowd clearly see Jesus as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet, so they shouted that Jesus is 'the prophet who is coming into the world'. Jesus' feeding miracle of the five thousand could prompt the crowd to identify Jesus as 'the prophet' in relation to the miracle of Moses' manna. When the crowd clearly declares Jesus to be 'the prophet who is to come into the world', Jesus seems not to deny the prophetic identity for himself. This implicitly indicates that Jesus accepts the title 'the prophet' for his identity. The response of the crowd after eating Jesus'

32. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 198-99; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 277.

33. The relation between prophets and miraculous signs has been already discussed in relation to the identity of the Johannine Jesus.

34. The crowd perhaps consider Jesus to be the expected eschatological prophet Elijah based on Mal. 3.1. The use of the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Jn 6.14 can be an indicator for this conjecture; see Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 64, 235.

miraculous loaves and fish is that they attempt to make Jesus be their king by force, and Jesus knows it, so he withdraws to the mountain by himself.<sup>35</sup> This implicitly indicates that Jesus perhaps did not accept his identity as a king, and also he may realize that to be a king may cause political tension.<sup>36</sup> John seems to use 'the prophet' in relation to Jesus' feeding miracle in order to depict the figure of Jesus as the prophet-like-Moses promised in Deut. 18.15-18.

*Understanding Jesus as the Expected Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*

The crowd in the miracle of the five thousand clearly claims the figure of the Johannine Jesus to be 'the prophet', who can be identified with the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18. In what ways can the figure of Jesus be seen as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet in the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand? First, in the narrative of the miracle of the five thousand the reference to τὸ ὄρος ('the mountain') in Jn 6.3 seems to give an allusion to 'the mountain' where Moses received the Law (cf. Exod. 19.20; 14.1-2; Isa. 34.2-4).<sup>37</sup> In the story of the feeding of the five thousand in the Gospels the phrase ἀνῆλθεν δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος Ἰησοῦς only occurs in John's Gospel (Jn 6.3). Jesus went up an unnamed mountain and sat with his disciples. John seems to have Jesus take up a position like Moses on Mount Sinai.<sup>38</sup> Some scholars do not consider the use of the article in relation to 'the mountain' of Moses,<sup>39</sup> but a considerable number of scholars attempt to make the connection with the gift of the Law at Sinai.<sup>40</sup> Moloney comments on 'the mountain' in Jn 6.3 that 'it should be read as a first hint that the gift made to the people in the Law through Moses is

35. In Jn 6.14-15, Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 87-91, has argued that Jesus is to be seen as a prophet-king in relation to his feeding miracle of the five thousand; however, as already indicated, this argument is not plausible.

36. It is possible that Jesus' flight does not imply a rejection of the term 'king' as such and what is rejected is worldly force and the world's 'hour', which is not yet his own. However, the implication of Jesus' withdrawal points to his rejection of being a king, because his expected time is not yet come.

37. The reference to τὸ ὄρος also occurs in Jn 6.15, so the term seems to be used for an *inclusio* in the narrative.

38. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 195, who also considers the use of the article as a hint of the mountain of Moses.

39. See Becker, *Evangelium nach Johannes*, I, p. 229.

40. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 195; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 14; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 232, who regards the mountain as 'a Christian Sinai'; J.M. Perry, 'The Evolution of the Johannine Eucharist', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 22-35, see esp. pp. 23-25; Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, p. 64.

about to be perfected in and through the gift of Jesus Christ (cf. 1:16-17).<sup>41</sup> As Moloney correctly notes, the use of ‘the mountain’ seems to be deliberately designed for recalling the Mosaic tradition in relation to the figure of Jesus. Schnackenburg suggests that the phrase ‘Jesus went up the mountain and sat down with his disciples’ in Jn 6.3 is deliberately used ‘to recall the memory of Moses, whose ascent of Sinai is a constant feature of the Sinai tradition’.<sup>42</sup> Thus, it is plausible that the use of the article in Jn 6.3, ‘the mountain’, offers a window in order to see the figure of Jesus as the Mosaic eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18.

Second, the reference to ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα in Jn 6.4 seems to point implicitly to the figure of Jesus as the Mosaic eschatological prophet. The term ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα does not appear in the Synoptics, but only in John. For the remark of the time, ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης is used in Mt. 14.15, ἡδὴ ὥρας πολλῆς in Mk 6.35 and ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν in Lk. 9.12. Thus, the use of ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα in Jn 6.4 seems to be deliberately used for a theological purpose of the Gospel. Schnackenburg correctly comments that ‘the meaning of the remark about the nearness of the Passover ... is also not chronological but theological’.<sup>43</sup> Moloney also notes that the mention of ‘the Passover in the introduction to 6:1-71 sets the theological agenda for the passage that follows’.<sup>44</sup> In his exegetical notes on Jn 6.4, Paul N. Anderson, however, disagrees with the theological purpose of the use of ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα in Jn 6.4. He comments that the use of ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα is:

neither chronological nor theological in its purpose, but it is used to describe the religious-political situation in which the feeding *and* the misperception of Jesus’ *messiahship* by the crowd (vs. 14f) were to have taken place.<sup>45</sup>

Anderson thinks that:

the primary function of the ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα theme in John is to increase the nationalistic intensity of the narrative in order to make an emphatic distinction between the kind of Messiah Jesus was anticipated as, and the kind of Messiah Jesus intended to be.<sup>46</sup>

41. Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 196; Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 333; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 273.

42. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 14.

43. Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 14.

44. Moloney, *Gospel of John*, p. 196; see also Brodie, *Gospel according to John*, p. 260; Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, pp. 281-82.

45. Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 172, italics in the original.

46. Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 172, who considers that such religio-political tensions associated with the feeding event is corroborated by the primary interpretative comment within Marcan tradition (Mk 6.34).

It is, however, highly unlikely that the primary purpose of the use of ἑγγύς τὸ πάσχα in Jn 6.4 is to emphasize the religio-political situation, because in John's Gospel as a whole the reference to 'the Passover' (Jn 2.13; 6.4; 11.55) seems to be used for a literary framework pointing to the death of Jesus as the Lamb of God (Jn 1.29, 36). In particular, the use of the term ἑγγύς points to an imminent situation:<sup>47</sup> it will happen almost immediately but not yet, in which the impending violent death of Jesus, which will take place on the day of preparation for the Passover (Jn 19.14, 31), seems to be implicitly indicated. From the beginning of the Gospel the Johannine Jesus is introduced as ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ in Jn 1.29, 36, indicating implicitly the Pascal Lamb slaughtered for the day of the Passover.<sup>48</sup> The Johannine Jesus is depicted as the prophet-like-Moses in relation to the use of 'the Passover' in Jn 6.4. The reference to 'the Passover' as the most characteristic feast of the Jews is primarily to the commemoration of the past event of Israel in connection with Moses, and offers the ground of hope for a present deliverance by the second Moses, who is promised in Deut. 18.15-18.<sup>49</sup> Yee notes on Jn 6.15 that 'given the time of Passover when the Messiah was thought to appear and Jesus' resemblance to their former powerful leader Moses, the people rush to make him their king'.<sup>50</sup> In this respect, the Johannine Jesus is introduced as the Mosaic eschatological prophet in Jn 6.1-15.

Third, the miracle account in Jn 6.1-15, in which Jesus multiplies a boy's five barley loaves and two fish, so the five thousand people eat and have food left over, parallels the miracle performed by the prophet Elisha in 2 Kgs 4.42-44, in which he multiplies twenty barley loaves of a man from Baal-Shalishah and so a hundred men eat and have food left over.<sup>51</sup>

47. See D. Dormeyer, 'ἑγγύς', *EDNT*, I, pp. 371-72.

48. See Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, pp. 67-68; M.C. de Boer, *Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus* (CBET, 17; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), pp. 85-95.

49. See S.E. Porter, 'Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfilment Motif and the Passover Theme', in C.A. Evans and W.R. Stegner (eds.), *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup, 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), pp. 396-428; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 24, who comments that 'the Passover' in Jn 6.4 is another association with Moses.

50. Yee, *Jewish Feasts*, p. 65.

51. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 235, who comments that the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Jn 6.14 is 'a description of the prophet Elijah' based on Mal. 3.1. Indeed, Jesus has multiplied barley bread in Jn 6.1-15, as did Elijah's follower Elisha (2 Kgs 4.42-44); Lindars, *Gospel of John*, p. 243.

Table 8.1 *Feeding of the five thousand (Jn 6.1-15)*

<i>Jn 6.1-15</i>	<i>2 Kgs 4.42-44</i>
Source of multiplication of food: five <i>barley loaves</i> and two fish offered by a boy (v. 9).	Source of multiplication of food: twenty <i>barley loaves</i> and fresh ears of grain provided by a man from Baal-Shalishah (v. 42).
Number of people to eat the multiplication of food: about five thousand men (v. 10).	Number of people to eat the multiplication of food: a hundred men (vv. 43-44).
The excess of food after eating: twelve baskets (v. 13).	The excess of food after eating: some of food (vv. 43-44).

In both miracles, the quantity of food is indeed quite different, but the story of miraculous multiplication of such small food and the excess of food after distributing the food to the people in general quite resemble each other. In particular, the use of *κριθίνους* for specifying the loaves in 2 Kgs 4.42 appears *only* in John's Gospel. The word *κριθίνους* seems to be an unimportant detail, but it indicates John's awareness of the miraculous feeding in 2 Kgs 4.42-44.<sup>52</sup>

The reason for understanding Jesus as 'the prophet-like-Moses', instead of 'the prophet-like-Elisha', in relation to Jesus' feeding miracle of the five thousand in John's Gospel is that the tradition of the appearance of 'the eschatological prophet' promised in Deut. 18.15-18 is well known, and that Jewish people were expecting 'the prophet'. Moreover, the prophet Elisha seems to be presented in 2 Kgs 4.42-44 as a prophet-like-Moses in terms of the feeding miracle and the connection between the succession from Elijah to Elisha,<sup>53</sup> with Elijah as one who is presented as a 'Moses figure who defeats the false prophets of the first kind as presented in Deut. 18.9-14—namely, the Canaanite or pagan prophets'.<sup>54</sup> Hence, the succession of Elisha in place of Elijah points to the prophet Elisha as a prophet like Moses. In this respect, the parallel between Elisha's feeding of a hundred men with twenty barley loaves and Jesus' feeding of the five thousand in John's Gospel reveals Jesus as one greater than Elisha, and

52. Trudinger, 'Cleansing of the Temple', p. 330.

53. See Hobbs, *2 Kings*, pp. 27-28.

54. D.L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy* (WBC; 2 vols.; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, rev edn, 2001), I, pp. 406-407, who comments that Elijah's theophanic experience on Mount Horeb (1 Kgs 19.9-18) is patterned 'after that of Moses, who not only encountered God in the awesome "thunderstorm" on the same holy mountain (Exod. 19:16-24), but who also had the privilege of a glimpse of YHWH's glory from a "cave" on that very mountain (Exod. 33:17-23)'.

thus as the one to be identified most adequately as ‘the prophet-like-Moses’. Jesus’ miracle of the multiplication of the five barley loaves in the Gospel points to the miracle of Manna in the works of Moses both directly and in connection with Elisha as a prophet like Moses. In Jn 6.14, after the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, the crowd recognize Jesus as ‘the prophet’, which refers to ‘the prophet-like-Moses’ promised in Deut. 18.15-18, rather than ‘the prophet-like-Elisha’.<sup>55</sup> Thus, the reaction of the crowd after Jesus’ miracle of the feeding of the five thousand clearly shows that the crowd understood the figure of Jesus as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18.

In this respect, Jesus’ feeding of the five thousand is apparently reminiscent of Elisha’s feeding miracle in 2 Kgs 4.42-44. In John, after eating the barley loaves the crowd immediately and explicitly recognize Jesus as ‘the prophet’ (Jn 6.14). The multitudes quite clearly perceive Jesus’ identity as ‘the prophet’ in relation to the miracle performed by him. The miraculous feeding of the five thousand, therefore, clearly becomes a trigger to indicate Jesus’ identity as the Mosaic eschatological prophet, who was expected by the people in the time of Jesus, in conjunction with Deut. 18.15-18 and the feeding miracle of Elisha in 2 Kgs 4.42-44.

### *Summary*

Jn 6.1-15 most clearly expresses the identity of Jesus as ‘the prophet’ in the Fourth Gospel as a whole. The use of ‘the prophet’ in Jn 6.14 shows a popularly expected Jewish eschatological figure in the time of Jesus. The reference to ‘the prophet’ in relation to the feeding miracle of the five thousand in the pericope shows that there is a relation between prophet and sign, in which Jesus is understood as ‘the prophet’. Recognition of the crowd of the identity of Jesus as ‘the prophet’ in the pericope shows that Jesus is being viewed as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18. (1) The use of article in Jn 6.3, τὸ ὄρος (*‘the mountain’*), points to the figure of Jesus as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18, with its echo of the mountain where Moses received the Law. (2) The reference to ἐγγὺς τὸ πᾶσχα in Jn 6.4 implicitly points to the figure of Jesus as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet. (3) The feeding miracle of the five thousand performed by Jesus resembles that of Elisha, in which Jesus is recognized as ‘the prophet-like-Moses’, rather than ‘the prophet-like-Elisha’, because of the tradition of the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet promised in Deut. 18.15-18.

55. See Glasson, *Moses*, pp. 45-47.



*Jesus as the Expected Messianic  
Eschatological Prophet (John 7.37-52)*

In Jn 7.37-52, reference to ὁ προφήτης occurs twice, in vv. 40 and 52.<sup>56</sup> The word 'the prophet' in Jn 7.40 is explicitly used for describing the identity of Jesus, but in v. 52 the term seems to point implicitly to Jesus' prophetic identity. What is the significance of the use of 'the prophet' in Jn 7.40, 52 in relation to the identity of Jesus? On what basis is the figure of Jesus understood as the expected messianic eschatological prophet? In order to answer the questions, first, the significance of the use of 'the prophet' in Jn 7.40, 52 will be examined in relation to the identity of Jesus, and then the figure of Jesus as the expected messianic eschatological prophet will be investigated in the pericope.

*Significance of the Use of 'the Prophet' in John 7.40, 52*

For investigating the significance of the use of 'the prophet' in Jn 7.40, 52, first of all, the literary context of Jn 7.37-52 needs to be examined.<sup>57</sup> The text is surrounded by Jn 7.1-10.21 as immediate context.<sup>58</sup> It is generally considered that the central theme of Jn 7.1-10.21 is the question of the identity of Jesus.<sup>59</sup> Jn 7.1-10.21 can be divided into two parts, Jn 7.1-8.59 and 9.1-10.21, with Jesus' departure from the Temple at the point of division (Jn 8.59). The first part (Jn 7.1-8.59) can be divided into four sections with reference to the feast, the celebration of Tabernacles:<sup>60</sup>

56. The reading of ὁ προφήτης in Jn 7.52 will be discussed below in relation to textual variation.

57. For recent studies on the pericope, see F.J. Moloney, 'Narrative and Discourse at the Feast of Tabernacles: John 7:1-8:59' in J. Painter *et al.* (eds.), *Word, Theology and Community in John* (St Louis, MI: Chalice Press, 2002), pp. 155-72; C. Cory, 'Wisdom's Rescue: A New Reading of the Tabernacles Discourse (John 7:1-8:59)', *JBL* 116 (1997), pp. 95-116; H.M. Knapp, 'The Messianic Water which Gives Life to the World', *HBT* 19 (1997), pp. 109-21; J.H. Neyrey, 'The Trial (Forensic) and Tribulations (Honor Challenges) of Jesus: John 7 in Social Science Perspective', *BTB* 26 (1996), pp. 107-24.

58. The reason for the temporal unity across Jn 7.1-10.21 is that no other feast than the feast of Tabernacles introduced in Jn 7.2 is mentioned until Jn 10.22 where the narrator announces the feast of the Dedication.

59. See Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 232-33; Brodie, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 309-10; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 136-37; L. Schenke, 'Joh 7-10: Eine dramatische Szene', *ZNW* 80 (1989), pp. 172-92; Cory, 'Wisdom's Rescue', p. 95.

60. For the Feast of Tabernacles, see G.W. MacRae, 'The Meaning and Evolution of the Feast of Tabernacles', *CBQ* 22 (1960), pp. 251-76; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 233-36; *idem*, 'Narrative and Discourse', pp. 156-59.

(1) before the feast (Jn 7.1-9), (2) the beginning of the feast (Jn 7.10-13), (3) the middle of the feast (Jn 7.14-36) and (4) the last day of the feast (Jn 7.37-8.59). This last section has three major subsections: (a) Jn 7.37-52, (b) Jn 8.12-30 and (c) Jn 8.31-59.<sup>61</sup> In particular, the first subsection (Jn 7.37-52) shows schism among the crowds in connection with the identity of Jesus. Some of the crowds recognize Jesus as 'the prophet' (v. 40), but others said that he is 'the Christ' (v. 41), and another group of the people reject the claim that Jesus is the Messiah because of his origins in Galilee (vv. 41-43).

What is the significance of the use of 'the prophet' in relation to the identity of Jesus in Jn 7.40? The use seems to show that the crowds already have a category of expectation of 'the prophet' promised in Deut. 18.15-18. After the declaration of Jesus at the feast of Tabernacles in vv. 37-38, the crowds exclaim, οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης in v. 40, but alongside this others affirm, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός in v. 41. The people continue their discussion on the basis of Jewish expectation of the Davidic Messiah.<sup>62</sup> Some accept that Jesus is the Messiah on the basis of his words (vv. 37-38), but others point out that Jesus comes from Galilee, and the Christ is not to come from there (v. 41). Those in the crowds who identified him as 'the prophet', however, could see the figure of Jesus as the expected prophet like Moses promised in Deut. 18.15-18. Along with Jn 1.21, 25 and 6.14, discussed earlier, Jn 7.40 shows Jesus' prophetic identity proclaimed by the crowds. In particular, Jesus' identity recognized as 'the prophet' by the crowds seems to point to him as the expected messianic eschatological prophet who appears at the end time of salvation, as in the formula in use among the Qumran Community (1QS 9.11). Thus, Jesus identified as 'the prophet' indicates that he is *the* awaited prophet like Moses in Deut. 18.15-18. In this respect, Jesus is pictured not as a prophet, but as *the expected messianic eschatological prophet*.

61. The so-called *Pericopa de Adultera* (Jn 7.53-8.11) is not relevant for this study, and so will not be discussed. For detailed discussions on Jn 7.53-8.11, see U. Becker, *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin. Untersuchungen zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte von Joh 7,53-8,11* (BZNW, 28; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963); B.D. Ehrman, 'Jesus and the Adulteress', *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 24-44; J.P. Heil, 'The Story of Jesus and the Adulteress (John 7,53-8,11) Reconsidered', *Bib* 72 (1991), pp. 182-91; *idem*, 'A Rejoinder to "Reconsidering "The Story of the Adulteress Reconsidered"', *Eglise et Théologie* 25 (1994), pp. 361-66; D.B. Wallace, 'Reconsidering "The Story of Jesus and the Adulteress Reconsidered"', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 290-96; J.I.H. McDonald, 'The So-Called *Pericopa de Adultera*', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 415-27; L.J. Kreitzer and D.W. Rooke (eds.), *Ciphers in the Sand: Interpretations of the Woman Taken in Adultery (John 7.53-8.11)* (Biblical Seminar, 74; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

62. Cf. 2 Sam. 7.12-16; Pss. 18.50; 80.3-4, 35-37; Isa. 11.1, 10; Jer. 23.5.

Why, then, do some people affirm that Jesus is 'the prophet' and others understand him as 'the Messiah'? The distinction between 'the Messiah' and 'the prophet' is a blurred one. It can be assumed that the crowds understood what Jesus said in the Temple (vv. 37-38) in relation to 'the prophet' as the expected eschatological figure promised in Deut. 18.15-18. Thus, some of the crowds declare Jesus to be 'the prophet', but others understand him as 'the Messiah'. However, we are not told where the idea of 'the Messiah' in relation to the identity of Jesus comes from and what kind of messianic figure they have in mind. The reference to 'the Messiah' in relation to Jesus' identity seems to refer to the expected bringer of salvation in connection with the expected messianic figure.<sup>63</sup> Before being recognized as 'the prophet' or 'the Messiah', Jesus was considered to be 'a good man' (v. 12). But now 'the good man' is declared to be 'the prophet' or 'the Messiah' by the same people.<sup>64</sup> In this respect, although it is not very clear, both titles seem to refer to the same expected eschatological figure as the prophet-Messiah<sup>65</sup> who belongs to the end time of salvation in relation to the gift of living water (v. 38).<sup>66</sup> Thus, the reason for the use of two different terms 'the prophet' and 'the Messiah' for the identity of Jesus seems to be that the crowds expressed a similar eschatological expectation, but with the difference that in the use of 'the Messiah' the agent of salvation would be thought of in royal and messianic categories, and in the other case in prophetic categories in relation to Deut. 18.15-18.

Jesus' identity in relation to *προφήτης* is also implied in v. 52. There are some textual variants in v. 52. The vast majority of witnesses read *προφήτης*, but P<sup>66</sup> and P<sup>75</sup> have *ὁ προφήτης*.<sup>67</sup> I accept the reading of the two Bodmer papyri for the following reasons: (1) The Johannine concept

63. See Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, I, pp. 157-58.

64. Recognizing Jesus as 'the prophet' or 'the Messiah' by the crowds seems to show that the Jewish concepts of a messianic figure were diverse and consisted of a large complex of ideas; see G.S. Oegema, *The Anointed and his People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPSup, 27; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 21-27; J. Neusner, W.S. Green and E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

65. In a few passages of the Old Testament, 'the Messiah' referring to 'anointed one' is used of prophets (most notably in Isa. 61.1) and of priests (Lev. 4.3, 5, 16), but without further designation the term normally refers to the king of Israel.

66. See Boismard, *Moses or Jesus*, pp. 6-10, who considers that there must be some equivalence between 'the prophet' and 'the Messiah'; see also Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 32-41; Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 305 n. 4; Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 117.

67. See E.R. Smothers, 'Two Readings in Papyrus Bodmer II', *HTR* 51 (1958), pp. 109-22.

of ὁ προφήτης ('the prophet') could easily have been misunderstood in the process of copying.<sup>68</sup> (2) The statement that no prophet would ever come from Galilee is not true in the past, for example, Jonah was from Gath-hepher, a Galilee town (2 Kgs 14.25). (3) The alternative reading of ὁ προφήτης in v. 52 is more probable than προφήτης in relation to Jn 7.40-41 (cf. Jn 6.14), and 'is increasingly viewed as authentic'.<sup>69</sup>

In sum, the significance of the use of 'the prophet' in Jn 7.40, 52 is to make a picture of Jesus as the prophet like Moses. Jesus is not a prophet, but the prophet, *the expected messianic eschatological prophet*. Readers can understand that Jesus is more than a prophet.

#### *Understanding Jesus as the Expected Messianic Eschatological Prophet*

On what basis is the Johannine Jesus understood as the expected messianic eschatological prophet in Jn 7.37-52? The reason to identify Jesus as 'the prophet' is pointed to by the use of οὖν in v. 40. The conjunction οὖν is one of the favourite Johannine dictions, used with an inferential sense.<sup>70</sup> The reason for the declaration of the crowds that οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης in v. 41 is obviously due to hearing about what Jesus said at the last day, the great day of the feast in v. 37.<sup>71</sup> There is already a schism about Jesus, whether he is a good man or leads the people astray (vv. 10-13). The people remain divided over the issue, and serious questions are being asked: where is Jesus (v. 11), and what is he doing (v. 12)? This conflict is continued in relation to the question of the origins of Jesus' teaching and authority (vv. 14-24). The Jerusalemites wonder whether Jesus can be the Christ, as they know his origins. Many of the people recognize him as the miracle-working Messiah (vv. 25-31). But the claim that Jesus is the Messiah is rejected (v. 41) and the people eventually consider Jesus a false prophet who leads them astray, 'away from the Law and orthodoxy'.<sup>72</sup> Thus, the chief priests and Pharisees have decided to

68. See Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 325.

69. See Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 121.

70. See Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*, p. 358; *idem*, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1906), pp. 164-68; V.S. Poythress, 'The Use of the Inter-sentence Conjunctions De, Oun, Kai, and Asyndeton in the Gospel of John', *NovT* 26 (1984), pp. 312-40; *idem*, 'Testing for Johannine Authorship'.

71. It is uncertain exactly which day is meant, because 'there is no Jewish background for calling the seventh or the eighth day "the great day"': see Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 255-56. For the seventh day, see Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 320; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, p. 152. For the eighth day, see Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 320; Barrett, *Gospel according to St John*, p. 326; Lindars, *Gospel of John*, pp. 297-98.

72. Pancaro, *Law in the Fourth Gospel*, p. 100.

kill Jesus (cf. Jn 5.18; 7.1, 11, 19, 25), but when some of the people heard Jesus' teaching in the Temple at the last day, the great day of the feast of Tabernacles, the crowds declare Jesus to be 'the prophet' (v. 40), although another group of people do not accept this (vv. 41-43).<sup>73</sup> The following reasons can be suggested for Jesus being identified as prophet by the crowds at the Jewish feast of Tabernacles.

First, the image of Jesus' teaching in the Temple implicitly points to his prophetic identity in relation to Old Testament prophets who proclaimed God's message in the Temple. Jn 7.14 clearly mentions that about the middle of the feast of Tabernacles Jesus went up to the Temple and taught. Jesus' teaching in the Temple creates a negative reaction from the chief priests and Pharisees who have already decided that Jesus must be slain (Jn 5.18; 7.1, 11, 19, 25). And this picture of the Jewish plotting of Jesus' death also seems to demonstrate that Jesus stands in the rejected-prophet tradition, as has been discussed earlier. The chief priests and the Pharisees eventually sent temple guards to arrest Jesus (v. 32). Jesus himself seems to be aware of his final destiny as death on the cross, because he mentions that 'I am with you for only a short time, and then I go to the one who sent me' (v. 33; cf. vv. 34-36), in which his final destiny seems to be expressed implicitly. The picture of Jesus' teaching in the Temple at the feast of Tabernacles and his death implied in vv. 32-36 seem to indicate his prophetic identity, like Old Testament prophets. The picture of Jesus' teaching in the Temple at the Jewish feast of Tabernacles also recalls his sayings and actions in the Temple in Jn 2.13-20, in relation to which I have shown that Jesus' prophetic identity is being pointed to. The image of Jesus' teaching in the Temple at the Jewish feast of Tabernacles implicitly shows his prophetic identity in relation to the picture of Old Testament prophets in the Temple. Furthermore, the use of the Greek verb *ἐκράξεν* in v. 37 points to Jesus' saying as a 'prophetic-authoritative proclamation' (see Jn 7.28; 12.44; cf. 1.15).<sup>74</sup> This verb (*κράζω*) occurs four times in the Gospel and denotes a message that is declared in spite of contradiction and opposition. It is best rendered as crying in the sense of proclamation. The verb is used of John the Baptist in Jn 1.15, and in John 7 it is used twice of Jesus (vv. 28, 37) when he makes 'a solemn proclamation of a

73. Some groups of people rejected any messianic status for Jesus because they knew his origins (cf. Jn 7.27, 41) and they call upon the evidence of the Scripture that the prophet does not come from Galilee (Jn 7.52). But Jesus did not come from Galilee, and there were actually prophets from Galilee, for example, Jonah, Hosea and Nahum.

74. See H. Fendrich, 'κράζω', *EDNT*, II, pp. 313-14; W. Grundmann, 'κράζω, κτλ', *TDNT*, III, pp. 898-903.

truth regarding his person and work'.<sup>75</sup> Jesus' proclamation points to a future time in v. 38, and alludes to his coming death (cf. Jn 19.34). In Jn 12.44, the same verb is also used of Jesus' proclamation. The use of the verb κρᾶζω is also found in the proclamation of Old Testament prophets (Isa. 6.3-4; 42.2; Jer. 33.3).<sup>76</sup> The manner of Jesus' speaking and teaching seems to point to his prophetic identity.

Second, the mode of Jesus' teaching in the Temple at the feast of Tabernacles implicitly points to his prophetic identity. Jesus' teaching seems not to be seen as the ordinary teaching of a Jewish man, because the crowds marvel at Jesus' teaching in the Temple (v. 15). Furthermore, temple officers, who have been ordered by the chief priests and Pharisees to arrest Jesus (v. 32), return to the chief priests and Pharisees without seizing Jesus (v. 45), because they also are amazed at Jesus' teaching (v. 46). The reason for the crowds being amazed at Jesus' teaching is that he taught as one who had authority, and not as their teachers of the Law. In vv. 15 and 46, the question of Jesus' authority is raised in relation to his public teaching in the Temple: how did this man get such learning without having studied? Probably Jesus' public teaching in the Temple leads the crowds to think he has authority. Jesus repeatedly says that his teaching comes from his Father (v. 16, 28-29; cf. Jn 5.19-20). So Jesus' teaching in the Temple is the teaching of the Father who sent him (v. 16). Eventually, there was a division concerning the identity of Jesus because of his teaching in the Temple. The chief priests and Pharisees were not happy with the division over Jesus among the people (cf. vv. 30-31), because they would not accept the designations 'the prophet' or 'the Christ' for Jesus' identity, so they send temple officers to arrest Jesus (v. 32). Thus, the chief priests and Pharisees say to the temple officers, 'Why do you not bring Jesus?' (v. 45). The temple officers answer, 'Never has anyone spoken like this man [Jesus] does' (v. 46). The answer indicates that the temple officers somehow experienced Jesus' teaching in the Temple as if he had authority. Thus, the picture of Jesus' authoritative teaching in the Temple shows his prophetic image.

Finally, Jesus proclaims his identity in relation to the living water, and also claims that he fulfils the Scriptures,<sup>77</sup> promising rivers of living water

75. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, p. 320.

76. See Grundmann, 'κρᾶζω', pp. 899-900.

77. In v. 38, what passage of Scripture is cited is not clear, because the words cited in the Gospel do not reflect exactly any one passage in MT or LXX. However, since this issue is not very closely related to the identity of Jesus as prophet, I will omit the discussion. For detailed discussions on Jn 7.37-38, see Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 320-24; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 152-56; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 252-57.

(vv. 37-38). Jesus said ἂν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρὸς με καὶ πινέτω. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος (vv. 37b-38). In the saying of Jesus (vv. 37b-38), first of all, the punctuation of the words is uncertain, so there are two different readings: one is to place a full stop after πινέτω, and the other to place the full stop after εἰς ἐμέ. I prefer to put a full stop after εἰς ἐμέ in order to support the christological interpretation that Jesus is the source of water for the following reasons. (1) It offers excellent poetic parallelism in the first two lines: the chiasmic parallelism fits Johannine style. (2) The idea that water will flow from Jesus is supported by Jn 19.34, where it comes from his side. (3) According to Jn 7.39, the water is the Spirit, and the Johannine Jesus gives the Spirit (Jn 19.30; 20.22).<sup>78</sup> As I have discussed on Jn 4.4-42 earlier, 'the living water' in Jn 7.37-39 can be related to Jesus' prophetic identity, by means of texts such as Isaiah (Isa. 12.3), Zechariah (Zech. 13.1; 14.8, 11), Ezekiel (Ezek. 47.1-11)<sup>79</sup> in relation to their messages regarding 'streams of living water'. It seems to be clear that Jesus' speaking of the living water led people to consider his identity as prophet. This is clearly indicated in Jn 7.40. When the people heard Jesus' teaching in the Temple, some of the crowds declare, οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης. Jesus' prophetic identity is obviously related to 'the living water', so when Jesus proclaims 'the living water' in relation to his work, the crowds can easily recognize his claim to a prophetic identity.

In sum, the Johannine Jesus is understood as the expected messianic eschatological prophet in Jn 7.37-52. The image of Jesus' teaching in the Temple at the Jewish feast of Tabernacles and his authoritative teaching indicate his prophetic identity. Jesus' speaking of 'the living water' in relation to his work apparently demonstrates his prophetic identity.

### *Summary*

The significance of the use of 'the prophet' in Jn 7.40, 52 is apparent for an understanding of Jesus' prophetic identity in the Gospel. Jesus' identity

78. For more detailed discussions on this issue, see Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 320-24; Moloney, *Gospel of John*, pp. 252-57; Schnackenburg, *Gospel according to St John*, II, pp. 152-56; Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 113-17; K.H. Kuhn, 'St John VII.37-8', *NTS* 4 (1957-58), pp. 63-65; J. Blenkinsopp, 'John VII.37-9: Another Note on a Notorious Crux', *NTS* 6 (1959-60), pp. 95-98; J.B. Cortés, 'Yet Another Look at Jn 7,37-38', *CBQ* 29 (1967), pp. 75-86; G.D. Fee, 'Once More: John 7.37-39', *ExpTim* 89 (1978), 116-18; G. Balfour, 'The Jewishness of John's Use of the Scripture in John 6:31 and 7:37-38', *TynB* 46 (1995), pp. 357-80, see esp. pp. 368-79; Knapp, 'Messianic Water', pp. 109-21.

79. See Vawter, 'Ezekiel and John'; J. Daniélou, 'Joh 7,38 et Ezéch 47,1-11', *SE* 2 (1961), pp. 158-63.

as *the expected messianic eschatological prophet*, who will come at the end time of salvation, is clearly depicted by the crowds. The way in which the crowds can recognize Jesus' prophetic identity is as follows. (1) The image of Jesus teaching in the Temple implicitly points to his prophetic identity in relation to Old Testament prophets. Moreover, the use of the Greek verb ἔκραξεν in v. 37 points to Jesus' saying as a 'prophetic-authoritative proclamation'. (2) Jesus' authoritative teaching in the Temple at the feast of Tabernacles implicitly indicates his prophetic identity. (3) That Jesus proclaims his identity in relation to the living water shows his prophetic identity. Thus, it can be claimed that the Johannine Jesus is depicted as *the expected messianic eschatological prophet* in Jn 7.37-52.

### *Conclusions*

In this chapter, along with the preceding chapter, the Johannine Jesus has been examined as to whether he is depicted as the expected eschatological prophet in Jn 1.19-28, 6.1-15 and 7.37-52. First, in Jn 1.19-28 the identity of 'the prophet' is associated with the well-known Jewish tradition of the figure of *the expected deuteronomic eschatological prophet* promised in Deut. 18.15-18. John the Baptist as the witness for Jesus implicitly introduces the identity of Jesus as involving either 'the Christ' or 'the prophet' in the passage. In relation to the identity of Jesus, the figure of 'Elijah' as one of popular Jewish eschatological expectations is not very important in comparison with the other two figures. The term 'Elijah' completely disappears in the Gospel after this passage (Jn 1.21, 25). It is true that 'the Christ' in relation to the identity of Jesus is the most significant epithet in the Gospel as a whole, but the figure of 'the prophet' is employed for Jesus' identity because of the well-known Jewish tradition of the expected deuteronomic eschatological prophet. John the Baptist as the witness for Jesus implicitly introduces the Johannine Jesus to be *the expected deuteronomic eschatological prophet* in Jn 1.19-28.

Second, the identity of Jesus as 'the prophet' is most clearly expressed in Jn 6.1-15. The use of 'the prophet' in Jn 6.14 shows a popularly expected Jewish eschatological figure in the time of Jesus. The reference to 'the prophet' in relation to the feeding miracle of the five thousand shows that there is a relation between prophets and sign, in which Jesus is clearly understood as 'the prophet', more clearly, *the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet* promised in Deut. 18.15-18. In the feeding miracle of the five thousand, the use of article τὸ ὄρος in Jn 6.3 and the reference to ἐγγὺς τὸ πᾶσχα in Jn 6.4 implicitly point to the figure of Jesus as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet. The feeding miracle of the five thousand



performed by Jesus resembles that of Elisha, in which Jesus is recognized as ‘the prophet-like-Moses’ rather than ‘the prophet-like-Elisha’. The Johannine Jesus is clearly introduced as *the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet* in Jn 6.1-15.

Finally, in Jn 7.37-52 Jesus’ prophetic identity is clearly depicted by the crowds. The use of ‘the prophet’ in Jn 7.40, 52 is obviously an indicator of Jesus’ prophetic identity in the Gospel. In Jn 7.37-52, the image of Jesus teaching in the Temple implicitly points to his prophetic identity in relation to Old Testament prophets. Moreover, the use of the Greek verb ἔκραξεν (v. 37) in relation to Jesus’ saying in the Temple implicitly points to Jesus’ prophetic-authoritative proclamation, like prophets of the Old Testament. The picture of Jesus’ authoritative teaching in the Temple at the feast of Tabernacles implicitly shows his prophetic identity. The reference to ‘the living water’ (v. 38) in relation to the identity of Jesus indicates his prophetic identity. The Johannine Jesus is introduced as *the expected messianic eschatological prophet*, who will come at the end time of salvation, in Jn 7.37-52.



## PART IV

### THE ROLE OF 'PROPHET' IN CHARACTERIZATION AND ITS CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE

In Part III, the Johannine Jesus as the expected eschatological prophet has been considered with reference to the passages Jn 4.4-42; 9.1-10.21; 1.19-28; 6.1-15; 7.37-52. It has been found that the identity of Jesus is portrayed in part through the figure of the expected eschatological prophet in the Fourth Gospel. The purpose of portraying Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel as a whole and the significance of Jesus as prophet in Johannine Christology needs to be elucidated. Why is the Johannine Jesus depicted in the image of the expected eschatological prophet? What is the significance of Jesus as prophet in respect of Johannine Christology? In Part IV, as reflection on the earlier explorations, the role of 'prophet' for describing the figure of Jesus with regard to characterization in the Fourth Gospel will be contemplated, and then finally the christological implication of Jesus as prophet in Johannine Christology will be considered in conjunction with other christological titles used in the Gospel.

## THE ROLE OF 'PROPHET' IN CHARACTERIZATION

The purpose of this chapter is to discover the role of 'prophet' for depicting Jesus in respect of characterization in John's Gospel.<sup>1</sup> What is the role of 'prophet' with regard to characterization in the Gospel? In order to answer this question, some aspects of characterization theories will briefly be offered to develop a framework for the subsequent discussion, and then the role of 'prophet' in characterization will be explored based on characterization theory.

### *The Theory of Characterization*

Before exploring the function of the Johannine Jesus as prophet in respect of characterization in the Fourth Gospel, a few theoretical issues should be clarified with reference to characterization.<sup>2</sup> It is helpful to begin with

1. I will not discuss all the characters that appear in the Fourth Gospel, because it is not the aim of this study. The focus will be on the role of 'prophet' in respect of characterization; however, if characters are related to the expression of 'prophet' in connection with the figure of the Johannine Jesus, they will be included in the discussion. For discussions on characters in John's Gospel, see R.F. Collins, 'From John to the Beloved Disciples: An Essay on Johannine Characters', *Int* 49 (1995), pp. 359-69; D.R. Beck, 'The Narrative Function of Anonymity in Fourth Gospel Characterization', *Semeia* 63 (1993), pp. 143-58; Hakola, 'A Character Resurrected'; Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*; D.F. Tolmie, 'The Characterization of God in the Fourth Gospel', *JSNT* 69 (1998), pp. 57-75; P.W. Meyer, "'The Father': The Presentation of God in the Fourth Gospel', in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 255-73; W.W. Watty, 'The Significance of Anonymity in the Fourth Gospel', *ExpTim* 90 (1979), pp. 209-21.

2. I will not discuss all the theoretical issues in this regard. For a review of the theoretical issues as related to biblical characters and characterization, see O. Lehtipuu, 'Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and the Poor Man in Luke 16.19-31', in Rhoads and Syreeni (eds.), *Characterization in the Gospel*, pp. 73-105; S. Harstine, *Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup, 229; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), pp. 19-26.

a working definition of the key term, 'characterization', thus providing a framework for the following deliberations. What is 'characterization'? The term 'characterization' means, in general:

the representation of persons in narrative and dramatic works. This may include direct methods like the attribution of qualities in description or commentary, and indirect (or 'dramatic') methods inviting readers to infer qualities from characters' actions, speech, or appearance.<sup>3</sup>

The theory of characterization, however, is not so simple, and so it is still debated among non-biblical literary critics and biblical scholars, who are interested in literary approaches or narrative criticism.<sup>4</sup> Thus, various models have been developed in literary criticism in order to analyse characterization.

Since E.M. Forster's *Aspects of the Novel* appeared in 1927,<sup>5</sup> a distinction introduced by Forster has often been made between 'flat characters', which are simple and unchanging, and 'round characters', which are complex, dynamic, subject to development and less predictable.<sup>6</sup> He has had a profound impact on the discussion of characters and characterization in fiction, and his theory on characters has been picked up by subsequent literary critics, such as W.J. Harvey and Seymour Chatman.<sup>7</sup> Forster's division of characters into two types, however, has now been criticized.<sup>8</sup> It is hard to argue that there are only two types of characters. There are some other types of characters in the text, so his dichotomy between flat and round characters seems to be too reductive. However, Forster's valuable observations that (1) characters are different from people; (2) characters can be transparent, but people can know each other only imperfectly; (3) characters can be fully exposed, but people cannot, are meaningful for the study of the narratives in the Gospels.

3. C. Baldick, *Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), p. 34.

4. See Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 101-104.

5. E.M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel* (ed. O. Stallybrass; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962 [1927]).

6. See Forster, *Aspects of the Novel*, pp. 73-84.

7. See W.J. Harvey, *Character and the Novel* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1965), p. 192; S. Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978), pp. 131-34. Nowadays, Forster's theory has frequently been adopted by biblical critics who are interested in literary or narrative criticism.

8. See S. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London: Routledge, 2nd edn, 2002), pp. 40-41.

Chatman, as a follower of Forster's theory, considers that the contemporary criticism of characterization in narrative is divided into two main streams.<sup>9</sup> One is that characters are interpreted as autonomous with independent personalities, and the other only as functionaries of a plot with commissions to be fulfilled.<sup>10</sup> According to Chatman, the Formalists and (some) Structuralists argue that 'characters are products of plots, that their status is "functional", that they are, in short, participants or *actants* rather than *personnages*, that [it] is erroneous to consider them as real beings'.<sup>11</sup> In the view of the Formalists and some Structuralists, characters cannot be treated as 'autonomous beings'.<sup>12</sup> Chatman defines character as a 'paradigm of traits'.<sup>13</sup> He also says that 'character is reconstructed by the audience from evidence announced or implicit in an original construction and communicated by the discourse through whatever medium'.<sup>14</sup> Chatman argues for a theory of character that makes independent room for characters as 'autonomous beings' apart from the plot. In John's Gospel, Jesus is an autonomous being, according to Chatman's theory of character, because the character of Jesus is not always depicted by the plot, but beyond the plot, and also he is free from the structure of John's narrative in some respect.

Chatman's theory of characterization has been criticized by Derek Tovey.<sup>15</sup> The application of Chatman's theory to the Gospel of John is limited because most of the characters in the Gospel are only briefly on stage. Only Jesus appears long enough as an autonomous being to receive 'substantial multi-faceted development'.<sup>16</sup> Culpepper also thinks that Chatman's theory on characters and characterization probably has limited value for the study of the Fourth Gospel, although his claim is convincing with regard to modern fiction. Because 'most of the characters in John's

9. See Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, pp. 116-19.

10. Similarly, Culpepper says that 'contemporary approaches to characters in narrative literature fall roughly into two camps depending on whether characters are seen primarily as autonomous beings with traits and even personalities or as plot functionaries with certain commissions or tasks to be fulfilled'; see Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 101-102.

11. Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, p. 111, italics in the original.

12. In John's Gospel, the character of Jesus is not a product of the plot, but an autonomous being, and so he is free from the plot in some respect.

13. See Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, pp. 126-34, who defines "'trait" in the sense of "relatively stable or abiding personal quality", recognizing that it may either unfold, that is, emerge earlier or later in the course of the story, or that it may disappear and be replaced by another. In other words, its domain may end" (p. 126).

14. Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, p. 119.

15. See Tovey, *Narrative Art and Act*, pp. 44-52.

16. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 102.

