Discerning Segment Boundaries within John 1:19-4:54

Joseph R. Dongell
Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, Ky.
joe.dongell@asburyseminary.edu

ABSTRACT: Bible commentators have traditionally supplied hierarchical outlines for the books they interpret under the assumption that texts are semantically structured, and that valid interpretation flows in part from accurately discerning textual structure. The disciplines of narrative criticism and discourse analysis have significantly advanced our understanding of textual structure, and have crossed paths by way of mutual influence with the IBS movement, which has given sustained attention to formalizing the study of textual structure. Against this backdrop, John 1:19-4:54 invites closer scrutiny in terms of the logic of its composition. The nearly universal agreement that 1:1-18 forms a clear literary unit, and that 5:1 begins another, contrasts with a lack of agreement about how to construe the intervening material. One popular view, that 2:1-4:54 is gathered as a literary whole by virtue of a Cana-to-Cana inclusio, falters under careful examination. According to the conclusions and introductions supplied by the narrator, 1:19-2:22 stands forth as cohesive unit devoted to presenting the Disciples as those who come to full and stable faith in Jesus. Likewise, 2:23-4:54 stands forth as a cohesive unit devoted to presenting Jesus as the Savior of all: Jews, Samaritans, and gentiles.

PART ONE: BACKGROUNDS FOR SEGMENT STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS

Discourse Architecture as a Perennial Interest

An essentially universal practice among modern commentators is that of proposing an analytical outline for the biblical book under consideration. It matters not from what theological or methodological camp a scholar hails, or what sort of commentary (e.g. popular or

scholarly) is being produced.[1] The commentary reader will find that the biblical material has been broken into large sections that are progressively subdivided into smaller units. Each block of material, whatever its standing within the resulting hierarchy of textual elements, is supplied with a title designed to convey something of its essential content and significance. Within the relatively short compass of such an outline, the scholar can convey rather wide-ranging judgments regarding the nature, purpose, and theological vision of the biblical book at hand.

But until recent decades, little formal attention has been paid to how one might go about constructing such outlines, or even defending the validity of the venture. It has just seemed the right thing to do. One can conclude that readers and writers have cooperated in embracing at least two intuitions about the nature of human discourse: that it is hierarchically structured, and that discerning the relational linkages among its component parts is an important part of interpretation.

Traditional exegetical guides and classroom instruction began by building up students' skills in examining the smallest components. First, the text should be established through Textual Criticism. Only after that task has been fully completed (it is often implied) should the individual words of the text be examined for the semantic freight and connotation they carry. Then moving up to the next level of textual organization, the student may begin discerning, by means of the rules of grammar, how words are combined to form phrases, clauses, and sentences. Finally, sentences, typically joined to each other by conjunctions, can then be shown to form a paragraph (or a pericope) as a whole.[2]

The larger context beyond the pericope has not always been ignored, of course. But the advice given to students for assessing larger contextual structure tended to be basic and uncritical: look at "what

---

1. These three commentators represent distinctive approaches, yet each proposes a structural analysis of the Fourth Gospel: representing a standard historical-critical approach is George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (WBC 36; Waco, Tex.: Word, 1987), xc-xcii; representing an explicitly theological reading is Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary* (trans. John Vriend; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), v-xv; and representing a social-historical emphasis is Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003), xi-xxiv.

2. Gordon Fee's exegetical advice names these very steps (though in a slightly different order). His approach is extremely helpful as far as it goes, but there is only the thinnest recommendation for how to analyze text at levels above the pericope itself (*New Testament Exegesis: A Handbook for Students and Pastors*, Revised Edition [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993], 63-143).

comes before" and "what comes after," and notice "how the pericope participates in the overall theme or purpose of the book." Now I am not at all claiming that traditional exegetes had no interest in or feel for the larger fabric of discourse, but it is fair to say that few analytical tools or terminology had been developed for discerning discourse architecture.[3]

Disciplines that have changed the Game

But much has happened over the last forty years. Two disciplines in particular, narrative criticism and discourse analysis, have helped their practitioners to conduct a more formal analysis of textual organization at levels above the pericope.[4] For instance, operating under the conviction that the Gospels are literary wholes manifesting the techniques of storytelling, practitioners of *narrative criticism* are keen to discern the patterns, designs, and structures employed in crafting the architecture of the entire narrative.[5]

Under one form of analysis, the narrated events of a story are judged as not bearing equal strength in carrying plot development forward. Some events (called kernels) can be discerned as forming the backbone elements of narrative movement, while other events (called satellites) appear to serve supportive roles to the kernels.[6] Just this differentiation between events, heretofore seen merely as forming a simple linear sequence, can create levels of hierarchy between texts and

---

3. In two examples of exegetical method presented by Kümmel (one on Rom 5:1-11 and the other on Matt 12:22-37), no meaningful attention is given to how these passages contribute to the overall flow of the entire book, or to how these passages relate to the writer's overall purposes. As modeled in the exegetical handbook of Otto Kaiser and Werner G. Kummel, exegesis focuses largely on an isolated pericope (*Exegetical Method: A Student's Handbook* [trans. E. V. N. Goetchius; New York: Seabury, 1963], 49-69).