Gospel appear so briefly that it is difficult to form an impression of them as "autonomous beings".<sup>17</sup> It should be noted that the author of the Fourth Gospel is 'not a novelist whose concern is full-blown development of his characters', as Culpepper has noted.<sup>18</sup>

In his theory of characterization, W.J. Harvey, as another follower of Forster's theory of characterization along with Chatman, employs a different scale to see characters in the different positions in the story. For describing character, Harvey puts strong emphasis on the contextual knowledge of character.<sup>19</sup> He says:

When, in real life, we try to describe a person's character we generally speak in terms of a discrete identity. We think of it as something unique and separable from all other identities. We do this, of course, because the most intimate sense of character we can possibly have—our knowledge of self—is of this kind ... We can never know another in himself since in the very act of knowing our presence creates the context on which knowledge depends. The data by which we describe character are the aggregate of our experience in a number of situations, relationships, contexts.<sup>20</sup>

Harvey employs three major categories of characters: protagonists, intermediate figures and background characters.<sup>21</sup> The protagonists are the most fully developed and central characters, and 'they are the vehicles by which all the most interesting questions are raised; they evoke our beliefs, sympathies, revulsions'.<sup>22</sup> In a sense, the protagonists are 'what the story exists for, in other words, the story exists to reveal them'.<sup>23</sup> The intermediate characters as *ficelles* are recognizable by their plot functions to reveal the protagonist. In most cases, they are of symbolic value according to their functional role in the story as a whole. There are various types of intermediate figures.<sup>24</sup> The background characters may 'be allowed a moment of intensity and depth, but equally they may be almost entirely anonymous, voices rather than individualized characters'.<sup>25</sup> They provide the density of society in action. In John's Gospel, for example, most of the characters are *ficelles* although they are related to each other in terms of their functions towards the protagonist Jesus. The *ficelles* and the

17. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 102.

18. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 102.

19. See Harvey, *Character and the Novel*, pp. 30-51.

20. Harvey, *Character and the Novel*, p. 31.

21. See Harvey, *Character and the Novel*, pp. 54-58.

22. Harvey, *Character and the Novel*, p. 56.

23. Harvey, *Character and the Novel*, p. 56.

24. See Harvey, *Character and the Novel*, pp. 56-57.

25. Harvey, *Character and the Novel*, p. 56.

background characters actually enlighten the protagonist for the reader. John's painting of Jesus, for instance, is then a contextual picture coloured by the ficelles and the background characters in the text.

Along with Harvey's emphasis on the contextual knowledge of character, it should be noted that characterization serves to make the plot in a narrative come to life. In this respect, characterization and the plot are correlated in a narrative, and so inseparable in the reading process. Stephen D. Moore says:

Plot and character are inseparably bound up in the reading experience, if not always in critical thought. Each works to produce the other. Characters are defined in and through the plot, by what they do and by what they say. The plot in turn comes into view as characters act and interact. Characters are further defined by what the narrator and fellow characters say about them.<sup>26</sup>

In his discussion of characterization, Culpepper also notes the interdependence of plot and characterization.<sup>27</sup> The interrelationship between plot and character in a narrative seems to be important in the discussion of characterization. In John's Gospel, for example, the figure of Jesus as prophet can be understood not only in characterization, but also in the plot of the Gospel.

Furthermore, minor characters as subsidiary characters have a part to play in the network of interpersonal relations in both speech and acts.<sup>28</sup> On minor characters, Bar-Efrat comments that:

the minor characters play a structural role in literature, paralleling and highlighting the main ones, whether through correspondence or contrast. The positive or negative parallel between the primary and secondary characters is not enough to shape the characters, but it provides emphasis and colour.<sup>29</sup>

Culpepper also comments on the minor characters that they have a 'disproportionately high representational value', and are 'vital to the

26. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels*, p. 15.

27. See Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 79-98.

28. See U. Simon, 'Minor Characters in Biblical Narrative', *JSOT* 46 (1990), pp. 11-19; Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 132-44, who identifies two functions of minor characters: (1) they further the plot; (2) they lend the narrative greater meaning and depth (p. 14). See also E.S. Malbon, 'The Major Importance of Minor Characters in Mark', in Malbon and McKnight (eds.), *New Literary Criticism*, pp. 58-86; Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, pp. 86-92; Watty, 'Significance of Anonymity', pp. 209-21. For more detailed discussions on anonymous characters, see D.R. Beck, *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel* (BIS, 27; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997).

29. Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, p. 86; see Simon, 'Minor Characters', pp. 11-19.



fulfilment of the gospel's purposes'.<sup>30</sup> In John's Gospel, for example, the minor characters such as the Samaritan woman (Jn 4.4-42), the royal official (Jn 4.46-54), the man born blind (Jn 9.1-10.21), Mary, Martha and Lazarus (Jn 11.1-46; 12.1-11) have an excessively high value, and are essential to paint the picture of Jesus in relation to the fulfilment of the purpose of John's Gospel.

Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan makes a valuable contribution to the debate of characterization theory. She says that one has to assemble 'various character-indicators distributed along the text-continuum' to be able to infer character traits from them.<sup>31</sup> Rimmon-Kenan's theory of characterization consists of two basic types of textual indicators of character: 'direct definition' and 'indirect presentation'. She explains that:

The first type [direct definition] names the trait by an adjective (e.g. 'he was good-hearted'), an abstract noun ('his goodness knew no bounds'), or possibly some other kind of noun ('she was a real bitch') or part of speech ('he loves only himself'). The second type [indirect presentation], on the other hand, does not mention the trait but displays and exemplifies it in various ways, leaving to the reader the task of inferring the quality they imply.<sup>32</sup>

Direct definition of character in a text can produce a rational, authoritative and static impression.<sup>33</sup> Thus, direct definition is the most reliable and trustworthy definition of the character. Direct definition is a well-known feature of Johannine characterization. The narrator's or Jesus' direct definition of characters in the Fourth Gospel, for example, lies at the highest level of reliability in understanding characters. On the other hand, indirect presentation displays or exemplifies characters' traits in several different ways. Indirect presentation is less explicit than direct definition, so possibly less substantial. Nonetheless, indirect presentation, such as action, speech, external appearance and environment, is useful and even indispensable in building a character.<sup>34</sup>

For characters' action, Rimmon-Kenan notes that:

30. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 106, see also pp. 132-44.

31. See Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, p. 59.

32. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, pp. 59-60.

33. See Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, pp. 60-61.

34. See Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, pp. 61-67. In Rimmon-Kenan's theory of character, the mode of analogy is considered as a significant factor for characterization, along with direct definition and indirect presentation. She treats analogy 'as reinforcement of characterization rather than as a separate type of character-indicator (equivalent to direct definition and indirect presentation)' (p. 67). However, the aspect of analogy is arbitrary on some occasions, and is not applicable for this study, so it will not be considered here.

A trait may be implied both by one-time (or non-routine) actions ... and by habitual ones... One-time actions tend to evoke the dynamic aspect of the character, often playing a part in a turning point in the narrative. By contrast, habitual actions tend to reveal the character's unchanging or static aspect, often having a comic or ironic effect.<sup>35</sup>

She says that 'all ... kinds of action can (but need not) be endowed with a *symbolic dimension*'.<sup>36</sup> Regarding characters' speech, Rimmon-Kenan comments that 'the form or style of speech is a common means of characterization in texts'.<sup>37</sup> Action and speech convey character-traits. In John's Gospel, for example, Jesus' actions and his speech, the description of Jesus' external appearance and the environment of Jesus, are indispensable means of understanding the characterization of Jesus. Moreover, Rimmon-Kenan points out the significance of the 'proper name' for the construction of a character.<sup>38</sup> In this regard, for example, the various christological titles used in the Fourth Gospel can emphasize or further elucidate the character of the Johannine Jesus.<sup>39</sup> The readers of John's Gospel are to interpret the christological titles against their theological background in order to come to a genuine understanding of the Johannine Jesus as the protagonist.

This brief survey of a few theoretical issues associated with characterization provides a framework for contemplating the role of Jesus as prophet with regard to characterization in the Fourth Gospel. Indeed, the tension between an integration of existing theories and adopting a particular theory as a presentation of a personal view is one of the inevitable frustrations of any attempt at a synthesis. Similarly, it is necessary to extract the relevant points from each theory without presenting the theory as a whole or following all of its implications. For the subsequent deliberations, Rimmon-Kenan's theory of characterization seems to be of considerable importance and more applicable than other theories, so her theory will be taken seriously. In addition, some aspects of the characterization theories, such as 'flat' and 'round' character, 'paradigm of traits', 'contextual knowledge of character' and 'minor characters', are useful in some respects, thus they are also considered in part.

35. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, p. 61.

36. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, p. 62, italics are mine.

37. Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, p. 64.

38. See Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, pp. 68-69.

39. It should be noted that the christological epithets in John's Gospel are not 'proper names', so they might not be categorized in the theory of Rimmon-Kenan, although they can reinforce or explain the character of Jesus.

*The Role of 'Prophet' in Characterization*

Characters presented by the narrator or other characters always have a particular function, either a minor role or an important role, in a story. I have examined in the earlier chapters the depiction of the Johannine Jesus as prophet in the Fourth Gospel. What is the role of 'prophet' in characterization in John's Gospel? In order to answer the question, character indicators, 'direct definition' and 'indirect presentation', introduced by Rimmon-Kenan will be considered in John's Gospel. In doing so, direct definition will be discussed first in respect of the figure of Jesus as prophet, and then, indirect presentation, such as Jesus' actions, his speech and minor characters associated with his prophetic role, will follow.<sup>40</sup>

*Direct Definition in Characterization*

Direct definition plays a critical part in the characterization because it creates in the mind of the readers an explicit, rational and authoritative impression of a character. Such descriptions are especially important during the initial stages of the narrative, because initial information has a crucial influence upon the readers' perception of a character. There is no explicit self-designation of Jesus, as direct definition, employing the term 'prophet' in John's Gospel.<sup>41</sup> Only on one occasion is direct definition clearly found, in Jn 4.44 (προφήτης ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει), so it will be discussed here.

Before discussing Jn 4.44, we need to reflect briefly on the question why this one direct statement comes so late. The introduction of the category of 'prophet' appears first in Jn 1.21, 25, in which the identity of Jesus is implicitly depicted as prophet. However, the figure of Jesus as prophet depicted in Jn 1.21, 25 is too vague, so his prophetic identity needs to be reintroduced. Thus, John implicitly introduces Jesus as prophet in the picture of his first miracle at Cana (Jn 2.1-11) and in the Temple incident (Jn 2.13-22), in which the information of Jesus' movement is also given.

40. For studies on the characterization of the Johannine Jesus, see M.W.G. Stibbe, *John* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993); *idem*, 'The Elusive Christ: A New Reading of the Fourth Gospel', *JSNT* 44 (1991), pp. 20-39; J.A. du Rand, 'The Characterization of Jesus as depicted in the Narrative of the Fourth Gospel', *Neot* 19 (1985), pp. 18-36; D.M. Smith, 'The Presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel', *Int* 31 (1977), pp. 367-78.

41. In John's Gospel, a kind of direct definition is found on the following occasions: the Samaritan woman's confession (Jn 4.19), the announcement of the man born blind (Jn 9.17), the voice of the crowds (Jn 6.14; 7.40), but these cases totally depend on either the narrator's point of view or the reader's. I will consider those cases as indirect presentation in this study.

The readers may be able to consider Jesus' identity in relation to the first miracle at Cana and the Temple incident, but there is no explicit self-designation of Jesus, employing the term 'prophet'. When Jesus comes to a town in Samaria, his prophetic identity is confessed by the Samaritan woman using the word 'prophet'. However, the Samaritan woman's confession, although supported in various ways by the narrator's art, is still not on the level of a statement by the narrator naming Jesus as prophet. So a reliable comment on the identity of Jesus as prophet is now offered by the narrator.

The omniscient narrator's direct definition of the identity of Jesus can be seen in Jn 4.44, where Jesus' prophetic identity is implicitly characterized by the use of the term 'prophet'. Jn 4.44 is a proverbial saying about the authentic identity of prophet, and comes in a narrator's explanatory aside, which presents direct definition on the part of a powerful and reliable authority. The narrator does not explicitly depict the identity of Jesus as prophet, but implicitly demonstrates his prophetic identity by providing the maxim in Jn 4.44. In this respect, the narrator seems to offer the maxim as a reliable indicator to the readers and the characters surrounding Jesus in the story, so both of them may be able to consider whether Jesus is a prophet or not.

The narrator provides information about Jesus' itinerary (cf. Jn 2.12) in Jn 4.43. The readers are informed that Jesus spent the two days with the Samaritans in Jn 4.40. The rationale for Jesus' movements is provided in the narrator's aside in Jn 4.43. As I have demonstrated earlier, according to the narrator's point of view, Jesus tests himself as prophet: if Jesus is honoured in his own country, he would not be a prophet.<sup>42</sup> The narrator shows how Jesus applies the literal meaning of the maxim, rather than merely the metaphorical significance of the proverb, to himself. According to the maxim in Jn 4.44, Jesus seems to know why he has to move from Samaria to Galilee (cf. Jn 4.4). The readers also can understand why Jesus moves from Samaria to Galilee by the proverb in Jn 4.44.

In Samaria, Jesus is honoured by the people of Samaria, so they ask him to stay in their home, and he stays there for two days (Jn 4.40). In contrast, when Jesus arrives in Galilee, the Galileans do not honour, but they do accept him, because they had seen all that he had done in Jerusalem (Jn 4.48; cf. Jn 2.23-25). By the result of the Galileans' attitude towards Jesus, the readers and the characters surrounding Jesus in the story are encouraged to identify him as prophet, and so they can clearly

42. Stibbe, *John*, p. 70, who comments that 'there is a distant analepsis of the Prologue, where the narrator says that Jesus came to his own (*ta idia*) but his own did not receive him' in connection with Jn 4.44.

recognize his prophetic identity in the unfolding of the story. In this regard, it seems to be that the readers are called, by means of the narrator's aside in Jn 4.44, to make a decision regarding Jesus' identity, as to whether he is a prophet. The narrator characterizes Jesus' identity as that of a prophet by the use of the maxim in Jn 4.44. The role of the Johannine explanatory asides is generally to clarify names and symbols, and to correct possible misunderstandings, and in particular to reintroduce the characters of the story.<sup>43</sup> In this regard, Jn 4.44 as a Johannine explanatory aside is different from the normal use of explanatory asides in the Gospel of John.

We have then a use of one of the Johannine literary devices to characterize Jesus as prophet implicitly, by means of which the most powerful and reliable presentation of his prophetic identity is provided in the Fourth Gospel as a whole. This literary technique is more efficient than the use of direct quotations by characters for describing the characters in narratives. The direct quotations used by the narrator in the narratives can be more credible for understanding a stream of consciousness of the characters in the narratives, but it does not always guarantee a correct understanding of the characters because of ambiguity as to the significance of the quotations. The maxim in Jn 4.44, however, clearly demonstrates Jesus' self-consciousness as prophet. Here, the narrator opens a door for entering into an aspect of Jesus' consciousness.<sup>44</sup> The authoritative narrator's credible commentary in Jn 4.44 at first persuades the readers to consider the identity of Jesus as prophet, and thereby, in the unfolding story, to contemplate the authentic identity of Jesus: whether he is only a prophet.<sup>45</sup>

The role of 'prophet' in the narrator's aside in Jn 4.44 is this: if Jesus is established as prophet, then he will be trusted as a reliable source; if he is once trusted as a reliable source the door will be opened, then, to go a further step to consider whether he is only a prophet or even more than a prophet. The readers and the characters surrounding Jesus in the story, therefore, can clearly recognize Jesus as prophet by the maxim in Jn 4.44.

43. On the Johannine explanatory commentaries, see Tenney, 'The Footnotes of John's Gospel'; O'Rourke, 'Asides in the Gospel of John'; van Belle, *Les parenthèses dans l'Évangile de Jean*; Thatcher, 'A New Look at Asides'.

44. Along with the maxim in Jn 4.44, Jesus' consciousness is also clearly expressed in Jn 6.15.

45. The most obvious case is shown in the narrative of the Samaritan woman, in which she recognizes Jesus as prophet at first, and then ponders as to whether he is *only* a prophet or more than a prophet; eventually she confesses Jesus to be 'the Saviour of the world' (Jn 4.42). A similar case is also found in the story of the man born blind (Jn 9.1–10.21).

By recognizing Jesus as prophet, the readers are encouraged to contemplate whether Jesus is *only* a prophet or much more than a prophet, because the readers are already informed about Jesus' supernatural knowledge revealed in the Samaritan woman's private sexual and marital life (Jn 4.17-18) and also about the miracles performed in Jerusalem (Jn 2.23). The role of 'prophet' in Jn 4.44 is, therefore, first, by establishing his identity as prophet to present Jesus as a trustworthy character, and then to encourage considering Jesus' authentic identity whether he is *only* a prophet or much more than a prophet, the prophet *par excellence* expected at the end time.

#### *Indirect Presentation in Characterization*

Most of the characterization in John's Gospel takes place through indirect presentation, which may take the form of speech, action, external appearance or environment. In particular, John's presentation of Jesus as prophet is mostly offered through such indirect presentation in the Gospel. Thus, Jesus' actions and speech will be discussed first, and then, minor characters associated with Jesus' prophetic identity will follow for discovering the role of 'prophet' in respect of characterization in the Fourth Gospel. However, external appearance and environment will not be considered, because external appearance is hard to find in relation to the figure of the Johannine Jesus,<sup>46</sup> and environment is not very significant and applicable for the traits of Jesus in this study.

*Jesus' Actions.* Actions can help to define characters quite clearly. In particular, characters' routine acts carry more weight than their one-time action, as seen in the continual conflicts between Jesus and the Jewish people throughout the Fourth Gospel, for example. Acts of omission, things that characters do not perform, also help to illustrate important aspects of characterization, for example, 'John the Baptist never performed a miraculous sign' in Jn 10.41, 'Jesus himself did not baptize' in Jn 4.2. In addition, contemplated acts are also useful for character analysis. All of these actions serve to illustrate the nature of each character. Any action, no matter how great or small, may be of great importance as far as characterization is concerned.

In the Fourth Gospel, Jesus performs many miraculous signs, in which his character is depicted as prophet indirectly. In Jesus' miraculous signs, his actions are not so much involved in the characterization as are his

46. Generally speaking, there is no precise, detailed description of the physical appearance of the characters in biblical narratives. Only in a few instances is a brief mention made of the characters' outward appearance.

verbal sayings. The narrator does not offer any 'indirect presentation' for characterizing the identity of Jesus as prophet in his miraculous signs, but they seem to be used as an indicator for his prophetic identity implicitly. For example, in Jesus' first miracle at Cana (Jn 2.1-11), the readers can clearly realize his supernatural ability to perform a miraculous sign. By Jesus' miraculous sign at Cana, the readers are encouraged to consider his genuine identity whether he is a prophet, like one of the prophets in the Old Testament, in particular in connection with the miraculous act of Moses (Exod. 15.22-27) or that of Elijah (2 Kgs 2.19-22; 1 Kgs 17.8-16). The narrator seems to expect that the readers can believe Jesus as a trustworthy hero in relation to his first miracle at Cana. Jesus' second miracle at Cana (Jn 4.46-54) is to heal a royal official's son who was ill and was at the point of death in Capernaum. The narrator clearly shows the link between the first and the second miracle at Cana in Jn 4.46. Thus, the readers can make a link between the two miracles at Cana, and so perhaps continually contemplate Jesus' prophetic identity in conjunction with a similar miracle performed by Elijah (1 Kgs 17.17-24). The reason for mentioning the name of the place, Cana, seems to be to reinforce Jesus' identity. The readers are, therefore, encouraged to believe that Jesus is a prophet once again in connection with the second miracle at Cana. The narrator does not offer any clear indication about Jesus' prophetic identity through his miracles, but the readers and the characters surrounding Jesus in the story may be able to recognize his heroic identity in connection with the miracles. Furthermore, the readers and the characters surrounding Jesus in the miracle stories seems to be encouraged to ponder Jesus' genuine identity whether he is *only* a prophet, like one of the Old Testament prophets.

In the narrative of the healing of the paralytic in Jn 5.1-47, Jesus seems to be characterized as a prophet in order to encourage readers to consider him as reliable.<sup>47</sup> The healing miracle itself does not directly tell who Jesus is, and Jesus' actions are not actively involved in the miracle.<sup>48</sup> After healing the crippled man, the Jews ask the man about Jesus' identity (Jn 5.12), but the man does not know because Jesus had already disappeared in the crowd (Jn 5.13). Although the Jews and the cured man do not recognize Jesus' identity, the readers may be able to consider whether Jesus is a prophet in relation to his healing miracle. The readers are already informed about Jesus' supernatural knowledge about the paralytic, who has been ill for 38 years (Jn 5.5-6). Thus, the readers are able to assume

47. See J.L. Staley, 'Stumbling in the Dark, Reaching for the Light: Reading Character in John 5 and 9', *Semeia* 53 (1991), pp. 55-80, esp. pp. 58-64.

48. See Collins, 'From John to the Beloved Disciples', pp. 364-65.

the identity of Jesus as prophet in connection with his supernatural knowledge and his miraculous healing of the crippled man. Recognizing Jesus as prophet establishes reliability, and readers are encouraged to go a further step in considering his real identity.<sup>49</sup>

The narrative of Jesus' raising of the dead, Lazarus, in Jn 11.1-44 seems to be used for characterizing Jesus' prophetic identity, implicitly.<sup>50</sup> In the narrative of the raising of Lazarus, the readers are informed of Jesus' prophecy concerning the raising of Lazarus from the dead in Jn 11.4, 23, but Jesus' disciples, Mary and Martha do not understand what Jesus says. Moreover, the readers are also informed of Jesus' supernatural knowledge about Lazarus's death expressed in figurative language (Jn 11.11). The narrator indicates that Jesus' prediction about the raising of Lazarus from the dead (Jn 11.4, 23) is fulfilled in Jn 11.40-44. In this regard, although the narrator does not directly present Jesus' prophetic identity in the narrative of the raising of Lazarus, the whole picture of the raising of Lazarus seems to be used as a reliable indicator pointing to Jesus' prophetic identity. In this way, the readers are provided with a basis for considering Jesus to be trustworthy. The readers are also encouraged to contemplate whether Jesus is *only* a prophet.

The readers are informed of Jesus' actions found in the Temple incident (Jn 2.13-25).<sup>51</sup> The account of Jesus' actions in the Temple opens with the

49. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 240, who indirectly implies that 'the prophet' may represent 'a stage towards a true estimate of the status of Jesus'; Ehrman, *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet*, p. 238, who says, 'Already by the end of the first century, Christians in some circles proclaimed that Jesus was himself divine, that he existed prior to his birth, that he created the world and all that is in it, and that he came into the world on a divine mission as God himself (as in the Gospel of John). *This is a far cry from the humble beginnings of Jesus as an apocalyptic prophet.* Perhaps these beginnings can be likened to a mustard seed, the smallest of all seeds....' (italics are mine); see also F. Watson, 'The Quest for the Real Jesus', in M. Bockmuehl (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), pp. 156-69; Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, pp. 83-102.

50. See W. Wuellner, 'Putting Life Back into the Lazarus Story and its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith', *Semeia* 53 (1991), pp. 113-32.

51. Jesus' actions are also found in the narrative of the man born blind. In the story, Jesus 'spat on the ground and made mud with saliva and spread the mud on the man's eyes' (Jn 9.6), and he tells the blind man to go and wash in the pool of Siloam. In this miracle, Jesus' actions are involved in producing the healing miracle. However, on other occasions, Jesus' actions are not greatly involved in his miracle performance, and understanding of his actions related to his miracles is an open question. The narrative of the man born blind will be discussed later in connection with characterization of Jesus.



description of his unusual behaviour in Jn 2.14-16, highlighted by his words in Jn 2.16, followed by the reaction of 'the Jews', also marked by direct speech from Jesus and the Jews in Jn 2.18-20. The readers are given a closing comment on the true meaning of Jesus' words in Jn 2.21-22. Jesus' actions in the Temple are unexpected and depict utterly violent behaviour (Jn 2.15). The readers and bystanders surrounding Jesus, including his disciples, in the narrative are totally surprised by Jesus' unexpected actions. Furthermore, the readers and bystanders surrounding Jesus in the Temple are astonished by his words in Jn 2.16. The readers are informed that during or after Jesus' actions, he was not immediately or later reported to the Temple police by the Jews or bystanders, nor was he instantly arrested by the Jewish authorities. After Jesus' violent actions, the Jews ask, 'what *sign* can you show us for doing this?' (Jn 2.18). So the readers may blink their eyes about Jesus' authentic identity whether he is a prophet or not in relation to the question. The use of the word 'sign' in the question implicitly shows that the Jews may consider the identity of Jesus as prophet. The Jews clearly demand of Jesus to show a sign, which is used as an indicator for the figure of prophet. In this respect, the readers can potentially suppose Jesus' prophetic identity in relation to his behaviour in the Temple. However, Jesus' response to the Jews in Jn 2.19 makes the readers and bystanders surrounding Jesus in the story of the Temple incident question their self-confidence about Jesus' prophetic identity. The readers are offered the narrator's explanatory comment concerning what Jesus says about his body in connection with the Temple (Jn 2.21-22). The narrator implicitly characterizes the identity of Jesus by the explanatory aside, so the readers are able to contemplate the authentic identity of Jesus whether he is only a prophet, or more than a prophet.

In sum, the readers and bystanders in the miracle stories and the Temple incident at first are encouraged to believe Jesus as a prophet. The role of 'prophet' in characterization is to offer that Jesus is a trustworthy character, and then to encourage the readers to ponder whether he is *only* a prophet or much more than a prophet.

*Jesus' Speech.* Speech may reflect the occasion more than the speaker. Inward speech would be at the top of the scale as far as trustworthiness, since the narrator reports it. When the narrator reports what a character says, the report is a trustworthy report of the character's thoughts, although the content itself is not reliable according to the narrator's point of view. Direct speech would be the next reliable report for presenting characters. The form of characters' speech can tell the readers much about their social standing, relationships with other characters, and other aspects of characterization. The use of certain terms by the characters also helps

characterization. For example, the term 'Father' as a reference to God is used only by Jesus in John's Gospel. The use of the term 'Son of Man' is also greatly restricted. Jesus only uses the phrase 'Son of Man' in John's Gospel, except for when the crowds quote the term (Jn 12.34). For Jesus' speech as indirect presentation regarding the identity of Jesus, I will focus on his fulfilled predictions only, because the predictions are the most noticeable indicator of his prophetic identity.<sup>52</sup>

The readers are informed that the Johannine Jesus shows his ability to predict future events. Jesus' speech in the form of predictions is found in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>53</sup> Jesus' predictions that point toward his self-awareness of his own imminent death are found in John's Gospel.<sup>54</sup> The readers are shown by the Johannine explanatory note in Jn 2.21 that Jesus' saying in Jn 2.19 implies his own death and resurrection. The narrator's authoritative comment characterizes Jesus' identity and his death. The readers are also informed that Jesus clearly knows his impending death and resurrection by his own expressions, 'where I am going, you cannot come' (Jn 7.34; 8.21; 13.33, 36; 14.12, 28; 16.5, 7, 10) and 'you will no longer see me [Jesus]' (Jn 16.16, 20.22). Jesus' predictions on his own death and resurrection are clearly fulfilled in Jn 19.28-42; 20.1-29, so the readers know Jesus' ability to predict his own death and resurrection in advance. Thus, Jesus' prophetic image is undoubtedly recognized by the readers and his disciples in the story.

The readers are clearly informed of Jesus' predictions concerning his disciples in Jn 6.70; 13.21, 38; 16.2, 32 (cf. Jn 21.18). The clear prediction regarding Judas Iscariot in Jn 6.70 and 13.21 is announced by Jesus. The readers are evidently informed of the fulfilment of Jesus' prediction on Judas Iscariot in Jn 18.1-5, in which the narrator obviously introduces Judas Iscariot as the betrayer of Jesus. The fateful prediction about Simon Peter, who will deny all knowledge of Jesus, is also announced by Jesus in Jn 13.38. The trustworthiness of Jesus' prediction on the denials of Peter with its accurate time reference means that its fulfilment will give the most powerful and significant credibility regarding Jesus' prophetic identity. The readers are able to verify the accuracy of the fulfilment of Jesus' prediction on the denials of Peter in Jn 18.15-27. The fact that

52. A number of eschatological events are announced by Jesus in Jn 1.50-51; 2.19, 5.20, 25, 28-29; 4.13-14, 21, 23; 6.39-40, 44, 54; cf. 7.37-38, but these predictions refer to an unspecified future time, so they will be omitted here.

53. See Jn 1.51; 5.24-25; 12.24-25; 13.21, 38; 14.12; 16.20; 21.18. For Jesus' predictions related to the theme of judgment, see Jn 3.36; 8.21; 12.48; 16.8.

54. See Jn 2.19-22; 3.14; 7.34; 8.21, 28; 12.31-32; 13.33, 36; 14.12, 18-20, 28, 30; 16.5, 7, 10, 16, 20, 22.

Jesus' predictions are accurately fulfilled is to be the most powerful indicator pointing to Jesus' prophetic figure.

The various sayings of Jesus in the manner of predictions indirectly characterize him as a prophet, in order to encourage the readers to believe him as belonging to a category of reliable heroes. The readers can clearly understand that the ability of the Johannine Jesus to predict future events indirectly points to his prophetic identity. The readers may start to ponder the identity of Jesus whether he is only a prophet, like prophets of the Old Testament, with regard to his predictions fulfilled accurately in the Fourth Gospel.

*Minor Characters.* Minor characters play a structural role in a narrative, and highlight the protagonists. In Harvey's theory, minor characters are called 'intermediate figures' who reveal the protagonists. In John's Gospel, minor characters predominantly reveal the identity of Jesus as the protagonist in various ways, so their role is very important in respect of the identity of Jesus. The Johannine Jesus presented as prophet is found in the role of the minor characters in the Gospel, such as the Samaritan woman, the man born blind and the anonymous crowds.

In Harvey's terminology, the Johannine Jesus is the protagonist, and he is the central character in the Fourth Gospel, while the Samaritan woman, the man born blind and the anonymous crowds are intermediate characters as *ficelles*, and their function is to reveal the protagonist. There are various minor characters presented in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>55</sup> Among the minor characters, the Samaritan woman (Jn 4.19), the man born blind (Jn 9.17) and the anonymous crowds described in Jn 6.14 and 7.40, are more significant, and apparently provide indirect presentation about the identity of Jesus, so they will be discussed here in due course.

First, the Samaritan woman recognizes Jesus as a Jew, when she met Jesus the first time. This is clearly expressed by her own question to Jesus in Jn 4.9: 'how is it that you, a Jew, ask a drink of me, a woman of Samaria?' The question of the Samaritan woman as a minor character in the Gospel may not be reliable or authoritative according to the narrator's point of view, so her asking needs to be proved by the most credible authority.<sup>56</sup> After the woman's question, the extraordinary comment is followed by the narrator in Jn 4.9b (οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις), which is one of the Johannine asides, in order to approve

55. See Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 132-44; Collins, 'From John to the Beloved Disciples', pp. 359-64.

56. See Collins, 'From John to the Beloved Disciples', pp. 363-64; Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 136-37.

her asking as trustworthy. From the narrator's point of view, the Johannine commentary is the most reliable voice, so the readers can understand the relationship between Jews and Samaritans at the time by the extra information. In the continual conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman, she recognizes Jesus as prophet in Jn 4.19: 'Sir, I perceive that you are [the] prophet' (προφήτης εἶ σύ). The woman directly defines Jesus is the/a prophet. The Samaritan woman's perception about Jesus' identity as prophet is reliable, because the authoritative narrator has approved her innermost thought as plausible in respect of recognizing Jesus as a Jew in Jn 4.9. Omniscient narrators speak from an omniscient vantage point, such as knowing characters' innermost thoughts and feelings. In this regard, the woman's thought acknowledged by the authoritative narrator is to be a trustworthy presentation of the character of Jesus as prophet. Thus, the readers are implicitly called upon to accept the indirect presentation in the reading process. As the narrative progresses, the readers come to trust the omniscient, reliable narrator and learn to depend upon the narrator for how the story and characters should be interpreted.

The Samaritan woman's indirect presentation of Jesus' prophetic identity is once again accredited by the omniscient narrator's comment that many Samaritans *believed* in Jesus because of the woman's testimony (Jn 4.39). The woman's testimony shows why she believes in Jesus. In this regard, the woman's direct confession, προφήτης εἶ σύ ('you are [the] prophet') in Jn 4.19, is closely related to Jesus' supernatural knowledge about her private sexual and marital life (Jn 4.18).<sup>57</sup> The Samaritan woman's indirect presentation about the identity of Jesus is to be a credible message for her own people and the readers as well.<sup>58</sup> The readers are encouraged initially to put their faith in Jesus as prophet, but they go a further step to believe in Jesus as 'the Saviour of the world', rather than 'prophet'. The Samaritans' indirect presentation about the identity of Jesus as 'the Saviour of the world' (Jn 4.42) encourages the readers to believe in Jesus, as they did. It is true that the group of the Samaritan people are an anonymous character as ficelles in the story of the Samaritan woman, and they are 'flat' characters according to Forster. Thus, no credibility can be given to the Samaritans by the authoritative narrator. The Samaritans seriously consider their own self-confidence about the identity of Jesus, and say to the Samaritan woman, who has already been given reliability by the narrator, what they believe in the identity of Jesus (Jn 4.42). The

57. See Collins, 'From John to the Beloved Disciples', pp. 363-64; Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 136-37.

58. See O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*, p. 76; Beck, 'Narrative Function', p. 151.

Samaritan woman seems to agree with what the people of Sychar believe about the identity of Jesus as 'the Saviour of the world'. Eventually, the Samaritan woman's initial confession of Jesus as prophet leads her and her neighbours to believe in Jesus as 'the Saviour of the world', and so do the readers in the reading process.

Second, similar to the Samaritan woman, the voice of the man born blind makes a clear statement about the identity of Jesus in Jn 9.17: 'He [Jesus] is [the] prophet', which is an indirect presentation for characterizing the traits of Jesus.<sup>59</sup> The man born blind is also a minor character in the Fourth Gospel, so the credibility of his indirect presentation about the traits of Jesus is in a question, according to the narrator's point of view. The words of Jesus' followers have some reliability, but still need to be evaluated according to the opinions of Jesus and the narrator. The most explicit evidence about the prophetic identity of Jesus is associated with his miraculous power to open the blind's eyes (Jn 9.17). After the healing of his eyes, the restored man can undoubtedly identify the traits of Jesus as prophet.

The neighbours of the cured man are confused about the restoration of his sight as to whether the man born blind is the same person, as they had previously known, as a beggar (Jn 9.8). But some of the neighbours recognize the man born blind, and keep asking how his eyes were opened (Jn 9.9-10). The group of neighbours are anonymous characters, as *ficelles* in the narrative of the man born blind, and they are also 'flat' characters, as they are simple and unchanging. However, the *ficelles* give credibility to the healed man in some aspects with regard to their continual asking *how* his eyes were opened (Jn 9.10, 15, 19, 26). The Jewish authorities also keep asking *who* is the person who opened the eyes of the man born blind (Jn 9.17, 21). The restored man's reliability to declare Jesus is a/the prophet seems to be given by his neighbours and the Jewish authorities in some respect.<sup>60</sup>

During the second interrogation between the healed man and the Jewish authorities, the man clearly confesses Jesus as a healer in his indirect presentation of the traits of Jesus (Jn 9.25). But, after the cured man confesses Jesus as prophet, the Jewish authorities continuously ask the healed man: 'what did he do to you? How did he open your eyes?' (Jn 9.26). This indicates that the Jewish authorities do not accept the identity of Jesus as prophet, although the cured man clearly and directly declares Jesus' prophetic identity (Jn 9.27). It is also implicitly indicated that the Jewish authorities cannot recognize Jesus' genuine identity as the Son of

59. See Staley, 'Stumbling in the Dark', pp. 64-69.

60. See Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 139-40.

Man, the Messiah, because of their ignoring the prophetic identity of Jesus witnessed by the healed man. In this regard, the healed man undoubtedly accepts Jesus as a healer and miracle worker, so he can declare Jesus is a/the prophet. But the healed man needs to learn more about who Jesus is in respect of his genuine identity.

After encountering Jesus, the healed man is involved in a conversation with Jesus, and the restored man learns more about who Jesus is. Eventually, the man confesses Jesus is 'Lord' (Jn 9.38). The readers can understand Jesus is not only a prophet, but also more than that through the restored man's indirect presentation. Moreover, the narrator gives the healed man's innermost thought by expressing his attitude towards Jesus: 'he [the healed man] prostrated himself before him' (Jn 9.38). The readers are witnessing the movement on to higher categories of the blind man's understanding of Jesus. Thus, the readers can more clearly understand Jesus' prophetic identity by the healed man's announcement and his attitude towards Jesus and then on this basis, directed in part by additional clues in the same account, go a further step towards perceiving his authentic identity.

Finally, the role of the anonymous crowds, as minor characters, described in Jn 6.14 and 7.40 is also to highlight the prophetic identity of Jesus, as the protagonist, in the narratives.<sup>61</sup> In Jn 6.14, the anonymous crowds, as a minor character, seem to offer a popular Jewish eschatological expectation by the use of 'the prophet'. The recognition of the crowds that Jesus is 'the prophet who is to come into the world' indicates that they already have knowledge about the Jewish eschatological tradition of the prophet-like-Moses promised in Deut. 18.15-18. The anonymous crowds undoubtedly see Jesus as the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet in relation to the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand, so they simply recognize Jesus as 'the prophet who is coming into the world'. Though the crowd are not to be considered reliable witness, the readers are encouraged to believe in the prophetic identity of Jesus by the declaration of the crowds. After the anonymous crowds clearly declare Jesus to be 'the prophet who is to come into the world', the readers are informed of Jesus' supernatural knowledge—his prophetic awareness—that he knows what the crowds are thinking about him. The readers can recognize that the miracle account in Jn 6.1-15 parallels the miracle performed by the prophet Elisha in 2 Kgs 4.42-44. That Jesus' feeding of the five thousand is obviously reminiscent of Elisha's feeding miracle in 2 Kgs 4.42-44 supports the crowd's recognition of his prophetic identity. But

61. See Beck, 'Narrative Function', pp. 149-53.

whereas for the blind man to recognize that Jesus was a prophet was a step in the direction of understanding Jesus yet more deeply, for the crowds here to recognize that Jesus was the prophet who is coming into the world leads them to the plan to force Jesus precipitously into the political role of king. The Passion Narrative will make it clear that for John the category of king is relevant to an understanding of Jesus, but not on the terms envisaged by the crowds here. So Jesus withdraws to the mountain by himself (Jn 6.14-15).

In Jn 7.40, similar to Jn 6.14, the use of 'the prophet' in relation to the identity of Jesus seems to show that the anonymous crowds, as a minor character, already have a category of expectation of 'the prophet' promised in Deut. 18.15-18. The crowds exclaim, οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης in Jn 7.40, but alongside this others affirm, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός in Jn 7.41. The anonymous crowds give a clear indication of Jesus' identity, but there is an option about his identity, either the prophet or the Messiah, or both. The readers are invited to reflect more seriously about the identity of Jesus, and they may have to decide who Jesus is. Before being recognized as 'the prophet' or 'the Messiah', Jesus was considered to be 'a good man' (Jn 7.12). But now 'the good man' is declared to be 'the prophet' or 'the Messiah' by the same crowds. In this respect, both titles seem to refer to the same expected eschatological figure as the prophet-Messiah. In Jn 7.40, 52, Jesus' prophetic identity is clearly depicted by the anonymous crowds' indirect presentation. The role of 'the prophet' in Jn 7.40, 52 is obviously to offer a credible identity of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, although there is a different voice from others in the same group. The anonymous crowds, as a minor character, introduced in Jn 6.14 and 7.40 declare Jesus is the prophet, so the readers can believe the identity of Jesus as prophet. The anonymous crowds clearly point to the identity of Jesus by their own voice. But they are perhaps less reliable than other minor characters, such as the Samaritan woman and the man born blind, because the anonymous crowds are not precisely described, so have less significance than other minor characters. Moreover, the speech of Jesus' opponents would be unreliable, so their claims must be weighed as to their certainty and importance.

### *Summary*

The role of 'prophet' in characterization is to encourage the readers after first being convinced that Jesus is a prophet, and therefore one who is to be believed, to contemplate Jesus' identity whether he is *only* a prophet or much more than *a* prophet, and even much more than *the* prophet. The credible narrator's commentary in Jn 4.44, as direct definition, is used as an indicator of Jesus' prophetic identity, and the readers are encouraged

by the narrator's note to consider whether Jesus should be identified in the prophetic category. Jesus' actions and speech, as indirect presentation, at first seem to be used to depict his prophetic identity, but the readers are also challenged to consider whether the identity of Jesus is *only* a prophet. The minor characters, the Samaritan woman, the man born blind and the anonymous crowds introduced in Jn 6.14 and 7.40, initially encourage the readers to consider the identity of Jesus as a prophet, and then the readers are also encouraged to go a further step in considering Jesus' authentic identity: he is not a prophet, but the prophet, *par excellence*, expected at the end of time.

### *Conclusions*

In this chapter, the role of 'prophet' in characterization in John's Gospel has been explored. The theory of characterization is offered in order to provide a framework for contemplating the role of Jesus as prophet in respect of characterization in John's Gospel. The function of 'prophet' in characterization has been considered in terms of direct definition and indirect presentation. The use of the term 'prophet' in the maxim (Jn 4.44), as direct definition, is the most powerful indicator pointing to the identity of Jesus, so the readers are encouraged to make a decision about the character of Jesus whether he is a genuine prophet or not. Furthermore, the readers are prompted to contemplate more about Jesus' prophetic identity whether this is the genuine identity of Jesus, and so eventually they can go a further step to perceive his authentic identity. Jesus' actions and speech characterize his identity as prophet in some aspect, so the readers can believe Jesus as prophet, but they are encouraged to ponder whether Jesus is *only* a prophet. The miraculous signs involve little *activity* as such of Jesus, but the signs in part characterize his identity as prophet, so that he may be considered to be a reliable character. Jesus' fulfilled predictions are given more weight than his actions for recognizing his prophetic identity, and offer the most obvious indicator of his prophetic identity. So the readers can trust his identity as prophet, and they can go a further step to ponder further his genuine identity. The credibility of the crowds is probably less than other minor characters, such as the Samaritan woman and the man born blind, in the narrator's point of view, because they are not precisely defined or described. The crowds' claim, however, cannot totally be ignored, because the use of the designation 'prophet' is reliable. By the direct definition and the indirect presentation, the readers are encouraged to understand the identity of Jesus: he is not only a prophet, and thus to be trusted but also more than a prophet, more precisely the prophet, *par excellence*, expected at the end of time. The role of 'prophet'



in characterization is to identify the Johannine Jesus as prophet, and to persuade the readers to engage on a further journey of discovery from which they may come to contemplate the authentic identity of Jesus, the Son of God, the Messiah.

## THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS AS PROPHET

In this chapter, the christological implication of Jesus as prophet will be explored with regard to Johannine Christology more broadly. What is the relation between Jesus as prophet and other Johannine christological designations in the Gospel? What is the implication of Jesus as prophet in respect of Johannine Christology? In order to answer these questions, first, the connection between Jesus as prophet and other christological appellations used in the Gospel will be considered, and then the significance of Jesus as prophet will be contemplated with regard to Johannine Christology.

### *Other Johannine Christological Titles and Jesus as Prophet*

One of the most striking features of John's Gospel is its distinctive Christology. For Johannine Christology, not only προφήτης but also various christological designations are used in the Gospel: ὁ λόγος; μονογενὴς θεός; μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; ὁ υἱός; ὁ ἐρχόμενος; ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ; ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου; κύριος; ῥαββί; διδάσκαλος; βασιλεύς; χριστός; θεός; and ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. In this section, the various christological titles will be briefly discussed with reference to Jesus as prophet, but the titles, κύριος,<sup>1</sup> ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ (Jn 1.29, 36) and ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου (Jn 4.42) will not be considered because they play a minor role and are in any case of more significance for soteriology than for Christology in the Gospel. Discussion about the christological designations in John's Gospel will

1. The title κύριος in connection with the identity of Jesus appears 54 times in John's Gospel. The use of 'Lord' with reference to Jesus was no more than a polite form of address in the Gospel. In the case of Jn 13.13-14, Jesus accepts the title ὁ κύριος ('the Lord') for his identity.

follow in the following order: (1) Logos and prophet; (2) God and prophet; (3) Son of God and prophet; (4) Messiah and prophet; (5) Coming One and prophet; (6) Teacher and prophet; (7) King and prophet and (8) Son of Man and prophet.

### *Logos and Prophet*

The term λόγος is used forty times in John's Gospel.<sup>2</sup> The word λόγος generally refers to 'word', 'speech', 'account', 'story' or 'message'.<sup>3</sup> The word λόγος occurs not only in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel (Jn 1.1-18), but also elsewhere in the Gospel, such as Jn 4.37; 6.60; 7.36; 8.37; 10.35; 12.38, 48; 14.24; 15.25; 18.9, 32; 21.23. In John's Gospel, ὁ λόγος is used in a particular way to refer to Jesus, so it is one of John's special christological designations. The term λόγος is not, however, used for a christological title in John's Gospel outside the prologue of the Gospel.<sup>4</sup> In the prologue, ὁ λόγος is a designation appropriate only in reference to *the pre-existent one*. In other words, John refers to *the pre-existent one* as ὁ λόγος. In John's Gospel almost every occurrence of λόγος occurs in some syntactical sequence with Jesus or God, but it is not always easy to tell if there is an exact nuance to the word or if it refers generally to Jesus' speech. In a few instances λόγος is used in the

2. The term λόγος is used 128 times in the Gospels (Matthew 32 times; Mark 23 times and Luke 32 times). Matthew and Mark use λόγος in a non-philosophical sense. Luke begins to use λόγος in a more technical sense, in particular, when read in the light of Acts.

3. See BDAG, pp. 598-601.

4. The only other place in the New Testament 'Logos' appears as a christological title is in 1 Jn 1.1 and Rev. 19.13. For the Logos, see Endo, *Creation and Christology*, pp. 206-29; H.C. Waetjen, 'Logos πρὸς τὸν θεόν and the Objectification of Truth in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel', *CBQ* 63 (2001), pp. 265-286; M. Görg, 'Fleischwerdung des Logos: Auslegungs- und religionsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zu Joh 1,14a', in R. Hoppe and U. Busse (eds.), *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien; Festgabe für Paul Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1998), pp. 467-82; E. Harris, *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist* (JSNTSup, 107; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), pp. 196-201; C.A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (JSNTSup, 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 47-145; M. Theobald, *Die Fleischwerdung des Logos: Studien zum Verhältnis des Johannesprologs zum Corpus des Evangeliums und zu 1 Joh* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 20; Münster: Aschendorff, 1988); G. Richter, 'Die Fleischwerdung des Logos im Johannes-evangelium', *NovT* 14 (1972), pp. 257-76; W. Eltester, 'Der Logos und sein Prophet: Fragen zur heutigen Erklärung des johanneischen Prologs', in W. Eltester and F.H. Kettler (eds.), *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1964), pp. 109-34.

context of a fulfilment formula (Jn 18.9, 32), that is, Jesus' prophetic word about himself is fulfilled. In Jn 2.22 there is an equating of the predictive nature of the Scripture and Jesus' word. The word of Jesus is even equated with the word of God (Jn 14.24; 17.14).<sup>5</sup>

The crucial question arising out of John's use of *ὁ λόγος* in Jn 1.1, 14 concerns the source of his language.<sup>6</sup> Scholars have assumed that by determining the source of John's language the meaning of *λόγος* would become clear. This may be so in terms of the parallels with Jewish-Hellenistic Wisdom writings and related writings, such as those by Philo,<sup>7</sup> and some targumic elements.<sup>8</sup> But it is not at all clear whether John borrows the term *λόγος* from Hellenistic philosophy, or from a proto-gnostic source, or from Jewish ideas or from a combination of two or three of these. Many have asserted that in his prologue (Jn 1.1-18) John has taken over a so-called 'Logos' hymn and modified it to fit his story of Jesus.<sup>9</sup> The milieu in which this 'Logos' hymn was composed has been a matter of debate. Other questions centre on the structure and meaning of the prologue as a whole as it now stands in the Gospel.<sup>10</sup>

In the prologue of the Gospel, *ὁ λόγος* exists 'in the beginning', 'with God', and as divine (Jn 1.1). The intimate relationship between *ὁ λόγος* and God is clearly expressed in the Johannine prologue (Jn 1.1, 2, 18). The activity of *ὁ λόγος* is personal for *ὁ λόγος* is the agent in creation and the source of life and light (Jn 1.3-9). Unknown by the world, *ὁ λόγος*

5. See D.H. Johnson, 'Logos', *DJG*, pp. 481-84.

6. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 519-24.

7. The association of the Johannine Logos with Philo's Logos has long been discussed because of similarities in the personified figure; see Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 54-73; P. Borgen, *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

8. See Evans, *Word and Glory*, pp. 47-145; Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 519-24; Endo, *Creation and Christology*, pp. 12-179; P. Borgen, 'Observations on the Targumic Character of the Prologue of John', *NTS* 16 (1970), pp. 288-95.

9. For example, see Bultmann, *Gospel of John*, p. 21, who set forth a hypothesis that the Johannine prologue was originally a pre-Christian cultic hymn, with its ultimate source in Gnosticism, as reflected in such texts as the Odes of Solomon and some of the Mandaean writings. However, Bultmann's hypothesis has not been accepted.

10. For the structure of the Johannine prologue, see Endo, *Creation and Christology*, p. 187-202; F.F. Segovia, 'John 1:1-18 as Entrée into Johannine Reality: Representation and Ramifications', in Painter *et al.* (eds.), *Word, Theology, and Community*, pp. 33-64; E. Käsemann, 'The Structure and Purpose of the Prologue to John's Gospel' in Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (trans. W.J. Montague; NTL; London: SCM Press, 1969), pp. 138-67; I. de la Potterie, 'Structure du Prologue de Saint Jean', *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 354-81; H. Ridderbos, 'The Structure and Scope of the Prologue to the Gospel of John', *NovT* 8 (1966), pp. 180-201.

came to his own, but those who were his own did not receive him, while as many as did receive him were given by him the right to become the children of God (Jn 1.10-12). John declares ὁ λόγος became flesh and a visible dwelling of God among his people (Jn 1.14). The identity of ὁ λόγος is disclosed in John the Baptist's testimony in Jn 1.15 and in Jn 1.17, 'the law indeed was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ'. In Jn 1.18, the language of Sonship is used, 'No one has ever seen God. It is God the only son (μονογενὴς θεός), who is close to the Father's heart, who has made him known'. The relationship between ὁ λόγος and θεός (Jn 1.1-2, 18), ὁ λόγος and ζωή (Jn 1.4 cf. 3.15-16, 36; 5.21, 26; 6.57), ὁ λόγος and φῶς (Jn 1.4, 9) are clearly expressed in the prologue, but the relationship between ὁ λόγος and 'prophet' is hard to find. In this respect, ὁ λόγος in the prologue of John's Gospel seems not to be related to the figure of 'prophet'.

### *God and Prophet*

In John's Gospel, the term θεός appears in some form 83 times.<sup>11</sup> When the nominative singular ὁ θεός occurs, it is normally the subject, rarely predicative.<sup>12</sup> In the Gospel, there are no references to (ὁ) θεός in chs. 2, 15 and 18 and only one in each of chs. 7, 12, 14, 17, 19 and 21. The Fourth Gospel contains the most explicit designation of Jesus as God in the New Testament as a whole.<sup>13</sup> The designation of Jesus as God occurs in Jn 1.1-2 and 20.28. When, in the climatic confession of the Gospel, Thomas addresses the risen Jesus as 'My Lord and my God!' (Jn 20.28) this formulation stands as the summary and elaboration of the work and person of Jesus through the Gospel. The direct confession of the risen Lord as God stands alongside and interprets, but does not eclipse, the narrative that points to his dependence upon and authorization by the Father. Like the Johannine prologue, the entire Gospel points both to the one who is 'with God' and who 'is God'. In Jn 5.18, Jesus is accused of making himself equal to God and making himself God in Jn 10.33, 'I and

11. See M.J. Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992), pp. 51-129.

12. However, the plural forms θεοί and θεούς in Jn 10.34-35 are predicative, and in Jn 8.54 θεός is also predicative.

13. See B.A. Mastin, 'A Neglected Feature of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 22 (1975), pp. 32-51, who says that in comparison with the other books of the New Testament the Fourth Gospel uses the term θεός of Jesus not only with greater frequency but also with considerably more care' (pp. 50-51); G. Reim, 'Jesus as God in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Background', *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 158-60.

the Father are one'. To the Jews' assertion, 'we have one Father, even God' (Jn 8.41), Jesus replies, 'If God were your Father, you would love me' (Jn 8.42).

In John's Gospel, God has given to Jesus certain uniquely divine prerogatives, such as the power to give life and to judge (Jn 5.26-27). Even the assertion that Jesus is the incarnation of the Word of God assumes that the Word comes from God. For John the supreme manifestation of God's sovereignty comes through God's power to create and to give life. The Johannine prologue opens with echoes of Genesis and the creation of the world. The life-giving God continues to bestow life to the world, as is manifested specifically in the signs of Jesus, as well as in the gift of the life-giving Spirit. God is known primarily as the one who creates, saves, gives life, and judges. Those divine actions such as salvation, creation and judgment are carried out through the agency of Jesus. John makes his argument for the identity of Jesus, and simultaneously for the identity of God, by attributing to Jesus alone powers that are not routinely granted to any other agent or mediator figure.

In John's Gospel, there is an interesting pattern involving the regular occurrence of genitive phrases that speak of some entity, reality or figure in relationship to God, for example, the son of God (10.36; 20.31), the lamb of God (1.29, 36), the gift of God (4.10), the bread of God (6.33), the works of God (6.28; 9.3), the glory of God (11.40; 12.43) and so on.<sup>14</sup> These patterns are quite different from what has been discussed above, because the reference to God in the genitive phrases does not lend the attribute of deity to what is thus qualified. Most of the genitive phrases that relate some entity to God serve to characterize Jesus or something that Jesus mediates, brings or gives. In such cases the connection with God indicated by the genitive phrase has a contribution to make to Johannine Christology.<sup>15</sup>

14. See Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 113-14, who also calls attention to the frequent use of 'God' in genitive phrases. Cf. M.M. Thompson, *The God of the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), pp. 48-55, who has drawn a different conclusion from this fact.

15. The title  $\delta \ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  (the holy one of God) appears only once in Jn 6.69, and elsewhere in the New Testament only in Mk 1.24 (cf. 1 Jn 2.20). Various attempts have been made to establish a background for the expression. The term  $\delta \ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$  is in fact unknown outside the New Testament. The title reflects no real messianic background, but evokes a general image of one who belongs uniquely to God; see Beasley-Murray, *John*, p. 97. For a discussion of the title  $\delta \ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ , see W.R. Domeris, 'The Confession of Peter according to John 6:69', *TynB* 44 (1993), pp. 155-67; L. Schenke, 'Das johanneische Schisma und die "Zwölf" (Johannes 6,60-71)', *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 105-21; H.L.N. Joubert, "'The Holy One of God' (John

In the Gospel, God is repeatedly and regularly identified primarily in terms of the activity and work of Jesus. The verbs 'send' and 'work' are key identifying characteristics of the God in John's Gospel in connection with the close relationship to the sending of Jesus and 'working' through Jesus.<sup>16</sup> The identity of the Johannine Jesus as the one who is sent by God is connected with the figure of 'prophet' who is sent by God. In this sense, both the theology and Christology of John are functional. In John's Gospel, the identity and character of God are explicated in terms of the works and words of Jesus.

### *Son of God and Prophet*

The phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ used in Jn 1.34, 49; 5.25; 10.36; 11.4, 27; 20.31 (cf. Jn 19.7, υἱὸς θεοῦ) is a traditional New Testament christological title.<sup>17</sup> The epithet is often abbreviated simply to ὁ υἱός (Jn 5.19), usually in such a context that it is clear that the Son of God is meant.<sup>18</sup> The term ὁ υἱός is employed 18 times in John's Gospel. Alongside the word ὁ υἱός, the phrase μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is used in Jn 3.18 (cf. Jn 3.16).<sup>19</sup> Thus, the term ὁ υἱός, μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ will be considered briefly in this section, along with the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

The appellation 'Son of God' in John's Gospel is clearly related to the divinity of Jesus as opposed to the humanity of Jesus.<sup>20</sup> The Johannine 'Son of God' has most obviously to do with the 'Son' image, which is

6:69), *Neot* 2 (1968), pp. 57-69; E.K. Broadhead, *Naming Jesus: Titular Christology in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSup, 175; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), pp. 97-100.

16. Thompson, *God of the Gospel of John*, p. 52.

17. The declaration that Jesus Christ is the Son of God is one of the most universal in the New Testament. For a discussion on the Son of God, see Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 292-329; Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament*, pp. 270-305.

18. In particular, the christological title to which 'Logos' seems to give place in John's Gospel is that of 'Son of God'; see Smalley, *John*, p. 244, who considers that 'it is probable that John's use of "Son" will include some of the theological ideas which we discovered behind his use of *Logos*' (italics in the original).

19. For a detailed discussion of the term μονογενής, see G. Pendrick, 'μονογενής', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 587-600; J.V. Dahms, 'The Johannine Use of Monogenes Reconsidered', *NTS* 29 (1983), pp. 222-32; P. Winter, 'Μονογενής παρὰ πατρός', *ZRGG* 5 (1953), pp. 335-65; F. Büchsel, 'μονογενής', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 737-41.

20. But the title 'Son of God' originally did *not* imply full *divinity*, but simply a person's special relationship with God. As Christian theology developed, the title took on more exclusively divine connotations.

used to represent his unique relationship to God.<sup>21</sup> In John's Gospel, 'it can be said that the Father-Son relationship appears as one of the most constitutive and significant features of Johannine theology'.<sup>22</sup> So the absolute use of the term  $\delta$  υἱός in John's Gospel seems to be a kind of transition from the 'Son of God'. The term  $\delta$  υἱός is used in counter-relation to the 'Father' in the Gospel (Jn 3.16, 35, 36; 5.19-26). In John's Gospel, the term  $\delta$  υἱός is more than a title of exaltation since it is consistently used within contexts designating a unique relation between the Father and the Son.<sup>23</sup> The Son is not an independent figure but one with the Father. In John's Gospel, the epithets of 'Son' and 'Son of God' unite in meaning.<sup>24</sup>

The expression  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ also shows the relationship between Jesus and God, who sent his Son into the world for the specific purpose of bringing salvation. So it can be said that Jesus' unique relationship to God as the Father is expressed by the unique expression  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ. The use of the adjective  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  in John's Gospel underscores Jesus' unique relationship with God, the Father.<sup>25</sup> In Jn 3.16, 18,  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  qualifies God's son. In Jn 1.18,  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  stands in apposition to 'God', while in Jn 1.14 it appears without a substantive expressed. The adjective  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  used in John's Gospel emphasizes Jesus' unique status as the *only* son of God.<sup>26</sup>

In John's Gospel, Jesus is known as both Christ and Son of God (cf. Jn 20.31; cf. 11.27). The appellation Son of God has been given a unique function and can be used as a mode of self-reference by Jesus in the Gospel.<sup>27</sup> Jesus himself declares and demonstrates that he is the Son of

21. The title 'Son of God' in the New Testament never refers to the pre-existence of Christ. But it is clear in John's Gospel that this implication was not absent, even though it was not as prominent as it became soon thereafter.

22. Appold, *Oneness Motif*, p. 55.

23. The analogy of the unique relationship between Jesus and God can be found in an intimate relationship between Moses and God expressed in Num. 12.8; Deut. 34.10; Exod. 33.11; however, the relationship of Jesus to God is quite different from that of Moses.

24. See Appold, *Oneness Motif*, pp. 58-64.

25. In John's Gospel, the adjective  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  appears in Jn 1.14, 18; 3.16, 18 (cf. 1 Jn 4.9). The word  $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  means 'unique' or 'only', 'single'; see Dahms, 'Johannine Use of Monogenes', pp. 222-32. Against this consensus several scholars have recently argued for the sense 'only-begotten'; see Theobald, *Fleischwerdung des Logos*, p. 250 n. 206; Pendrick, ' $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$ ', p. 596.

26. See Mastin, 'Neglected Feature', pp. 37-41.

27. The debate regarding the background of the Son of God designation (whether of Palestinian or Hellenistic derivation) need not concern us in depth here. For the background of the Son of God, see Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament*,



God (Jn 10.36; 19.7). Jesus can always be described as the Son of God, because he is always one with God.<sup>28</sup> The use of the title 'the Son of God' reflects an established confessional position and offers clear expression to the faith conviction that Jesus is one with God.<sup>29</sup> Thus, not believing in the name of the only Son of God (Jn 3.18) means condemnation. Conversely, Martha confesses, in response to Jesus' declaration ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωὴ in Jn 12.25, that she believes Jesus is the Son of God (Jn 11.27). John the Baptist points beyond himself and gives witness that Jesus is the Son of God (Jn 1.34). Nathanael confesses that Jesus is the Son of God (Jn 1.49). In a concluding statement of the Gospel, John clearly mentions Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ in Jn 20.31.

The designation Son of God is often closely related to the theme of God sending his Son, as developed in Jn 3.16-21, although it does not always appear in contexts relating to the Father in conjunction with the sending motif in the Gospel. Certainly, John's Gospel emphasizes that God *sent* his Son into the world (Jn 3.17; 10.36; 17.18), and that Jesus as his Son has come from the Father (Jn 3.31; 6.33-42). In conjunction with the motif of sending, the comment that 'John has deliberately moulded the idea of the Son of God in the first instance upon the [Old Testament] prophetic model'<sup>30</sup> is quite acceptable. It may be true that 'there is no natural association between the idea of sonship and the idea of mission',<sup>31</sup> but the idea that the Son was sent into the world is clearly expressed in the Fourth Gospel.<sup>32</sup> Thus, the influence of the prophetic tradition upon John's Christology should not be ignored in connection with the sending motif in the Gospel. In this respect, the Son of God as a christological designation in the Gospel reflects the figure of prophet in conjunction with the sending motif.

pp. 270-305; M. de Jonge, 'The Son of God and the Children of God in the Fourth Gospel' in J.I. Cook (ed.), *Saved by Hope: Essays in Honour of Richard C. Oudersluys* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), pp. 44-63; M. Hengel, *The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1976), pp. 21-56.

28. Jesus, therefore, can be described as the one from above (Jn 8.23) who is not of this world (Jn 17.16) and who after his earthly mission returns to the Father (Jn 13.1; 16.28).

29. See Appold, *Oneness Motif*, pp. 55-58.

30. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 225; cf. Appold, *Oneness Motif*, p. 59.

31. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, p. 318.

32. See Broadhead, *Naming Jesus*, pp. 116-20.

*Messiah and Prophet*

The word *χριστός* is used 19 times in John's Gospel (Jn 1.17, 20, 25, 41; 3.28; 4.25, 29; 7.26, 27, 31, 41 (twice), 42; 9.22; 10.24; 11.27; 12.34; 17.3; 20.31). The compound title *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* appears in Jn 1.17 and 17.3. The term *χριστός* is the transliterated form of the Hebrew or Aramaic *מָשִׁיחַ*, *מְשִׁיחָא* ('Messiah', cf. Jn 1.41; 4.25), which means 'The Anointed One'.<sup>33</sup>

What did 'Messiah' mean to those who heard Jesus in Galilee or in Jerusalem? This is by no means an easy question to answer, since 'Messiah' was understood in quite diverse ways in first-century Judaism.<sup>34</sup> In numerous passages in the Old Testament 'anointed one' is applied to the divinely appointed King, for example, 1 Sam. 12.3 (Saul) and 2 Sam. 19.22 (David). In a few passages 'anointed one' is used of prophets (most notably in Isa. 61.1) and of priests (Lev. 4.3, 5, 16), but without further designation the term normally refers to the king of Israel. So for many 'Messiah' and 'King' were almost synonymous terms.<sup>35</sup>

In John's Gospel, 'Messiah' and 'prophet' are clearly distinguished in Jn 7.40-41, as has been discussed. But this does not mean that the terms 'Messiah' and 'prophet' are not at all closely related to each other in John's Gospel.<sup>36</sup> The first occurrence of the designation *χριστός* comes in the Jews' confrontation with John the Baptist where the question of identity is raised and he is asked whether he is the Christ (Jn 1.20, 25). The addition of the names 'Elijah' and 'the prophet' as part of the same question reflects the variety in Jewish messianic expectation, as has been considered. In particular, the Samaritan woman recognizes Jesus as the one who will come at the end of time, so she uses *χριστός* for identifying him in Jn 4.25 and 29. But the Samaritan woman has already identified Jesus as prophet in Jn 4.19, before recognizing him as *χριστός*. In this case, the terms 'Messiah' and 'prophet' seem to be able to be used interchangeably for identifying the expected eschatological figure that will appear at the end time. It is very significant to see that the epithet *χριστός* can be used not only as a criterion of identity, but also from a confessional standpoint as a statement of faith in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 1.41; 11.27; 20.30). In John's Gospel, 'Messiah' and 'prophet' are closely

33. See BDAG, p. 1091; for a succinct discussion on the Messiah, see also Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 238-79.

34. See de Jonge, 'Jewish Expectations'; R.A. Horsley, 'Popular Messianic Movements around the Time of Jesus', *CBQ* 46 (1984), pp. 471-95.

35. John knows, and makes explicit, the role of the Messiah as king of Israel.

36. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity*, p. 153, who comments that the two terms prophet and Messiah 'cannot be regarded as completely distinct from each other'.

related to each other for identifying the expected eschatological figure, even though the appellations are distinctively employed in the Gospel.

### *Coming One and Prophet*

The term ὁ ἐρχόμενος appears in Jn 1.9, 15, 27; 3.31 (twice); 6.14; 11.27; 12.13, and seems to be used as a christological epithet.<sup>37</sup> The Messianic claim of Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος is supported by the witness of John the Baptist (Jn 1.7).<sup>38</sup> From the standpoint of John the Baptist, Jesus is ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος (Jn 1.15, 27). According to Brown, the phrase ὁ ἐρχόμενος marks John the Baptist's expectations both in the Gospels and Acts.<sup>39</sup> Brown comments that the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Jn 6.14 is 'a description of the prophet Elijah' based on Mal. 3.1.<sup>40</sup> Indeed, Jesus has multiplied barley bread in Jn 6.1-15, as did Elijah's follower Elisha (2 Kgs 4.42-44), so the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used for describing the identity of Jesus with reference to the expected eschatological prophet Elijah based on Mal. 3.1.

In Jn 6.14, οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος is closely related to 'the prophet' expected to appear at the end time with reference to the prophet Elijah based on Mal. 3.1. When the crowds recognize Jesus as the prophet as ὁ ἐρχόμενος after eating the barley bread produced by him, they attempted to take him by force to make him king in terms of their contemporary political situation. In Jn 11.27, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος, the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος is employed along with the christological designation 'the Christ' and 'the Son of God'. The word ὁ ἐρχόμενος is used in the full sense of the traditional Messianic designation, along with other traditional designations of Jesus. In Jn 12.13, the term ὁ ἐρχόμενος is associated with 'the Lord' and 'the King of Israel' (ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). The crowd which hails Jesus as the Messiah on his entry into Jerusalem praises him in the words of εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Jn 12.13). The term ὁ ἐρχόμενος seems to be a christological appellation in John's Gospel for designating the identity of Jesus as the expected eschatological messianic figure. The use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος

37. See J. Schneider, 'ἐρχομαι, κτλ', *TDNT*, II, pp. 666-84.

38. In the Synoptics 'the Coming of the Messiah' is expressed in connection with the return of Elijah (Mt. 11.14; 17.10, 12; 27.49; cf. Mk 9.12-13; 15.35). The doubts of John the Baptist concerning Jesus are stated in the question: σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος (Mt. 11.3; Lk. 7.19-20).

39. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 44.

40. Brown, *Gospel according to John*, I, pp. 64, 235.

in the Gospel demonstrates the significance of Jesus and the nature of his mission. In this respect, ὁ ἐρχόμενος as a christological designation is closely related to the term ‘prophet’ for identifying Jesus as prophet with reference to the figure of the prophet Elijah based on Mal. 3.1.

### *Teacher and Prophet*

The term διδάσκαλος appears in Jn 1.38; 3.2, 10; 8.4; 11.28; 13.13-14; 20.16, and ῥαββί occurs eight times in John’s Gospel (Jn 1.38, 49; 3.2, 26; 4.31; 6.25; 9.2; 11.8). The word ραββουνι is used once in Jn 20.16, which is Greek transliteration of Aramaic, although the narrator explains that it is Hebrew.<sup>41</sup> When the risen Lord calls Mary in Jn 20.16, she responds to Jesus calling him ραββουνι.<sup>42</sup>

According to Jn 1.38, the term ῥαββί is translated as διδάσκαλε, so these two words are interchangeable and there is no distinction between ‘rabbi’ and ‘teacher’ in John’s Gospel. Neither designation was used as a title in Old Testament times, but were common titles of respect by the time of Jesus, especially but not only for teachers.<sup>43</sup> In Jn 1.38, 49, the ex-disciples of John the Baptist, who followed Jesus, and Nathanael address Jesus as ῥαββί in a general sense. In Jn 3.2 Nicodemus calls Jesus ῥαββί, but the epithet is not used in a christological manner. Martha introduces Jesus as ὁ διδάσκαλος to her sister Mary in Jn 11.28, ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν, but the language is used to express imperfect faith, as is the

41. Mark uses ῥαββί three times (Mk 9.5; 11.21; 14.45) and ραββουνι once (Mk 10.51). All four instances convey a sense of Jesus’ particular greatness (9.5; 11.21 [Peter]; 14.45 [Judas]; 10.51 [Bartimaeus, who follows Jesus]). In three of the four instances, Jesus is called ῥαββί in response to a miraculous action on Jesus’ part: the Transfiguration (9.5); the withering of the fig tree (11.21); and the healing of the blind (10.51). In Matthew the use of the appellation ῥαββί is polemical. The only person who addresses Jesus as ῥαββί is Judas (Mt. 26.25, 49; cf. 23.1-12 [twice]). In Luke the term ῥαββί does not occur; see H. Lapin, ‘Rabbi’, *ABD*, V, pp. 600-602. For more detailed discussions of the subject, see Dodd, ‘Jesus as Teacher and Prophet’; M. Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Cambridge: James Clark; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), p. 68; H. Shanks, ‘Is the Title “Rabbi” Anachronistic in the Bible?’, *JQR* 53 (1963), pp. 337-45; *idem*, ‘On the Origin of the Title “Rabbi”’, *JQR* 59 (1968), pp. 152-57; S. Zeitlin, ‘A Reply [to Shanks]’, *JQR* 53 (1963), pp. 345-49; *idem*, ‘The Title Rabbi in the Gospels Is Anachronistic’, *JQR* 59 (1968), pp. 158-60.

42. See Marsh, *Saint John*, p. 633; see also Hoskyns, *Fourth Gospel*, p. 542; S.M. Schneiders, ‘John 20:11-18: The Encounter of the Easter Jesus with Mary Magdalene: A Transformative Feminist Reading’, in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 155-68, see esp. 162-64.

43. See G. Stanton, *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), p. 185.

case also with uses of ῥαββί for Jesus in Jn 4.31; 6.25; 9.2; 11.8. In this respect, Jesus' disciples understand him only in a limited manner, because the use of the term 'Rabbi' for Jesus indicates this. The Johannine Jesus knows that his disciples call him 'the teacher', and accepts the designation ὁ διδάσκαλος for his identity in Jn 13.13-14. The use of the appellation ὁ διδάσκαλος for the identity of Jesus is correct, but there is no clear messianic expectation around this epithet with regard to Johannine Christology.<sup>44</sup> The title ὁ διδάσκαλος is clearly distinguished from ὁ κύριος in Jn 13.13-14. In the first century the designations 'teacher' and 'prophet' seem to be related to each other much more closely,<sup>45</sup> but in John's Gospel there is no such indication.

### *King and Prophet*

The designation βασιλεύς occurs 16 times in John.<sup>46</sup> Jesus is called ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ twice in Jn 1.49; 12.13 (cf. Mt. 27.42; Mk 15.32). Jesus himself refuses to be made king in Jn 6.15 (cf. Mt. 4.8-10), but speaks of ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in Jn 3.3, 5. The word βασιλεύς frequently occurs in the passion narrative in the Gospel (Jn 18.33, 37 [twice], 39; 19.3, 12, 14, 15 [twice], 19, 21 [twice]).

In comparison with the synoptic narratives,<sup>47</sup> the Johannine account gives pronounced emphasis to the kingship of Jesus. In particular, the occurrence of 'King of Israel' in John's Gospel should be considered here with regard to Jesus' kingship. The term occurs twice, once in the confessional response of Nathanael at the beginning of Jesus' appearing (Jn 1.49), and at the end in the acclamation of the pilgrims at Jesus' final entry into Jerusalem (Jn 12.13). Nathanael uses initially a characteristic messianic term in confessing that Jesus is the king of Israel. Similarly in the picture of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem the crowd proclaims Jesus as king of Israel.<sup>48</sup> The concept of a messianic king seems to be

44. The Old Testament portrays God as the eschatological teacher of Israel in Isa. 30.20 and 51.4.

45. John the Baptist was undoubtedly a prophet, yet he is called 'teacher' in one passage (Lk. 3.12) and there are several references to his circle of disciples (Mk 2.18; 6.29; Mt. 11.2; Lk. 7.18; 11.1). In the Dead Sea Scrolls (1Q4.22), the Teacher of Righteousness did not claim to be a prophet, but he appears to have regarded himself as such, as did his followers.

46. Jn 1.49; 6.15; 12.13, 15; 18.33, 37 (twice), 39; 19.3, 12, 14, 15 (twice), 19, 21 (twice).

47. In the synoptic Gospels the concept of a messianic king is a rather ambivalent title for Jesus (Mt. 2.2; 27.1, 29, 37; 27.42; Mk 15.2, 9, 12, 18, 26, 32; Lk. 23.2, 36-38).

48. See Appold, *Oneness Motif*, pp. 76-77.

found in the term 'King of Israel'. Messianic hopes converge around the image of a future Davidic king and John's Gospel takes up this image in connection with the expression 'King of Israel'. Israel expected a Davidic king in the figure of Messiah. The concept of 'King of Israel' offers the point of origin for the central messianic developments of the Old Testament.<sup>49</sup>

In Jn 6.14-15 the implied association of 'the prophet who is to come into the world' and 'the king' comes as a surprise in connection with the feeding miracle. W.A. Meeks argues that the connection between 'the prophet' and 'the king' can be seen in certain Moses traditions in which prophetic and royal functions combine.<sup>50</sup> However, the 'prophet-king' designation, assuming the two terms belong together, receives no primary function, and Jesus expressly does not accept it. In answer to the attempt to make him (as 'the prophet') king, Jesus withdraws by himself to the hills (Jn 6.15). Here the epithet βασιλεύς is closely related to 'prophet' in terms of Jesus' identity recognized in Jn 6.15, but the two designations have different functions for identifying Jesus.

The term βασιλεύς used in the Johannine passion narrative seems to play an important role in terms of the dignity of Jesus who is not of this world but comes from above.<sup>51</sup> In the passion narrative, the term 'King of the Jews' (Jn 18.33, 39; 19.3, 19, 21 [twice]) is not an eschatological designation and does not stem from Jewish messianic ideology nor for that matter from early Christian titular usage. The phrase 'King of the Jews' is used interchangeably in the passion narrative with the designation 'king' (Jn 18.37 [twice]; 19.12, 14, 15 [twice]).<sup>52</sup>

In sum, the word 'king' with reference to the use of 'King of Israel' in John's Gospel seems to show a Davidic king with respect to the messianic figure. However, Jesus' kingship is not radically redefined in terms of the mission of the prophet, rather in terms of the exalted figure of him who is one with the Father.

49. See Broadhead, *Naming Jesus*, pp. 75-77.

50. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, pp. 59-87, who insists on trying to detect royalty accents in the Good Shepherd account in John 10 and conjoining these with the king motif in the Passion narrative against the background of the prophetic tradition of Deut. 18.15.

51. Since it is generally held that the Johannine interpretation explicitly denies the political element of the Davidic ideology, the title 'king' is ordinarily thought to have no special significance; cf. J. Kügler, 'Der andere König: Religionsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zum Jesusbild des Johannesevangeliums', *ZNW* 88 (1997), pp. 223-41.

52. See J.J. Kanagaraj, 'Jesus the King, Merkabah Mysticism and the Gospel of John', *TynB* 47 (1996), pp. 349-66; *idem*, 'Mysticism' in *the Gospel of John*, pp. 233-47.

*Son of Man and Prophet*

In John's Gospel, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου seems to be very important, and occurs 13 times.<sup>53</sup> The 13 occurrences of 'Son of Man' in John's Gospel fit into the general pattern of the imagery found in Dan. 7.13-14 and *1 En.* 37-71. John uses the epithet 'Son of Man' to explain Jesus' origin (Jn 1.51; 3.13), authority (Jn 5.27; 6.27), and exaltation (Jn 8.28; 12.23). However, we do not know how the phrase became a title.<sup>54</sup>

A.J.B. Higgins classifies the Johannine Son of Man in comparison with that of the Synoptics as follows: (1) Earthly activity of the Son of Man: none; (2) Sufferings of the Son of Man: 3.14-15; 6.53; 8.28; 12.23, 34; 13.31; (3) Glory of the Son of Man: 1.51; 3.13-14; 5.27; 6.27, 62; 8.28; 12.23, 34; 13.31.<sup>55</sup> He then comments that 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 stands outside these categories. He divides the sayings into two main groups, sayings of synoptic type (1.51; 3.14-15; 5.27; 8.28; 12.34) and sayings of non-synoptic type (3.13; 6.27, 53, 62; 12.23; 13.31), but Jn 9.35 is not put in either group.<sup>56</sup> In his book, *Son of Man*, M. Casey notes that the influence of Dan. 7.13 is certainly found in the synoptic Gospels,<sup>57</sup> but in the Fourth Gospel 'there is no certain trace of Dan. 7 at all'.<sup>58</sup> Casey does not discuss Jn 9.35 at all. The 'Son of Man' sayings in the Fourth Gospel are different from those of the synoptic Gospels, and are distinct-

53. See Jn 1.51; 3.13-14; 5.27; 6.27, 53, 62; 8.28; 9.35; 12.23, 34 (twice); 13.31. For detailed discussion of the Johannine Son of Man, see Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*; Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*; Burkett, *Son of the Man*; *idem*, *Son of Man Debate*; Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 337-73.

54. For the background of John's use of 'the Son of Man', see Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 222-47.

55. See A.J.B. Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), pp. 156-84. For a discussion on the Son of Man in the synoptic Gospels, see Nolland, *Luke*, II, pp. 468-74.

56. See Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, pp. 154-55.

57. Mk 13.26//Mt. 24.30//Lk. 21.27; Mk 14.62//Mt. 26.64; Mt. 24.44//Lk. 12.40; Mt. 10.23; 16.28; 25.31; Lk. 18.8.

58. M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979), p. 163; see T.W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn, 1935), pp. 227-29. Scholars disagree on the role of the Aramaic description which underlies the Son of Man title, see G. Vermes, 'The "Son of Man" Debate', *JSNT* 1 (1978), pp. 19-32; J. Fitzmyer, 'Another View of the "Son of Man" Debate', *JSNT* 4 (1979), pp. 58-68; W. Walker, 'The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments', *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 584-607; J.R. Donahue, 'Recent Studies on the Origin of "Son of Man" in the Gospel', *CBQ* 48 (1986), pp. 484-98; C.F.D. Moule, '"The Son of Man": Some of the Facts', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 277-79; T.B. Slater, 'One Like a Son of Man in First-Century CE Judaism', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 183-98.

tive in comparison with them. The Johannine Son of Man sayings lack strong apocalyptic trappings (except for Jn 1.51; 5.28-29), and the element of realized eschatology dominates. Only in John's Gospel does the Son of Man descend (cf. 3.13; 6.62; 1.51). In John's Gospel, 'Son of Man' is limited to the earthly career of Jesus, but 'Son of God' is used by John to describe Jesus' relationship with God, the Father, as discussed earlier.

After investigating Son of Man in John's Gospel, R. Rhea concludes that:

It is *highly likely* that the Evangelist has derived his use of the term [Son of Man] as a messianic title from a prophetic background and tradition ... It is *highly probable* that the term Son of Man was a somewhat obscure yet significant phrase which provided a means of referring to prophetic office. It served to indicate the divine presence which had made itself manifest to the human prophet.<sup>59</sup>

Rhea sees the Son of Man in John's Gospel as reflecting a prophetic figure with regard to the identity of Jesus. According to Rhea, it is *probable* that 'the Son of Man' saying in Jn 9.35 is related to Jesus' prophetic identity. The use of 'the Son of Man' in Jn 9.35 is of an idiosyncratic type and quite distinctive from the other Johannine Son of Man sayings. Rhea's overall argument is not very persuasive, however, because his study on the Johannine Son of Man sayings selectively focuses on only four cases (Jn 5.27; 6.62, 53; 9.35), not the whole body of evidence.

In contrast to Rhea, Moloney and Burkett have exhaustively examined the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in John's Gospel.<sup>60</sup> In his research on the Johannine Son of Man sayings, Moloney aims to show that the author of the Fourth Gospel had a specific theological point to make when he used the title 'the Son of Man'.<sup>61</sup> After surveying the history of the Johannine Son of Man research, Moloney examines each Son of Man saying occurring in the Fourth Gospel. He argues that the first Son of Man saying in Jn 1.51 has a special purpose, and plays an important role, both in its immediate context and in the Fourth Gospel as a whole.<sup>62</sup> He considers that Jn 1.51 shows 'the Son of Man's close and continual contact with heaven, hinting at his origin and goal, admirably introducing the reader to the Johannine Son of Man, the unique revealer'.<sup>63</sup> In Jn 3.13-14,

59. Rhea, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 70, italics are mine.

60. See Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*; Burkett, *Son of the Man*; cf. *idem*, *Son of Man Debate*.

61. For a brief summary of Moloney's study on the Johannine Son of Man, see F.J. Moloney, 'The Johannine Son of Man', *BTB* 6 (1976), pp. 177-89.

62. See Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 23-41.

63. Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 41.



Moloney sees that the Son of Man is closely related to Jesus as the unique revealer who is 'lifted up'.<sup>64</sup> In his study, Moloney continually emphasizes the 'lifting up' of the Son of Man upon the cross in John's Gospel (Jn 6.53; 8.28; 12.23, 32). He notes that 'the cross has been indicated throughout as the place where the Son of Man would be "lifted up" and "exalted"'.<sup>65</sup> For Moloney, the human Jesus expressed by the designation 'Son of Man', especially in his being lifted up on the cross, is the place, on earth, where people can see the revelation of God in the elevated Son of Man. He believes that all the Son of Man sayings in the Fourth Gospel point ultimately to the cross. The epithet 'Son of Man' refers solely to Jesus as a man on earth, and it does not itself have to do with either his pre-existence or his ascended state, though it characterizes him as having come from heaven. He notes that in John's Gospel 'there is a concentration on the human figure of Jesus in the use of the appellation "the Son of Man"'.<sup>66</sup> He claims that 'the Johannine Son of Man has always referred to the historical presence of Jesus'.<sup>67</sup> For Moloney, the Johannine Son of Man is not interchangeable with 'the Son' or 'the Son of God'.<sup>68</sup> After a thorough examination on the Johannine Son of Man sayings, Moloney concludes that 'the Johannine Son of Man is the human Jesus, the incarnate Logos; he has come to reveal God with a unique and ultimate authority and in acceptance or refusal of this revelation the world judges itself'.<sup>69</sup> This conclusion seems to be persuasive with respect to the revelation of God in Jesus expressed by 'the Son of Man' in John's Gospel. The Johannine Jesus is in the world to reveal God, and this can only be grasped when one understands his relationship with God, the Father.

Burkett investigates the origin, the meaning and the significance of the expression  $\delta \text{ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου}$  in John's Gospel.<sup>70</sup> He argues that the Johannine Jesus is not the Son of Man as previously thought, but the Son of *the* Man. He considers that the article  $\text{τοῦ}$  in the expression is not

64. See Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 42-67, 124-41.

65. Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 202.

66. Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 213; Moloney's claim is quite different from Higgins' consideration that the Johannine Son of Man is not totally related to earthly activity of the Son of Man; see Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, pp. 156-84; see also B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research* (London: SPCK, 1983), p. 155, who notes that 'the Son of Man sayings in John never occur in discussions of the humanness of Jesus'.

67. Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 215.

68. See Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, pp. 208-20.

69. Moloney, *Johannine Son of Man*, p. 220.

70. Burkett, *Son of the Man*.

generic but individualizing.<sup>71</sup> He discusses the Son of Man in Prov. 30.1-4 and Jn 3.13. He then attempts to show that the Son of Man is to be explained by a series of Old Testament backgrounds: Jacob's ladder from Gen. 28.12 (Jn 1.51),<sup>72</sup> the Suffering Servant of God from Isa. 6.1; 52.13 (Jn 3.14; 12.23, 32, 34; 13.31-32),<sup>73</sup> the Word of God from Isa. 55.1-3, 10-11 (Jn 6.27, 53, 62),<sup>74</sup> ἐγώ εἰμι from Isa. 41.4; 43.10, 13; 46.4; 48.12; 52.6 (Jn 8.28),<sup>75</sup> and the light of the world from Gen. 1.3 (Jn 9.35; 12.34-36; 3.13-21).<sup>76</sup> Burkett, however, does not consider the Son of *the* Man designation with reference to Dan. 7.13 or the apocalyptic tradition. After a thorough investigation of 'the Son of Man' in John's Gospel, Burkett concludes that (1) the Son of Man is 'Ithiel' ('God is with me'), the son of 'the Man' in Prov. 30.1-4; (2) the Son of the Man is the Son of God; (3) the Son of Man is identified with a variety of entities in the Old Testament.<sup>77</sup> Burkett's claim seems not to be persuasive. First, Burkett's understanding that the descent/ascent terminology associated with the Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel (Jn 1.51; 3.13; 6.62) is the key to the background and meaning of the expression seems to be reasonable, so he looks to Prov. 30.1-4.<sup>78</sup> However, Prov. 30.1-4 is used only for the background of Jn 3.13, but is not directly used in a discussion of the other Johannine Son of Man passages. Second, the claim that the Son of the Man is the Son of God is totally unacceptable. Burkett seems to follow Martyn's view, in some respects, that 'the titles Son of Man and Son of God have become interchangeable for John'.<sup>79</sup> If 'the Son of the Man' and 'the Son of God' are equivalent, then why use both? Why not simply use 'the Son of God' at all times? In John's Gospel, the Son of God is clear, but the Son of Man is cryptic and enigmatic, so they are not simply identical. Finally, Burkett's claim that God is frequently portrayed in the Old Testament as ascending from earth to heaven is not supported by the texts he cites,<sup>80</sup> nor does he offer any Old Testament text in which God is represented as first ascending in order to descend. In his study, Burkett offers a possibility that Jesus

71. See Burkett, *Son of the Man*, pp. 16-37.

72. Burkett, *Son of the Man*, pp. 112-19.

73. Burkett, *Son of the Man*, pp. 120-28.

74. Burkett, *Son of the Man*, pp. 129-41.

75. Burkett, *Son of the Man*, pp. 142-60.

76. Burkett, *Son of the Man*, pp. 161-68.

77. Burkett, *Son of the Man*, pp. 169-78.

78. See Burkett, *Son of the Man*, pp. 51-75.

79. Martyn, *History and Theology*, p. 193. Martyn's view has been severely criticized; see Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, p. 339, who says that 'this is a careless, throw-away opinion, quite untypical of Martyn's work as a whole...'.  
80. See Burkett, *Son of the Man*, p. 66 n. 1.

as the Son of Man is to be identified with an Old Testament figure, as in Burkett's use of Prov. 30.1-4. However, it is hard to claim any relationship between the Johannine Son of Man and prophet as an Old Testament figure in the Gospel.

In sum, it is hard to specify any features common to all the Johannine Son of Man sayings apart from the epithet itself. But at most the following aspects can be said in respect of the above deliberations. (1) The Son of Man in John's Gospel is utilized for reflecting Jesus' humanity, as a role of the unique revealer, in relation to the 'lifting up' of the Son of Man upon the cross. (2) The possibility that the Johannine Jesus as the Son of Man is identified with an Old Testament figure in conjunction with Prov. 30.1-4 shows that the Son of Man is a human figure rooted in an Old Testament figure. (3) The Johannine Son of Man, in Jn 9.35 in particular, is probably associated with Jesus' prophetic identity. The Son of Man sayings in John's Gospel play a very significant role for Jesus' identity in the narrative of the Gospel, but they are still a mystery, and thus need more comprehensive research.

### *Summary*

The relation between the Johannine Jesus as prophet and other christological designations (Logos, God, Son of God, Messiah, Coming One, Teacher, King and Son of Man) employed in the Fourth Gospel has been discussed. It has been found that some christological titles are closely related to 'prophet' in John's Gospel, but others are not, for example, Logos, Teacher and King. The following christological epithets are directly or indirectly associated with 'prophet' in John's Gospel. (1) God is not directly connected with the figure of Jesus as 'prophet', but the identity of the Johannine Jesus as the one who is sent by God is related to the figure of 'prophet' who is sent by God. (2) The appellation 'Son of God' used for describing the identity of Jesus is not directly associated with 'prophet', but the sending motif with reference to 'Son of God' in the Gospel reflects the figure of prophet. (3) The designations 'Messiah' and 'prophet' are clearly distinguished in the Gospel, but both designations are correlated to each other for identifying the expected eschatological figure. (4) The term 'the Coming One' is strongly associated with 'the prophet' expected to appear at the end time with reference to the prophet Elijah based on Mal. 3.1. (5) The expression 'Son of Man' is connected with the identity of Jesus as human figure, in which the epithet 'prophet' seems to be associated with Jesus' prophetic identity in the Gospel. In this respect, the title 'prophet' used for Jesus' identity in the Fourth Gospel seems to have a significant role in Johannine Christology: this will be investigated in the following section.

*The Significance of the Johannine Jesus  
as Prophet in Johannine Christology*

What is the significance of the Johannine Jesus as prophet with regard to Johannine Christology? There seems to be an important role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet with regard to Johannine Christology, as we shall see. Before arguing the significant role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet, first of all, Oscar Cullmann's view on 'Prophet Christology' with respect to New Testament Christology needs to be critically assessed, because he argues that the concept of 'Prophet Christology' is *inadequate* for a New Testament Christology.<sup>81</sup> Donald Guthrie agrees with Cullmann, and succinctly summarizes Cullmann's view on the disadvantages of the concept of the eschatological prophet in New Testament Christology.<sup>82</sup> Is Cullmann's view on Prophet Christology, followed by Guthrie, decisive and final? Probably not. Cullmann refers not only to the disadvantages of the prophetic concept, but also to its advantages for explaining the uniqueness of the person and work of Christ in view of the total witness of the early Christian faith. He notes that:

There are incontestable advantages. On the one hand, this concept takes into consideration the unique and unrepeatable character of the person and work of Jesus in so far as its application to Jesus treats the decisive if not the final appearance of the Prophet. On the other hand, it takes the human character of Jesus fully into account: the eschatological Prophet expected by Judaism appears on earth as a man. Moreover, concerning the content of the task to be fulfilled by the Prophet, this concept is quite adequate to express one side of the earthly work completed by Jesus. At least it does not contain anything which contradicts the nature and goal of the work of Jesus as it is presented in the Gospels. In this respect, the concept of the Prophet without doubt has advantages over the concept of the Messiah.<sup>83</sup>

81. See Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, pp. 44-50, who notes disadvantages of using the concept of Jesus as prophet as follows: (1) The prophet concept is inadequate because 'it emphasizes too strongly only one side of Christ's earthly work, his preaching activity' (p. 45); (2) The prophet idea does not offer 'a temporal interval between an earthly activity (which is itself eschatological) and a second coming of the Prophet' (p. 46); (3) The prophet concept is also difficult to apply to the *future, eschatological phase*, which the early Church expected as the consummation of the work of Jesus' (p. 47, italics in the original); (4) In the concept of prophet, there is no account of Christ as a pre-existent being (see esp. pp. 48-49). For these reasons, he claims that the concept of prophet plays no significant part in New Testament Christology.

82. See Guthrie, *New Testament Theology*, pp. 269-70.

83. Cullmann, *Christology of the New Testament*, pp. 43-44.

Cullmann apparently admits that the function of 'Prophet Christology' has numerous advantages for depicting Jesus' role as the Messiah. Moreover, he asserts on several occasions that the concept of the prophet best allows for the expectation of a second coming of Jesus to earth.<sup>84</sup> In this respect, the concept of 'Prophet Christology' cannot totally be ignored, even though it is inadequate to express a full New Testament Christology.<sup>85</sup> In particular, 'Prophet Christology' seems to have a significant role in John's Gospel, in which Jesus with respect to Johannine Christology is portrayed as prophet in line with the prophets of the Old Testament, as we shall see.

In John's Gospel, the picture of Jesus as prophet is of considerable importance with regard to Johannine Christology, although *Prophet Christology* is not the final goal of the Gospel with respect to Jesus' identity. It is quite clear that the idea of a coming of the eschatological prophet was strong in Jewish belief based on Deut. 18.15-18, which declares that the Lord will raise up a prophet like Moses. Moreover, in Acts 3.22 and 7.37, it is implied that Jesus is the coming prophet.<sup>86</sup> The Jewish expectation of the eschatological prophet is implicitly and explicitly expressed in Jn 1.21, 25; 6.14; 7.40, 52; 9.17,<sup>87</sup> in which the figure of Jesus as prophet is evidently depicted, as discussed in earlier chapters. Some significant roles of the Johannine Jesus as prophet with regard to Johannine Christology can be explained in terms of didactic and apologetic christological functions.

84. Cullmann's claim that a disadvantage of using the concept of 'prophet' in New Testament Christology is difficult to apply to the framework of Jesus' future work contradicts his own assertion that the concept of prophet has an incontestable advantage for a second coming of Jesus to earth (see pp. 44, 47-48).

85. It is not insignificant that all four Gospels contain evidence that Jesus was regarded as a prophet during his lifetime, although the four evangelists recognize that Jesus is greater than a prophet; see Hooker, *Signs of a Prophet*, who argues that 'Jesus must have appeared to his contemporaries to stand firmly in the Jewish prophetic tradition' (pp. 78-79), when his actions and words are considered. Recently many argue Jesus as prophet in terms of various aspects, although these studies are not directly related to John's Gospel; see Kaylor, *Jesus the Prophet*; Ehrman, *Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet*; N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996), pp. 146-97; Witherington III, *Jesus the Seer*.

86. On Messianic expectation in Jewish belief, see Oegema, *The Anointed and his People*; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*; Charlesworth et al. (eds.), *Qumran-Messianism*; Gray, *Prophetic Figures*.

87. Cf. Mt. 16.13-16; Mk 8.27-30; Lk. 4.24; 9.18-20; Acts 3.22; 7.37 also imply that Jesus is the coming prophet.

*Didactic Christological Role of the Johannine Jesus as Prophet*

What is the didactic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet with respect to Johannine Christology? The didactic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet can be explained in conjunction with an authentic understanding of Johannine Christology. The Johannine Jesus as prophet seems to offer a first and promising step on the road of Christology in John's Gospel towards a comprehensive perception of Johannine Christology. The authentic understanding of Johannine Christology means that the identity of Jesus is not only as a true human being, but also as the true God. Thus, John's Gospel portrays the figure of Jesus as prophet to provoke people to believe Jesus' genuine identity as the Son of God, the Messiah (Jn 20.30-31). The synoptic evangelists regard 'prophet' as an inadequate designation of Jesus, but John seems to suggest that the first stage in converting anyone to Jesus is to get him to recognize Jesus as prophet. J. Bligh thinks that 'this comparatively "low" title [prophet] may be a *necessary* stepping-stone to the "higher" ones—Messiah and Son of God'.<sup>88</sup> In John's Gospel, the epithet 'prophet' seems to be an indispensable springboard for recognizing Jesus' authentic identity, and perhaps plays an important didactic christological role with regard to a genuine understanding of Johannine Christology. For John, depicting Jesus as prophet in the Gospel would be more suitable for introducing who Jesus is in connection with the Jewish expectation of an eschatological prophet than to any other figures (Jn 1.19-28; 7.37-52).<sup>89</sup> It would be difficult to introduce Jesus as the Son of God, who comes from God, directly to the Jewish people at the time, because they already know the origin of Jesus, who is the son of Joseph (Jn 6.42; cf. 7.3-5, 52).

The didactic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet can clearly be found, for example, in the narrative of the Samaritan woman (Jn 4.4-42), the narrative of the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand (Jn 6.1-15) and the story of the man born blind (Jn 9.1-10.21), as has been discussed.<sup>90</sup> First, the Samaritan woman initially recognizes Jesus simply

88. J. Bligh, 'Four Studies in St John, I: The Man Born Blind', *HeyJ* 7 (1966), pp. 129-44 (142).

89. See de Jonge, 'Jewish Expectations', pp. 246-70; Teeple, *Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, pp. 2-11.

90. See E. Liebert, 'That You May Believe: The Fourth Gospel and Structural Developmental Theory', *BTB* 14 (1984), pp. 67-73, who argues for 'the Johannine concept of belief as an active, deepening process culminating in resurrection faith (p. 72)' in connection with the structural developmental process of the Gospel. It seems to be that developing belief should be explained by means of the didactic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet, as I will discuss; see also J. Painter, *John: Witness and Theologian* (London: SPCK, 1975), pp. 77-85.

as 'a Jew' (Jn 4.9), however, soon after she realizes that his behaviour is unusual for a Jew, because in Jewish custom no one asks for drinking water from a Samaritan woman (Jn 4.7).<sup>91</sup> The woman begins to ponder whether Jesus might be something more than just any Jew, so she calls him κύριε (Jn 4.11).<sup>92</sup> However, when Jesus shows his supernatural knowledge about the Samaritan woman's private sexual and marital life, she immediately declares Jesus to be 'prophet' (Jn 4.19). In the Samaritan traditions, the *Taheb* as the expected eschatological prophet is expected. If one shows supernatural knowledge, that one must be the *Taheb* in the Samaritan traditions. The issue of worship in the Samaritan woman's response in Jn 4.20 indicates that she potentially recognizes Jesus as the Samaritan eschatological prophet, the *Taheb*. After recognizing Jesus as prophet, the Samaritan woman could make a bridge to understand Jesus' authentic identity, the Son of God, the Messiah.<sup>93</sup> The Samaritan woman introduces Jesus as prophet (possibly as the *Taheb*) to the people of Sychar (Jn 4.28-29). After hearing about Jesus from the woman, the people of Sychar came out of the city to see Jesus. Many Samaritans from the city believed in Jesus because of the woman's testimony (Jn 4.39). Eventually, many people in Sychar, including the Samaritan woman, declare Jesus as 'the Saviour of the world'.<sup>94</sup> This indicates that the woman's perception of Jesus as prophet prepares for his further self-disclosure as Messiah in v. 25 and for the greater title, 'the Saviour of the world' (Jn 4.42). In this respect, it is quite clear that the Samaritan woman's perception of the identity of Jesus as 'prophet' becomes a stepping-stone for a full understanding of Jesus as the Son of God, the Messiah. The didactic christological role of Jesus as prophet is obviously observed in connection with the Samaritan woman's understanding of Jesus' identity.

Second, in the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand (Jn 6.1-15), the crowd does not at first clearly recognize who Jesus is, but after eating the barley loaves and fish the crowd immediately and explicitly recognizes Jesus as 'the prophet'. The crowd clearly declares Jesus to be 'the prophet who is to come into the world' (Jn 6.14). The people obviously understand the identity of Jesus as 'the prophet' with respect to the miracle performed by him. The miraculous feeding of the five thousand, therefore,

91. See Maccini, *Her Testimony Is True*, pp. 119-20.

92. See Maccini, *Her Testimony Is True*, p. 122.

93. See M.M. Pazdan, 'Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Models of Discipleship', *BTB* 17 (1987), pp. 145-48.

94. Maccini, *Her Testimony Is True*, p. 128, considers the use of 'the Saviour of the world' as messianic title in Johannine thought. See also Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 136-37.

clearly becomes a trigger to indicate Jesus' identity as the Mosaic eschatological prophet, who was expected by the people in the time of Jesus, in conjunction with Deut. 18.15-18 and Elisha's feeding miracle in 2 Kgs 4.42-44.<sup>95</sup> Once recognizing Jesus as prophet, the crowd could go a further step to understand Jesus' identity more appropriately. The crowd attempts to make Jesus their king by force. But Jesus knows their plan, so he withdraws to the mountain by himself (Jn 6.15). The crowd's understanding of Jesus' identity as 'the prophet' in the narrative of the feeding of the five thousand seems to be continued in the debate introduced in Jn 7.37-52.<sup>96</sup> In Jn 7.40, the use of 'the prophet' in connection with Jesus' identity shows that the crowds are already in the right position to understand who Jesus is, and can go a step further towards perceiving Jesus' identity properly, as the Son of God, the Messiah. Some people affirm that Jesus is 'the prophet', but others understand him as 'the Messiah' (Jn 7.41). This is a clear indication that recognizing Jesus as 'the prophet' leads people to understand him more precisely as the Messiah, although we are not told where the idea of the Messiah with regard to Jesus' identity comes from and what kind of messianic figure they have in mind.<sup>97</sup> At least it can be said that Jesus' prophet identity encourages the crowds to consider Jesus' identity more accurately. The debate whether Jesus is the prophet or the Messiah implicitly indicates that Jesus' prophetic identity offers a springboard for trying to understand Jesus' genuine identity, as the Son of God, the Messiah.<sup>98</sup>

Finally, in the story of the man born blind (Jn 9.1-10.21), there is also an interesting progression of the former blind man's initial confession of Jesus, from 'man' (Jn 9.11) to 'prophet' (Jn 9.17) to 'Messiah' (Jn 9.22) to

95. See Trudinger, 'Cleansing of the Temple', pp. 329-30.

96. See Beasley-Murray, *John*, pp. 113-17; Carson, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 267-68, 304-306; Brodie, *Gospel according to John*, pp. 299-300.

97. The use of the titles 'the prophet' and 'the Messiah' by the crowds seems to show that the Jewish concepts of a messianic figure were diverse and consisted of a large complex of ideas; see Oegema, *The Anointed and his People*, pp. 21-27.

98. It is true that there is uncertainty about how people would take the step: Jesus is the prophet, and therefore the Son of God, the Messiah. In particular, Jn 7.41 seems to set 'the prophet' and 'the Messiah' over against each other, rather than supporting the possibility of making the step from the prophet to the Son of God, the Messiah. However, the two terms 'prophet' and 'Messiah' cannot be regarded as completely distinct from each other, as I discussed earlier, although the terms are clearly distinguished in Jn 7.40-41. If the two terms are interchangeable, 'the Messiah' in Jn 7.41 can mean the expected messianic prophet, and therefore, the crowd show that they have a different branch of the expected eschatological figure, prophet-like-Messiah, in their mind; see de Jonge, 'Jewish Expectations', pp. 255-57.



‘Son of Man’ (Jn 9.35) to ‘Lord’ (Jn 9.38).<sup>99</sup> John seems to regard the lower steps as indispensable steps on the way to the fuller confession of Jesus. In particular, the designation ‘prophet’ in connection with Jesus’ identity seems to lead the man born blind to a further step to understand Jesus as the Messiah (cf. Jn 9.22). The healed man’s understanding of Jesus’ identity as prophet is solely based on his healing miracle. From the starting point of the understanding of Jesus as prophet, the healed man can perceive Jesus’ identity more precisely. The healed man probably understood Jesus as the expected Jewish prophet with regard to his Jewish background, as has been discussed. On the ground of the healed man’s understanding of Jesus as prophet, the man can perceive Jesus’ identity as more than that of a prophet, the prophet *par excellence*, as the expected Jewish eschatological prophet, the Messiah. In this respect, the didactic christological function of Jesus as prophet can obviously be seen in the story of the man born blind.<sup>100</sup>

Prophet Christology in John’s Gospel, therefore, seems to have served as an appeal to people within the Johannine community, the Jewish community, the Samaritan community and possibly the Greek community (Jn 12.20-22), persuading them to come to faith in Jesus, who is not a prophet, but the prophet, *par excellence*, expected at the end time, and the Son of God, the Messiah, with reference to Jn 20.31. Prophet Christology in John’s Gospel, in particular, seems to be used as a vehicle of transition for Jewish Christians, who probably do not belong to the Johannine community and who believe in Jesus as prophet, but not as the Son of God, for encouraging them to believe in Jesus as the Son of God, the Messiah. In this respect, the epithet ‘prophet’ is an indispensable stepping-stone for recognizing Jesus’ authentic identity, and plays a significant didactic christological role in connection with a genuine understanding of Johannine Christology.

#### *Apologetic Christological Role of the Johannine Jesus as Prophet*

What is the apologetic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet? In order to answer this question, the issue whether John’s Gospel has anti-docetic elements should briefly be discussed first, because the apologetic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet seems to be closely

99. See Beck, ‘Narrative Function’ p. 152, who also comments that ‘the blind man’s growing understanding of Jesus’ identity is expressed through the naming progression: man called Jesus (v. 9), prophet (v. 17), man from God (v. 33), Lord (v. 38)’; Liebert, ‘That You May Believe’, pp. 67-73; Painter, *John*, pp. 77-85.

100. Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 140, who also notes ‘the progressive enlightenment’ as an indication of the didactic christological role of Jesus as prophet with regard to the faith of the Samaritan woman and the man born blind.

related to this matter. Are there antidocetic elements in the Fourth Gospel? First of all, *Docetism* should be defined briefly in order to answer the question. It is commonly known that Docetism was a tendency of the early Church, rather than a formulated and unified doctrine, which considered the humanity and sufferings of the earthly Christ as visible rather than real.<sup>101</sup>

A tendency toward Docetism grounded in the Fourth Gospel's portrayal of Jesus as the descending and ascending revealer may have been manifested by the dissidents attacked for 'denying that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh' (1 Jn 4.2; 2 Jn 7).<sup>102</sup> The term 'naïve docetism' in connection with John's Gospel was made popular by E. Käsemann.<sup>103</sup> In his book, Käsemann notes that:

One can hardly fail to recognize the danger of his christology of glory, namely, the danger of docetism. It is present in a still naïve, unreflected form and it has not yet been recognized by the Evangelist or his community.<sup>104</sup>

It is, however, not appropriate to call Johannine Christology either 'docetic' or 'naïvely docetic' if those terms are understood as characterizing a Jesus who is not truly part of this world. Rather, John's Gospel can be understood as having an 'antidocetic' character with reference to Jn 1.14 which insists on the reality of Jesus' humanity and flesh, although 'antidocetic' does not sum up adequately the Gospel's thrust. It is true that in John's Gospel Jesus is viewed as an exalted figure who is in control of the course of events, playing out his soteriological role in his own way, in his own time. He is omniscient and authoritative. He is, without doubt, a divine figure. However, the opposing view, which emphasizes the humanity

101. Evidence for the existence of Docetism is to be found in the New Testament (1 Jn 4.1-3; 2 Jn 7; cf. Col. 2.8-10), but it reached its zenith in the next generation, especially among the Gnostics. Docetic doctrines were vigorously attacked by Ignatius and all the leading anti-Gnostic writers. Among those especially charged with Docetism was Cerinthus. Sarapion, Bishop of Antioch (190-203), who was the first to use the name 'Docetists' (Δοκηταί), and some others wrote of them as a distinct body. Polycarp also attacks a group holding such a view; see P. Perkins, 'Docetism', in E. Ferguson (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* (New York: Garland, 2nd edn, 1999), pp. 341-42; F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn, 1997), pp. 313-14, 493; Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology*, pp. 63-70.

102. For a brief comment on Docetism and antidocetism in the Fourth Gospel, see M.M. Thompson, *The Humanity of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), pp. 121-22.

103. Käsemann, *Testament of Jesus*, p. 70.

104. Käsemann, *Testament of Jesus*, p. 26.

of Jesus in the Gospel, has been traditionally upheld by Rudolf Bultmann. Bultmann's focus is on the Word made flesh:

Jesus is the Revealer who appears not as man-in-general, i.e. not simply as a bearer of human nature, but as a definite human being in history: Jesus of Nazareth. His humanity is genuine humanity.<sup>105</sup>

Moreover, Jesus is a human being 'in whom nothing unusual is perceptible except his bold assertion that in him God encounters men'.<sup>106</sup> Bultmann and Käsemann represent the opposite ends of the christological spectrum with many scholars falling somewhere between these two points.<sup>107</sup>

Two scholars who have argued against the prevailing view of the so-called high-Christology in recent times are M.M. Thompson and M. Davies.<sup>108</sup> Thompson discusses the humanity of Jesus in detail, arguing that the Fourth Gospel clearly sees Jesus as fully human, but that this does not mean that he was 'nothing but a man'. Thompson does not see the humanity and divinity of Jesus as mutually exclusive options, concluding that:

Although Jesus shares his humanity in common with all other human beings, that humanity does not finally limit or define him; nevertheless, his uniqueness or unlikeness does not efface his humanity. It is that unlikeness which is disconcerting.<sup>109</sup>

Davies argues against both ancient and modern docetic and subordinationist views of the Johannine Jesus. Jesus is not 'God merely appearing to be a man', but 'a man wholly dedicated to the mission God sent him to fulfil'.<sup>110</sup> Moreover, as a human being Jesus is made of flesh, is vulnerable and is mortal.<sup>111</sup> In this respect, it is a misreading of the Fourth Gospel to label it 'docetic' or 'naïvely docetic'. Rather, John's Gospel seems to be antidocetic against a gnostic or docetic tendency, in which Jesus is clearly depicted as human being.

In his *Habilitation*, Udo Schnelle argues for an antidocetic Christology in John's Gospel.<sup>112</sup> Schnelle attempts to prove that the Gospel of John is

105. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (2 vols.; trans. K. Grobel; London: SCM Press, 1983), II, p. 41.

106. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, II, p. 50.

107. For a brief criticism of Käsemann's approach, see Thompson, *Humanity of Jesus*, pp. 1-6.

108. Thompson, *Humanity of Jesus*; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*; cf. J.F. O'Grady, 'The Human Jesus in the Fourth Gospel', *BTB* 14 (1984), pp. 63-66.

109. Thompson, *Humanity of Jesus*, p. 128.

110. Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, p. 43, see also pp. 197-208.

111. Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, p. 16.

112. Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology*.

a response to a docetic heresy within the Johannine community. For his argument, Schnelle uses the Johannine miracle stories for probing for an antidocetic tendency of the Gospel. According to him, the miracle stories in John's Gospel originated not from an alleged 'signs source', but from individual traditions of the Johannine community. He argues that these miracle stories do not reflect a 'gnostic' or 'docetic' tendency, but an antidocetic stance.<sup>113</sup> He concludes that 'the miracles in the Gospel of John have an antidocetic function... Consequently, from the point of view of the evangelist, they [the miracles] are to be understood as antidocetic'.<sup>114</sup> Schnelle's claim seems to be reasonable and persuasive, although John's Gospel as a whole does not always highlight antidocetic elements.

It is true that John's Gospel does not emphasize Jesus' humanity only. John has to defend his message against people for whom that humanity is so obvious that they could not believe in Jesus' claim to be the Son of God. Only a few passages in John's Gospel, like 1.14-18, are definitely antidocetic, as is the case in the first and the second epistle of John. The whole Gospel of John, however, seems to be the result of an antidocetic reinterpretation of the Gospel against another party in the Johannine community that interpreted this document in a docetic and gnostic way.<sup>115</sup>

It can be supposed that at some stage Johannine Christology was characterized by a great emphasis on the glory of Jesus the Son of God in connection with Logos Christology based on Jn 1.1-18 and the theme of the glory of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel as a whole.<sup>116</sup> This emphasis would lead to a denial of the humanity and of the crucifixion of Jesus. Others may have felt compelled to develop an explicitly antidocetic Christology. If the Johannine community had a christological crisis, the calamity would be related to Docetism that denied the reality of the humanity of Jesus. If this is a correct conjecture, Prophet Christology with an antidocetic role in Johannine Christology seems to be necessary in connection with a tendency of Docetism in its contemporary hazardous situation.

113. See Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology*, pp. 74-175.

114. Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology*, p. 175.

115. See H. Thyen, 'Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium', *TRu* 44 (1979), pp. 97-134; H.A. Fischel, 'Jewish Gnosticism in the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 157-74; P. Perkins, 'Gnostic Christologies and the New Testament', *CBQ* 43 (1981), pp. 590-606.

116. See Evans, *Word and Glory*, pp. 184-86; Schnackenburg, 'Strukturanalyse von Joh 17'; G.B. Caird, 'The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics', *NTS* 15 (1969), pp. 265-77; M. Pamment, 'The Meaning of *doxa* in the Fourth Gospel', *ZNW* 74 (1983), pp. 12-16.

What, then, is the apologetic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet? Recently, in his doctoral thesis, J.F. McGrath argues for John's Christology as apologetic.<sup>117</sup> He argues that 'the evangelist seeks to defend and legitimate the Christian view of Jesus as the one to whom God has given authority as his agent and viceroy, who sits at God's right hand and even bears God's own name'.<sup>118</sup> In his thesis, McGrath asserts that the author of John's Gospel is using and adapting parts of the Christian tradition to convince his readers to believe, or continue to believe, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. He argues that the motif of misunderstanding that all scholars have found to be common in the Fourth Gospel may have had an apologetic purpose, reflecting an aspect of the relationship of Johannine Christians and the synagogue at the time of the composition of the book.<sup>119</sup> McGrath concludes that the Fourth evangelist creatively adapted and developed aspects of the traditions which he inherited in order to defend his community's belief in Jesus as the supreme revealer and to respond to objections raised by Jewish opponents.<sup>120</sup>

The apologetic role of John's Christology argued by McGrath is similar to the apologetic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet. However, the specific apologetic intent is quite different from that promoted by McGrath. The role of Prophet Christology as apologetic in John's Gospel seems to contribute to offering a proper balance between *high-Christology* and *low-Christology* in Johannine Christology.<sup>121</sup> Since the high-Christology was considered as the predominant view in the Johannine Christology, the low-Christology has been downplayed as a result.<sup>122</sup> Thus, there seems to be christological tension between the high-

117. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*.

118. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, p. 145.

119. See McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, pp. 145-47.

120. McGrath, *John's Apologetic Christology*, p. 230.

121. For the terminology of *high-Christology* and *low-Christology*, I employ Brown's definition; see R.E. Brown, *An Introduction to New Testament Christology* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994), pp. 3-5. The term high-Christology is used for covering 'the evaluation of Jesus in terms that include an aspect of divinity', and low-Christology for covering 'the evaluation of him in terms that do not necessarily include divinity' (p. 4, italics in the original).

122. See R. Scroggs, *Christology in Paul and John* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), p. 63, who notes that: 'High Christology! Jesus Christ is completely divine, is God. This is the judgement universally held of the thought of the Gospel'; Cassidy, *John's Gospel in New Perspective*, p. 29, who writes that 'it is hardly an exaggeration to say that the entire Gospel of John is permeated with the sovereignty of Jesus. Jesus possesses sovereign standing from the first moment that he is present within John's Gospel ... [this] concept of sovereignty ... is closely related to the widely recognized

Christology and the low-Christology in John's Gospel: in other words, there is a tension between Jesus' divine character and his human character.<sup>123</sup> O'Grady notes that John and his community struggled with the difficult aspect of binding together the humanity and divinity of Jesus.<sup>124</sup> In this regard, the apologetic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet seems to have been given to the Johannine community to solve the difficulty of understanding the humanity and the divinity of Jesus. By introducing Jesus as prophet, Johannine Christians probably did not fall into the erroneous impression that the divinity of Jesus obscured his humanity. O'Grady comments that:

The Fourth Gospel has long been seen as the one that emphasizes the divinity of Jesus. The author also carefully preserves for us the Christian belief that Jesus is also very human ... the Johannine community preserved a particular sensitivity to the divinity of Jesus but also ... they did not fall into the mistaken notion that the divinity eclipsed the humanity. With careful progression, the author led us from humanity to divinity without losing anything in the process.<sup>125</sup>

In John's Gospel, not only the high-Christology is needed, but also the Prophet Christology as the so-called low-Christology, and it is still needed today in a time when (mostly unconscious) docetic Christology is rampant. In this respect, the probable apologetic function of the Johannine Jesus as prophet contributes to providing a proper balance between the high-Christology and the low-Christology, both of which John is deeply committed to.<sup>126</sup>

concept of John's Christology'; H. Windisch, 'John's Narrative Style', in M.W.G. Stibbe (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspectives* (NTTS, 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993), pp. 25-64, who sees the Johannine Jesus as 'the new Christ-type, detached from the earth and from history ... a divine Christ from heaven'.

123. Anderson, *Christology of the Fourth Gospel*, pp. 4-15, who has emphasized John's christological tensions which modern readers perceive in Johannine thought may be either *internal* or *external* to John. He thinks that the tensions in the literary work may represent either tensions in his own thought, or tensions between unharmonized elements of different literary strata.

124. See O'Grady, 'Human Jesus', p. 64.

125. O'Grady, 'Human Jesus', p. 66.

126. It should be noted that in John's Gospel, the humanity of Jesus is depicted by not only the figure of prophet, but also his human characterization, for example, the expression of his flesh which denotes Jesus' human existence in this world (Jn 1.14, 18), his weariness at Jacob's well (Jn 4.6), his weeping (Jn 11.35), and so on; see Thompson, *Humanity of Jesus*, pp. 117-28.

*Conclusions*

In this chapter, the christological significance of Jesus as prophet has been explored with regard to Johannine Christology. First, the various christological appellations employed in John's Gospel have been discussed in connection with the christological designation 'prophet'. In John's Gospel, the various christological titles reflect either Jesus' humanity or his divine character in some degree, although few designations (notoriously the title 'Son of Man') do not clearly indicate whether they point to Jesus' human character or his divinity. In the Fourth Gospel, the epithets 'the Logos', 'God' and 'Son of God' imply Jesus' divinity to some extent. The intimate relationship between 'the Logos' and God is clearly expressed in the Johannine prologue. The expression 'Son of God' is clearly used for describing the identity of Jesus: this designation reflects his relationship to God as Father. These christological appellations are not directly connected with the title 'prophet'. On the other hand, some Johannine christological designations, for example, 'Messiah', 'Coming One', 'teacher', 'prophet' and 'king' are connected with Jesus' humanity. The designations 'Messiah', 'Coming One' and 'prophet' are clearly distinguished in John's Gospel, but they reflect the eschatological figure expected to appear at the end time with reference to Elijah based on Mal. 3.1 and 'the Prophet' promised in Deut. 18.15-18. The epithets 'teacher' and 'king' implicitly show Jesus' humanity. The various christological designations are employed in John's Gospel for characterizing Jesus in respect of Johannine Christology.

Second, the significance of the Johannine Jesus as prophet has been contemplated with respect to Johannine Christology. In John's Gospel, Jesus as prophet has an important christological role with regard to Johannine Christology. (1) The Johannine Jesus as prophet has a didactic christological role in the Gospel concerned to win people, who do not believe in Jesus, or who believe in Jesus as prophet, but not as the Son of God, the Messiah, within the Johannine community, the Jewish community, the Samaritan community and possibly the Greek community (Jn 12.20-22), persuading them to come to faith in Jesus, as the Son of God, the Messiah. The didactic christological role of Jesus as prophet has been found in the narrative of the Samaritan woman, the miracle story of the feeding of the five thousand and the narrative of the man born blind. (2) Jesus as prophet in John's Gospel has an apologetic christological role in Johannine Christology. The apologetic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet contributes to providing a proper balance between the high-Christology and the low-Christology in Johannine Christology. The Johannine Jesus has not only human integrity, but also a divine character.

A prophet is a human being, but more especially is an agent for God's work. In this respect, it can be claimed that the Johannine Jesus as prophet, at least, has two significant roles in Johannine Christology: the didactic christological role and the apologetic christological role.



## CONCLUSION

The goal of this study has been to identify the extent to which the Johannine Jesus is portrayed as prophet in John's Gospel as a whole, and to comprehend the reference to the term προφήτης (prophet) used in the Gospel with regard to the identity of the Johannine Jesus. For this study, the basic method identified as *historical narrative analysis* has been employed. By exploring relevant features of the Gospel with the prophetic colouring in mind, I have sought to offer a cumulative argument for identifying the prophetic category as much more persuasive and important in the Fourth Gospel than has previously been appreciated.

In this final chapter, the conclusions that have been offered at the end of each chapter are summarized here to indicate briefly the results of this research. Chapter 2 offered preliminary considerations for this study: the context of present study was set; a brief historical survey of research on the Johannine Jesus as prophet was offered; and methodological issues were discussed. Chapter 3 looked at the significance of the term 'prophet' and of prophetic figures in the Old Testament and some of the literature of the late Second Temple period as background for exploring the Johannine Jesus as prophet.

Chapters 4, 5 and 6 explored prophetic features of Jesus' ministry. Chapter 4 considered Jesus' first miracle—water into wine (Jn 2.1-11), his healing of the royal official's son (Jn 4.46-54), his healing of the paralytic (Jn 5.1-47), his raising of the dead, Lazarus (Jn 11.1-44) and his actions in the Temple (Jn 2.13-25). The picture of the Johannine Jesus painted by his extraordinary actions and the Temple incident all involve the giving of a prophetic colouring to the portrayal of Jesus. The colouring remains muted, but is quite sufficient to offer a credible springboard for considering more explicit marks of Jesus' identity as prophet in John's Gospel. Chapter 5 investigated Jesus' words in search of links with the prophetic category. In particular, Jesus' prayer in John 17, his predictions and his role as spokesman for God were explored. Jesus' prayer in John 17 is

identified as prophetic intercession. Jesus' ability to predict future events obviously demonstrates his comparability with the Old Testament prophets. Jesus' role as spokesman for God is a significant indication for his prophetic character. Chapter 6 considered Jesus' self-awareness in respect of the proverbial saying in Jn 4.44, the sending formula, Jesus' self-consciousness of his coming violent death and the double Amen formula. The aphorism in Jn 4.44 as a Johannine comment indicates what John clearly thinks of as Jesus' self-awareness as prophet. The double Amen formula used by Jesus in John's Gospel, similar to the speech formula of the prophets in the Old Testament, implicitly reveals his self-awareness as prophet. Jesus' self-consciousness of his coming death demonstrates his self-awareness as prophet in respect of the rejected-prophet tradition. It should be noted that some of the features explored point at one and the same time to Jesus' prophetic identity and to his transcending of this identity.

Only in Jn 4.44 thus far has the word *προφήτης* been found in connection with Jesus. In Chapters 7 and 8, I examined the other uses of prophet language in connection with Jesus. Chapter 7 examined Jesus' prophetic identity with reference to the use of *προφήτης*. The Johannine Jesus is initially depicted as *the expected Samaritan eschatological prophet* in Jn 4.4-42, and he is also primarily described as *the expected Jewish eschatological prophet* in Jn 9.1-10.21. Chapter 8 also investigated the figure of Jesus as the expected eschatological prophet in connection with the use of *ὁ προφήτης*. John the Baptist as the witness for Jesus implicitly introduces the Johannine Jesus to be *the expected deuteronomic eschatological prophet* in Jn 1.19-28. The Johannine Jesus is clearly indicated to be *the expected Mosaic eschatological prophet* in Jn 6.1-15. During the feast of Tabernacles, Jesus is depicted as *the expected messianic eschatological prophet* in Jn 7.37-52.

Chapters 9 and 10 considered the role of 'prophet' in characterization and the christological significance of the prophet category in relation to Jesus. Chapter 9 introduced the theory of characterization, and examined the role of 'prophet' in respect of characterizing the figure of the Johannine Jesus. The Johannine Jesus has been characterized as 'prophet' in order to offer Jesus as a credible and honourable figure, and to encourage people (including readers of John's Gospel) to travel further until they are ready to believe in the genuine identity of Jesus as the Son of God, the Messiah. Chapter 10 considered the christological significance of Jesus as prophet. The various christological titles used in the Fourth Gospel have been discussed in connection with 'prophet', and it has been found that the various christological designations reflect either Jesus' human character or his divinity in some aspects. Both didactic and apologetic christological roles for the Johannine presentation of Jesus as prophet have been discovered.

The didactic christological role of the Johannine Jesus as prophet offers a springboard for recognizing the genuine identity of Jesus as the Son of God, the Messiah. On the other hand, the apologetic christological function of the Johannine Jesus as prophet contributes to providing a proper balance between the high-Christology and the low-Christology in Johannine Christology.

In connection with this research, the question about the role of Prophet Christology in New Testament Christology as a whole could be a matter for future research. In some respect, Prophet Christology seems to be of considerable importance in New Testament Christology, as briefly indicated with respect to Johannine Christology. Prophet Christology, however, seems constantly ignored in the discussion of New Testament Christology, since Cullmann and Guthrie regarded it as inadequate. In this regard, a more comprehensive study regarding Prophet Christology would be required in order to demonstrate its overall significance in New Testament Christology as a whole.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Texts and Translations*

- Aland, K., B. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini and B.M. Metzger (eds.), *Novum Testamentum graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 27th edn, 1993).
- Aland, K. (ed.), *Synopsis quattuor evangeliorum: Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis edidit* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 13th edn, 1985).
- Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985).
- Danby, H. (trans.), *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933).
- Dio Chrysostom, *Discourses* (trans. J.W. Cohoon and H.L. Crosby; LCL; 5 vols.; London: W. Heinemann, 1932–51).
- Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica stuttgartensia* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1983).
- Epictetus, *Dissertations* (trans. W.A. Oldfather; LCL; 2 vols.; London: W. Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966–67).
- Epstein, I. (ed.), *Hebrew–English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud* (trans. M. Simon; 30 vols.; London: Soncino Press, 1960–90).
- Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* (trans. K. Lake and J.E.L. Oulton; LCL; 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1926–32).
- Grenfell, B.P., A.S. Hunt *et al.* (eds. and trans.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, I (51 vols.; London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1898–).
- Guillaumont, A. *et al.* (eds. and trans.), *The Gospel according to Thomas: Coptic Text Established and Translated* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959).
- Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* (trans. A. Roberts, J. Donaldson in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, I; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953).
- Josephus, *Works* (trans. H.St.J. Thackeray and R. Marcus; LCL; 10 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–65).
- Kohlenberger III, J.R. (ed.), *The Parallel Apocrypha* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).
- Lake, K. (trans.), *The Apostolic Fathers: I Clement, II Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache, Barnabas*, I (LCL; 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1912).
- Lohse, E. (ed. and trans.), *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1964).

- Macdonald, J. (ed. and trans.), *Memar Marqah: The Teaching of Marqah* (2 vols.; BZAW, 84; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1963).
- Marcus, R. (ed. and trans.), *Philo Supplement* (LCL; 2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1953).
- Martinez, F.G., and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds. and trans.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pbk edn, 2000).
- Neusner, J. (trans.), *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).
- Neusner, J. (eds. and trans.), *The Tosefta* (6 vols.; New York: Ktav, 1977–86).
- Nielsen, J.T., *Irenaeus of Lyons versus Contemporary Gnosticism: A Selection from Books I and II of Adversus Haereses* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977).
- Penella, R.J., *The Letters of Apollonius of Tyana: A Critical Text with Prolegomena, Translation and Commentary* (Mnemosyne Supplementa, 56; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979).
- Philo, *Complete Works* (trans. F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker; LCL; 10 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929–62).
- Rahlfs, A. (ed.), *Septuaginta* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1935, 1979).
- Schneemelcher, W., and R. McL. Wilson (eds.), *New Testament Apocrypha* (trans. R. McL. Wilson; 2 vols.; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2nd edn, 1991).

### Reference Works

- Baldick, C., *Concise Dictionary of Literary Terms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Balz, H., and G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–93 [1978–80]).
- Bauer, W., F.W. Danker *et al.*, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 3rd edn, 2000).
- Belle, G. van, *Johannine Bibliography 1966–1985: A Cumulative Bibliography on the Fourth Gospel* (Collectanea biblica et religiosa antiqua, 1; Brussel: Koninklijke Academie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België; BETL, 82; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 1988).
- Blass, F., and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (trans. and ed., R.W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).
- Borgen, P., K. Fuglseth and R. Skarsten (eds.), *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria* (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- Botterweck, G.J., H. Ringgren *et al.* (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (trans. J.T. Willis, G.W. Bromiley *et al.*; 14 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–2002).
- Brown, C. (ed.), *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology* (4 vols.; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1986).

- Brown, F., S.R. Driver *et al.*, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907).
- Buttrick, G.A. *et al.* (eds.), *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (4 vols.; New York: Abingdon Press, 1962).
- Carson, D.A., R.T. France and J.A. Motyer (eds.), *New Bible Commentary* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 4th edn, 1994).
- Charlesworth, J.H., L.G. Hickerson, S.R. Starbuck, L.T. Stuckenbruck and R.E. Whitaker *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991).
- Coggins, R.J., and J.L. Houlden (eds.), *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London: SCM Press, 1990).
- Cross, F.L., and E.A. Livingstone (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn, 1997).
- Even-Shoshan, A. (ed.), *A New Concordance of the Bible: Thesaurus of the Language of the Bible. Hebrew and Aramaic Roots, Words, Proper Names Phrases and Synonyms* (Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sefer, 1997).
- Ferguson, E. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity* (New York: Garland, 2nd edn, 1999).
- Freedman, D.N. (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992).
- Green, J.B., I.H. Marshall and S. McKnight (eds.), *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (Leicester: Intervarsity Press, 1992).
- Harris, R.L., G.L. Archer and B. Waltke (eds.), *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament* (2 vols.; Chicago: Moody Press, 1980).
- Jenni, E., and C. Westermann (eds.), *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (trans. M.E. Biddle; 3 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997).
- Kittel, G., and G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (trans. G.W. Bromiley; 10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76).
- Kuhn, K., *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960).
- Liddell, H.G., and Scott, R., *A Greek–English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 9th edn, 1940).
- Louw, J.P., and E.A. Nida, *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (2 vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 2nd edn, 1989).
- Mills, W.E., *The Gospel of John* (Bibliographies for Biblical Research, New Testament Series, 4; Lampeter: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995).
- Morgenthaler, R., *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1958).
- Rengstorff, K.H., *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus* (4 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973–83).
- Roth, C. (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (16 vols.; Jerusalem: Keter, 1972).
- Ryken, L., J.C. Wilhoit and T. Longman (eds.), *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1998).
- Strack, H.L., and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (4 vols.; München: C.H. Beck, 1922–28).
- VanGemenen, W.A. (ed.), *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (5 vols.; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997 [1996]).

Werblowsky, R.J.Z., and G. Wigoder (eds.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University, 1997).

### General Works

- Abbott, E.A., *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Fourth Gospel with Those of the Three* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1905).  
 —*Johannine Grammar* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1906).  
 Agourides, S., 'The "High Priestly Prayer" of Jesus', *SE* 4 (1968), pp. 137-45.  
 Aland, K., and B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (trans. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2nd edn, 1989).  
 Alexander, L., 'Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 71-111.  
 Alison, J., 'The Man Blind from Birth and the Subversion of Sin: Some Questions about Fundamental Morals', *T&S* 7 (1997), pp. 83-102.  
 Allen, L.C., *Ezekiel 1–19* (WBC; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1994).  
 Allison, D.C., "'Elijah Must Come First'", *JBL* 103 (1984), pp. 256-58.  
 —*The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993).  
 —*Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press: 1998).  
 Alter, R., *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (London: George Allen & Unwin: 1981).  
 Alter, R., and F. Kermode (eds.), *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1987).  
 Amaru, B.H., 'The Killing of the Prophets: Unravelling a Midrash', *HUCA* 54 (1983), pp. 153-80.  
 Andersen, Ø., 'Oral Tradition', in Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel*, pp. 17-58.  
 Anderson, B.W., and W. Harrelson (eds.), *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (London: SCM Press, 1962).  
 Anderson, P.N., *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996).  
 Anderson, R.T., 'Samaritans', *ABD*, V, pp. 940-47.  
 —'Samaritan Pentateuch: General Account', in Crown (ed.), *Samaritans*, pp. 390-96.  
 Annen, F., 'θαύμαζω', *EDNT*, II, pp. 134-35.  
 Appold, M.L., *The Oneness Motif in the Fourth Gospel: Motif Analysis and Exegetical Probe into the Theology of John* (WUNT, 2.1; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1976).  
 Ariel, D., 'A Survey of Coin Finds in Jerusalem', *Liber annuus studii biblici franciscani* 32 (1982), pp. 273-326.  
 Ashton, J., *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).  
 —*Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).  
 —'John and the Johannine Literature: The Woman at the Well', in Barton (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion*, pp. 259-75.  
 Ashton, J. (ed.), *The Interpretation of John* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).  
 Asiedu-Pepurah, M., *Johannine Sabbath Conflicts as Juridical Controversy: An Exegetical Study of John 5 and 9:1–10:21* (WUNT, 2.132; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2001).

- Aune, D.E., 'The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 419-21.  
 — *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).  
 — *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (Library of Early Christianity, 8; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987).  
 Baarda, T., "'Siloam' in John 5,2? Ephraem's Commentary on the Diatessaron", *ETL* 76 (2000), pp. 136-48.  
 Bacon, B.W., *The Gospel of the Hellenists* (ed. C.H. Kraeling; New York: Henry Holt, 1933).  
 Bailey, J.A., *The Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963).  
 Bailey, J.L., and L.D. Vander Broek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1992).  
 Baker, M., *The Lost Prophet: The Book of Enoch and its Influence on Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1988).  
 Baldermann, I. (ed.), *"Gesetz" als Thema biblischer Theologie* (Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie, 4; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989).  
 Balentine, S.E., 'Jeremiah, Prophet of Prayer', *RevExp* 78 (1981), pp. 331-44.  
 — 'The Prophet as Intercessor: A Reassessment', *JBL* 103 (1984), pp. 161-173.  
 — 'Prayer in the Wilderness Traditions: In Pursuit of Divine Justice', *HAR* 9 (1985), pp. 53-74.  
 Balfour, G., 'The Jewishness of John's Use of the Scripture in John 6:31 and 7:37-38', *TynB* 46 (1995), pp. 357-80.  
 Ball, D.M., *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications* (JSNTSup, 124; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).  
 Baltz, F.W., *Lazarus and the Fourth Gospel Community* (Mellen Biblical Press Series, 37; Lampeter: Mellen Press, 1996).  
 Bammel, E., 'The Feeding of the Multitude', in Bammel and Moule (eds.), *Jesus and the Politics of his Day*, pp. 211-40.  
 Bammel, E., and C.F.D. Moule (eds.), *Jesus and the Politics of his Day* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).  
 Barclay, J.M.G., *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996).  
 Bar-Efrat, S., *Narrative Art in the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).  
 Barnett, P.W., 'The Jewish Sign Prophets—A.D. 40–70: Their Intentions and Origin', *NTS* 27 (1981), pp. 679-97.  
 Barr, J., *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).  
 Barrett, C.K., *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (London: SPCK, 1947).  
 — 'Jesus as Prophet', in Barrett, *Holy Spirit*, pp. 94-99.  
 — 'John and the Synoptic Gospels', *ExpTim* 85 (1974), pp. 228-33.  
 — *The Gospel of John and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975).  
 — *The Gospel according to St John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (London: SPCK, 2nd edn, 1978 [1955]).  
 Barth, K., *Church Dogmatics. IV. The Doctrine of Reconciliation, Part One* (trans. G.W. Bromiley; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956).  
 Barton, J., 'Thinking about Reader-Response Criticism', *ExpTim* 113 (2002), pp. 147-51.



- Barton, J. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- Barton, S.C., 'Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 173-94.
- Bauckham, R., 'Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple', in Lindars (ed.), *Law and Religion*, pp. 72-89, 171-76.
- 'Papias and Polycrates on the Origin of the Fourth Gospel', *JTS* 44 (1993), pp. 24-69.
- 'The Beloved Disciple as Ideal Author', *JSNT* 49 (1993), pp. 21-44.
- 'For Whom Were Gospels Written?', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 9-48.
- 'John for Readers of Mark', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 147-71.
- Bauckham, R. (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting* (BAFCS, 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).
- The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- Bauer, B., *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte des Johannes* (Leipzig: Owigand, 1846).
- Bauer, W., *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT, 6; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 3rd edn, 1933).
- Baur, F.C., *Kritische Untersuchungen über die kanonischen Evangelien* (Tübingen: L.F. Fues, 1847).
- Beardslee, W.A., *Literary Criticism of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970).
- Beasley-Murray, G.R., *John* (WBC; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2nd edn, 1999).
- Beck, D.R., 'The Narrative Function of Anonymity in Fourth Gospel Characterization', *Semeia* 63 (1993), pp. 143-58.
- The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel* (BIS, 27; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Becker, J., 'Aufbau, Schichtung und theologiegeschichtliche Stellung des Gebetes in Johannes 17', *ZNW* 60 (1969), pp. 56-83.
- 'Wunder und Christologie: Zum literarkritischen und christologischen Problem der Wunder im Johannesevangelium', *NTS* 16 (1970), pp. 130-48.
- Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (ÖTK; 2 vols.; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1979-81).
- 'Die Geschichte der johanneischen Gemeinden', *TRu* 47 (1982), pp. 305-12.
- 'Das Johannesevangelium im Streit der Methoden (1980-1984)', *TRu* 51 (1986), pp. 1-78.
- Becker, U., *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin: Untersuchungen zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte von Joh 7,53-8,11* (BZNW, 28; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1963).
- Beegle, D.M., 'Moses: Old Testament', *ABD*, IV, pp. 909-18.
- Bell, G.K.A., and D.A. Deissmann (eds.), *Mysterium Christi: Christological Studies by British and German Theologians* (London: Longmans, Green, 1930).
- Belle, G. van, *Les parenthèses dans l'Évangile de Jean: Aperçu historique et classification. Texte grec de Jean* (SNTA, 11; Leuven: Peeters, 1985).
- The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel: Historical Survey and Critical Evaluation of the Semeia Hypothesis* (BETL, 116; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1994).

- ‘Prolepsis in the Gospel of John’, *NovT* 43 (2001), pp. 334-47.
- Benoit, P., ‘Les outrages à Jésus prophète (Mc xiv 65 par.)’, in Wilder *et al.* (eds.), *Neotestamentica*, pp. 92-110.
- Berger, K., *Im Anfang war Johannes: Datierung und Theologie des vierten Evangeliums* (Stuttgart: Quell, 1997).
- Berkhof, L., *Systematic Theology* (London: Banner of Truth Trust, 1958).
- Bernard, J.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1928).
- Bertram, G., ‘ὅψος, ὅψω, κτλ’, *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 602-20.
- Best, E., and R. McL. Wilson (eds.), *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
- Betlyon, J.W., ‘Coinage’, *ABD*, I, pp. 1076-88.
- Beutler, J., ‘Psalm 42/43 im Johannesevangelium’, *NTS* 25 (1978), pp. 33-57.
- ‘Literarische Gattungen im Johannesevangelium: Ein Forschungsbericht 1919–1980’, *ANRW* II, 25.3 (1985), pp. 2506-68.
- ‘Der alttestamentlich-jüdische Hintergrund der Hirtenrede in Johannes 10’, in Beutler and Fortna (eds.), *Shepherd Discourse of John 10*, pp. 18-32.
- ‘The Use of “Scripture” in the Gospel of John’, in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 147-62.
- Beutler, J., and R.T. Fortna (eds.), *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context: Studies by Members of the Johannine Writings Seminar* (SNTSMS, 67; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Bietenhard, H., ‘ἀμήν’, *NIDNTT*, I, pp. 97-99.
- Bittner, W.J., *Jesu Zeichen im Johannesevangelium: Die Messias-Erkenntnis im Johannesevangelium vor ihrem jüdischen Hintergrund* (WUNT, 2.26; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987).
- Black, C.C., ‘Rhetorical Criticism’, in Green (ed.), *Hearing the New Testament*, pp. 256-77.
- Black, D.A., ‘On the Style and Significance of John 17’, *CTR* 3 (1988), pp. 141-59.
- Blenkinsopp, J., ‘John VII.37-9: Another Note on a Notorious Crux’, *NTS* 6 (1959–60), pp. 95-98.
- ‘Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus’, *JJS* 25 (1974), pp. 239-62.
- Bligh, J., ‘Four Studies in St John, I: The Man Born Blind’, *HeyJ* 7 (1966), pp. 129-44.
- Blinzler, J., ‘Das Synedrium von Jerusalem und die Strafprozessordnung der Mischna’, *ZNW* 52 (1961), pp. 54-65.
- Blomberg, C.L., *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1987).
- The Historical Reliability of John’s Gospel* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 2001).
- Böcher, O., ‘διάβολος’, *EDNT*, I, pp. 297-98.
- Bockmuehl, M., *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).
- Bockmuehl, M. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Jesus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- Boer, M.C. de, ‘Narrative Criticism, Historical Criticism, and the Gospel of John’, *JSNT* 47 (1992), pp. 35-48.
- Johannine Perspectives on the Death of Jesus* (CBET, 17; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996).

- Boer, M.C. de (ed.), *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (JSNTSup, 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).
- Boer, P.A.H. de, *Oudtestamentische Studiën* (OTS, 8; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950).
- Boers, H., *Neither on this Mountain nor in Jerusalem: A Study of John 4* (SBLMS, 35; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1988).
- Boismard, M.-É., 'Le caractère adventice de Jo., XII,45-50', in Coppens *et al.* (eds.), *Sacra Pagina*, pp. 189-92.
- 'Les citations targumiques dans le quatrième évangile', *RB* 66 (1959), pp. 376-78.
- 'Saint Luc et la rédaction du quatrième évangile (Jn. IV,46-54)', *RB* 69 (1962), pp. 185-211.
- 'Jesu, le prophète par excellence, d'après Jean 10,24-39', in Gnika (ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche*, pp. 160-71.
- Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology* (trans. B.T. Viviano; BETL, 84; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
- Le martyre de Jean l'apôtre* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 35; Paris: Gabalda, 1996).
- 'Bethzatha ou Siloé?', *RB* 106 (1999), pp. 206-18.
- Boismard, M.-É., and A. Lamouille, *L'Évangile de Jean* (Synopse des quatre évangiles en français, 3; Paris: Cerf, 1977).
- Booth, S., *Selected Peak Marking Features in the Gospel of John* (American University Studies, 7; Theology and Religion, 178; New York: Peter Lang, 1996).
- Booth, W.C., *A Rhetoric of Irony* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974).
- Borg, M.J., 'Luke 19:42-44 and Jesus as Prophet?', *Forum* 8 (1992), pp. 99-112.
- Borgen, P., *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (NovTSup, 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965).
- 'Observations on the Targumic Character of the Prologue of John', *NTS* 16 (1970), pp. 288-95.
- 'The Use of Tradition in John 12:44-50', *NTS* 26 (1979), pp. 18-35.
- 'John and the Synoptics: Can Paul Offer Help?', in Hawthorne (ed.), *Tradition*, pp. 80-94.
- Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).
- 'The Gospel of John and Hellenism: Some Observations', in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 98-123.
- Boring, M.E., *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982).
- 'Prophecy (Early Christian)', *ABD*, V, pp. 495-502.
- Bornhäuser, K., *Das Johannesevangelium: Eine Missionschrift für Israel* (BFCT, 2.15: Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928).
- Bostock, D.G., 'Jesus as the New Elisha', *ExpTim* 92 (1980), pp. 39-41.
- Botha, J., *Jesus and the Samaritan Woman: A Speech Act Reading of John 4:1-42* (NovTSup, 65; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991).
- Bowen, C.R., 'The Fourth Gospel as Dramatic Material', *JBL* 49 (1930), pp. 292-305.
- Bowley, J.E., 'Prophet and Prophecy at Qumran', in Flint and VanderKam (eds.), *Dead Sea Scrolls*, II, pp. 354-78.

- Bowman, J., 'The Exegesis of the Pentateuch among the Samaritans and among the Rabbis', in de Boer (ed.), *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, pp. 220-62.
- 'Samaritan Studies', *BJRL* 40 (1958), pp. 298-327.
- The Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism, and Early Christianity* (PTMS, 4; Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick Press, 1975).
- Samaritan Documents Relating to their History, Religion and Life* (POTTS, 2; Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick Press, 1977).
- Boyle, J.L., 'The Last Discourse (Jn 13,31-16,33) and Prayer (Jn 17): Some Observations on their Unity and Development', *Bib* 56 (1975), pp. 210-22.
- Braun, F.M., *Jean le théologien. II. Les grandes traditions d'Israël et l'accord des écritures selon le quatrième évangile* (Paris: Gabalda, 1964).
- Breck, J., 'John 21: Appendix, Epilogue or Conclusion?', *SVTQ* 36 (1992), pp. 27-49.
- Bremmer, J.N. (ed.), *The Apocryphal Acts of Peter: Magic, Miracles and Gnosticism* (Studies on the Apocryphal Acts of Apostles, 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1998).
- Bright, J., *Jeremiah* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965).
- Broadhead, E.K., *Prophet, Son, Messiah: Narrative Form and Function in Mark 14-16* (JSNTSup, 97; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).
- Naming Jesus: Titular Christology in the Gospel of Mark* (JSNTSup, 175; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Brodie, T.L., 'Jesus as the New Elisha: Cracking the Code', *ExpTim* 93 (1981), pp. 39-42.
- The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- The Gospel according to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- The Crucial Bridge: The Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2000).
- Brooke, G.J., 'Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives', in Flint and VanderKam (eds.), *Dead Sea Scrolls*, I, pp. 271-301.
- 'E Pluribus Unum: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls', in Lim (ed.), *Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 107-19.
- Brooks, J.A., and C.L. Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1988).
- Brouwer, W., *The Literary Development of John 13-17: A Chiastic Reading* (SBLDS, 182; Atlanta: SBL, 2000).
- Brown, R.E., 'Parable and Allegory Reconsidered', *NovT* 5 (1962), pp. 36-45.
- New Testament Essays* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965).
- The Gospel according to John* (AB; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1966-70).
- The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979).
- An Introduction to New Testament Christology* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994).
- Brownlee, W.H., 'Whence the Gospel according to John?', in Charlesworth (ed.), *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 166-94.
- Bruce, F.F., *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).
- 'Travel and Communication: The New Testament World', *ABD*, VI, pp. 648-53.

- Brueggemann, W., 'Amos' Intercessory Formula', *VT* 19 (1969), pp. 385-99.
- Bruns, J.E., 'A Note on Jn 12,3', *CBQ* 28 (1966), pp. 219-22.
- 'The Use of Time in the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 13 (1967), pp. 285-90.
- Bryan, S.M., *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* (SNTSMS, 117; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).
- Buchanan, G.W., 'The Samaritan Origin of the Gospel of John', in Neusner (ed.), *Religious in Antiquity*, pp. 149-75.
- Büchsel, F., 'μονογενής', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 737-41.
- Budd, P.J., *Numbers* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1984).
- Bühner, J.-A., *Der Gesandte und sein Weg im 4. Evangelium: Die kultur- und religionsgeschichtliche Grundlagen der johanneischen Sendungschristologie sowie ihre traditionsgeschichtliche Entwicklung* (WUNT, 2.2; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1977).
- Bull, R.J., 'An Archaeological Footnote to "Our Fathers Worshipped on this Mountain", John IV.20', *NTS* 23 (1977), pp. 460-62.
- Bultmann, R., 'Die Bedeutung der neuerschlossenen mandäischen und manichäischen Quellen für das Verständnis des Johannesevangeliums', *ZNW* 24 (1925), pp. 100-46.
- Jesus and the Word* (trans. L.P. Smith and E.H. Lantero; London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1934).
- The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray *et al.*; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971).
- Theology of the New Testament* (trans. K. Grobel; 2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1983).
- Burkett, D., *The Son of the Man in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup, 56; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).
- 'Two Accounts of Lazarus's Resurrection in John 11', *NovT* 36 (1994), pp. 209-32.
- The Son of Man Debate: A History and Evaluation* (SNTSMS, 107; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
- Burkill, T.A., 'The Competence of the Sanhedrin', *VC* 10 (1956), pp. 80-96.
- Burney, C.F., *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922).
- Burnham, S., 'Jesus as a Prophet', *Biblical World* 10 (1897), pp. 327-32.
- Burridge, R.A., *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTSMS, 70; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- 'About People, by People, for People: Gospel Genre and Audience', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 113-45.
- Burrows, M., 'Prophecy and the Prophets at Qumran', in Anderson and Harrelson (eds.), *Israel's Prophetic Heritage*, pp. 223-32.
- Buse, I., 'The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John', *ExpTim* 70 (1958-59), pp. 22-24.
- Byrskog, S., *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (WUNT, 123; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2000).
- Caird, G.B., 'The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics', *NTS* 15 (1969), pp. 265-77.
- The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (London: Duckworth, 1980).

- Callaway, P.R., *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (JSPSup, 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988).
- Calvin, J., *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (trans. F.L. Battles; LCC, 20; London: SCM Press, 1961).
- The Gospel according to St John 1–10* (rev. T.H.L. Parker; Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, rev. edn, 1961).
- The Gospel according to St John 11–21 and the First Epistle of John* (rev. T.H.L. Parker; Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, rev. edn, 1961).
- Campbell, R.J., 'Evidence for the Historicity of the Fourth Gospel in John 2:13–22', *SE* 7 (1982), pp. 101–20.
- Carmichael, C.M., 'Marriage and the Samaritan Woman', *NTS* 26 (1980), pp. 332–46.
- Carruth, T.R., 'The Jesus-as-Prophet Motif in Luke–Acts' (unpublished PhD thesis; Waco, TX: Baylor University, 1973).
- Carson, D.A., 'Current Source Criticism of the Fourth Gospel: Some Methodological Questions', *JBL* 97 (1978), pp. 411–29.
- 'The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered', *JBL* 106 (1987), pp. 639–51.
- The Gospel according to John* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1991).
- Carson, D.A., D.J. Moo and L. Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992).
- Casey, M., *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1979).
- From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Cambridge: James Clark; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991).
- Is John's Gospel True?* (London: Routledge, 1996).
- Cassidy, R.J., *John's Gospel in New Perspective: Christology and the Realities of Roman Power* (Marynoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1992).
- Casson, L., *Travel in the Ancient World* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974).
- The Ancient Mariners: Seafarers and Sea Fighters of the Mediterranean in Ancient Times* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2nd edn, 1991).
- Charlesworth, J.H., 'The Odes of Solomon—not Gnostic', *CBQ* 31 (1969), pp. 357–69.
- 'Qumran, John and the Odes of Solomon', in Charlesworth (ed.), *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 107–36.
- The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- 'Old Testament Apocrypha', *ABD*, I, pp. 292–94.
- 'Pseudepigrapha, OT', *ABD*, V, pp. 537–40.
- The Beloved Disciple: Whose Witness Validates the Gospel of John?* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995).
- Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.), *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroad, 1990 [The original title was *John and Qumran*, 1972]).
- Charlesworth, J.H., and R.A. Culpepper, 'The Odes of Solomon and the Gospel of John', *CBQ* 35 (1973), pp. 298–322.
- Charlesworth, J.H., H. Lichtenberger and G.S. Oegema (eds.), *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

- Charpentier, E., 'Le Prophète, ami des pécheurs: Lc 7,36–8,3', *Assemblées du Seigneur* 42 (1970), pp. 80–92.
- Chatman, S., *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978).
- Chevallier, R., *Roman Roads* (trans. N.H. Eield; London: B.T. Batsford, 1976).
- Chilton, B., 'Amen', *ABD*, I, pp. 184–86.
- Christensen, D.L., *Deuteronomy* (WBC; 2 vols.; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, rev. edn, 2001).
- Clark, D.K., 'Signs in Wisdom and John', *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 201–209.
- Clavier, H., 'L'ironie dans le quatrième évangile', *SE* 1 (1959), pp. 261–76.
- Clements, R.E., *God and Temple: The Idea of the Divine Presence in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965).
- Isaiah 1–39* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).
- Cohen, J.M., *A Samaritan Chronicle: A Source-Critical Analysis of the Life and Times of the Great Samaritan Reformer, Baba Rabbah* (SPB; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981).
- Collins, A.Y., "From Noble Death to Crucified Messiah," *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 481–503.
- Collins, C.J., 'שֶׁלֶח', *NIDOTTE*, IV, pp. 119–23.
- Collins, J.J., 'Essenes', *ABD*, II, pp. 619–26.
- 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *ABD*, II, pp. 85–101.
- The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995).
- Collins, M.F., 'The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions', *JSJ* 3 (1972), pp. 97–116.
- Collins, R.F., 'Cana (Jn 2:1–12): The First of his Sign or the Key to his Signs?', *ITQ* 47 (1980), pp. 79–95.
- 'From John to the Beloved Disciples: An Essay on Johannine Characters', *Int* 49 (1995), pp. 359–69.
- Coloe, M.L., *God Dwells with Us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001).
- Colwell, E.C., 'A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament', *JBL* 52 (1933), pp. 12–21.
- Comiskey, J.P., "'Rabbi, who has sinned...?' (John 9:2)", *TBT* 26 (1966), pp. 1808–14.
- Connick, M., 'The Dramatic Character of the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 67 (1948), pp. 159–69.
- Conway, C.M., *Men and Women in the Fourth Gospel: Gender and Johannine Characterization* (SBLDS, 167; Atlanta: SBL, 1999).
- Cook, J.I. (ed.), *Saved by Hope: Essays in Honour of Richard C. Oudersluys* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).
- Cooper, K.T., 'The Best Wine: John 2:1–11', *WTJ* 41 (1978–79), pp. 364–80.
- Coppens, J., A. Descamps and E. Massaux, *Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea biblica congressus internationalis catholici de re biblica*, II/2 (BETL, 13; Paris: Gabalda, 1959).
- Corrington, G.P., *The 'Divine Man': His Origin and Function in Hellenistic Popular Religion* (American University Studies, 7; Theology and Religion, 17; Berlin: Lang, 1986).
- Cory, C., 'Wisdom's Rescue: A New Reading of the Tabernacles Discourse (John 7:1–8:59)', *JBL* 116 (1997), pp. 95–116.

- Cortés, J.B., 'Yet Another Look at Jn 7,37-38', *CBQ* 29 (1967), pp. 75-86.
- Cothenet, É., 'Prophétisme dans le Nouveau Testament', in L. Pirot and A. Robert [continued by H. Cazelles and A. Feuillet] (eds.), *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, XLVII-XLVIII (Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1971-72), pp. 1222-337.
- Cowley, A.E., *The Samaritan Liturgy* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1909).
- Craige, P.C. et al., *Jeremiah 1-25* (WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1991).
- Cribbs, F.L., 'A Reassessment of the Date of Origin and the Destination of the Gospel of John', *JBL* 89 (1970), pp. 38-55.
- 'St Luke and the Johannine Tradition', *JBL* 90 (1971), pp. 422-50.
- Cross, F.M., *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, rev. edn, 1980).
- Crossan, J.D., 'It is Written: A Structuralist Analysis of John 6', *Semeia* 26 (1983), pp. 3-21.
- Crown, A.D. (ed.), *The Samaritans* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989).
- Crown, A.D., R. Pummer and A. Tal (eds.), *A Companion to Samaritan Studies* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1993).
- Crump, D.M., *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts* (WUNT, 2.49; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992).
- Cullmann, O., *Christology of the New Testament* (trans. S.C. Guthrie and C.A.M. Hall; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, rev. edn, 1963).
- The Johannine Circle* (trans. John Bowden; London: SPCK, 1976).
- Prayer in the New Testament* (trans. John Bowden; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1995).
- Culpepper, R.A., *The Johannine School: An Evaluation of the Johannine-School Hypothesis Based on an Investigation of the Nature of Ancient Schools* (SBLDS, 26; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1975).
- Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).
- John, the Son of Zebedee: The Life of a Legend* (Studies on Personalities in the New Testament; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994).
- The Gospel and Letters of John* (IBT; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998).
- Culpepper, R.A. (ed.), *Critical Readings of John 6* (BIS, 22; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Culpepper, R.A., and C.C. Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996).
- Cunningham, W., *Historical Theology: A Review of the Principal Doctrinal Discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age* (2 vols.; London: Banner of Truth Trust, 4th edn, 1960).
- Curtis, J.B., 'A Folk Etymology of NĀBĪ', *VT* 29 (1979), pp. 491-93.
- Dahms, J.V., 'Isaiah 55:11 and the Gospel of John', *EQ* 53 (1981), pp. 78-88.
- 'The Johannine Use of Monogenes Reconsidered', *NTS* 29 (1983), pp. 222-32.
- Dalman, G., *Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels* (trans. P.P. Levertoff; London: SPCK, 1929).
- Dammers, A.H., 'Studies in Texts: A Note on Luke vii, 36-50', *Theology* 49 (1946), pp. 78-80.
- Daniélou, J., 'Le Christ Prophète', *Vie Spirituelle* 78 (1948), pp. 154-70.
- 'Joh 7,38 et Ezéch 47,1-11', *SE* 2 (1961), pp. 158-63.



- The Development of Christian Doctrine before the Council of Nicaea. I. The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (trans. and ed. J.A. Baker; London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964).
- Danna, E., 'A Note on John 4:29', *RB* 106 (1999), pp. 222-23.
- Danner, D.G., 'Johannine Christology during the Reformation', in Priest (ed.), *Johannine Studies*, pp. 36-53.
- Daube, D., 'Jesus and the Samaritan Woman: The Meaning of συγχρόμαι', *JBL* 69 (1950), pp. 137-47.
- The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1956).
- Dauer, A., 'Spuren der (synoptischen) Synedriumsverhandlung im 4. Evangelium: Das Verhältnis zu den Synoptikern', in Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics*, pp. 307-39.
- Davey, J.E., *The Jesus of St John: Historical and Christological Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1958).
- Davies, E.W., *Numbers* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).
- Davies, M., 'Reader-Response Criticism', *DBI*, pp. 578-80.
- Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup, 69; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).
- Davies, P.E., 'Jesus and the Role of the Prophet', *JBL* 64 (1945), pp. 241-54.
- 'Did Jesus Die as a Martyr-Prophet?', *BR* 19 (1974), pp. 37-47.
- Davies, W.D., *Invitation to the New Testament: A Guide to its Main Witnesses* (Anchor Books; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966).
- The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).
- 'Reflections on Aspects of the Jewish Background of the Gospel of John', in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 43-64.
- Davies, W.D., and D.C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew* (ICC; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991-97).
- Davis, S.T., "'This Is Truly the Savior of the World": The Theological Significance of the Earthly Jesus', *ExAud* 14 (1998), pp. 97-103.
- Debrunner, A., H. Kleinknecht, O. Procksch, G. Kittel, G. Quell and G. Schrenk, 'λέγω, λόγος, ῥῆμα, κτλ', *TDNT*, IV, pp. 69-192.
- Decocq, P.B., 'The Concept of Jesus as Prophet in the Synoptic Tradition' (unpublished PhD thesis; Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal, 1974).
- Deeks, D., 'The Structure of the Fourth Gospel', *NTS* 15 (1968), pp. 107-29.
- Denaux, A. (ed.), *John and the Synoptics* (BETL, 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992).
- Derrett, J.D.M., 'The Good Shepherd: St. John's Use of Jewish Halakah and Haggadah', *ST* 27 (1973), pp. 25-50.
- 'Miracles, Pools, and Sight: John 9:1-41: Genesis 2:6-7; Isaiah 6:10; 30:20; 35:5-7', *Bibbia e Oriente* 36 (1994), 71-85.
- 'John 9:6 Read with Isaiah 6:10; 20:9', *EQ* 66 (1994), pp. 251-54.
- Devillers, L., 'Une piscine peut en cacher une autre: A propos de Jean 5,1-9a', *RB* 106 (1999), pp. 175-205.
- De Vries, S.J., *1 Kings* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985).
- Dexinger, F., *Der Taheb. Ein "messianischer" Heilsbringer der Samaritaner* (Kairos, Religionswissenschaftliche Studien, 3; Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1986).

- ‘Moses’, in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion to Samaritan Studies*, pp. 160-62.
- ‘Taheb’, in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion to Samaritan Studies*, pp. 224-26.
- Dibelius, M., *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B.L. Woolf; Cambridge: James Clark, 1971).
- Dockery, D.S., ‘Reading John 4:1-45: Some Diverse Hermeneutical Perspectives’, *CTR* 3 (1988), pp. 127-40.
- ‘John 9:1-41: A Narrative Discourse Study’, *OPTAT* 2 (1988), pp. 14-26.
- Dodd, C.H., ‘Jesus as Teacher and Prophet’, in Bell and Deissmann (eds.), *Mysterium Christi*, pp. 53-66.
- The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935).
- The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953).
- Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963).
- Domeris, W.R., ‘The Confession of Peter according to John 6:69’, *TynB* 44 (1993), pp. 155-67.
- Donahue, J.R., ‘Recent Studies on the Origin of “Son of Man” in the Gospel’, *CBQ* 48 (1986), pp. 484-98.
- Dormeyer, D., ‘ἐγγύς’, *EDNT*, I, pp. 371-72.
- Duke, P.D., *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985).
- Dunn, J.D.G., ‘John and the Oral Gospel Tradition’, in Wansbrough (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel*, pp. 351-79.
- ‘John and the Synoptics as a Theological Question’, in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 301-13.
- Dupont, J., *Essais sur la christologie de Saint Jean* (Bruges: Saint-André, 1951).
- Dupont-Sommer, A., *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. R.D. Barnett; London: Vallentine, Mitchell, 1954).
- Durham, J.I., *Exodus* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987).
- Dvorak, J.D., ‘The Relationship between John and the Synoptic Gospels’, *JETS* 41 (1998), pp. 201-13.
- Easton, B.S., ‘Bultmann’s RQ Source’, *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 143-56.
- Edersheim, A., *Sketches of Jewish Social Life* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, updated edn, 1994 [1876]).
- Edwards, D.R., ‘Tyre’, *ABD*, VI, pp. 686-92.
- Edwards, R.B., ‘The Christological Basis of the Johannine Footwashing’, in Green and Turner (eds.), *Jesus of Nazareth*, pp. 367-83.
- The Johannine Epistles* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
- Ehrman, B.D., ‘Jesus and the Adulteress’, *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 24-44.
- Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millennium* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- Eichrodt, W., *Ezekiel* (OTL; London: SCM Press, 1970).
- Eicken, E. von, H. Lindner, D. Müller and C. Brown, ‘Apostle’, *NIDNTT*, I, pp. 126-37.
- Eisler, R., *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel: Its Author and its Writer* (London: Methuen, 1938).
- Elliott, J., *Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament* (London: SPCK, 1995 [1993]).

- Ellis, E.E., *The World of St John: St John's Gospel and the Epistles* (Bible Guides, 14; London: Lutterworth Press; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965).
- Eltester, W., 'Der Logos und sein Prophet: Fragen zur heutigen Erklärung des johanneischen Prologs', in Eltester and Kettler (eds.), *Apophoreta*, pp. 109-34.
- Eltester, W., and F.H. Kettler (eds.), *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1964).
- Emerton, J.A., 'Melchizedek and the Gods: Fresh Evidence for the Jewish Background of John X,34-36', *JTS* 17 (1966), pp. 399-401.
- Endo, M., *Creation and Christology: A Study on the Johannine Prologue in the Light of Early Jewish Creation Accounts* (WUNT, 2.149; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).
- Ensor, P.W., *Jesus and his 'Work': The Johannine Sayings in Historical Perspective* (WUNT, 2.85; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996).
- Epstein, V., 'The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple', *ZNW* 55 (1964), pp. 42-58.
- Erickson, M.J., *Christian Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983-85).
- Eslinger, L., 'The Wooing of the Woman at the Well: Jesus, the Reader, and Reader-Response Criticism', *JLT* 1 (1987), pp. 167-83.
- Evans, C., 'Christ at Prayer in St John's Gospel', *Lumen Vitae* 24 (1969), pp. 579-96.
- Evans, C.A., 'On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel', *BZ* 26 (1982), pp. 79-83.
- 'Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction', *CBQ* 51 (1989), pp. 237-70.
- 'Jesus' Action in the Temple and Evidence of Corruption in the First-century Temple', *SBLSP* (1989), pp. 522-39.
- Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue* (JSNTSup, 89; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).
- 'David in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Porter and Evans (eds.), *Scrolls and the Scriptures*, pp. 183-97.
- Evans, C.A. and W.R. Stegner (eds.), *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup, 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
- Faierstein, M.M., 'Why Do the Scribes Say that Elijah Must Come First', *JBL* 100 (1981), pp. 75-86.
- Fascher, E., *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1927).
- 'Christologie und Gnosis im vierten Evangelium', *TLZ* 93 (1968), cols. 721-30.
- Fee, G.D., 'Once More—John 7.37-39', *ExpTim* 89 (1978), pp. 116-18.
- Feldman, L.H., 'Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus', *JTS* 41 (1990), pp. 386-422.
- Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993).
- Fendrich, H., 'κράζω', *EDNT*, II, pp. 313-14.
- Fiedler, P., and D. Zeller (eds.), *Gegenwart und kommendes Reich* (A. Vögtle Schölergabe; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975).
- Fiorenza, E.S. (ed.), *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976).
- Fischel, H.A., 'Martyr and Prophet (A Study in Jewish Literature)', *JQR* 37 (1946-47), pp. 265-80, 363-86.

- ‘Jewish Gnosticism in the Fourth Gospel’, *JBL* 65 (1946), pp. 157-74.
- Fisher, M.C., ‘ $\text{ἰ}\nu\text{ῖ}\nu\text{ῖ}$ ’, in Harris *et al.*, *Theological Wordbook*, II, pp. 608-10.
- Fitzmyer, J.A., ‘The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament’, *NTS* 7 (1960-61), pp. 297-333.
- ‘Another View of the “Son of Man” Debate’, *JSNT* 4 (1979), pp. 58-68.
- ‘More about Elijah Coming First’, *JBL* 104 (1985), pp. 295-96.
- Flanagan, N., ‘The Gospel of John as Drama’, *TBT* 19 (1981), pp. 264-70.
- Flint, P.W., and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1999).
- Fokkelman, J., *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide* (trans. Ineke Smit; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1999).
- Formesyn, R., ‘Le sèmeion johannique et le sèmeion hellénistique’, *ETL* 38 (1962), pp. 856-94.
- Forster, E.M., *Aspects of the Novel* (ed. O. Stallybrass; Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962 [1927]).
- Fortna, R.T., *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS, 11; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).
- France, R.T., *The Gospel according to Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1985).
- ‘Chronological Aspects of “Gospel Harmony”’, *VE* 16 (1986), pp. 33-59.
- Freed, E.D., ‘Variations in the Language and Thought of John’, *ZNW* 55 (1964), pp. 167-97.
- Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (NovTSup, 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965).
- ‘Samaritan Influences in the Gospel of John’, *CBQ* 30 (1968), pp. 580-87.
- ‘Did John Write his Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts?’, *NovT* 12 (1970), pp. 241-56.
- ‘Psalm 42/43 in John’s Gospel’, *NTS* 29 (1983), pp. 62-73.
- Freed, E.D., and R.B. Hunt, ‘Fortna’s Signs-Source in John’, *JBL* 94 (1975), pp. 563-79.
- Freire, C.E., ‘Jesús profeta, libertador del hombre: Vision lucana de su ministerio terrestre’, *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 51 (1976), pp. 463-95.
- Friebel, K.G., *Jeremiah’s and Ezekiel’s Sign-Acts: Rhetorical Nonverbal Communication* (JSOTSup, 283; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Gaebelein, F.E. (ed.), *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary* (12 vols.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981).
- Gallagher, E.V., *Divine Man or Magician? Celsus and Origen on Jesus* (SBLDS, 64; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).
- Gardner-Smith, P., *Saint John and the Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938).
- Gaster, M., *The Samaritans: Their History, Doctrine and Literature* (The Schweich Lectures; London: British Academy, 1925).
- Gatzweiler, K., ‘La rédaction du quatrième évangile: Deux essais de solution’, *La Foi et le Temps* 10 (1980), pp. 359-79.
- Genette, G., *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (trans. J.E. Lewin; New York: Cornell University Press, 1980).

- Gerhardsson, B., *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity with Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Livonia, MI: Dove Booksellers, 1998).
- Gill, D.W.J., and C. Gempf (eds.), *The Book of Acts in its Graeco-Roman Setting* (BAFCS, 2; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994).
- Gils, F., *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques* (OBL, 2; Leuven: Université de Leuven, 1957).
- Glasson, T.F., *Moses in the Fourth Gospel* (SBT, 40; London: SCM Press, 1963).
- Gnilka, J., *Johannesevangelium* (NEBKNT, 4; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1983).
- Gnilka, J. (ed.), *Neues Testament und Kirche: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg* (Freiburg: Herder, 1974).
- Godet, F.L., *Commentary on John's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1978 [1864–65]).
- Goguel, M., 'Le rejet de Jésus à Nazareth', *ZNW* 12 (1911), pp. 321–24.
- Golb, N., *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (London: BCA, 1995).
- Goldingay, J., *God's Prophet God's Servant: A Study in Jeremiah and Isaiah 40–55* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1984).
- Goodman, M., 'Jewish Proselytizing in the First Century', in Lieu *et al.* (eds.), *Jews among Pagans*, pp. 53–78.
- Goppelt, L., 'ὁδωρ', *TDNT*, VIII, pp. 314–33.
- Görg, M., 'Fleischwerdung des Logos: Auslegungs- und religions- geschichtliche Anmerkungen zu Joh 1,14a', in Hoppe and Busse (eds.), *Von Jesus zum Christus*, pp. 467–82.
- Goulder, M.D., 'John 1,1–2,12 and the Synoptics', in Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics*, pp. 201–37.
- Grant, F.C., *The Gospels: Their Origin and their Growth* (London: Faber & Faber, 1957).
- Gray, R., *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
- Green, J.B., *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- Green, J.B. (ed.), *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995).
- Green, J.B., and H.E. Hearon, 'Anointing', *DJG*, pp. 11–13.
- Green, J.B., and M. Turner (eds.), *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994).
- Greenberg, M., 'Stoning', *IDB*, IV, p. 447.
- Greene, G.R., 'The Portrayal of Jesus as Prophet in Luke–Acts' (unpublished PhD thesis; Louisville, KY: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975).
- Greeven, H., 'προσκυνέω, προσκυνητής', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 758–66.
- Grenz, S.J., *Theology for the Community of God* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1994).
- Grigsby, B., 'Washing in the Pool of Siloam: A Thematic Anticipation of the Johannine Cross', *NovT* 27 (1985), pp. 227–35.
- Grisanti, M.A., 'אָב', *NIDOTTE*, III, pp. 575–76.
- Grob, F., *Faire l'œuvre de Dieu: Christologie et éthique dans l'Évangile de Jean* (EHPR, 68; Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1986).

- Grundmann, W., 'κράζω, κτλ', *TDNT*, III, pp. 898-903.
- Der Zeuge der Wahrheit: Grundzüge der Christologie des Johannesevangeliums* (ed. W. Wiefel; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1985).
- Guelich, R.A., *Mark 1:1–8:26* (WBC; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989).
- Guilding, A., *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960).
- Guillet, J., *Jésus Christ dans l'Évangile de Jean* (Cahiers Évangile, 31; Paris: Cerf, 1980).
- Guthrie, D., *New Testament Theology* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981).
- New Testament Introduction* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 4th edn, 1990).
- Guy, H.A., *New Testament Prophecy: Its Origin and Significance* (London: Epworth Press, 1947).
- Haacker, K., 'Samaritan, Samaria', *NIDNTT*, III, pp. 449-67.
- Hadley, J.M., 'Elijah and Elisha', *NIDOTTE*, IV, pp. 572-78.
- Haenchen, E., *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John* (trans. R.W. Funk; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- Hagner, D.A., *Matthew* (WBC; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1993).
- Hahn, F., *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (trans. H. Knight and G. Ogg; London: Lutterworth Press, 1969).
- Hakola, R., 'A Character Resurrected: Lazarus in the Fourth Gospel and Afterwards', in Rhoads and Syreeni (eds.), *Characterization in the Gospel*, pp. 223-63.
- Hall, B.W., *Samaritan Religion from John Hyrcanus to Baba Rabba: A Critical Examination of the Relevant Material in Contemporary Christian Literature, the Writings of Josephus, and the Mishnah* (Studies in Judaica, 3; Sydney: Mandelbaum Trust, University of Sydney, 1987).
- Hall, D.R., 'The Meaning of συγχράομαι in John 4,9', *ExpTim* 83 (1971–72), pp. 56-57.
- Hammer, R.A., 'Gen 3:15 and Johannine Theology', *Marian Studies* 27 (1976), pp. 99-109.
- Hanson, A.T., 'The Old Testament Background to the Raising of Lazarus', *SE* VI (1973), pp. 252-55.
- The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991).
- Hare, D.R.A., *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).
- Harner, P.B., 'Qualitative Anarthrous Predicate Nouns: Mark 15:39 and John 1:1', *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 75-87.
- Harris, E., *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist* (JSNTSup, 107; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).
- Harris, M.J., *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1992).
- Harstine, S., *Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup, 229; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).
- Harvey, A.E., *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1982).
- Harvey, W.J., *Character and the Novel* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1965).
- Hastings, A., *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1958).

- Hawthorne, G.F., 'Amen', *DJG*, pp. 7-8.
- Hawthorne, G.F. (ed.), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987).
- Hayes, C.E., 'Sanhedrin', in Werblowsky and Wigoder (eds.), *Dictionary of the Jewish Religion*, pp. 606-607.
- Heil, J.P., *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22-33, Mark 6:45-52 and John 6:15b-21* (AnBib, 87; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1981).
- 'The Story of Jesus and the Adulteress (John 7,53-8,11) Reconsidered', *Bib* 72 (1991), pp. 182-91.
- The Gospel of Mark as Model for Action: A Reader-Response Commentary* (New York: Paulist Press, 1992).
- 'A Rejoinder to "Reconsidering 'The Story of the Adulteress Reconsidered'"', *Eglise et Théologie* 25 (1994), pp. 361-66.
- 'Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John', *CBQ* 57 (1995), pp. 729-45.
- Hendriksen, W., *The Gospel of John* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1959).
- Hengel, M., *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. J. Bowden; 2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1974).
- The Son of God: The Origin of Christology and the History of Jewish-Hellenistic Religion* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1976).
- The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989).
- The Johannine Question* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1989).
- 'Die Schriftauslegung des 4. Evangeliums auf dem Hintergrund der urchristlichen Exegese', in Baldermann (ed.), "Gesetz", pp. 249-88, which also appears in *HBT* 12 (1990), pp. 19-41.
- Hengstenberg, E.W., *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John* (2 vols.; Minneapolis: Klock & Klock, 1980 [1865]).
- Heppe, H., *Reformed Dogmatics* (trans. G.T. Thomson; rev. E. Berger; London: George Allen & Unwin, rev. edn, 1950 [1857]).
- Herczeg, P., 'Θεῖος ἀνὴρ Traits in the Apocryphal Acts of Peter', in Bremmer (ed.), *Apocryphal Acts of Peter*, pp. 29-38.
- Hertzberg, H.W., 'Sind die Propheten Fürbitter?', in Würthwein and Kaiser (eds.), *Tradition und Situation*, pp. 63-74.
- Higgins, A.J.B., 'Jesus as Prophet', *ExpTim* 57 (1945-46), pp. 292-94.
- Jesus and the Son of Man* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964).
- Hill, D., 'The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke iv 16-30)', *NovT* 13 (1971), pp. 161-80.
- New Testament Prophecy* (Basingstoke: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979).
- 'Jesus and Josephus' "Messianic Prophets"', in Best and Wilson (eds.), *Text and Interpretation*, pp. 143-54.
- Hinnebusch, P., *Jesus, the New Elijah: An Inspiring New Light into the Person of Jesus* (Ann Arbor, MI: Servant Books, 1978).
- Hirsch, E., *Das vierte Evangelium in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt verdeutscht und erklärt* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1936).
- Hitchcock, F.R.M., 'The Dramatic Development of the Fourth Gospel', *Expositor*, Series 7, 4 (1907), pp. 266-79.

- ‘Is the Fourth Gospel a Drama?’, *Theology* 7 (1923), pp. 307-17.
- Hobbs, T.R., *2 Kings* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985).
- Hodge, C., *Systematic Theology* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1952).
- Hoffman, P., N. Brox and W. Pesch (eds.), *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Für Josef Schmid* (Freiburg: Herder, 1973).
- Holleran, J.W., ‘Seeing the Light: A Narrative Reading of John 9’, *ETL* 49 (1993), pp. 5-26, 354-82.
- Hooker, M.D., *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus* (London: SCM Press, 1997).
- Hoppe, R., and U. Busse (eds.), *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien; Festgabe für Paul Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1998).
- Horbury, W., ‘The Benediction of the *Minim* and Early Jewish-Christian Controversy’, *JTS* 33 (1982), pp. 19-61.
- Horsley, G.H.R., ‘The Inscriptions of Ephesos and the New Testament’, *NovT* 34 (1992), pp. 105-68.
- Horsley, R.A., ‘Popular Messianic Movements around the Time of Jesus’, *CBQ* 46 (1984), pp. 471-95.
- “‘Like One of the Prophets of Old’: Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus’, *CBQ* 47 (1985), pp. 435-63.
- Horsley, R.A., and J.S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movement in the Time of Jesus* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1999).
- Horst, P.W. van der, ‘The *Birkat ha-minim* in Recent Research’, *ExpTim* 105 (1994), pp. 363-68.
- Hoskyns, E.C., *The Fourth Gospel* (ed. F.N. Davey; London: Faber & Faber, 2nd edn, 1947).
- Howard, W.F., *The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation* (revised by C.K. Barrett; London: Epworth Press, 4th edn, 1955).
- Hübner, H., ‘*ἀλλέω*’, *EDNT*, II, pp. 335-36.
- Hunter, W.B., ‘The Prayers of Jesus in the Gospel of John’ (unpublished PhD thesis; Aberdeen: University of Aberdeen, 1979).
- Hurowitz, V.A., ‘*אכל* in Malachi 3:11—Caterpillar’, *JBL* 121 (2002), pp. 327-30.
- Hyatt, J.P., *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1966).
- Jansen, J.F., *Calvin’s Doctrine of the Work of Christ* (London: James Clarke, 1956).
- Jansma, H.P., ‘The Prophetic Office of Christ in John Calvin’s Theology’ (unpublished doctoral thesis; Durham: University of Durham, 1991).
- Jasper, A., *The Shining Garment of the Text: Gendered Readings of John’s Prologue* (JSNTSup, 165; GCT, 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- Jepson, A., ‘*אֵלֶּה*’, *TDOT*, I, pp. 292-323.
- Jeremias, J., *The Rediscovery of Bethesda, John 5:2* (trans. and rev. J. Vardaman, C. Burchard, D. Hume and M. Zalampas; NTAM, 1; Louisville, KY: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966 [1949]).
- Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period* (trans. F.H. and C.H. Cave; London: SCM Press, 1969).
- New Testament Theology. I. The Proclamation of Jesus* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press, 1971).



- ‘Zum nicht-responsorischen Amen’, *ZNW* 64 (1973), pp. 122-23.
- ‘נְבִיאִי’, *TLOT*, II, pp. 697-710.
- Jervell, J., and W.A. Meeks (eds.), *God’s Christ and his People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977).
- Johnson, A.R., *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2nd edn, 1962).
- The Cultic Prophet and Israel’s Psalmody* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1979).
- Johnson, D.H., ‘Logos’, *DJG*, pp. 481-84.
- Johnson, S.E., ‘Notes on the Prophet-King in John’, *ATR* 51 (1969), pp. 35-37.
- Johnstone, E.D., ‘The Johannine Version of the Feeding of the Five Thousand: An Independent Tradition?’, *NTS* 8 (1962), pp. 151-54.
- Jones, D.R., *Jeremiah* (NCBC; London: Marshall Pickering; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992).
- Jones, L.P., *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup, 145; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Jonge, M. de, ‘Jewish Expectations about the “Messiah” according to the Fourth Gospel’, *NTS* 19 (1973), pp. 246-70.
- ‘Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel’, *ETL* 49 (1973), pp. 160-77.
- Jesus, Stranger from Heaven and Son of God: Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective* (ed. and trans. J.E. Steely; SBLSPBS, 11; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977).
- ‘The Son of God and the Children of God in the Fourth Gospel’, in Cook (ed.), *Saved by Hope*, pp. 44-63.
- Jonge, M. de (ed.), *L’Évangile de Jean: Sources, rédaction, théologie* (BETL, 44; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977).
- Joubert, H.L.N., ‘“The Holy One of God” (John 6:69)’, *Neot* 2 (1968), pp. 57-69.
- Kaiser, O., *Isaiah 1–12* (trans. J. Bowden; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1983 [1981]).
- Isaiah 13–39* (trans. R.A. Wilson; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1974 [1973]).
- Kalantzis, G., ‘Ephesus as a Roman, Christian, and Jewish Metropolis in the First and Second Centuries C.E.’, *Jian Dao* 8 (1997), pp. 103-19.
- Kalimi, I., and J.D. Purvis, ‘The Hiding of the Temple Vessels in Jewish and Samaritan Literature’, *CBQ* 56 (1994), pp. 679-85.
- Kanagaraj, J.J., ‘Jesus the King, Merkabah Mysticism and the Gospel of John’, *TynB* 47 (1996), pp. 349-66.
- ‘Mysticism’ in the *Gospel of John: An Inquiry into its Background* (JSNTSup, 158; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- Karimattam, M., ‘Jesus the Prophet: A Study of the Prophet Motif in the Christology of Luke–Acts’ (unpublished PhD thesis; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978).
- Käsemann, E., ‘Ketzer und Zeuge: Zum johanneischen Verfasserproblem’, *ZTK* 48 (1951), pp. 292-311.
- The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17* (trans. G. Krodel; NTL; London: SCM Press, 1968).
- New Testament Questions of Today* (trans. W.J. Montague; NTL; London: SCM Press, 1969).
- ‘The Structure and Purpose of the Prologue to John’s Gospel’, in Käsemann, *New Testament Questions*, pp. 138-67.

- Kaylor, R.D., *Jesus the Prophet: His Vision of the Kingdom on Earth* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994).
- Kee, H.C., 'Self-Definition in the Asclepius Cult', in Meyer and Sanders (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, III, pp. 118-36, 211-13.
- Keener, C.S., *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003).
- Kelber, W., *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul and Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983).
- Kerr, A.R., *The Temple of Jesus' Body: The Temple Theme in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup, 220; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).
- Kidner, F.D., 'Isaiah', *NBC*, pp. 629-70.
- Kim, S., "The 'Son of Man'" as the Son of God (WUNT, 30; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1983).
- Kim, T.H., 'The Anarthrous οὐδὲ θεοῦ in Mark 15,39 and the Roman Imperial Cult', *Bib* 79 (1998), pp. 221-41.
- Kimelman, R., 'Birkat Ha-Minim and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Jewish Prayer in Late Antiquity', in E.P. Sanders, A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (3 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1981), I, pp. 226-44, 391-403.
- Kingsbury, J.D. (ed.), *Gospel Interpretation: Narrative-Critical and Social-Scientific Approaches* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997).
- Kitzberger, I.R., 'How Can This Be? (John 3:9): A Feminist-Theological Re-Reading of the Gospel of John', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 19-41.
- Klauck, H.-J., 'Der Weggang Jesu: Neue Arbeiten zu Joh 13-17', *BZ* 40 (1996), pp. 236-50.
- Klawans, J., 'Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice', *NTS* 48 (2002), pp. 1-17.
- Klein, H., 'Die lukanisch-johanneische Passionstradition', *ZNW* 67 (1976), pp. 155-86.
- Kleinknecht, H., 'θεῖος, θεϊότης', *TDNT*, III, pp. 122-23.
- Klockenbring, G., *Das Johannes-Evangelium: Ein Kurs in 22 Betrachtungen* (Stuttgart: Urachhaus, 1995).
- Knapp, H.M., 'The Messianic Water which Gives Life to the World', *HBT* 19 (1997), pp. 109-21.
- Knowles, M., *Jeremiah in Matthew's Gospel: The Rejected-Prophet Motif in Matthaean Redaction* (JSNTSup, 68; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).
- Koch, K., *The Prophets* (trans. M. Kohl; 2 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1982-83 [1978-80]).
- Koester, C.H., 'The Spectrum of Johannine Readers', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 5-19.
- Koester, C.R., "'The Savior of the World" (John 4:42)', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 665-80.
- Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995).
- Koester, H., *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990).
- Koskeniemi, E., 'Apollonius of Tyana: A Typical θεῖος ἄνθρωπος?', *JBL* 117 (1998), pp. 455-67.

- Kossen, H.B., 'Who Where the Greeks of John XII 20?', in Rientsma *et al.* (eds.), *Studies in John*, pp. 97-110.
- Köstenberger, A.J., *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples according to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).
- Krämer, H., R. Rendtorff, R. Meyer and G. Friedrich, 'προφήτης, προφήτις, κτλ', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 781-861.
- Kreitzer, L.J., 'The Temple Incident of John 2.13-25: A Preview of What Is to Come', in Rowland and Fletcher-Louis (eds.), *Understanding, Studying and Reading*, pp. 93-101.
- Kreitzer, L.J., and D.W. Rooke (eds.), *Ciphers in the Sand: Interpretations of the Woman Taken in Adultery (John 7.53-8.11)* (Biblical Seminar, 74; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).
- Kremer, J., *Lazarus: Die Geschichte einer Auferstehung. Text, Wirkungsgeschichte und Botschaft von Joh 11,1-46* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1985).
- Kreplin, M., *Das Selbstverständnis Jesu: Hermeneutische und christologische Reflexion* (WUNT, 2.141; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).
- Krieger, M., *A Window to Criticism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1964).
- Kugel, J., 'The Ladder of Jacob', *HTR* 88 (1995), pp. 209-27.
- Kügler, J., 'Der andere König: Religionsgeschichtliche Anmerkungen zum Jesusbild des Johannesevangeliums', *ZNW* 88 (1997), pp. 223-41.
- Kuhl, J., *Die Sendung Jesu und der Kirche nach dem Johannesevangelium* (Studia instituti missiologicae societatis verbi domini, 11; St Augustin: Styler, 1967).
- Kuhn, K.H., 'St John VII.37-8', *NTS* 4 (1957-58), pp. 63-65.
- Kysar, R., 'The Source Analysis of the Fourth Gospel: A Growing Consensus?', *NovT* 15 (1973), pp. 134-52.
- The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1975).
- John's Story of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).
- 'The Fourth Gospel: A Report on Recent Research', *ANRW* II, 25.3 (1985), pp. 2389-480.
- John* (ACNT; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986).
- 'The Making of Metaphor: Another Reading of John 3:1-15', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 21-41.
- La Potterie, I. de, 'Structure du Prologue de Saint Jean', *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 354-81.
- The Hour of Jesus: The Passion and the Resurrection of Jesus according to John* (trans. D.G. Murray; New York: Alba House, 1989).
- Labahn, M., 'Between Tradition and Literary Art: The Miracle Tradition in the Fourth Gospel', *Bib* 80 (1999), pp. 178-203.
- Lacocque, A., 'The Narrative Code of the Fourth Gospel: Response to Wolfgang Roth's Paper', *Bib Res* 32 (1987), pp. 30-41.
- Lalleman-de Winkel, H., *Jeremiah in Prophetic Tradition: An Examination of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Israel's Prophetic Traditions* (CBET, 26; Leuven: Peeters, 2000).
- Langbrandtner, W., *Weltferner Gott oder Gott der Liebe: Die Ketzerstreit in der johanneischen Kirche. Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung mit*

- Berücksichtigung der koptisch-gnostischen Texte aus Nag-Hammadi* (BBET, 6; Frankfurt a.M.: Lang, 1977).
- Lapin, H., 'Rabbi', *ABD*, V, pp. 600-602.
- Lee, D.A., *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning* (JSNTSup, 95; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
- Lee, E.K., *The Religious Thought of St. John* (London: SPCK, 1950).
- Lehtipuu, O., 'Characterization and Persuasion: The Rich Man and the Poor Man in Luke 16.19-31', in Rhoads and Syreeni (eds.), *Characterization in the Gospel*, pp. 73-105.
- Leidig, E., *Jesu Gespräch mit der Samaritanerin und weitere Gespräche im Johannesevangelium* (Theologischen Dissertationen, 15; Basel: Reinhardt, 1979).
- Leivestad, R., 'Exit the Apocalyptic Son of Man', *NTS* 18 (1972), pp. 243-67.
- Lenski, R.C.H., *The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1943).
- Levinskaya, I., *The Book of Acts in its Diaspora Setting* (BAFCS, 5; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1996).
- Levison, J.R., 'The Prophetic Spirit as an Angel according to Philo', *HTR* 88 (1995), pp. 189-207.
- Liebert, E., 'That You May Believe: The Fourth Gospel and Structural Developmental Theory', *BTB* 14 (1984), pp. 67-73.
- Lieu, J., 'Blindness in the Johannine Tradition', *NTS* 34 (1988), pp. 83-95.
- 'History and Theology in Christian Views of Judaism', in Lieu *et al.* (eds.), *Jews among Pagans*, pp. 79-96.
- Lieu, J., J. North and T. Rajak (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London: Routledge, 1992).
- Lightfoot, J., *A Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* (4 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995 [1859]).
- Lightfoot, R.H., *St John's Gospel: A Commentary* (ed. C.F. Evans; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956).
- Lim, T.H. *et al.* (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000).
- Lincoln, A.T., *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000).
- Lindars, B., 'Elijah, Elisha and the Gospel Miracles', in Moule (ed.), *Miracles*, pp. 61-79.
- Behind the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1971).
- The Gospel of John* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972).
- Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research* (London: SPCK, 1983).
- Lindars, B. (ed.), *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 1988).
- Lindblom, J., *Prophecy in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962).
- Lingad, C.G., *The Problems of Jewish Christians in the Johannine Community* (Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia, 73; Rome: Editrice Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 2001).
- Link, A., "Was redest du mit ihr?" Eine Studie zur Exegese-, Redaktions- und Theologiegeschichte von Joh 4,1-42 (BU, 24; Regensburg: Pustet, 1992).

- Livingstone, E.A. (ed.), *Studia Biblica 1978. II. Papers on the Gospels* (JSNTSup, 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980).
- Loader, W., *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Structure and Issues* (BBET, 23; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2nd edn, 1992).
- Loewe, R., "'Salvation' Is not of the Jews", *JTS* 32 (1981), pp. 341-68.
- Loewenstamm, A. L., 'Samaritan Chronology', *EncJud*, XIV, pp. 748-52.
- 'Samaritan Language and Literature', *EncJud*, XIV, pp. 752-57.
- Lohse, E., 'ῥαββί, ῥαββουί', *TDNT*, VI, pp. 961-65.
- Longman, T., *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Leicester: Apollos, 1987).
- Loos, H. van der, *The Miracle of Jesus* (NovTSup, 9; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968).
- Louis, K.R.R.G., and J.S. Ackerman (eds.), *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives* (2 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982).
- Louw, J.P., 'On Johannine Style', *Neot* 20 (1986), pp. 5-12.
- Lozada, Francisco, *A Literary Reading of John 5: Text as Construction* (Studies in Biblical Literature, 20; New York: Peter Lang, 2000).
- Lüdemann, G., 'ὁψώ', *EDNT*, III, p. 410.
- Lundbom, J.R., 'Jeremiah', *ABD*, III, pp. 684-98.
- Lundin, R. et al., *The Promise of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
- Lupieri, E., *The Mandaean: The Last Gnostics* (trans. C. Hindley; ITSORS; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).
- Maccini, R.G., 'A Reassessment of the Woman at the Well in John 4 in Light of the Samaritan Context', *JSNT* 53 (1994), pp. 35-46.
- Her Testimony Is True: Women as Witnesses according to John* (JSNTSup, 125; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
- Macdonald, J., 'The Samaritan Doctrine of Moses', *SJT* 13 (1960), pp. 149-62.
- The Theology of the Samaritans* (NTL; London: SCM Press, 1964).
- Macgregor, G.H.C., *The Gospel of John* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1928).
- Mack, B.L., *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).
- MacRae, G.W., 'The Meaning and Evolution of the Feast of Tabernacles', *CBQ* 22 (1960), pp. 251-76.
- 'The Fourth Gospel and *Religionsgeschichte*', *CBQ* 32 (1970), pp. 13-24.
- Madden, P.J., *Jesus' Walking on the Sea: An Investigation of the Origin of the Narrative Account* (BZNW, 81; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1997).
- Malatesta, E., 'The Literary Structure of John 17', *Bib* 52 (1971), pp. 190-214.
- Malbon, E.S., 'The Major Importance of Minor Characters in Mark', in Malbon and McKnight (eds.), *New Literary Criticism*, pp. 58-86.
- Malbon, E.S., and McKnight, E.V. (eds.), *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (JSNTSup, 109; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994).
- Malherbe, A.J., 'The Inhospitability of Diotrophes', in Jervell and Meeks (eds.), *God's Christ*, pp. 222-32.
- Malina, B.J., 'Jesus as Astral Prophet', *BTB* 27 (1997), pp. 83-98.
- Malina, B.J., and R.L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998).
- Manson, T.W., *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn, 1935).

- ‘The Fourth Gospel’, *BJRL* 30 (1946–47), pp. 312–29.
- On Paul and John: Some Selected Theological Themes* (SBT, 38; London: SCM Press, 1963).
- Marsh, J., *The Gospel of St John* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1968).
- Marshall, I.H., ‘Historical Criticism’, in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 126–38.
- The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).
- The Origins of New Testament Christology* (Leicester: Apollos, 2nd edn, 1990).
- Marshall, I.H. (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1977).
- Martens, E.A., ‘Jeremiah’, *NIDOTTE*, IV, pp. 752–55.
- Martínez, F.G., and J.T. Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995).
- Martyn, J.L., *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2nd edn, 1979 [1968]).
- ‘We Have Found Elijah’, in Scroggs and Hamerton-Kelly (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians*, pp. 181–219.
- ‘Glimpses into the History of the Johannine Community’, in de Jonge (ed.), *L’Évangile de Jean*, pp. 149–75.
- Mason, S., ‘Chief Priests, Sadducees, Pharisees, and Sanhedrin in Acts’, in Bauckham (ed.), *Book of Acts*, pp. 115–77.
- Mastin, B.A., ‘A Neglected Feature of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel’, *NTS* 22 (1975), pp. 32–51.
- Matson, M.A., ‘The Contribution to the Temple Cleansing by the Fourth Gospel’, *SBLSP* (1992), pp. 489–506.
- Matthews, V.H., ‘Perfumes and Spices’, *ABD*, V, pp. 226–28.
- Mattill, A.J., ‘Johannine Communities behind the Fourth Gospel: Georg Richter’s Analysis’, *TS* 38 (1977), pp. 294–315.
- Mauchline, J., ‘Jesus Christ as Intercessor’, *ExpTim* 64 (1952–53), p. 356.
- Mayer, A., ‘Elijah and Elisha in John’s Signs Source’, *ExpTim* 99 (1988), pp. 171–73.
- McConville, J.G., *Judgment and Promise: An Interpretation of the Book of Jeremiah* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993).
- McDonald, J.I.H., ‘Rhetorical Criticism’, *DBI*, pp. 599–600.
- ‘The So-Called *Pericopa de Adultera*’, *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 415–27.
- McEleny, N.J., ‘153 Great Fishes—Gematriachal Atbash’, *Bib* 58 (1977), pp. 411–17.
- McGrath, J.F., *John’s Apologetic Christology: Legitimation and Development in Johannine Christology* (SNTSMS, 111; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).
- McKelvey, R.J., *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969).
- McKnight, S., ‘Jesus and Prophetic Actions’, *BBR* 10 (2000), pp. 197–232.
- McNeill, J.T. (ed.), *Calvin: Institute of the Christian Religion* (trans. F.L. Battles; LCC, 20; London: SCM Press, 1961).
- McVann, M., ‘Rituals of Status Transformation in Luke–Acts: The Case of Jesus the Prophet’, in Neyrey (ed.), *Social World of Luke–Acts*, pp. 333–60.
- ‘One of the Prophets: Matthew’s Testing Narrative as a Rite of Passage’, *BTB* 23 (1993), pp. 14–20.

- Meeks, W.A., *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup, 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967).
- ‘The Divine Agent and his Counterfeit in Philo and the Fourth Gospel’, in Fiorenza, *Aspects of Religious Propaganda*, pp. 43-67.
- The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).
- ‘Breaking Away: Three New Testament Pictures of Christianity’s Separation from the Jewish Communities’, in Neusner and Frerichs (eds.), *To See Ourselves*, pp. 93-115.
- ‘The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism’, in Ashton (ed.), *Interpretation of John*, pp. 141-73.
- Meier, J.P., ‘The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What Can Be Said?’, *Bib* 81 (2000), pp. 202-32.
- Mendner, S., ‘Die Tempelreinigung’, *ZNW* 47 (1956), pp. 93-112.
- Menken, M.J.J., ‘The Quotation from Isa 40,3 in John 1,23’, *Bib* 66 (1985), pp. 190-205.
- Numerical Literary Techniques in John: The Fourth Evangelist’s Use of Numbers of Words and Syllables* (NovTSup, 55; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985).
- ‘The Old Testament Quotation in John 6,45: Source and Redaction’, *ETL* 64 (1988), pp. 164-72.
- ‘The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research’, in de Boer (ed.), *From Jesus to John*, pp. 292-320.
- Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (CBET, 15; Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996).
- ‘The Origin of the Old Testament Quotation in John 7:38’, *NovT* 38 (1996), pp. 159-74.
- “‘Zeal for your House Will Consume Me’ (John 2:17)”, in Menken (ed.), *Old Testament Quotations*, pp. 37-45.
- Mercer, C., ‘Ἀποστέλλειν and Πέμπειν in John’, *NTS* 36 (1990), pp. 619-24.
- Merlier, O., *Le quatrième évangile: La question johannique* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962).
- Merrill, A.L., and T.W. Overholt (eds.), *Scripture in History and Theology: Essays in Honor of J. Coert Rylaarsdam* (Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick Press, 1977).
- Metzger, B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; New York: United Bible Societies, 2nd edn, 1994).
- Meyer, B.F., and E.P. Sanders (eds.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (3 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).
- Meyer, H.A.W., *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospel of John* (trans. W. Urwick; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876 [1869]).
- Meyer, P.W., ‘“The Father”: The Presentation of God in the Fourth Gospel’, in Culpepper and Black (eds.), *Exploring the Gospel of John*, pp. 255-73.
- Meyer, R., *Der Prophet aus Galiläa: Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelien* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970 [1940]).
- Michaels, J.R., *John* (NIBC, 4; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989).
- Michaelis, W., ‘λιθάζω, καταλιθάζω, λιθοβολέω’, *TDNT*, IV, pp. 267-68.
- Millar, F., ‘The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora between Paganism and Christianity, AD 312-438’, in Lieu *et al.* (eds.), *Jews among Pagans*, pp. 97-123.

- Mimouni, S.C., 'La "Birkat Ha-Minim": Une prière juive contre les judéo-chrétiens', *RSR* 71 (1997), pp. 275-98.
- Miranda, J.P., *Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den johanneischen Sendungsformeln; zugleich ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Christologie und Ekklesiologie* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, 23.7; Bern: Peter Lang; Frankfurt: Herbert Lang, 2nd edn, 1976 [1972]).
- Die Sendung Jesu im vierten Evangelium: Religions- und theologieggeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Sendungsformeln* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 87; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977).
- Mlakuzhyil, G., *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (AnBib, 117; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987).
- Moberly, R.W.L., 'JES', *NIDOTTE*, I, pp. 427-33.
- Moloney, F.J., 'The Johannine Son of Man', *BTB* 6 (1976), pp. 177-89.
- The Johannine Son of Man* (BSR, 14; Rome: RAS, 2nd edn, 1978).
- 'A Sacramental Reading of John 13:1-38', *CBQ* 53 (1991), pp. 237-56.
- Belief in Word: Reading John 1-4* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
- Signs and Shadows: Reading John 5-12* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996).
- Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998).
- The Gospel of John* (Sacra Pagina Series, 4; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998).
- 'The Fourth Gospel and the Jesus of History', *NTS* 46 (2000), pp. 42-58.
- 'Narrative and Discourse at the Feast of Tabernacles: John 7:1-8:59', in Painter *et al.* (eds.), *Word, Theology and Community*, pp. 155-72.
- Montgomery, J.A., *The Samaritans the Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1968 [1907]).
- Moore, S.D., *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- Morgan, R., 'Which Was the Fourth Gospel? The Order of the Gospels and the Unity of Scripture', *JSNT* 54 (1994), pp. 3-28.
- Morris, L., *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries* (London: Tyndale Press, 1964).
- Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1969).
- The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971).
- Jesus Is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1989).
- Morton, A.Q., and J. McLeman, *The Genesis of John* (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1980).
- Motyer, A., *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1993).
- Motyer, S., *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and the Jews* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997).
- Moule, C.F.D., '"The Son of Man": Some of the Facts', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 277-79.
- Moule, C.F.D. (ed.), *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in their Philosophy and History* (London: A.R. Mowbray, 1965).
- Muddiman, J., 'Form Criticism', *DBI*, pp. 240-43.
- Mulienburg, J., 'Literary Form in the Fourth Gospel', *JBL* 51 (1932), pp. 40-53.
- 'The "Office" of the Prophet in Ancient Israel', in Hyatt (ed.), *Bible in Modern Scholarship*, pp. 74-97.



- Müller, H.P., 'ג'י'א', *TDOT*, IX, pp. 129-50.
- Müller, U.B., *Die Geschichte der Christologie in der johanneischen Gemeinde* (SBS, 77; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975).
- Murphy-O'Connor, J., 'Travelling Conditions in the First Century: On the Road and on the Sea with St Paul', *BR* 1/2 (1985), pp. 38-47.
- 'Community, Rule of the (1QS)', *ABD*, I, pp. 1110-12.
- 'Jesus and the Money Changers (Mark 11:15-17; John 2:13-17)', *RB* 107 (2000), pp. 42-55.
- Nations, A.L., 'Historical Criticism and the Current Methodological Crisis', *SJT* 36 (1983), pp. 59-71.
- Naud, J.A., 'ה'ח', *NIDOTTE*, II, pp. 56-61.
- 'ה'א', *NIDOTTE*, III, pp. 1007-15.
- Nebe, G., *Prophetische Züge im Bilde Jesu bei Lukas* (BWANT, 127; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989).
- Neil, S., and Wright, T., *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1986* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2nd edn, 1988).
- Neirynck, F., 'John and the Synoptics', in de Jonge (ed.), *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 73-106.
- 'John and the Synoptics: 1975–1990', in Denaux (ed.), *John and the Synoptics*, pp. 3-62.
- Evangelica III: 1992–2000. Collected Essays* (BETL, 150; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2001).
- Nereparampil, L., *Destroy this Temple: An Exegetico-Theological Study on the Meaning of Jesus' Temple-Logion in Jn 2:19* (Bangalore: Dharmaram, 1978).
- Neugerbauer, F., *Die Entstehung des Johannesevangeliums: Altes und Neues zur Frage seines historischen Ursprungs* (Arbeiten zur Theologie, 1.36; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1968).
- Neusner, J., 'Money-Changers in the Temple: The Mishnah's Explanation', *NTS* 35 (1989), pp. 287-90.
- Jews and Christians: The Myth of a Common Tradition* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1991).
- Neusner, J. (ed.), *Religious in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (Studies in the History of Religions [Supplement to Numen], 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1968).
- Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975).
- Neusner, J., and E. Frerichs (eds.), *'To See Ourselves as Others See Us': Christians, Jews, 'Others' in Late Antiquity* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985).
- Neusner, J., W.S. Green and E.S. Frerichs (eds.), *Judaisms and their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- Newheart, M.W., 'Toward a Psycho-literary Reading of the Fourth Gospel', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 43-58.
- Neyrey, J. H., 'Jacob Traditions and the Interpretation of John 4.10-26', *CBQ* 41 (1979), pp. 419-37.
- 'The Sociology of Secrecy and the Fourth Gospel', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 79-109.

- ‘The Trial (Forensic) and Tribulations (Honor Challenges) of Jesus: John 7 in Social Science Perspective’, *BTB* 26 (1996), pp. 107-24.
- ‘The “Noble Shepherd” in John 10: Cultural and Rhetorical Background’, *JBL* 120 (2001), pp. 267-91.
- Neyrey, J.H. (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991).
- Nicol, W., *The Sēmeia in the Fourth Gospel: Tradition and Redaction* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1972).
- Niederwimmer, K., *The Didache: A Commentary* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998).
- Nielsen, H.K., ‘Johannine Research’, in Nissen and Pedersen (eds.), *New Readings in John*, pp. 11-30.
- Nissen, J., and S. Pedersen (eds.), *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives. Essays from the Scandinavian Conference on the Fourth Gospel Århus 1997* (JSNTSup, 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Noack, B., *Zur johanneischen Tradition: Beiträge zur Kritik an der literarkritischen Analyse des vierten Evangeliums* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1954).
- Nolland, J., *Luke* (3 vols.; WBC; Dallas: Word Books, 1989-93).
- North, W.E.S., *The Lazarus Story within the Johannine Tradition* (JSNTSup, 212; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).
- O’Connell, M.J., ‘The Concept of Commandment in the Old Testament’, *TS* 21 (1960), pp. 351-403.
- O’Connell, R.H., ‘אֲכָל’, *NIDOTTE*, I, pp. 393-97.
- O’Day, G.R., *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986).
- Odeberg, H., *The Fourth Gospel: Interpreted in its Relation to Contemporaneous Religious Currents in Palestine and the Hellenistic-Oriental World* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1929).
- Oegema, G.S., *The Anointed and his People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPSup, 27; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- Oehler, W., *Das Johannesevangelium: Eine Missionschrift für die Welt* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1936).
- Oepke, A., ‘ἀνὴρ, ἀνδρίζομαι’, *TDNT*, I, pp. 360-63.
- ‘ἀποκαθίστημι, ἀποκατάτασις’, *TDNT*, I, pp. 387-93.
- O’Grady, J.F., ‘The Human Jesus in the Fourth Gospel’, *BTB* 14 (1984), pp. 63-66.
- O’Kane, M., ‘Isaiah: A Prophet in the Footsteps of Moses’, *JSOT* 69 (1996), pp. 29-51.
- Okure, T., *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1-42* (WUNT, 2.31; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988).
- Olsson, B., *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1-11 and 4:1-42* (trans. Jean Gray; CBNTS, 6; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1974).
- Orchard, H.C., *Courting Betrayal: Jesus as Victim in the Gospel of John* (JSNTSup, 161; GCT, 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- O’Rourke, J.J., ‘The Historical Present in the Gospel of John’, *JBL* 93 (1974), pp. 585-90.

- ‘Asides in the Gospel of John’, *NovT* 21 (1979), pp. 210-19.
- Osborne, G.R., *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991).
- Oswalt, J.N., *The Book of Isaiah* (NICOT; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986–98).
- Painter, J., *John: Witness and Theologian* (London: SPCK, 1975).
- ‘Tradition, History and Interpretation in John 10’, in Beutler and Fortna (eds.), *Shepherd Discourse of John 10*, pp. 53-74, 150-56.
- The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn, 1993).
- Mark’s Gospel: Worlds in Conflict* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997).
- Painter, J. et al. (eds.), *Word, Theology and Community in John* (St Louis: Chalice Press, 2002).
- Pamment, M., ‘The Meaning of *doxa* in the Fourth Gospel’, *ZNW* 74 (1983), pp. 12-16.
- Pancaro, S., *The Law in the Fourth Gospel: The Torah and the Gospel, Moses and Jesus, Judaism and Christianity according to John* (NovTSup, 42; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975).
- Pannenberg, W., *Jesus-God and Man* (trans. Lewis L. Wilkins and D.A. Priebe; London: SCM Press, 1968).
- Patsch, H., ‘εὐχαριστέω’, *EDNT*, II, pp. 87-88.
- Patte, D., *Structural Exegesis for New Testament Critics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).
- Pazdan, M.M., ‘Nicodemus and the Samaritan Woman: Contrasting Models of Discipleship’, *BTB* 17 (1987), pp. 145-48.
- Pendrick, G., ‘μονογενής’, *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 587-600.
- Perry, A.M., ‘Is John an Alexandrian Gospel?’, *JBL* 63 (1944), pp. 99-106.
- Perry, J.M., ‘The Evolution of the Johannine Eucharist’, *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 22-35.
- Perkins, P., ‘Gnostic Christologies and the New Testament’, *CBQ* 43 (1981), pp. 590-606.
- ‘Docetism’, in Ferguson (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, pp. 341-42.
- Petersen, D.L. (ed.), *Prophecy in Israel: Search for an Identity* (Issues in Religion and Theology, 10; Philadelphia: Fortress Press; London: SPCK, 1987).
- Petersen, N.R., *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978).
- Poffet, J.M., *La méthode exégétique d’Héracléon et d’Origène: Commentateurs de Jn 4: Jésus, la Samaritaine et les Samaritains* (Paradosis, 78; Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1985).
- Pollard, E.B., ‘The Prophetic Activity of Jesus’, *Biblical World* 24 (1904), pp. 94-99.
- Pollard, T.E., *Johannine Christology and the Early Church* (SNTSMS, 13; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970).
- Porter, S.E., ‘Why Hasn’t Reader-Response Criticism Caught on in New Testament Studies?’, *JLT* 4 (1990), pp. 278-92.
- Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Biblical Languages: Greek, 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).
- ‘Can Traditional Exegesis Enlighten Literary Analysis of the Fourth Gospel? An Examination of the Old Testament Fulfilment Motif and the Passover Theme’, in Evans and Stegner (eds.), *Gospels and Scriptures of Israel*, pp. 396-428.

- Porter, S.E., and C.A. Evans (eds.), *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (JSPSup, 26; RILP, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Powell, M.A., *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).
- Poythress, V.S., 'Testing for Johannine Authorship by Examining the Use of Conjunctions', *WTJ* 46 (1984), pp. 350-69.
- 'The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions De, Oun, Kai, and Asyndeton in the Gospel of John', *NovT* 26 (1984), pp. 312-40.
- Pratt, E.B., 'The Gospel of John from the Standpoint of Greek Tragedy', *Biblical World* 30 (1907), pp. 448-59.
- Priest, J.E. (ed.), *Johannine Studies: Essays in Honor of Frank Pack* (Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University Press, 1989).
- Pryor, J.W., 'John 4:44 and the *Patris* of Jesus', *CBQ* 49 (1987), pp. 254-63.
- 'Covenant and Community in John's Gospel', *RTR* 47 (1988), pp. 44-51.
- 'The Johannine Son of Man and the Descent-Ascent Motif', *JETS* 34 (1991), pp. 341-51.
- 'The Great Thanksgiving and the Fourth Gospel', *BZ* 35 (1991), pp. 157-79.
- Purvis, J.D., *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect* (HSM, 2; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).
- Radl, W., 'αἰτέω', *EDNT*, I, p. 43.
- Rajak, T., 'The Jewish Community and its Boundaries', in Lieu *et al.* (eds.), *Jews among Pagans*, pp. 9-28.
- Rand, J.A. du, 'The Characterization of Jesus as Depicted in the Narrative of the Fourth Gospel', *Neot* 19 (1985), pp. 18-36.
- 'A Syntactical and Narratological Reading of John 10 in Coherence with Chapter 9', in Beutler and Fortna (eds.), *Shepherd Discourse of John 10*, pp. 94-115, 161-63.
- Randall, J.F., 'The Theme of Unity in John 17:20-23', *ETL* 41 (1965), pp. 373-94.
- Raney, W.H., *The Relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Christian Cultus* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1933).
- Rapske, B.M., 'Acts, Travel and Shipwreck', in Gill and Gempf (eds.), *Book of Acts*, pp. 1-47.
- Reiling, J., 'The Use of ΨΕΥΔΟΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in the Septuaginta, Philo and Josephus', *NovT* 13 (1971), 147-56.
- Reim, G., *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (SNTSMS, 22; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974).
- 'John IV.44: Crux or Clue? The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth in Johannine Composition', *NTS* 22 (1976), pp. 476-80. The same article is reprinted in Reim, *Jochanan: erweiterte Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (Erlangen: Verlag der Ev.-Luther Mission, 1995), pp. 397-401.
- 'Jesus as God in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Background', *NTS* 30 (1984), pp. 158-60.
- Rein, M., *Die Heilung des Blindgeborenen (Joh 9). Tradition und Redaktion* (WUNT, 2.73; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995).
- Reinhartz, A., 'Jesus as Prophet: Predictive Prolepses in the Fourth Gospel', *JSNT* 36 (1989), pp. 3-16.
- 'The Johannine Community and its Jewish Neighbors: A Reappraisal', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 111-56.

- Befriending the Beloved Disciple: A Jewish Reading of the Gospel of John* (New York: Continuum, 2001).
- Reinmuth, E., 'Lazarus und seine Schwestern—was wollte Johannes erzählen? Narratologische Beobachtungen zu Joh 11,1-44', *TLZ* 124 (1999), cols. 127-38.
- Reiser, M., *Jesus and Judgment: The Eschatological Proclamation in its Jewish Context* (trans. M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997).
- 'Numismatik und Neues Testament', *Bib* 81 (2000), pp. 457-88.
- Rengstorff, K.H., 'ἀποστέλλω (πέμπω), κτλ', *TDNT*, I, pp. 398-406.
- 'σημεῖον, σημαίνω, κτλ', *TDNT*, VII, pp. 200-269.
- Rensberger, D., *Overcoming the World: Politics and Community in the Gospel of John* (London: SPCK, 1989).
- 'Sectarianism and Theological Interpretation in John', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 139-56.
- Rese, M., 'Das Selbstzeugnis des Johannesevangeliums über seinen Verfasser', *ETL* 72 (1996), pp. 75-111.
- Resseguie, J.L., 'John 9: A Literary-Critical Analysis', in Louis and Ackerman (eds.), *Literary Interpretations*, II, pp. 295-303, 320.
- Rhea, R., *The Johannine Son of Man* (ATANT, 76; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1990).
- Rhoads, D., and K. Syreeni (eds.), *Characterization in the Gospel: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism* (JSNTSup, 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Rhodes, A.B., 'Israel's Prophets as Intercessors', in Merrill and Overholt (eds.), *Scripture in History and Theology*, pp. 107-28.
- Richter, G., 'Die Fleischwerdung des Logos im Johannesevangelium', *NovT* 14 (1972), pp. 257-76.
- 'Präsentische und futurische Eschatologie in 4. Evangelium', in Fiedler and Zeller (eds.), *Gegenwart*, pp. 117-52.
- Riddle, D.W., 'Early Christian Hospitality: A Factor in the Gospel Transmission', *JBL* 57 (1938), pp. 141-54.
- Ridderbos, H., 'The Structure and Scope of the Prologue to the Gospel of John', *NovT* 8 (1966), pp. 180-201.
- The Gospel according to John: A Theological Commentary* (trans. J. Vriend; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).
- Rientsma, M.C., A. Geysers and K. Hanhart (eds.), *Studies in John: Presented to Professor Dr J.N. Sevenster on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (NovTSup, 24; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1970).
- Rigg, W.H., *The Fourth Gospel and its Message for To-day* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952).
- Rimmon-Kenan, S., *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics* (London: Routledge, 2nd edn, 2002).
- Ringe, S.H., *Wisdom's Friends: Community and Christology in the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1999).
- Roberts, C.H., *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library* (Manchester: John Rylands Library, 1935).
- Robinson, B.P., 'Christ as a Northern Prophet in St John', *Scripture* 17 (1965), pp. 104-108.

- Robinson, J.A., *The Historical Character of St John's Gospel* (London: Longmans, Green, 1908).
- Robinson, J.A.T., 'The Parable of the Shepherd (John 10.1-5)', *ZNW* 46 (1955), pp. 233-40.
- Twelve New Testament Studies* (SBT, 34; London: SCM Press, 1962).
- 'The New Look on the Fourth Gospel', in Robinson, *Twelve New Testament Studies*, pp. 94-106.
- 'The Destination and Purpose of St John's Gospel', *NTS* 6 (1960), pp. 117-31.
- Redating the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1976).
- 'His Witness Is True': A Test of the Johannine Claim', in Bammel and Moule (eds.), *Jesus and the Politics*, pp. 453-76.
- Twelve More New Testament Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1984).
- 'The Last Tabu? The Self-Consciousness of Jesus', in Robinson, *Twelve More New Testament Studies*, pp. 155-70.
- The Priority of John* (ed. J.F. Coakley; London: SCM Press, 1985).
- Rosas, R.L., *La Señal del Templo: Jn 2.13-22, redefinición cristológica de lo sacro* (Biblioteca mexicana, 12; Mexico City: Universidad Pontificia de México, 2001).
- Ross, J.F., 'The Prophet as Yahweh's Messenger', in Petersen (ed.), *Prophecy in Israel*, pp. 112-21.
- Roth, W., 'Scriptural Coding in the Fourth Gospel', *Bib Res* 32 (1987), pp. 6-29.
- Rothschild, J.-P., 'Samaritan Manuscripts: A Guide to the Collections and Catalogues', in Crown (ed.), *Samaritans*, pp. 771-94.
- Rowland, C., and C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis (eds.), *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton* (JSNTSup, 153; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- Rudolph, K., 'Mandaism', *ABD*, IV, pp. 500-502.
- Ruiz, M.R., *Der Missionsgedanke des Johannesevangeliums: Ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Soteriologie und Ekklesiologie* (Forschung zur Bibel, 55; Würzburg: Echter, 1986).
- Ryken, L., *Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2nd edn, 1992).
- Ryken, L. et al. (eds.), *Dictionary of Biblical Imagery* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1998).
- Saldarini, A.J., 'Rabbinic Literature and the NT', *ABD*, V, pp. 602-604.
- 'Sanhedrin', *ABD*, V, pp. 975-80.
- Sand, A., *Das Gesetz und die Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Theologie des Evangeliums nach Matthäus* (BU, 11; Regensburg: Pustet, 1974).
- Sanday, W., *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).
- Sanders, E.P., *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).
- The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin Press, 1993).
- Sanders, J.A., 'From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4', in Neusner (ed.), *Christianity*, pp. 75-106.
- Sanders, J.N., *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943).
- 'St John on Patmos', *NTS* 9 (1962), pp. 75-85.
- The Gospel according to Saint John* (London: A. & C. Black, 1968).

- Sawyer, J.F.A., *Prophecy and the Prophets of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).
- Schelke, K.H., 'Jesus-Lehrer und Prophet', in Hoffman *et al.* (eds.) *Orientierung an Jesus*, pp. 300-308.
- Schenk, W., 'ἔρωτάω', *EDNT*, II, pp. 57-58.
- Schenke, L., 'Joh 7-10: Eine dramatische Szene', *ZNW* 80 (1989), pp. 172-92.
- 'Das johanneische Schisma und die "Zwölf" (Johannes 6,60-71)', *NTS* 38 (1992), pp. 105-21.
- Johannes Kommentar* (Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1998).
- Schlatter, A., *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt* (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1930).
- Schlier, H., 'ἀμήν', *TDNT*, I, pp. 335-38.
- Schmidt, N., *The Prophet of Nazareth* (London: Macmillan, 1905).
- Schnackenburg, R., 'Die Erwartung des "Propheten" nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten', *SE* 1 (1959), pp. 622-39.
- 'Zur Herkunft des Johannesevangeliums', *BZ* 14 (1970), pp. 1-23.
- 'Strukturanalyse von Joh 17', *BZ* 17 (1973), pp. 67-78, 196-202.
- 'Entwicklung und Stand der johanneischen Forschung seit 1955', in de Jonge (ed.), *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 19-44.
- The Gospel according to St. John* (trans. K. Smyth, C. Hastings, D. Smith and G.A. Kon; 3 vols.; London: Burns & Oates, 1968-82).
- Ihr werdet mich sehen: Die Abschiedsworte Jesu nach Joh 13-17* (Freiburg: Herder, 1985).
- Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology* (trans. O.C. Dean; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995).
- Schnelle, U., *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John: An Investigation of the Place of the Fourth Gospel in the Johannine School* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992).
- Schneiders, S.M., 'John 21:1-14', *Int* 43 (1989), pp. 70-75.
- 'John 20:11-18: The Encounter of the Easter Jesus with Mary Magdalene—A Transformative Feminist Reading', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 155-68.
- '“Because of the Woman's Testimony...”: Reexamining the Issue of Authorship', *NTS* 44 (1998), pp. 513-35.
- Written that You May Believe: Encountering Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1999).
- Schneider, J., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (THNT; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1976).
- 'ἔρχομαι, κτλ', *TDNT*, II, pp. 666-84.
- Schneider, F., *Jesus der Prophet* (OBO, 2; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973).
- Scholtissek, K., 'Johannine Studies: A Survey of Recent Research with Special Regard to German Contributions', *CRBS* 6 (1998), pp. 227-59.
- Schottroff, L., 'The Samaritan Woman and the Notion of Sexuality in the Fourth Gospel', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 157-81.
- Schuchard, B.G., *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).

- Schultz, R., 'פֶּלֶל', *NIDOTTE*, III, pp. 627-28.
- Schwank, B., *Evangelium nach Johannes* (St Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1996).
- Schwartz, E., 'Aporien im vierten Evangelium', *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 1 (1907), pp. 347-72.
- Schweizer, E., 'Der Menschensohn', *ZNW* 50 (1959), pp. 185-209.
- 'The Son of Man', *JBL* 79 (1960), pp. 119-29.
- 'The Son of Man Again', *NTS* 9 (1962), pp. 256-61.
- Scott, E., *The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2nd edn, 1923).
- Scroggs, R., *Christology in Paul and John* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).
- Scroggs, R., and R. Hamerton-Kelly (eds.), *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976).
- Segbroeck, F. van, 'Jésus rejeté par sa patrie (Mt 13,54-58)', *Bib* 48 (1968), pp. 167-98.
- Segovia, F.F., *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991).
- 'Inclusion and Exclusion in John 17: An Intercultural Reading', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, II, pp. 183-210.
- 'John 1:1-18 as Entree into Johannine Reality: Representation and Ramifications', in Painter *et al.* (eds.), *Word, Theology and Community*, pp. 33-64.
- Segovia, F.F. (ed.), *What Is John? Readers and Readings of the Fourth Gospel* (SBLSS, 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).
- *What Is John? II. Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel* (SBLSS, 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).
- Seynaeve, J., 'Les verbes ἀποστέλλω et πέμπω dans le vocabulaire théologique de Saint Jean', in de Jonge (ed.), *L'Évangile de Jean*, pp. 385-89.
- Shanks, H., 'Is the Title "Rabbi" Anachronistic in the Bible?', *JQR* 53 (1963), pp. 337-45.
- 'On the Origin of the Title "Rabbi"', *JQR* 59 (1968), pp. 152-57.
- Shaviv, S., 'NĀBÎ' and NĀĠÎD in 1 Samuel ix 1-x 16', *VT* 34 (1984), pp. 108-13.
- Shellard, B., 'The Relationship of Luke and John: A Fresh Look at an Old Problem', *JTS* 46 (1995), pp. 71-98.
- Shehadeh, H., 'Book of Joshua', in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion to Samaritan Studies*, pp. 42-43.
- Sidebottom, E.M., *The Christ of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of First-century Thought* (London: SPCK, 1961).
- Simon, U., 'Minor Characters in Biblical Narrative', *JSOT* 46 (1990), pp. 11-19.
- Skeel, C.A.J., *Travel in the First Century after Christ, with Special Reference to Asia Minor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1901).
- Slater, T.B., 'One Like a Son of Man in First-Century CE Judaism', *NTS* 41 (1995), pp. 183-98.
- Smalley, S.S., 'The Johannine Son of Man Sayings', *NTS* 15 (1969), pp. 278-301.
- 'The Sign in John 21', *NTS* 20 (1974), pp. 275-88.
- *John: Evangelist and Interpreter* (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 2nd edn, 1998).
- 'The Johannine Literature: A Sample of Recent Studies in English', *Theology* 103 (2000), pp. 13-28.
- Smith, D.M., 'The Sources of the Gospel of John: An Assessment of the Present State of the Problem', *NTS* 10 (1964), pp. 336-51.



- The Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel: Bultmann's Literary Theory* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965).
- 'The Presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel', *Int* 31 (1977), pp. 367-78.
- 'John and the Synoptics: Some Dimensions of the Problem', *NTS* 26 (1980), pp. 425-44.
- Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources, and Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987 [1984]).
- John* (Proclamation Commentaries; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 2nd edn, 1986).
- John among the Gospels* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2nd edn, 2001).
- The Theology of the Gospel of John* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- John* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1999).
- Smith, M., 'The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena', *HUCA* 29 (1958), pp. 273-313.
- Smothers, E.R., 'Two Readings in Papyrus Bodmer II', *HTR* 51 (1958), pp. 109-22.
- Solages, B. de, *Jean et les Synoptiques* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979).
- Stacey, W.D., *Prophetic Drama in the Old Testament* (London: Epworth Press, 1990).
- 'The Lord's Supper as Prophetic Drama', *Epworth Review* 21 (1994), pp. 65-74.
- Staley, J.L., *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (SBLDS, 82; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).
- 'Stumbling in the Dark, Reaching for the Light: Reading Character in John 5 and 9', *Semeia* 53 (1991), pp. 55-80.
- 'Reading Myself, Reading the Text: The Johannine Passion Narrative in Post-modern Perspective', in Segovia (ed.), *What Is John?*, pp. 59-104.
- Stambaugh, J.E., and D.L. Balch, *The New Testament in its Social Environment* (Library of Early Christianity, 2; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986).
- Stanton, G., *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).
- Stegemann, E.W., and W. Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of its First Century* (trans. O.C. Dean; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999).
- Stenhouse, P., 'Samaritan Chronicles', in Crown (ed.), *Samaritans*, pp. 218-65.
- Sternberg, M., *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).
- Stibbe, M.W.G., 'Structuralism', *DBI*, pp. 650-55.
- 'The Elusive Christ: A New Reading of the Fourth Gospel', *JSNT* 44 (1991), pp. 20-39.
- John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS, 73; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- John* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).
- 'A Tomb with a View: John 11.1-44 in Narrative-Critical Perspective', *NTS* 40 (1994), pp. 38-54.
- Stibbe, M.W.G. (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth-Century Perspective* (NTTS, 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993).
- Stimpfle, A., *Blinde sehen: Die Eschatologie im traditionsgeschichtlichen Prozess des Johannesevangeliums* (BZNW, 57; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1990).
- Strachan, R.H., *The Fourth Evangelist: Dramatist or Historian* (New York: George H. Doran, 1925).

- The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment* (London: SCM Press, 3rd edn, 1941).
- Strathmann, H., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1951).
- Stronstad, R., *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (JPTSup, 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).
- Sturch, R.L., 'The Alleged Eyewitness Material in the Fourth Gospel', in Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Biblica* 1978, II, pp. 313-27.
- Tal, A., 'Asatīr', in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion to Samaritan Studies*, p. 34.
- 'Targum', in Crown *et al.* (eds.), *Companion to Samaritan Studies*, pp. 226-28.
- Talbert, C.H., *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (London: SPCK, 1992).
- Tarelli, C.C., 'Johannine Synonyms', *JTS* 47 (1946), pp. 175-77.
- Teepie, H.M., *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (JBLMS, 10; Philadelphia: SBL, 1957).
- The Literary Origin of the Gospel of John* (Evanston, IL: Religion and Ethics Institute, 1974).
- Temple, P.J., 'The Rejection at Nazareth', *CBQ* 17 (1955), pp. 229-42.
- Temple, S., *The Core of the Fourth Gospel* (London: Mowbrays, 1975).
- Temple, W., *Readings in St John's Gospel* (London: Macmillan, complete edn, 1947).
- Tenney, M.C., 'The Footnotes of John's Gospel', *BSac* 117 (1960), pp. 350-64.
- Thatcher, T., 'A New Look at Asides in the Fourth Gospel', *BSac* 151 (1994), pp. 428-39.
- Theobald, M., *Die Fleischwerdung des Logos: Studien zum Verhältnis des Johannesprologs zum Corpus des Evangeliums und zu 1 Joh* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 20; Münster: Aschendorff, 1988).
- Thiselton, A.C., *New Horizons in Hermeneutics* (London: Harper Collins, 1992).
- 'Communicative Action and Promise in Interdisciplinary, Biblical, and Theological Hermeneutics', in Lundin *et al.* (eds.), *Promise of Hermeneutics*, pp. 133-239.
- Thomas, J.C., *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community* (JSNTSup, 61; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).
- Thompson, H.O., 'Marah', *ABD*, IV, p. 513.
- Thompson, J.A., *The Book of Jeremiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980).
- Thompson, M.B., 'The Holy Internet: Communication between Churches in the First Christian Generation', in Bauckham (ed.), *Gospels for All Christians*, pp. 49-70.
- Thompson, M.M., *The Humanity of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988).
- 'Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel', *BBR* 1 (1991), pp. 89-108.
- 'Gospel of John', *DJG*, pp. 368-83.
- *The God of the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).
- Thornton, T., 'Anti-Samaritan Exegesis Reflected in Josephus' Retelling of Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges', *JTS* 47 (1996), pp. 125-30.
- Thornton, T.C.G., 'Christian Understandings of the *birkath ha-minim* in the Eastern Roman Empire', *JTS* 38 (1987), pp. 419-31.
- Thyen, H., 'Johannes 10 im Kontext des vierten Evangeliums', in Beutler and Fortna (eds.), *Shepherd Discourse of John 10*, pp. 116-34, 163-68.

- ‘Aus der Literatur zum Johannesevangelium’, *TRu* 44 (1979), pp. 97-134.
- Tiede, D.L., ‘Aretalogy’, *ABD*, I, pp. 372-73.
- Tilborg, S. van, *Imaginative Love in John* (BIS, 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1993).
- Reading John in Ephesus* (NovTSup, 83; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).
- Tolmie, D.F., *Jesus’ Farewell to the Disciples: John 13:1-17:26 in Narratological Perspective* (BIS, 12; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995).
- ‘The Characterization of God in the Fourth Gospel’, *JSNT* 69 (1998), pp. 57-75.
- Torrance, T.F., *The School of Faith: The Catechisms of the Reformed Church* (London: James Clarke, 1959).
- Tov, E., ‘Proto-Samaritan Texts and the Samaritan Pentateuch’, in Crown (ed.), *Samaritans*, pp. 397-407.
- Tovey, D., *Narrative Art and Act in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup, 151; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Travis, S.H., ‘Form Criticism’, in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 153-64.
- Trudinger, P., ‘The Cleansing of the Temple: St John’s Independent, Subtle Reflections’, *ExpTim* 108 (1997), pp. 329-30.
- Trumbower, J.A., ‘Hermes Trismegistos’, *ABD*, III, pp. 156-57.
- Tuckett, C.M., ‘Redaction Criticism’, *DBI*, pp. 580-82.
- ‘Source Criticism (New Testament)’, *DBI*, pp. 646-48.
- Turner, G.A., ‘The Date and Purpose of the Gospel by John’, *BETS* 6 (1963), pp. 82-85.
- Turner, N., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. III. Syntax (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963).
- Unnik, W.C. van, ‘The Purpose of St John’s Gospel’, *SE* 1 (1959), pp. 382-411.
- VanderKam, J.C., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (London: SPCK; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).
- Vawter, B., ‘Ezekiel and John’, *CBQ* 26 (1964), pp. 450-58.
- ‘Were the Prophets nābī’s?’, *Bib* 66 (1985), pp. 206-19.
- Verhoef, P.A., ‘Prophecy’, *NIDOTTE*, IV, pp. 1067-78.
- Vermes, G., *Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973).
- ‘The “Son of Man” Debate’, *JSNT* 1 (1978), pp. 19-32.
- An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SCM Press, 1999).
- Vesco, J.-L., *Jérusalem et son prophète: Une lecture de l’évangile selon saint Luc* (Paris: Cerf, 1988).
- Vetter, D., ‘נָחִי’, *TLOT*, I, pp. 400-403.
- ‘נָחִי’, *TLOT*, III, pp. 1176-83.
- Vouga, F., ‘The Johannine School: A Gnostic Tradition in Primitive Christianity?’, *Bib* 69 (1988), pp. 371-85.
- Waetjen, H.C., ‘Logos πρὸς τὸν θεόν and the Objectification of Truth in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel’, *CBQ* 63 (2001), pp. 265-86.
- Wahlde, U.C. von, ‘Community in Conflict: The History and Social Context of the Johannine Community’, in Kingsbury (ed.), *Gospel Interpretation*, pp. 222-33.
- Walker, N., ‘What is NĀBHĪ?’, *ZAW* 73 (1961), pp. 99-100.
- Walker, P.W.L., *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996).

- Walker, W., 'The Son of Man: Some Recent Developments', *CBQ* 45 (1983), pp. 584-607.
- Walker, W.M.O., 'The Lord's Prayer in Matthew and in John', *NTS* 28 (1982), pp. 237-56.
- Wall, R.W., 'Community: New Testament Koinōnia', *ABD*, I, pp. 1103-10.
- Wallace, D.B., 'Reconsidering "The Story of Jesus and the Adulteress Reconsidered"', *NTS* 39 (1993), pp. 290-96.
- Walsh, J.T., 'Elijah', *ABD*, II, pp. 463-66.
- Waltke, B.K., 'Samaritan Pentateuch', *ABD*, V, pp. 932-40.
- Wansbrough, H. (ed.), *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition* (JSNTSup, 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991).
- Water, L. van der, 'De profeet Jezus', *TGL* 25 (1969), pp. 321-34.
- Watson, F., 'Trinity and Community: A Reading of John 17', *IJST* 1 (1999), pp. 168-84.
- 'The Quest for the Real Jesus', in Bockmuehl (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Jesus*, pp. 156-69.
- Watts, J.D.W., *Isaiah* (WBC; 2 vols.; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985-87).
- Watty, W.W., 'The Significance of Anonymity in the Fourth Gospel', *ExpTim* 90 (1979), pp. 209-21.
- Wead, D.W., *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1970).
- Webb, R.L., *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Study* (JSNTSup, 62; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).
- Weiland, D.J., 'John V.2 and the Pool of Bethesda', *NTS* 12 (1966), pp. 392-404.
- Welck, C., *Erzählte Zeichen: Die Wundergeschichten des Johannesevangeliums literarisch untersucht. Mit einen Ausblick auf Joh 21* (WUNT, 2.69; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994).
- Wellhausen, J., *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1908).
- Wengst, K., *Bedrängte Gemeinde und verherrlichter Christus: Der historische Ort des Johannesevangeliums als Schlüssel zu seiner Interpretation* (BthS, 5; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2nd edn, 1983 [1981]).
- Das Johannesevangelium* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2000).
- Wenham, D., 'Source Criticism', in Marshall (ed.), *New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 139-52.
- Wessel, W.W., 'Mark', in Gaebelein (ed.), *Expositor's Bible Commentary*, VIII, pp. 603-793.
- Westcott, B.F., *The Gospel according to St John: The Authorized Version with Introduction and Notes* (London: John Murray, 1908).
- Westermann, C., *Basic Forms of Prophetic Speech* (trans. H.C. White; London: Lutterworth Press, 1967).
- Isaiah 40-66* (trans. D.M. Stalker; OTL; London: SCM Press, 1969 [1966]).
- The Gospel of John: In the Light of the Old Testament* (trans. S.S. Schatzmann; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998).
- Wetter, G.P., *Der Sohn Gottes: Eine Untersuchung über den Charakter und die Tendenz des Johannes-Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1916).
- Whitacre, R.A., *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology* (SBLDS, 67; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).

- Whitelam, K.W., 'Elisha', *ABD*, II, pp. 472-73.
- Whiteley, D.E.H., 'Was John Written by a Sadducee?', *ANRW* II, 25.3 (1985), pp. 2481-2505.
- Whybray, R.N., *Isaiah 40-66* (NCBC; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).
- Wiener, A., *The Prophet Elijah in the Development of Judaism: A Depth-Psychological Study* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978).
- Wikenhauser, A., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (RNT, 6; Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 2nd edn, 1957).
- Wilckens, U., *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (NTD, 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).
- Wilcox, M., 'The "Prayer" of Jesus in John XI.41b-42', *NTS* 24 (1977), pp. 128-32.
- Wildberger, H., 'Ἰῆς', *TLOT*, I, pp. 134-57.
- Wilder, A., *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel* (London: SCM Press, 1964).
- Wilder, A.N., K.W. Clark, A. Descamps and P. Schubert (eds.), *Neotestamentica et patristica: Eine Freundesgabe, Herrn Professor Dr Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht* (NovTSup, 6; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1962).
- Willett, M.E., *Wisdom Christology in the Fourth Gospel* (San Francisco: Mellen Research University Press, 1992).
- Williams, D.T., 'The Four-Fold Office of Christ', *ExpTim* 100 (1989), pp. 134-37.
- Williams, M.H., *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diasporan Sourcebook* (London: Duckworth, 1998).
- Wind, A., 'Destination and Purpose of the Gospel of John', *NovT* 14 (1972), pp. 26-69.
- Windisch, H., 'Der Johanneische Erzählungsstil', in Hans Schmidt (ed.), *EYXAPISTHPION: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Hermann Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstags, den 23 Mai 1922, dargebracht von seinem Schülern und Freunden* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923), pp. 174-213.
- Johannes und die Synoptiker: Wollte der vierte Evangelist die älteren Evangelien ergänzen oder ersetzen?* (UNT, 12; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1926).
- 'John's Narrative Style', in Stibbe (ed.), *Gospel of John as Literature*, pp. 25-64.
- Wink, W., *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (SNTSMS, 7; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968).
- Winter, M., *Das Vermächtnis Jesu und die Abschiedsworte der Vater: Gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der Vermächtnisrede im Blick auf Joh. 13-17* (FRLANT, 161; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994).
- Winter, P., 'Μονογενὴς παρὰ πατρός', *ZRGG* 5 (1953), pp. 335-65.
- Witherington III, B., *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990).
- John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995).
- Jesus the Seer: The Progress of Prophecy* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999).
- Witkamp, L.T., *Jezus van Nazareth in de gemeente van Johannes: Over de interactie van traditie en ervaring* (Kampen: van den Berg, 1986).
- Wolfson, H.A., *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (2 vols.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948).

- Woude, A.S. van der, *Die messianische Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957).
- Wright, C., *Deuteronomy* (NIBC, 4; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996).
- Wright, N.T., *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996).
- Wuellner, W., 'Putting Life Back into the Lazarus Story and its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith', *Semeia* 53 (1991), pp. 113-32.
- Würthwein, E., and O. Kaiser (eds.), *Tradition und Situation: Studien zur alttestamentlichen Prophetie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963).
- Yee, G.A., *Jewish Feasts and the Gospel of John* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1989).
- Young, E.J., *The Book of Isaiah* (3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965-72).
- Young, F.W., 'Jesus the Prophet: A Re-Examination', *JBL* 68 (1949), pp. 285-99.
- 'A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel', *ZNW* 46 (1955), pp. 215-33.
- Zeitlin, S., 'The Political Synedrion and the Religious Synedrion', *JQR* 36 (1945), pp. 109-40.
- 'Synedrion in Greek Literature, the Gospels and the Institution of the Sanhedrin', *JQR* 37 (1946), pp. 189-98.
- 'Synedrion in the Judeo-Hellenistic Literature and Sanhedrin in the Tannaitic Literature', *JQR* 37 (1946), pp. 307-15.
- 'The Account of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena', *JQR* 49 (1958-59), pp. 292-300.
- 'A Reply [to Shanks]', *JQR* 53 (1963), pp. 345-49.
- 'The Title Rabbi in the Gospels Is Anachronistic', *JQR* 59 (1968), pp. 158-60.
- Zimmermann, J., *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftenfunden von Qumran* (WUNT, 2.104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998).

## INDEX OF REFERENCES

### Old Testament

#### *Genesis*

1.3	270
2.6-7	191
14.18-24	125
18.23-33	75
20.7	75
28.12	270
32.31	75, 139

#### *Exodus*

3-4	75
3	73
3.1-4.31	75
3.1-15	129, 156
4.13	156
4.19	160
7.14-11.10	76
14.1-31	76
14.1-2	216
15.22-27	98, 243
15.22-25	76, 175
16.1-36	76
16.11-36	215
17.1-7	76, 175
17.1-6	215
19.16-24	219
19.20	216
32.11-14	75-76
32.30-35	76, 124
33.7-11	75
33.11	75, 139, 260
33.17-23	219

#### *Leviticus*

4.3	223, 262
4.5	223, 262
4.16	223, 262

20.27	161
-------	-----

24.15-16	161
----------	-----

#### *Numbers*

5.22	164
11.1-33	215
11.16-35	76
11.16-17	75
11.24-30	75
12.1-15	75
12.6	75
12.8	75-76, 139, 260
12.13	76, 124, 193
14.11-19	76
14.13-24	75
14.14	76
16.28-29	156
16.28	111
20.1-11	175
20.2-11	215
21.16	175
21.17	175
21.18	175

#### *Deuteronomy*

5.1-27	47
5.28-29	89
9.18-29	76
13.1-5	77
13.2-6	161
17.2-7	161
18.9-22	69
18.9-14	219
18.15-22	37, 52
18.15-18	44-45, 49, 89, 184, 201-202, 210, 212, 215, 217-20, 222-23, 228, 250-51, 273, 276, 283

*Deuteronomy (cont.)*

18.15	3, 35, 39, 46, 50, 75, 90, 206, 208, 266
18.18-22	36
18.18-19	48-49, 89, 137
18.18	3, 35, 47, 50, 75, 136, 155, 158, 206, 208
18.20	75
18.22	75, 77
25.5-10	178
27.14-26	165-66
32-34	85
34.5	69
34.10	75, 86, 139, 260
34.10-12	75
34.10-11	103
39.19	138
39.26	138

*Joshua*

1.1	69
1.13	69
8.31	69
11.12	69
12.6	69
13.8	69
14.7	69
22.2	69
22.5	69
24.29	69

*Judges*

2.8	69
6.22	75, 139

*1 Samuel*

2.27	69
7.5-11	75
7.8-9	75
7.10-17	130
9.6	69
9.9	69
12.3	262
12.19-23	75
12.19	75
28.14	197
30.6	160-61

*2 Samuel*

12.1-12	178
19.22	262
24.11	69

*1 Kings*

2.18	161
13.1-31	69
13.6	124
17.1-19.21	70
17.1-18.46	70
17.1	70, 119
17.5	70
17.7-16	99, 120
17.8-16	71, 99, 243
17.10	70
17.13	70
17.14	70
17.16	70
17.17-24	71, 101, 106-107, 120, 124, 193, 243
17.18	70, 108
17.20-21	71
17.23	102
17.24	69-71
18.4	143
18.13	143
18.18	70
18.22	70
18.36	70
19.9-18	219
19.10	70, 160
19.14	70, 160
19.16-21	71
21.1-29	70
21.1-24	178
21.17	70
21.20-22	70
21.28	70

*2 Kings*

1.1-2.25	70
1.3	70
1.8	70, 208
1.9-13	70
1.16	70
2-13	71



2.3-6	105, 109, 179	14.25	224
2.13-14	71	17.13	69
2.15	197	17.29-34	178
2.19-22	71, 98, 175, 243	19.10	143
2.23-25	71	19.14	143
3.11	71	20.8-11	73
4.1-7	99	22.26-27	143
4.8-37	71, 101, 120, 193		
4.9	69, 71, 108	<i>1 Chronicles</i>	
4.16	71, 108, 119	16.36	164
4.18-37	124	21.9	69
4.21	71	25.5	69
4.22	71, 108	29.29	69
4.25	71		
4.27	71, 105	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
4.37	197	1.3	69
4.38-41	71	9.29	69
4.40	71	12.15	69
4.42-44	71, 218-20, 250, 263, 276	16.10	143
5.1-27	193	21.12	70
5.1-19	71	24.6	69
5.8	71	24.20-22	143
5.10	119, 193	29.25	69
5.13	71	30.27	124
5.14	71		
5.15	71	<i>Nehemiah</i>	
5.20-27	71	6.12	156
5.20	71	8.6	164, 166
5.25-27	105, 109, 179	9.26-30	143
6.1-7	71	10.30	69
6.6	71		
6.8-23	71	<i>Job</i>	
6.9	71	27.9	194
6.10	71	35.13	194
6.15	71		
7.2	71	<i>Psalms</i>	
7.17	71	19.7	194
7.18	71	34.4	160
7.19	71	37.13	160
8.2	71	39.15	160
8.4	71	41.9b	162
8.7	71	41.13	164, 166
8.8	71	41.14	164
8.11	71	53.5	160
9.7	143	62.10	160
9.36	70	66.18	194
13.20-21	71	68.10	114

<i>Psalms</i> (cont.)		39.3	71
72.19	164, 166	40–66	72
85.14	160	40.1–55.13	105
89.52	166	41.4	270
89.53	164	42.2	226
106.48	166	43.10	270
118.21a	110	43.13	270
		46.4	270
<i>Proverbs</i>		48.12	270
1.1	200	51.4	265
15.29	194	52.6	270
26.7	200	52.8	76
30.1–4	270–71	52.13	270
		55.1–3	270
<i>Isaiah</i>		55.1	176
1–39	72	55.10–11	270
1.10–12	116	56.7	114
1.15	194	60.13	116
2.1–12.6	72	61.1	223, 262
3.2	71	62.6	199
6.1–13	130, 156	63.7–64.11	73
6.1	270		
6.3–4	226	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
6.10	191	1.1–10	130, 156
7.3	73	1.2–3	74
7.14	72	1.4–19	73
8.1–4	73	1.5	73, 126
8.3	72–73	2–20	74
8.18	103	2.13	69, 176
9.1–2	72	2.30	143
9.14	71	3.2	156
10.27–11.9	72	6.17	199
10.34	116	7.2–15	74
12.3	227	7.11	114
13.1–23.18	72	7.14	116
20.2	72	7.16	75, 124
20.3	103	7.34	116
20.9	191	11–20	73
24–39	72	11.14	75, 124
28.7	71	11.18–23	74
29.10	69, 71	11.21	143
30.20	265	12.1–6	74
34.2–4	216	13.1–11	74
37.2	71	14.7–9	75, 124
38.1	71	14.11–12	75, 124
38.5	119	14.14	156
38.8	73	14.15	156

14.17	124	36.1-32	74
14.20-21	124	37.1-38.28	75
15.1	75, 124	37.3	75
15.10-12	74	37.15-16	143
15.15-21	74	38.6	143
16.1-9	74	42.2	75
16.1-4	74	43.8-13	74
16.5-7	74	46.1-51.64	74
17.13	69, 176	51.59-64	74
17.14-18	74		
17.15	75	<i>Ezekiel</i>	
18.1-12	74	2.1	197
18.18-23	74	3.1	197
19.1-15	74	3.17	132, 199
20.1-2	143	4.1-3	103
20.2	75	8.5	197
20.7-13	74	13.6	156
20.14-18	74	20.35	75-76, 139
21.2	75	33.7-9	132
23.1-4	199	34.1-16	199
23.5	69	34.20-23	199
23.21	156	47.1-12	175-76
23.32	156	47.1-11	227
25.3	74		
26-45	73	<i>Daniel</i>	
26.1-11	117	7.13-14	267, 270
26.1-6	74, 116	9.26	116
26.4-9	116	11.31	116
26.7-19	143		
26.12	116	<i>Hosea</i>	
26.20-23	143	1-3	72
27	72	6.6	116
27.1-28.17	74	12.13	75
27.15	156		
27.27	119	<i>Joel</i>	
28	130	3.18	175
28.9	156		
28.15	156	<i>Amos</i>	
29.9	156	3.12	199
29.31	156	5.4-7	116
30-31	74	5.21-23	116
31.34	69	7.1-6	75
32.2	143	7.2	124
32.20	103	7.12	69
33.3	226	9.1-15	105
33.22	69		
35.1-19	74		

<i>Jonah</i>		1.32	92
3.4	119	1.36	92
		2.1	92
<i>Micah</i>		7.130	92
3.12	116	12.42	92
4.11-13	116		
		<i>Tobit</i>	
<i>Nahum</i>		4.12	91
3.18-19	199	8.8	164
		14.4	91
<i>Habakkuk</i>		14.5	91
2.17	116		
		<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	
<i>Zechariah</i>		7.27	91
4.4-17	199	11.1	91
10.2-3	199	19.22	91
11.1	116		
11.3	199	<i>Sirach</i>	
13.1	227	6.35	200
13.4	208	8.8	200
13.7-9	199	18.29	200
13.7	134	36.16	91
14.8	175-76, 227	46.13	91
14.11	227	46.15	91
14.21b	114	47.17	200
		48.1	91
<i>Malachi</i>		48.8	91
3.1	207, 215, 218, 263-64,	48.10-11	207
	271, 283	48.22	91
3.23	70, 207, 212	49.7	91
4.5	89	49.10	91
		51.3	160
<i>Apocrypha</i>			
<i>1 Esdras</i>		<i>Baruch</i>	
1.20	91	1.16	91
1.28	91	1.21	91
1.32	91	2.20	91
1.47	91	2.24	91
1.51	91		
6.1	91	<i>Song 3 Children</i>	
6.2	91	1.15	91
7.3	91		
8.82	91	<i>Bel</i>	
9.47	164	1.33	91
<i>2 Esdras</i>			
1.1	92	<i>1 Maccabees</i>	
		4.45-46	81

4.46 40, 89, 91  
 9.27 81, 91  
 9.54 91  
 14.41 91

*2 Maccabees*

2.1 91  
 2.2 91  
 2.4 91  
 2.13 91  
 15.9 91  
 15.14 91

*New Testament*

*Matthew*

2.2 265  
 2.4-6 208  
 2.17-18 4  
 2.20 160  
 4.8-10 265  
 8.5-13 100  
 9.1-8 104  
 9.18-19 106  
 9.23-25 106  
 9.27-31 191  
 10.23 267  
 11.2 265  
 11.3 263  
 11.9-14 155  
 11.10-14 207  
 11.13-14 207-208, 211  
 11.13 89  
 11.14 263  
 12.22-23 191  
 13.57 142, 144-45, 147  
 14.13-21 214  
 14.15 217  
 14.17 214  
 14.20 214  
 14.21 214  
 15.30-31 191  
 16.13-16 273  
 16.13-14 207-208, 211  
 16.14 4  
 16.28 267  
 17.10-13 207-208, 211

17.10 263  
 17.12 89, 208, 263  
 21.12-13 74, 111  
 21.14 191  
 21.35 161  
 23.37 161  
 24.30 267  
 24.44 267  
 25.31 267  
 25.32-33 199  
 26.6-13 162  
 26.25 264  
 26.31 134  
 26.49 264  
 26.64 267  
 27.1 265  
 27.9-10 4  
 27.29 265  
 27.37 265  
 27.42 265  
 27.49 263

*Mark*

1.2 207-208, 211  
 1.6 208  
 1.24 258  
 2.1-12 103  
 2.18 265  
 5.22-24 106  
 5.38-42 106  
 6.4 3, 142, 144-45  
 6.14-15 145  
 6.14 5  
 6.15 3, 97  
 6.29 265  
 6.32-44 214  
 6.34 217  
 6.38 214  
 6.43 214  
 6.44 214  
 7.33 191  
 8.22-26 191  
 8.23 191  
 8.27-30 207-208, 211, 273  
 8.28 3, 40  
 9.5 264  
 9.11-13 155, 207-208, 211

*Mark (cont.)*

9.12-13	263
9.13	208
10.46-52	191
10.51	264
11.15-19	74
11.15-17	111
11.21	264
12.18-27	110, 178
13.26	267
14-16	3
14.3-9	162
14.27	134
14.45	264
14.62	267
15.1	206
15.2	265
15.9	265
15.12	265
15.18	265
15.26	265
15.32	265
15.35	263

*Luke*

1.1-4	15
1.17	208
1.39-56	27
2.1-5	27
2.11	186
2.22-39	27
3.12	265
4.24-26	207-208, 211
4.24	142, 144, 146, 273
4.25	70, 119
5.17-26	104
7.1-10	100
7.11-17	207-208, 211
7.11-15	106
7.16	4, 97
7.18	265
7.19-20	263
7.21-22	191
7.26-28	155
7.27	208
7.36-50	162
7.39	4
8.41-42	106

8.49-56	106
9.10b-17	214
9.12	217
9.14	214
9.17	214
9.18-20	273
11.1	265
12.32	199
12.40	267
13.33	142
18.8	267
19.45-47	74
19.45-46	111
21.27	267
23.2	265
23.36-38	265

*John*

1.1-18	255-56, 280
1.1-2	257
1.1	157, 256
1.2	256
1.3-9	256
1.6-8	210, 212
1.6	155
1.7	263
1.9	36, 263
1.10-12	257
1.10-11	128
1.11	159
1.14-18	280
1.14	157, 256-57, 260, 278, 282
1.15	36, 158, 210, 212, 225, 257, 263
1.17	69, 257, 261-62
1.18	256, 260
1.19-28	8, 44, 100, 155, 202, 205, 209, 212, 228, 231, 274, 286
1.19	205-206, 210, 212
1.20-23	206
1.20-21	211
1.20	206, 261-62
1.21	1, 35, 38-40, 42, 44, 48, 50, 52, 69, 77, 89, 205, 207-208, 210-12, 215, 222, 228, 239, 273

- |          |                             |         |                          |
|----------|-----------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| 1.22     | 209                         | 2.19-22 | 133, 246                 |
| 1.23     | 69, 155, 206, 209-10, 212   | 2.19    | 115, 117-19, 130, 133,   |
| 1.24-27  | 206                         |         | 135, 245-46              |
| 1.24     | 209                         | 2.21-22 | 113, 115, 118, 245       |
| 1.25     | 1, 40, 50, 52, 69, 77, 205, | 2.21    | 133, 149, 246            |
|          | 209-12, 215, 228, 239,      | 2.22    | 256                      |
|          | 261-62, 273                 | 2.23-25 | 113, 149, 150, 152, 159, |
| 1.26     | 209                         |         | 240                      |
| 1.27     | 36, 209, 263                | 2.23    | 96, 101-102, 117, 242    |
| 1.28     | 206                         | 2.24-25 | 42, 109, 179             |
| 1.29     | 36, 218, 254, 258           | 2.24    | 150                      |
| 1.30     | 168                         | 3.1-21  | 55                       |
| 1.33     | 126, 155                    | 3.2-3   | 152                      |
| 1.34     | 259, 261                    | 3.2     | 96, 101-102, 190, 264    |
| 1.36     | 218, 254, 258               | 3.3     | 128, 143, 164, 166, 168, |
| 1.38     | 149, 190, 264               |         | 265                      |
| 1.40-42  | 42                          | 3.5     | 128, 143, 164, 166, 168, |
| 1.41     | 36, 100, 261-62             |         | 265                      |
| 1.42     | 149                         | 3.10    | 208, 264                 |
| 1.45-46  | 151                         | 3.11    | 143, 164, 166, 168       |
| 1.45     | 52, 69, 208                 | 3.13-21 | 270                      |
| 1.47-51  | 42, 179                     | 3.13-14 | 267-68                   |
| 1.47-48  | 105, 109                    | 3.13    | 267-68, 270              |
| 1.47     | 36                          | 3.14-15 | 200, 267                 |
| 1.49     | 35, 100, 190, 259, 261,     | 3.14    | 69, 133, 137, 143, 246,  |
|          | 264-65                      |         | 270                      |
| 1.50-51  | 130, 135, 246               | 3.15-16 | 257                      |
| 1.51     | 131, 143, 164, 166, 168,    | 3.16-21 | 261                      |
|          | 246, 267-68, 270            | 3.16    | 128, 130, 259, 260       |
| 2.1-4.54 | 173                         | 3.17    | 142, 153, 157-58, 261    |
| 2.1-11   | 43, 96, 98-99, 105, 120,    | 3.18    | 128, 259-61              |
|          | 239, 243, 285               | 3.19    | 158                      |
| 2.11     | 98, 102, 120                | 3.22-23 | 209                      |
| 2.12     | 240                         | 3.22    | 105                      |
| 2.13-25  | 111, 120, 244, 285          | 3.26    | 190, 209, 264            |
| 2.13-22  | 74, 97, 239                 | 3.28-30 | 210                      |
| 2.13-20  | 225                         | 3.28    | 155, 206, 262            |
| 2.13     | 27, 113, 218                | 3.31    | 36, 261, 263             |
| 2.14-16  | 113, 117, 245               | 3.34    | 136, 153, 158            |
| 2.14-15  | 117                         | 3.35    | 260                      |
| 2.14     | 114, 119                    | 3.36    | 128, 246, 257, 260       |
| 2.15     | 114, 119, 245               | 4-7     | 213                      |
| 2.16     | 113-14, 117-18, 245         | 4.2     | 149, 242                 |
| 2.17     | 114, 118                    | 4.4-42  | 8, 172, 176, 203, 205,   |
| 2.18-22  | 115                         |         | 211, 227, 231, 237, 274, |
| 2.18-20  | 113, 245                    |         | 286                      |
| 2.18     | 97, 102, 117, 245           | 4.4-6   | 173, 174                 |

<i>John</i> (cont.)		4.43-5.47	100
4.4	240	4.43-44	149
4.6	178, 282	4.43	148, 150, 173, 185, 240
4.7-26	173, 174	4.44	1, 7, 38, 40, 42, 77, 142,
4.7-19	183		144, 148, 150-51, 159,
4.7	174, 275		169, 185, 239-42, 251-
4.9	174, 182, 247, 275		52, 286
4.10	174-75, 258	4.45	149-51
4.11-12	174, 176	4.46-54	96, 100-101, 105, 120,
4.11	174, 275		135, 237, 243, 285
4.12	182	4.47-48	101
4.13-14	130, 135, 174, 246	4.47	100
4.15	174	4.48	97, 102, 149, 152, 159,
4.16-19	42		240
4.16	175	4.49	100
4.17-19	42, 179	4.50	101-102, 130
4.17-18	242	4.53	101-102
4.17	175	4.54	102, 120
4.18-19	184	5.1-47	96, 103, 120, 243, 285
4.18	105, 109, 175, 177-78, 248	5.1-9	104
4.19	1, 38, 40-48, 77, 105,	5.1	27, 105
	133, 148, 172, 174-75,	5.4	104
	181-82, 187, 194, 201,	5.5-6	105, 243
	239, 247-48, 262, 275	5.6	104, 109, 150
4.20-24	183	5.8	105
4.20	179, 181, 182, 187, 275	5.9	105
4.21	130, 135, 183, 246	5.10-47	106
4.22	177, 179, 181, 183	5.10-12	106
4.23	130, 135, 183, 246	5.12	106, 243
4.24	128, 183	5.13	106, 243
4.25	87, 184-85, 262	5.14	105-106
4.26	206	5.17	136
4.27-30	173, 174	5.18	225, 257
4.28-30	173	5.19-26	260
4.28-29	184, 275	5.19-24	136
4.29	178, 262	5.19-20	226
4.30	185	5.19	143, 164, 166, 168, 259
4.31-38	174	5.20	130, 135, 246
4.31	173, 190, 265	5.21	257
4.34	136, 142, 153	5.22	132
4.37	255	5.23	142, 151-53, 157
4.38	173	5.24-25	130-31, 246
4.39-42	174	5.24	142-43, 153, 164, 166,
4.39	173, 178, 184-85, 248, 275		168
4.40	148, 185, 240	5.25	135, 143, 164, 166, 168,
4.42	36, 148, 173, 186, 241,		246, 259
	248, 254, 275	5.26-29	135



5.26-27	258	6.32	69, 143, 164, 166, 168
5.26	257	6.33-42	261
5.27	198, 267-68	6.33	258
5.28-29	130, 135, 246, 268	6.35	36, 130, 206
5.30	136, 142, 153	6.37	36
5.36-38	154	6.38	136, 142, 153
5.36	97, 136, 153, 157	6.39-40	130, 135, 246
5.37	142, 153, 157	6.39	142, 153
5.45	69	6.41-59	214
5.46	52, 69	6.41	206
5.52	42	6.42	274
6	37, 213	6.44	130, 135, 142, 153, 157, 246
6.1-71	213	6.45	69
6.1-15	8, 35-36, 96, 202, 205, 212-13, 218, 220, 228, 231, 263, 274-75, 286	6.47	143, 164, 166, 168
6.1-4	213	6.48	206
6.1	105	6.51	130, 143, 206
6.2	96, 102	6.53	143, 164, 166, 168, 198, 267-70
6.3	216-17	6.54	130, 135, 246
6.4	217-18	6.57	142, 153, 157, 257
6.5-13	213	6.58	130
6.6	149-50	6.60-71	214
6.9	214	6.60	255
6.10	214	6.61	150
6.11	110, 123, 194	6.62	198, 267-68, 270
6.13	214	6.64	109
6.14-15	36, 43-44, 49, 97, 213-14, 216, 251, 266	6.69	126
6.14	1, 35-40, 42, 46, 50, 52, 77, 102, 208, 211, 213, 215, 218, 224, 228, 239, 247, 250-51, 263, 273, 275	6.70	130, 133, 143, 161, 164, 246
6.15	50, 150, 153, 216, 241, 265-66, 276	6.71	161
6.16-21	96, 214	7	36
6.20	206	7.1-10.21	221
6.22-71	214	7.1-8.59	221
6.22-24	214	7.1-10	27
6.23	123	7.1-9	222
6.25-40	214	7.1	105, 150, 225
6.25	190, 265	7.2	221
6.26	102, 143, 164, 166, 168	7.3-5	274
6.27	130, 267, 270	7.10-13	222, 224
6.28	258	7.11	225
6.29	142, 153	7.12	192, 251
6.30	97, 102	7.14-36	222
		7.14-24	224
		7.14-15	136
		7.15	226
		7.16	136, 142, 153, 158, 226

<i>John</i> (cont.)		7.47-52	192
7.18	142, 153	7.50	149
7.19	69, 160, 164, 225	7.52	1, 39-40, 44, 46, 52, 77, 151, 208, 215, 221, 224-25, 251, 273-74
7.21	97		
7.22	69	8.4	264
7.23	69	8.5	69
7.25-31	224	8.12-30	222
7.25-26	192	8.12	130, 190, 206
7.25	225	8.14	143
7.26	36, 262	8.16	142, 153, 157
7.27	225, 262	8.18	142, 153, 157, 206
7.28-29	154, 226	8.20	143
7.28	142, 153, 158, 225	8.21-22	143
7.29	142, 153, 206	8.21	130-33, 137, 246
7.30-31	226	8.23-24	128
7.30	143, 161	8.23	206, 261
7.31	97, 102, 192, 262	8.24	130, 132, 137, 206
7.32-36	225	8.25	137, 192
7.32-33	154	8.26	136, 138-39, 142, 153
7.32	161, 225-26	8.27	137
7.33-34	143	8.28	130, 133, 136-37, 139, 143, 200, 206, 246, 267, 269, 270
7.33	142, 153, 163, 225		
7.34-36	225	8.29	142, 153
7.34	130, 133, 206, 246	8.31-59	63, 222
7.35	26	8.31	36
7.36	206, 255	8.32	130
7.37-8.59	222	8.34-47	128
7.37-52	8, 35, 50, 176, 202, 205, 221, 224, 227-31, 274, 276, 286	8.34	143, 164, 166, 168
		8.36	130
7.37-38	69, 130, 135, 227, 246	8.37	160, 164, 255
7.37	158	8.38	136
7.38	176	8.40	136, 160, 164
7.39	150, 227	8.41	258
7.40-52	42, 211	8.42	142, 153, 157, 258
7.40-43	192	8.44	134
7.40-41	176, 224, 262	8.48	192
7.40	1, 35, 38-40, 46, 49-50, 52, 77, 160, 208, 215, 221-22, 227, 239, 247, 250-51, 273, 276	8.49	151-52
		8.51	143, 164, 166, 168
7.41-43	225	8.52	130
7.41-42	176	8.53	192
7.41	151, 225, 251, 262, 276	8.54	257
7.42	69, 262	8.58	143, 157, 164, 166, 168, 206
7.45	226	8.59	161
7.46	226	9-10	65

9.1–10.21	8, 96, 172, 187, 203, 205, 211, 231, 237, 241, 274, 276, 286	9.39-41	128, 199
9.1-41	187	9.39	130
9.1-7	190-91	10.1-21	187
9.2	190, 265	10.1-18	198
9.3	190-91, 258	10.1	143, 164, 166, 168, 199
9.4	142, 153, 190-91	10.5	199
9.5	190	10.7	143, 164, 166, 168, 200, 206
9.6	190-91, 244	10.8	199
9.7	191	10.9	130, 206
9.8-12	190, 192-93	10.10	199
9.8	249	10.11	143, 200, 206
9.9-10	249	10.12	36, 199
9.9	192	10.13	199
9.10	192, 249	10.14	200, 206
9.11	192-93, 276	10.15	132, 143, 200
9.12	192	10.16	25-26, 28, 130
9.13-17	190, 192	10.17	132, 143, 200
9.14	192	10.18	143, 200
9.15	192, 249	10.19-21	192
9.16	102-103, 192-93	10.19	192
9.17	1, 38, 40, 42, 77, 108, 133, 172, 188, 190, 193, 201-202, 204, 239, 247, 249, 273, 276	10.22	221
9.18-23	190, 201	10.24-39	47
9.19	249	10.24	192, 262
9.21	249	10.25	97, 136
9.22	13, 262, 276	10.27	47
9.24-34	190, 193-94	10.28	130
9.25	249	10.30	157
9.26	249	10.31	161
9.27	249	10.32	96, 97
9.28	69	10.33	257
9.29	69, 198	10.34-35	257
9.31-33	194	10.35	255
9.31	110	10.36	126, 142, 153, 157, 258- 59, 261
9.32	195, 201	10.37	136
9.33	195	10.38	96, 97, 157
9.35-41	188	10.40	209
9.35-38	190	10.41	102, 210, 242
9.35	195-96, 198, 267-68, 270-71, 277	11.1-46	237
9.36	196	11.1-44	96, 106-107, 120, 244, 285
9.38	197, 250, 277	11.2	162
9.39–10.21	190	11.4	108, 130, 135, 244, 259
		11.5	150
		11.7-8	152
		11.8	190, 265

<i>John</i> (cont.)		12.24-25	130-31, 246
11.9	130	12.24	143, 164, 166, 168, 200
11.11-14	42, 179	12.25	261
11.11	105, 109, 244	12.26	130, 151-52, 206
11.13	109	12.27-36	137
11.14	109	12.31-32	130, 133, 200, 246
11.15	109	12.32	133, 143, 269-70
11.21-22	108	12.33	109, 149-50
11.21	109	12.34-36	270
11.22	110, 123	12.34	133, 197, 246, 262, 267,
11.23	108, 110, 130, 135, 244		270
11.24	108, 110	12.37-50	137
11.25	130, 206	12.37-43	137
11.27	36, 211, 259-63	12.37	96, 102
11.28	264	12.38-40	69
11.32	109	12.38	255
11.33	150, 162	12.42	13
11.35	282	12.43	258
11.37	108-109	12.44-50	137, 157
11.38	150, 162	12.44	142, 153, 225-26
11.39	110	12.45	142, 153
11.40-44	108, 244	12.46	158
11.40	258	12.47-50	138
11.41	123, 194	12.47	158
11.41b-42	110-11	12.48-50	158
11.42	142, 153	12.48	130, 132, 158, 246, 255
11.45	108	12.49-50	137-39
11.47	96, 102, 108, 120	12.49	132, 136, 138, 142, 153,
11.52	28		157
11.55	218	13.1-38	161
12.1-11	237	13.1-17	97
12.1	26	13.1	143, 150, 261
12.3	162-63	13.2	134
12.4	162	13.3	109, 150
12.5	163	13.7	105
12.7-8	143	13.10	130, 161
12.7	159, 162-64	13.11	150, 162
12.8	130, 163	13.13-14	254, 264-65
12.12-19	35	13.16	142-43, 164, 166, 168
12.12-16	97	13.17	130
12.13	36, 263, 265	13.18-38	97
12.15	265	13.18	109, 162
12.18	102-103	13.19	130, 206
12.20-22	277, 283	13.20	142-43, 158, 164, 166, 168
12.20	25-26	13.20b	153
12.23-24	143	13.21	130-34, 143, 150, 162,
12.23	267, 269-70		164, 166, 168, 246

13.23	10, 12	16.2-5	130
13.26-30	134	16.2	13, 133-34, 246
13.26	109	16.5-6	143
13.27	134	16.5	133, 142, 153, 246
13.31-32	270	16.7-8	130
13.31	267	16.7	133, 135, 246
13.33	130, 133, 143, 163, 206, 246	16.8-11	128, 133
13.36	130, 133, 143, 246	16.8	132, 246
13.37	200	16.10	130, 133, 143, 246
13.38	130-35, 143, 164, 166, 168, 246	16.13-14	130
14.1-4	200	16.13	36, 135
14.2-4	143	16.16-20	143
14.2-3	130	16.16	130, 133, 246
14.3	206	16.19	150
14.6	206	16.20	130-33, 143, 164, 166, 168, 246
14.10-11	97	16.21.18	130
14.10	136, 139, 157	16.22-23	130
14.11	157	16.22	133, 246
14.12	130-33, 143, 164, 166, 168, 246	16.23-27	194
14.13-14	194	16.23	123, 135, 143, 164, 166, 168
14.13	123, 130, 135	16.24	123
14.14	123	16.25-26	130
14.16-20	130	16.25	159, 143
14.16	123, 135	16.26	123, 135
14.18-20	133, 246	16.28	261
14.19	143	16.31	130
14.24	136, 142, 153, 157, 255- 56	16.32	133-34, 143, 246
14.26	126, 130, 135	17	7, 121-22
14.28-30	143	17.1-26	110
14.28	130, 133, 246	17.1-8	128
14.30	130, 133, 246	17.1	123, 128, 143
15.1	206	17.2	128
15.4-5	130	17.3	128-29, 142, 153, 158, 262
15.5	206	17.4	128, 136
15.7	123	17.5	157
15.13-14	200	17.6-8	128
15.13	132, 200	17.8	36, 129, 136, 142, 153, 158
15.16	123, 130, 135	17.9-19	128
15.18-25	128	17.9	123, 128
15.21	130, 142, 153	17.11	126, 168
15.22	128	17.11a	128
15.25	255	17.11b	128
15.26	130, 135	17.14	128, 136, 206, 256

*John* (cont.)

17.15	123, 128	19.39-40	163
17.16	206, 261	20.1-29	246
17.17	126, 128	20.16	264
17.18	127-29, 142, 158, 261	20.21	154, 157
17.18a	153	20.21a	153
17.19	126, 127	20.22	126, 227, 246
17.20-26	129	20.28	257
17.20-21	25	20.30-31	31, 274
17.20	123	20.30	18, 96, 102, 262
17.21-23	168	20.31	36, 186, 258-62, 277
17.21	129, 142, 153, 157-58	21.1-8	96
17.22	157	21.1	105
17.23	129, 142, 153, 158	21.7	10, 12
17.24	206	21.18	131-35, 143, 164, 166, 168, 246
17.25	129, 142, 153, 157-58	21.19	134, 150
18-19	62, 63	21.20-23	10, 12
18.1-14	161	21.20	149
18.1-5	134	21.23	255
18.2	134	21.24-25	18
18.4	36, 150	21.25	96
18.5	206		
18.6	206	<i>Acts</i>	
18.8	206	1.15-26	88
18.9	149, 255-56	2.29-31	88
18.15-27	134, 246	3.22-23	89
18.28-19.22	35	3.22	3, 208, 273
18.31-33	13	3.23	4
18.32	255-56	5.31	186
18.33	265-66	7.37	3, 4, 89, 273
18.37-38	13	7.54-60	161
18.37	206, 265-66	8.5	27
18.39	265-66	8.14	27
19.3	265-66	8.26	27
19.7	259, 261	8.40	27
19.12	265-66	9.26	27
19.14	218, 265-66	9.35-39	27
19.15	265-66	10.1-24	27
19.19	265-66	11.29-30	27
19.21	265-66	13.16	26
19.26-27	10, 12	13.23	186
19.28-42	246	14.5	161
19.28	150	15.1-29	27
19.30	227	15.41-21.17	27
19.31	218	27.1-28.16	27
19.34	226-27		
19.38	105		

*Romans*

1.25	165
8.34	129
11.3	160

*1 Corinthians*

1.12	27
14.16	165

*Galatians*

1.17	27
2.11	27

*Colossians*

2.8-10	278
--------	-----

*Titus*

1.5	27
-----	----

*Hebrews*

4.14	125
6.20	125
7.25	129
11.37	161
12.20	161

*James*

5.17	70, 119
------	---------

*1 John*

1.1	255
2.20	258
3.16	200
3.21-22	194
4.1-3	278
4.2	278
4.9	260
4.14	186

*2 John*

7	278
---	-----

*Jude*

14-15	92
-------	----

*Revelation*

19.13	255
-------	-----

*Pseudepigrapha**1 Enoch*

13.1-10	92
14.8-16.3	92-93
37-71	267
53.1-56.4	92
65.1-12	93
89.51-56	143
90.31	208
90.37	89

*4 Baruch*

91

*4 Ezra*

1.1	92
6.26	208

*Apocalypse of Elijah*

4.7-19	143
--------	-----

*Apocryphon of  
Ezekiel*

92

*Ascension of Isaiah*

1.2	92
-----	----

*Jubilees*

1.1-4	92
1.12-13	143
1.19-21	92

*Pseudo-Philo*

28.1	92
49.8	92
50.8	92
53.8	92
53.10	92
56.4	92
56.6	92
57.4	92
59.4	92
64.2	92

*Questions of Ezra*

A.1	92
A.2	92
A.4	92

<i>Questions of Ezra</i> (cont.)		I, 20	164
A.9	92	II, 10	164
A.18	92	II, 18	164
A.22	92		
A.23	92	<i>1Q14</i>	88
A.31	92	<i>1Q15</i>	88
<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>			
7.130-40	92	<i>4Q166-167</i>	88
<i>Testament of Moses</i>		<i>4Q166</i>	
1.5	92	2.5	87
<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>		<i>4Q168</i>	88
9.2	92	<i>4Q169</i>	88
<i>Testament of Judah</i>		<i>4Q174</i>	
21.9	92	1.15	88
Qumran		1.16	88
<i>1QH<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>4Q175</i>	49, 89
10.10-18	90	1-8	88
12.27-28	90	1.1-4	89
15.26-27	90	1.5-8	89
16.16-19	90		
23.10-14	90	<i>4Q182</i>	
<i>1QM</i>		1.4	88
11.8	87	<i>4Q286</i>	164
<i>1QpHab</i>		<i>4Q287</i>	164
1.1	88	<i>4Q289</i>	164
2.8-9	90		
2.9	87, 88, 90	<i>4Q293</i>	164
7.1	88	<i>4Q382</i>	88
7.5	87, 88		
<i>1QS</i>		<i>4Q504</i>	164
1.3	87, 88, 90	3.12-13	88
5.1-3	29	<i>4Q507</i>	164
8.12	90	<i>4Q509</i>	164
8.13	29		
8.15-16	88	<i>4Q511</i>	164
8.16	90		
9.10-11	90		
9.11	49, 89, 222		
9.20	29		



<i>4QMMT</i>		<i>y. Ber.</i>	
C.10	88	9.13	117
C.17	88		
<i>5Q4</i>	88	Tosefta	
<i>5Q10</i>	88	<i>Sanh.</i>	
		11a	81
		13.5	117
<i>11Q13</i>		<i>Šeq.</i>	
2.15-18	89	3.2-4	118
		3.9	118
<i>11QPs<sup>a</sup></i>		<i>Soṭ.</i>	
27.4-11	88	13.3	81
<i>CD</i>		48b	81
7.17	88		
<i>CD-A</i>		<i>Yom.</i>	
2.12	87	9b	81
3.21	88		
4.13	88	Philo	
6.1	87	<i>Cher.</i>	
6.7	90	27	79, 80
7.10	88		
7.18	90	<i>Congr.</i>	
		132	79
<i>CD-B</i>		<i>Dec.</i>	
19.7	88	175	78
Mishnah		<i>Det. pos. ins.</i>	
<i>Ber.</i>		39	79
6b	194		
58a	194	<i>Deus imm.</i>	
<i>Šab.</i>		136	79
7.2	192	138	79
<i>Šeq.</i>		<i>Gig.</i>	
1.3	118	61	79
5.1-4	118		
6.5	118	<i>Leg. all.</i>	
7.7	118	II.1	79
<i>Soṭ.</i>		<i>Migr. Abr.</i>	
9.12	81	34-35	80
		35	79
Talmud		38	79
<i>b. Roš Haš.</i>		84	79
17a	117		

<i>Mut. nom.</i>		4.118	81
103	78	4.312	80
125	78	4.313	80
		4.320	80
<i>Praem. poen.</i>		5.20	81
1	79	5.200	80
55	79	5.340	80
56	79	7.91-92	80
		9.27	80
<i>Quaes. in Gen.</i>		9.74	80
I.86	78	9.183	80
III.10	79	9.288	178
		9.291	182
<i>Rer. div. her.</i>		10.266	80, 82
249	79	10.276	82
258	79	10.59	80
259	79	10.60	80
260	79	10.79	80
261	79	11.341	182
266	79	13.299-300	81, 82
78	79	13.311-13	82
		14.172-76	83
<i>Spec. leg.</i>		15.3-4	83
II.104	79	15.373-79	82
		15.379	83
<i>Somn.</i>		17.41-45	83
I.254	78	17.345-48	83
II.38	80	18.85-89	86, 183
II.189	78	20.97-98	82
II.252	80	20.97	82
		20.169	82
<i>Virt.</i>			
51	79	<i>Against Apion</i>	
218	79	1.37-41	81
		1.41	81
<i>Vit. Mos.</i>		2.218	81
I.266	79	2.286	81
II.16-17	79		
II.37-40	79	<i>Jewish War</i>	
II.187	78	1.68-69	81, 82
II.188-191	79	1.78-80	82
II.269	79	2.112-13	83
II.280	79	2.261	82
		3.340	80
Josephus		3.351-54	81, 82
<i>Antiquities</i>		4.94	82
1.276	80	4.109-10	82

4.163 82  
 4.318 82  
 6.285 83  
 6.286 81-82  
 6.288 81  
 6.300-309 83

Other Jewish, Classical and Early  
 Christian Writings

*Didache*

11.5 185

*Gospel of Thomas*

31 144

31b 147

*Memar Marqah*

1.9 86-87

2.2 85

2.4 85

2.5 85

2.7-10 85

2.7 85

2.9 85-87, 181

2.12 85

3.3 86-87, 182

3.10 85

4.1-12 85

4.1 85

4.4 175

4.7-9 87

4.7 86

4.8 175

4.9 85

4.12 85-87, 177, 182

5.1-4 85

5.3 175

6.3 175

6.4 85

6.6 85

6.7-11 85

6.9 85

*Papyrus Oxyrhynchus*

1.6 144

Apollonius of Tyana

*Epistulae*

44 144

Dio Chrysostom

*Discourses*

30 [47].6 144, 147

Epictetus

*Discourses*

III, 16.11-12 144, 147

Eusebius

*Ecclesiastical History*

4.14.3-8 14

5.8.4 14

5.20.4-8 14

5.20.5-6 12

6.14.7 12

Irenaeus

*Against Heresies*

2. 22.5 12, 14

3.3.1 12, 14

3.3.4 12, 14

V, 15.2-4 191

## INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Abbott, E.A. 153, 224  
 Agourides, S. 127-29  
 Aland, B. 13  
 Aland, K. 13  
 Alexander, L. 25  
 Alison, J. 187  
 Allen, L.C. 198  
 Allison, D.C. 3, 6, 145, 208  
 Alter, R. 58, 143  
 Amaru, B.H. 143  
 Andersen, Ø. 16  
 Anderson, B.W. 87  
 Anderson, P.N. 5, 51-52, 213, 217, 282  
 Anderson, R.T. 83, 85  
 Annen, F. 136  
 Appold, M.L. 17, 126-27, 129, 184, 260-61, 265  
 Archer, G.L. 175  
 Ariel, D. 113  
 Ashton, J. 19, 23-24, 31, 53, 55, 57, 61, 65, 259, 261, 267, 270  
 Asiedu-Peprah, M. 104-106, 187, 189-91  
 Aune, D.E. 4, 33, 58, 68, 81-82, 97, 131-32, 167, 262
- Baarda, T. 104  
 Bacon, B.W. 19  
 Bailey, J.A. 16  
 Bailey, J.L. 58  
 Baker, M. 93  
 Balch, D.L. 27-28  
 Baldermann, I. 20  
 Baldick, C. 233  
 Balentine, S.E. 75, 76, 123
- Balfour, G. 227  
 Ball, D.M. 207  
 Baltz, F.W. 12  
 Bammel, E. 116, 213  
 Barclay, J.M.G. 28  
 Bar-Efrat, S. 143, 236  
 Barnett, P.W. 81, 193  
 Barr, J. 154  
 Barrera, J.T. 29  
 Barrett, C.K. 2, 11-12, 15-16, 20, 25, 28, 34-35, 48, 104, 112, 115, 127, 150, 154-55, 163, 166, 177, 181, 194, 215, 224  
 Barth, K. 2  
 Barton, J. 55  
 Barton, S.C. 32  
 Bauckham, R. 11, 23, 25, 32, 111, 114, 118, 206  
 Bauer, B. 56  
 Bauer, W. 14, 35, 40, 43, 45  
 Baumgarten, A.I. 14  
 Baur, F.C. 56  
 Beardslee, W.A. 58  
 Beasley-Murray, G.R. 11, 14, 49-51, 100, 104, 113, 128, 138, 148, 158, 162-63, 177, 182, 189, 199, 223-24, 227, 258, 276  
 Beck, D.R. 232, 236, 248, 250, 277  
 Becker, J. 11, 14, 17, 23-26, 49, 53, 100, 122, 178, 180, 189, 213, 216  
 Beegle, D.M. 76  
 Bell, G.K.A. 2  
 Belle, G. van 5, 18, 37, 59, 97, 102, 134, 149, 241  
 Benoit, P. 34  
 Berger, K. 13  
 Berkhof, L. 2

- Bernard, J.H. 36, 39, 57, 126, 128,  
150, 154, 189, 195, 209, 213
- Bertram, G. 133
- Best, E. 82
- Betlyon, J.W. 113
- Beutler, J. 21, 58
- Bietenhard, H. 165-66
- Billerbeck, P. 178
- Bittner, W.J. 18, 102-103
- Black, C.C. 16, 55
- Black, D.A. 122
- Blass, F. 38, 181, 201
- Blenkinsopp, J. 80-81, 227
- Bligh, J. 274
- Blomberg, C.L. 112-13
- Böcher, O. 34, 134
- Bockmuehl, M. 116-17, 244
- Boer, M.C. de 5, 53, 57, 61, 65, 218
- Boer, P.A.H. de 85
- Boers, H. 60, 173, 184
- Boismard, M.-É. 6, 11, 16, 18, 22,  
34, 47, 53, 104, 137, 210, 223
- Booth, S. 60, 105
- Booth, W.C. 152
- Borg, M.J. 34
- Borgen, P. 17, 22, 78, 138, 213, 256
- Boring, M.E. 33, 131
- Bornhäuser, K. 31-32
- Bostock, D.G. 98, 101, 193
- Botha, J.E. 172-74, 183
- Bowen, C.R. 59
- Bowley, J.E. 87-90
- Bowman, J. 84-86, 173, 180, 182
- Boyle, J.L. 122
- Braun, F.M. 156
- Breck, J. 96
- Bremmer, J.N. 180
- Bright, J. 75
- Broadhead, E.K. 3, 6, 34, 259, 261,  
266
- Brodie, T.L. 19, 23, 50, 60, 99, 101,  
108, 193, 209, 213, 217, 221, 276
- Broek, L.D.V. 58
- Brooke, G.J. 88
- Brooks, J.A. 38
- Brouwer, W. 122
- Brown, C. 153
- Brown, R.E. 10-20, 23, 25, 32, 44,  
97, 99, 102, 104, 108, 115, 128,  
131, 135, 138, 150, 152, 156, 163,  
173, 177-78, 185, 200, 207, 209-  
10, 213, 215-16, 218, 224, 226,  
256, 263, 281
- Brownlee, W.H. 13-14
- Brox, N. 6
- Bruce, F.F. 27, 112
- Brueggemann, W. 123
- Bruns, J.E. 59, 163
- Bryan, S.M. 211
- Buchanan, G.W. 180
- Büchsel, F. 259
- Budd, P.J. 76
- Bühner, J.-A. 153
- Bull, R.J. 182
- Bultmann, R. 14, 17, 19, 36, 42-43,  
45, 100, 143, 150, 177, 179, 185,  
196, 209, 213, 223, 256, 279
- Burkett, D. 107, 195, 197, 267-70
- Burkill, T.A. 206
- Burney, C.F. 14, 19, 56
- Burnham, S. 6
- Burridge, R.A. 32
- Burrows, M. 87-88, 90
- Buse, I. 112
- Busse, U. 255
- Byrskog, S. 16
- Caird, G.B. 151, 280
- Callaway, P.R. 29
- Calvin, J. 1, 38
- Campbell, R.J. 112
- Carmichael, C.M. 172, 177
- Carruth, T.R. 4
- Carson, D.A. 11-13, 18, 25-26, 31,  
50, 58, 97, 108-12, 125-27, 131-32,  
135, 150-51, 194, 196, 209, 276
- Casey, M. 111, 264, 267
- Cassidy, R.J. 51, 281
- Casson, L. 26-27
- Charlesworth, J.H. 3, 12, 13, 14, 63,  
88, 90, 92, 143, 273
- Charpentier, E. 4
- Chatman, S. 233-34
- Chevallier, R. 27

- Chilton, B. 166  
 Christensen, D.L. 219  
 Clark, D.K. 21  
 Clark, K.W. 34  
 Clavier, H. 59  
 Clements, R.E. 72, 116  
 Cohen, J.M. 84  
 Collins, A.Y. 201  
 Collins, C.J. 130, 156  
 Collins, J.J. 29, 89  
 Collins, M.F. 86, 182-83  
 Collins, R.F. 98, 232, 243, 247-48  
 Coloe, M.L. 113  
 Colson, F.H. 78  
 Colwell, E.C. 133, 181, 201  
 Comiskey, J.P. 190  
 Connick, M. 59  
 Conway, C.M. 172  
 Cook, J.I. 261  
 Cooper, K.T. 98  
 Corrington, G.P. 180  
 Cortés, J.B. 227  
 Cory, C. 221  
 Cothenet, É. 6  
 Cowley, A.E. 84-86  
 Craige, P.C. 75  
 Cribbs, F.L. 12, 16  
 Cross, F.L. 278  
 Cross, F.M. 29  
 Crossan, J.D. 55  
 Crown, A.D. 83  
 Crump, D.M. 124-25  
 Cullmann, O. 2, 12, 22, 24, 122, 125, 208, 259, 260, 272  
 Culpepper, R.A. 11, 14, 16, 22, 24, 59, 61, 104, 143, 151-52, 213, 232-37, 247-49, 258, 275, 277  
 Cunningham, W. 2  
 Curtis, J.B. 68  
  
 Dahms, J.V. 21, 259-60  
 Dalman, G. 147  
 Dammers, A.H. 4  
 Daniélou, J. 6, 12, 34, 227  
 Danna, E. 184  
 Danner, D.G. 37  
 Daube, D. 165, 174  
  
 Dauer, A. 206  
 Davey, J.E. 4, 33  
 Davies, E.W. 76  
 Davies, M. 11-13, 54-55, 57, 60-61, 149, 279  
 Davies, P.E. 6, 34  
 Davies, W.D. 19, 20, 104, 145  
 Davis, S.T. 185  
 Debrunner, A. 38, 139, 181, 201  
 Decocq, P.B. 3  
 Deissmann, D.A. 2  
 Denaux, A. 15  
 Derrett, J.D.M. 21, 187, 191  
 Descamps, A. 34  
 Devillers, L. 104  
 De Vries, S.J. 70  
 Dexinger, F. 86  
 Dibelius, M. 16  
 Dockery, D.S. 172  
 Dodd, C.H. 2, 16, 19, 34, 40-41, 77, 97, 114-15, 135, 158, 189, 209, 217, 244, 256, 261, 264  
 Domeris, W.R. 258  
 Donahue, J.R. 267  
 Dormeyer, D. 218  
 Duke, P.D. 59, 151  
 Dunn, J.D.G. 16  
 Dupont, J. 4  
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 29  
 Durham, J.I. 98  
 Dvorak, J.D. 16  
  
 Easton, B.S. 17  
 Edersheim, A. 27  
 Edwards, D.R. 113  
 Edwards, R.B. 2, 27  
 Ehrman, B.D. 6, 244  
 Eichrodt, W. 198  
 Eicken, E. von 153  
 Eisler, R. 56  
 Elliott, J. 56  
 Ellis, E.E. 19  
 Eltester, W. 255  
 Emerton, J.A. 21  
 Endo, M. 5, 51, 52, 256  
 Ensor, P.W. 97, 189  
 Epstein, V. 112

- Eslinger, L. 55, 172, 177  
 Evans, C. 122  
 Evans, C.A. 21, 88, 118, 218, 255-56, 280  
 Even-Shoshan, A. 71  
  
 Faienstein, M.M. 208  
 Fascher, E. 35, 79, 156  
 Fazekas, L. 34  
 Fee, G.D. 227  
 Feldman, L.H. 22, 28-29, 81  
 Fendrich, H. 225  
 Ferguson, E. 278  
 Fiedler, P. 22  
 Fiorenza, E.S. 57  
 Fischel, H.A. 143, 280  
 Fisher, M.C. 175  
 Fitzmyer, J.A. 88, 208, 267  
 Flanagan, N. 59  
 Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. 115  
 Flint, P.W. 87  
 Fokkelman, J. 143  
 Formesyn, R. 103  
 Forster, E.M. 233  
 Fortna, R.T. 17, 21, 58  
 France, R.T. 112, 147  
 Freed, E.D. 18, 21, 31, 69, 154, 180  
 Freire, C.E. 34  
 Frerichs, E.S. 13, 223  
 Friebel, K.G. 74  
 Friedrich, G. 3, 148, 154  
 Fuglseth, K. 78  
  
 Gaebelein, F.E. 147  
 Gallagher, E.V. 180  
 Gardner-Smith, P. 16  
 Gaster, M. 86, 183  
 Gatzweiler, K. 58  
 Genette, G. 134  
 Gerhardsson, B. 16  
 Geyser, A. 26  
 Gils, F. 3, 6, 34  
 Glasson, T.F. 6, 33, 35, 41, 129, 220  
 Gniska, J. 6, 49, 104  
 Godet, F.L. 19, 38-39, 121  
 Goguel, M. 4  
 Golb, N. 29  
  
 Goldingay, J. 74-75  
 Goodman, M. 26-28  
 Goppelt, L. 175  
 Görg, M. 255  
 Goulder, M.D. 112  
 Grant, F.C. 16-19  
 Gray, R. 3, 81-82, 273  
 Green, J.B. 2, 55, 146-47, 163  
 Green, W.S. 223  
 Greenberg, M. 161  
 Greene, G.R. 4  
 Greeven, H. 197  
 Grenz, S.J. 2  
 Grigsby, B. 191  
 Grisanti, M.A. 123  
 Grob, F. 50  
 Grundmann, W. 5, 225  
 Guelich, R.A. 145-147  
 Guilding, A. 21, 30  
 Guillet, J. 5  
 Guthrie, D. 2, 13, 272  
 Guy, H.A. 156  
  
 Haacker, K. 186  
 Hadley, J.M. 70-71  
 Haenchen, E. 25, 49, 112, 140, 173, 178, 186, 196, 199  
 Hagner, D.A. 145  
 Hahn, F. 2, 35  
 Hakola, R. 107, 232  
 Hall, B.W. 86  
 Hall, D.R. 174  
 Hamerton-Kelly, R. 208  
 Hammer, R.A. 21  
 Hanhart, K. 26  
 Hanson, A.T. 20-21, 110  
 Hanson, J.S. 201  
 Hare, D.R.A. 195  
 Harner, P.B. 133, 181, 201  
 Harrelson, W. 87  
 Harrington, D.J. 92  
 Harris, E. 255  
 Harris, M.J. 257  
 Harris, R.L. 175  
 Harstine, S. 232  
 Harvey, A.E. 191  
 Harvey, W.J. 233, 235

- Hastings, A. 4  
 Hawthorne, G.F. 17, 165  
 Hayes, C.E. 206  
 Hearon, H.E. 163  
 Heil, J.P. 96, 139, 147, 214  
 Hendriksen, W. 104  
 Hengel, M. 11, 15, 19-21, 25, 29, 261  
 Hengstenberg, E.W. 39  
 Heppe, H. 1  
 Herczeg, P. 180  
 Hertzberg, H.W. 76  
 Hickerson, L.G. 88  
 Higgins, A.J.B. 6, 34, 267, 269  
 Hill, D. 4, 78, 82, 90, 156, 167  
 Hinnebusch, P. 102  
 Hirsch, E. 56  
 Hitchcock, F.R.M. 59  
 Hobbs, T.R. 98, 219  
 Hodge, C. 1  
 Hoffman, P. 6  
 Holleran, J.W. 187  
 Holtz, T. 34  
 Hooker, M.D. 3, 103, 273  
 Hoppe, R. 255  
 Horbury, W. 14  
 Horsley, G.H.R. 15  
 Horsley, R.A. 82-83, 201, 262  
 Horst, P.W. van der 14  
 Hoskyns, E.C. 36, 39, 122, 126, 128, 177, 191, 195, 217, 224, 264  
 Howard, W.F. 19, 30, 56, 57, 177  
 Hübner, H. 139  
 Hunt, R.B. 18  
 Hunter, W.B. 110, 122, 125-26  
 Hurowitz, V.A. 115  
 Hyatt, J.P. 124  
  
 Jansen, J.F. 1  
 Jansma, H.P. 2  
 Jasper, A. 55  
 Jepson, A. 164-65  
 Jeremias, J. 27, 57, 68, 104, 113, 118, 165, 167  
 Jervell, J. 27  
 Johnson, A.R. 123, 124  
 Johnson, D.H. 256  
 Johnson, S.E. 6  
  
 Johnstone, E.D. 213  
 Jones, D.R. 75  
 Jones, L.P. 60, 172, 176  
 Jonge, M. de 5-6, 15-16, 47, 53, 57, 59, 202, 207, 211, 261-62, 274, 276  
 Joubert, H.L.N. 258  
  
 Kaiser, O. 72, 76  
 Kalantzis, G. 15  
 Kalimi, I. 86, 183  
 Kanagaraj, J.J. 20, 266  
 Karimattam, M. 4  
 Käsemann, E. 10, 17, 256, 278  
 Kaylor, R.D. 6, 273  
 Kee, H.C. 92, 186  
 Kelber, W. 16  
 Kermode, F. 58  
 Kerr, A.R. 113, 118  
 Kettler, F.H. 255  
 Kidner, F.D. 73  
 Kim, S. 196  
 Kim, T.H. 133, 181, 201  
 Kimelman, R. 14  
 Kingsbury, J.D. 23  
 Kittel, G. 139, 154  
 Kitzberger, I.R. 55  
 Klauck, H.-J. 122  
 Klawans, J. 97  
 Klein, H. 16  
 Kleinknecht, H. 139, 179  
 Klockenbring, G. 12  
 Knapp, H.M. 221, 227  
 Knowles, M. 4, 34  
 Koch, K. 72, 74, 75  
 Koester, C.H. 55  
 Koester, C.R. 175, 176, 179, 186  
 Koester, H. 16  
 Kohlenberger, J.R. III 91  
 Koskeniemi, E. 179-80  
 Kossen, H.B. 26  
 Köstenberger, A.J. 31, 128, 154  
 Krämer, H. 3, 86, 148, 183  
 Kreitzer, L.J. 115  
 Kremer, J. 107  
 Kreplin, M. 144  
 Krieger, M. 63  
 Kugel, J. 131



- Kügler, J. 266  
Kuhl, J. 153, 156  
Kuhn, K.H. 88, 227  
Kysar, R. 11-12, 18, 20, 23, 33, 55,  
58-59, 166, 177
- La Potterie, I. de 139, 256  
Labahn, M. 103, 213  
Lacocque, A. 112  
Lake, K. 185  
Lalleman-de Winkel, H. 75, 124  
Lamouille, A. 16, 22, 47  
Langbrandtner, W. 22, 24  
Lapin, H. 264  
Lebram, J.C.H. 34  
Lee, D.A. 60, 172, 176  
Lee, E.K. 19  
Lehtipuu, O. 232  
Leidig, E. 172  
Leivestad, R. 196  
Lenski, R.C.H. 38  
Levinskaya, I. 28  
Levison, J.R. 79  
Lichtenberger, H. 3  
Liddell, H.G. 134, 163  
Liebert, E. 274, 277  
Lieu, J.M. 26, 28, 195  
Lightfoot, J. 174  
Lightfoot, R.H. 10, 15, 30, 40, 57,  
128, 163, 191  
Lim, T.H. 88  
Lindars, B. 13, 15, 17-18, 46, 98-99,  
101, 104, 108, 110-11, 119, 150,  
166, 181, 184, 191, 199, 209, 218,  
224, 269  
Lindblom, J. 167  
Lindner, H. 153  
Lingad, C.G. 32  
Link, A. 172  
Livingstone, E.A. 11, 278  
Loader, W. 5, 50  
Loewe, R. 186  
Loewenstamm, A.L. 83  
Lohse, E. 190  
Longman, T. 58, 199  
Loos, H. van der 100  
Louw, J.P. 126, 151, 154
- Lozada, F. 60  
Lüdemann, G. 133  
Lundbom, J.R. 74  
Lundin, R. 55  
Lupieri, E. 77
- Maccini, R.G. 172-73, 275  
Macdonald, J. 84-86, 173, 175, 177,  
181-82, 186  
Macgregor, G.H.C. 56, 126  
Mack, B.L. 55, 58  
MacRae, G.W. 32, 221  
Madden, P.J. 96, 214  
Malatesta, E. 122  
Malbon, E.S. 59, 236  
Malherbe, A.J. 27  
Malina, B.J. 34, 56, 148  
Manson, T.W. 15, 126, 267  
Marcus, R. 78, 80  
Marsh, J. 102, 264  
Marshall, I.H. 54, 59, 146, 197  
Martens, E.A. 74  
Martinez, F.G. 29, 87, 164  
Martyn, J.L. 13, 15, 22, 23, 25, 58,  
189, 201, 208, 270  
Mason, S. 206  
Mastin, B.A. 257, 260  
Matson, M.A. 112  
Matthews, V.H. 163  
Mattill, A.J. 22  
Mauchline, J. 124  
Mayer, A. 98-99  
McConville, J.G. 75  
McDonald, J.I.H. 55  
McEleny, N.J. 96  
McGrath, J.F. 5, 51-52, 104, 281  
McKelvey, R.J. 116  
McKnight, E.V. 59  
McKnight, S. 103  
McL. Wilson, R. 14, 82  
McLeman, J. 58  
McVann, M. 3, 4, 34, 156  
Meeks, W.A. 6, 13, 24, 27, 33-37, 45,  
47, 53, 57, 182, 198, 210, 216, 223,  
266  
Meier, J.P. 184  
Mendelson, A. 14

- Mendner, S. 112  
 Menken, M.J.J. 5, 33, 51, 69, 115, 209  
 Mercer, C. 154  
 Merlier, O. 58  
 Merrill, A.L. 124  
 Metzger, B.M. 31, 175  
 Meyer, B.F. 186  
 Meyer, H.A.W. 38  
 Meyer, P.W. 232  
 Meyer, R. 3, 5, 34  
 Michaelis, W. 161  
 Michaels, J.R. 165  
 Millar, F. 28  
 Mills, W.E. 5, 59  
 Mimouni, S.C. 14  
 Miranda, J.P. 46, 153, 156-57  
 Mlakuzhyil, G. 5, 59, 113, 189  
 Moberly, R.W.L. 165-66  
 Moloney, F.J. 11, 21, 50, 60, 96-97, 104, 108-109, 112-13, 118, 128, 136-37, 158, 163, 178, 183, 189, 195-96, 198, 209, 213, 215-17, 221, 224, 226, 267-68  
 Montgomery, J.A. 84-85  
 Moo, D.J. 12  
 Moore, S.D. 59, 236  
 Morgan, R. 16  
 Morgenthaler, R. 164  
 Morris, L. 10-12, 21, 26, 31, 46, 104, 111-12, 121, 125, 165, 184  
 Morton, A.Q. 58  
 Motyer, A. 72-73  
 Motyer, S. 53, 54, 57, 61, 63-64  
 Moule, C.F.D. 98, 116, 267  
 Muddiman, J. 54  
 Muilenburg, J. 58, 124  
 Müller, D. 153  
 Müller, H.P. 68  
 Müller, U.B. 5  
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 27, 29, 112  
 Nations, A.L. 59  
 Naud, J.A. 69  
 Nebe, G. 4, 6  
 Neil, S. 57  
 Neirynck, F. 16  
 Nereparampil, L. 115  
 Neugerbauer, F. 58  
 Neusner, J. 13, 28, 118, 146, 180, 223  
 Newheart, M.W. 55  
 Neyrey, J.H. 4, 56, 172, 176-77, 183, 200-201, 221  
 Nicol, W. 17, 103  
 Nida, E.A. 126, 151  
 Niederwimmer, K. 185  
 Nielsen, H.K. 53  
 Nissen, J. 53  
 Noack, B. 17  
 Nolland, J. 4, 146, 267  
 North, J. 26  
 North, W.E.S. 107, 110  
 O'Connell, M.J. 138  
 O'Connell, R.H. 115  
 O'Day, G.R. 59, 172, 184, 248  
 O'Grady, J.F. 279, 282  
 O'Kane, M. 72  
 O'Rourke, J.J. 18, 149, 241  
 Odeberg, H. 184  
 Oegema, G.S. 3, 223, 273, 276  
 Oehler, W. 31  
 Oepke, A. 173, 179  
 Okure, T. 31-32, 53, 60, 153, 172, 174, 181, 183  
 Olsson, B. 59, 98, 172, 174-75, 177  
 Orchard, H.C. 162  
 Osborne, G.R. 61  
 Oswalt, J.N. 72  
 Overholt, T.W. 124  
 Painter, J. 23, 147, 156, 189, 201, 221, 274, 277  
 Pamment, M. 280  
 Pancaro, S. 136, 224  
 Pannenberg, W. 2  
 Patsch, H. 123  
 Patte, D. 54, 58  
 Pazdan, M.M. 275  
 Pedersen, S. 53  
 Pendrick, G. 259-60  
 Perkins, P. 278, 280  
 Perry, A.M. 14  
 Perry, J.M. 216

- Pesch, W. 6  
 Petersen, D.L. 139  
 Petersen, N.R. 58  
 Pirot, L. 6  
 Poffet, J.M. 172  
 Pollard, T.E. 5  
 Porter, S.E. 55, 88, 114, 119, 218  
 Powell, M.A. 54, 61  
 Poythress, V.S. 11, 224  
 Pratt, E.B. 59  
 Priest, J.E. 37  
 Procksch, O. 139  
 Pryor, J.W. 26, 122, 150, 197  
 Pummer, R. 84  
 Purvis, J.D. 84, 86, 183  
  
 Quell, G. 139  
  
 Radl, W. 123  
 Rajak, T. 26, 28  
 Rand, J.A. du 65, 189, 239  
 Randall, J.F. 122  
 Raney, W.H. 30  
 Rapske, B.M. 27  
 Reiling, J. 80  
 Reim, G. 20-21, 150, 257  
 Rein, M. 187  
 Reinhardt, A. 7, 12, 34, 50, 53, 56, 134  
 Reinmuth, E. 107  
 Reiser, M. 113, 158  
 Rendtorff, R. 3  
 Rengstorf, K.H. 80, 97, 102, 103, 154  
 Rensberger, D. 56  
 Rese, M. 11  
 Rhea, R. 51, 53, 196-98, 267-68  
 Rhoads, D. 107  
 Rhodes, A.B. 124  
 Richter, G. 22, 24, 255  
 Ridderbos, H. 49, 125, 132, 134, 209, 210, 256  
 Riddle, D.W. 27  
 Rientsma, M.C. 26  
 Rigg, W.H. 11  
 Rimmon-Kenan, S. 233, 237-38  
 Ringe, S.H. 51-52  
 Robert, A. 6  
 Roberts, C.H. 13  
 Robinson, B.P. 6, 33, 43  
 Robinson, J.A. 56  
 Robinson, J.A.T. 12-13, 20, 31-32, 111-12, 116, 143, 189, 199, 209  
 Rohrbaugh, R.L. 56, 148  
 Rosas, R.L. 113  
 Ross, J.F. 139  
 Roth, W. 112  
 Rothschild, J.-P. 83  
 Rowland, C. 115  
 Rudolph, K. 77  
 Ruiz, M.R. 31  
 Ryken, L. 58, 143, 199  
  
 Saldarini, A.J. 77, 206  
 Sand, A. 3, 6  
 Sanday, W. 56  
 Sanders, E.P. 14, 118, 157, 186  
 Sanders, J.A. 146  
 Sanders, J.N. 14, 57, 104  
 Sawyer, J.F.A. 74  
 Schelke, K.H. 6  
 Schenk, W. 123  
 Schenke, L. 50, 221, 258  
 Schlatter, A. 20  
 Schlier, H. 165, 168  
 Schmidt, H. 56  
 Schmidt, N. 6  
 Schnackenburg, R. 11, 15, 18, 20, 23, 26, 34, 45, 57-58, 98, 100, 104, 106, 108, 109-10, 112, 122, 128, 133, 138, 150, 152, 163, 166, 177-78, 181, 185-86, 194-95, 209-10, 213-14, 216-18, 221, 223-24, 226, 280  
 Schneemelcher, W. 14, 144  
 Schneider, J. 11, 263  
 Schneiders, S.M. 11, 55, 96, 264  
 Schnelle, U. 5, 50, 278-80  
 Schnider, F. 3, 6  
 Scholtissek, K. 65  
 Schottroff, L. 56  
 Schrenk, G. 139  
 Schubert, P. 34  
 Schuchard, B.G. 21, 69, 112  
 Schultz, R. 123

- Schwank, B. 50, 122, 125  
 Schwartz, E. 56  
 Schweizer, E. 197  
 Scott, E. 30, 56  
 Scott, R. 134, 163  
 Scroggs, R. 208, 281  
 Segbroeck, F. van 145  
 Segovia, F.F. 55, 60, 122, 256  
 Seynaeve, J. 154  
 Shanks, H. 264  
 Shaviv, S. 68  
 Shehadeh, H. 84  
 Shellard, B. 16  
 Sidebottom, E.M. 4, 33, 198  
 Simon, U. 236  
 Skarsten, R. 78  
 Skeel, C.A.J. 27  
 Slater, T.B. 267  
 Smalley, S.S. 11-12, 20, 26, 30-32, 61, 65, 96, 197, 259  
 Smith, D.M. 15, 17, 20, 30, 58, 155, 195, 239  
 Smith, M. 29  
 Smothers, E.R. 223  
 Solages, B. de 11, 17  
 Stacey, W.D. 72, 74, 98, 103  
 Staley, J.L. 55, 60, 243, 249  
 Stambaugh, J.E. 27-28  
 Stanton, G. 264  
 Starbuck, S.R. 88  
 Stegemann, E.W. 201  
 Stegner, W.R. 218  
 Stenhouse, P. 84  
 Stibbe, M.W.G. 12, 53-54, 57, 61-62, 106, 239-40, 282  
 Stimpfle, A. 187  
 Strachan, R.H. 57, 59  
 Strack, H.L. 178  
 Stronstad, R. 34  
 Stuckenbruck, L.T. 88  
 Sturch, R.L. 11  
 Syreeni, K. 107  
 Teeple, H.M. 3, 6, 17, 35, 58, 90, 207, 211, 274  
 Temple, P.J. 145  
 Temple, S. 58  
 Temple, W. 19, 112, 125  
 Tenney, M.C. 149, 241  
 Thackeray, H.St.J. 80  
 Theobald, M. 255, 260  
 Thiselton, A.C. 55  
 Thomas, J.C. 97  
 Thompson, H.O. 76  
 Thompson, J.A. 75  
 Thompson, M.B. 27  
 Thompson, M.M. 13, 103, 258, 278-79, 282  
 Thornton, T. 183  
 Thornton, T.C.G. 14  
 Thyen, H. 189, 280  
 Tiede, D.L. 180  
 Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 87, 164  
 Tilborg, S. van 15, 60  
 Tolmie, D.F. 60, 122, 232  
 Torrance, T.F. 2  
 Tov, E. 84  
 Tovey, D. 60, 234  
 Travis, S.H. 54  
 Trudinger, P. 112, 219, 276  
 Trumbower, J.A. 77  
 Tuckett, C.M. 54  
 Turner, G.A. 12  
 Turner, M. 2  
 Turner, N. 38, 184  
 Unnik, W.C. van 31-32  
 VanderKam, J.C. 29, 87, 90  
 Vawter, B. 68, 156, 197, 227  
 Verhoef, P.A. 68  
 Vermes, G. 2, 29, 89, 131, 157, 244, 267  
 Vesco, J.-L. 4, 6  
 Vetter, D. 69  
 Vouga, F. 22, 24  
 Waetjen, H.C. 255  
 Wahlde, U.C. von 23-24  
 Walker, N. 68  
 Tal, A. 84  
 Talbert, C.H. 60  
 Tarelli, C.C. 154

- Walker, P.W.L. 119  
Walker, W. 267  
Walker, W.M.O. 121  
Wall, R.W. 24  
Walsh, J.T. 70  
Waltke, B.K. 83, 175  
Wansbrough, H. 16  
Water, L. van der 6  
Watson, F. 122, 244  
Watts, J.D.W. 72-73  
Watty, W.W. 232, 236  
Wead, D.W. 59, 151  
Webb, R.L. 82, 155  
Weiland, D.J. 104  
Welck, C. 97  
Wellhausen, J. 56  
Wengst, K. 11, 23-24, 50  
Wenham, D. 54  
Werblowsky, R.J.W. 206  
Wessel, W.W. 147  
Westcott, B.F. 10, 19, 39, 56, 125, 153  
Westermann, C. 20-21, 73, 167  
Wetter, G.P. 35, 40, 43, 45  
Whitacre, R.A. 30  
Whitaker, G.H. 78  
Whitaker, R.E. 88  
Whitelam, K.W. 71  
Whiteley, D.E.H. 11  
Whybray, R.N. 73  
Wiener, A. 102  
Wigoder, G. 206  
Wilckens, U. 11, 18, 25, 26, 50, 195  
Wilcox, M. 110  
Wildberger, H. 165  
Wilder, A.N. 34, 58  
Wilhoit, J.C. 199  
Willett, M.E. 5, 51  
Williams, D.T. 2  
Williams, M.H. 28  
Winbery, C.L. 38  
Wind, A. 26, 30  
Windisch, H. 30, 56, 282  
Wink, W. 155  
Winter, M. 122  
Winter, P. 259  
Witherington III, B. 11, 15, 50, 69, 111, 114, 119, 273  
Witkamp, L.T. 5  
Wolfson, H.A. 78-80  
Woude, A.S. van der 35  
Wright, C. 77  
Wright, N.T. 273  
Wright, T. 57  
Wuellner, W. 107, 244  
Würthwein, E. 76  
Yee, G.A. 21, 216, 218  
Young, E.J. 72-73  
Young, F.W. 6, 69  
Zeitlin, S. 29, 206, 264  
Zeller, D. 22  
Zimmermann, J. 3, 273