4. Also, epistolary criticism and rhetorical criticism are ventures quite concerned with analyzing the structure of whole discourses. Given that these approaches appear much more fruitful in the epistles, and that the two disciplines I will consider—narrative criticism and discourse analysis—will supply sufficient categories for my analysis, I shall be content to rely on the latter for methodological guidance regarding the Fourth Gospel.

5. A useful guide to narrative criticism is James L. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005).

6. Mark Allan Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (GBS; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 36. Powell here relies on the work of Roland Barthes, but adds the important caveat that the business of actually distinguishing between satellites and kernels is "anything but self-evident."

---

illuminate yet another layer of significance for any given passage.

Significant attention is also being paid to the possibility that certain symmetrical patterns might be the organizing device for structuring large spans of text. Inclusio, chiasm, parallelism, and climax are rhetorical strategies that have been reintroduced (as I shall demonstrate below) to the awareness of present day readers.[7] While it is unwarranted to presume that one or more of these must be at work in any given text, we must be alert to the possibility that the presence of an artistic design may explain an otherwise mysterious concatenation of passages.

In the Gospel of Mark, for example, David Rhoads, Joanna Dewey and Donald Michie provide a useful listing of some of the most prevalent structuring devices employed by storytellers: verbal threads (established through repetition), foreshadowing and retrospection, two-step progressions, type scenes, sandwich episodes, framing episodes, and progressive episodes in series of three.[8] As they lay out their case, it becomes quite clear that the stories and events comprising Mark's Gospel are woven together by several different kinds of stitching, and that several distinct layers of connection are simultaneously at work between any given pericope and its neighbors, fore and aft. One leading implication of such a "texture" is that no single story of event within such narrative can be lifted out and interpreted in isolation from the rich flow within which it is situated.[9]

Another important contribution of narrative criticism to the issue of discourse structure has been the attention paid to the voice of the (implied) narrator. The narrator's "point of view" is essential

---

7. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 56-60. *Parallelism* involves repetition of several different elements in similar order (whether through immediate repetition, as with A-A', B-B', C-C' ..., or in through block repetition, as in A-B-C-D, A'-B'-C'-D'...); *Inclusio* involves the presence of brackets around a literary whole (as in the sequence A-B-C-D-E...A); *Chiasm* involves the repetition of elements, but in reversed order (as in A-B-C-D-D'-C'-B'-A'); and *Climax* ("ladder") involves the ordering of elements in either increasing order (to a zenith) or in decreasing order (towards a nadir).

8. David Rhoads, Joanna Dewey, and Donald Michie, *Mark as Story: An Introduction to the Narrative of a Gospel* (3rd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 47-54.

9. For example, the stories in Mark 2:1-3:6 together form a collection of controversy stories that build in their intensity from the indirect and internal opposition of Jesus' enemies toward their direct and overt opposition. While each story in the series surely bears a measure of truth, readers will miss the larger message if they ignore the connectedness between them all.

for the reader to identify, since that voice creates the perspective which functions authoritatively (within the logic of the narrative) for evaluating all other elements within the narrative. Whether characters are to be seen as reliable or unreliable, or events assessed as positive or negative (and so on), the voice of the narrator guides the (implied) reader in seeing reality as it should be seen. Of particular value are any explicit comments, summaries, or evaluations supplied throughout a narrative that might mark textual transitions or characterize the nature of given sections of the discourse.[10]

Just how numerous and diverse are the structural devices authors may deploy for creating a structural architecture can be gathered from the work of George Mlakuzhyil. While overlapping somewhat with the canon of devices listed above, Mlakuzhyil extends the canon and divides it into two categories. Under "literary" devices for signaling narrative structure (in the Fourth Gospel), he lists these twelve: conclusions, introductions, inclusions, characteristic vocabulary, geographical indicators, chronological indicators, liturgical feasts, transitions, bridge passages, hook words, repetition, and changes in literary genre.[11] Under "dramatic" devices for signaling narrative structure (in the Fourth Gospel) his lists these twelve: changes of scenes, alternating scenes, double-stage action, introduction of dramatis personae, change of dramatis personae, law of stage duality, vanishing characters, technique of seven scenes, techniques of diptych-scene, dramatic development, and dramatic pattern.[12] This brief selection of leading exponents of narrative criticism reveals a rich supply of devices that storytellers utilize in their artistic and creative crafting of narratives to give structure and shape to the resulting discourse.

Though enjoying some contact with narrative criticism, discourse analysis has arisen largely from the (often more "scientific") field of linguistics. A precise definition of discourse analysis would be difficult to produce, given its sprawling interests and lack of a central

---

10. Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 30-36.

11. George Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (AnBib 117; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987), 88-112.

12. Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Literary Structure*, 112-21.

methodology.[13] My more focused interest relates to how certain of its practitioners have been exploring the question of discourse structure. Several early works, such as *The Thread of Discourse*[14] and *The Grammar of Discourse*,[15] bore titles particularly suggestive of a leading conviction of the new break-out movement: that linguistic analysis must reach beyond the sentence to address progressively larger discourse spans, and ultimately the discourse as a whole. As Eugene A. Nida explains, most linguists had been confining their research to the inner workings of the sentence, having accepted the "artificially imposed limitation of earlier generative-transformational analyses."[16] He singles out Grimes and Longacre in particular as deserving praise for pointing the way forward to the analysis of larger units of discourse, and to "the possibility of extensive formalization of discourse structures."[17]

While narrative critics are often concerned to account for the *artistic* features of textual movement associated with storytelling, a number of Discourse Analysts have been probing the *semantic* dynamics of textual movement. In an exemplary chapter entitled "Grammatical Meaning of Secondary Semantic Configurations," Nida proposes two sets of semantic connections operating between units of text larger than the sentence. The first set, "Coordinate Semantic Relations," tie together elements that are relatively equal in textual hierarchy: Additive (whether these elements are similar or dissimilar) and Dyadic (including relations of alternation ["or"], contrast ["but"] or comparison ["than/as"]). More extensive is the second set of relations tying together elements that are unequal in textual hierarchy: The first subdivision of subordinate relationships is "Qualificational" (by which a "substance" is identified [whether by its content or its generic-specific relationships], or by

---

13. For a general introduction to discourse analysis as it relates to NT studies, see Joel B. Green, "Discourse Analysis and New Testament Interpretation," *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (ed. Joel Green; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 175-96. More illustrative of the technical side of discourse analysis are the essays in David Alan Black, ed., *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis* (Nashville: Broadman, 1992).

14. Joseph E. Grimes, *The Thread of Discourse* (Amsterdam: Mouton, 1975).

15. Robert E. Longacre, *The Grammar of Discourse* (New York: Plenum, 1983).

16. Eugene A. Nida, *Exploring Semantic Structures* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1975), 50.

17. Nida, *Semantic Structures*, 50.

which a "character" is qualified [whether through manner, setting, or characterization]). The second subdivision of subordinate relationships is "Logical," including such operations as: cause-effect, reason-result, means-result, means-purpose, condition-result, ground-implication, and concession-result. Nida then proceeds to illustrate the use of these relationships at all levels of discourse (especially beyond the boundaries of the sentence) by analyzing an article in *Time* magazine entitled "Fish Bites Dog."[18]

Being semantic in nature, these connections probe the movement in logic and sense from one sentence to the next, one paragraph to the next, one section to the next (and so on) largely through attention to "content." As with narrative criticism, one of the benefits of this kind of textual evaluation is that larger schemes of textual organization come to light, along with the various hierarchies suggested by the nature of the semantic relationships involved.

It is not necessary, of course, to choose between these disciplines and their emphases. Neither discipline claims exclusive rights in the business of interpreting texts well, nor does either claim to house in a comprehensive way the skills that effective readers should develop. In my judgment, the largely *artistic* interests of narrative criticism and the *semantic* interests of (certain streams of) discourse analysis can profitably be joined together to form a more robust approach for analyzing the architectural design of texts.

The Place of Inductive Biblical Study (IBS) in Structural Analysis

It is appropriate to note, especially in this inaugural issue of *The Journal of Inductive Biblical Studies*, something of the relationship between these recent developments in the study of textual architecture (as described above in narrative criticism and discourse analysis) and IBS as it has come to expression at Asbury Theological Seminary.[19] It turns out that the structural analysis of texts, at least in the artistic and semantic senses described above, had been enshrined already for

18. Nida, *Semantic Structures*, 50-65. The article is found in *Time's* August 23, 1968 issue.

19. IBS as practiced at Asbury Theological Seminary is a refined development of a larger IBS movement flowing especially from the curriculum and faculty of Biblical Seminary in New York. The fullest presentation of IBS as practiced at Asbury is found in David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina, *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011). A more concise treatment is found in David L. Thompson, *Bible Study that Works* (Rev. ed.; Nappanee, Ind.: Evangel, 1994).

decades before 1970 especially in the IBS exercises known as "segment survey" and "book survey." For example, it appears that Robert A. Traina had already codified into a single list of literary structures most of the artistic patterns named by narrative criticism and most of the semantic structures named by discourse analysis.[20] Traina's work itself stood as something of an adaptation of earlier lists of structural relationships identified by Howard Tillman Kuist in dependence upon the work of English literary critic John Ruskin.[21]

But while the IBS movement spread broadly from its beginnings at Biblical Seminary in New York City and significantly influenced a number of biblical scholars across the country,[22] it has not yet become widely recognized as a distinctive and cohesive hermeneutical vision and praxis.[23] But this "shadow existence" has not prevented it from having had some influence upon the development of facets both of narrative criticism and of discourse analysis. For example, Mark A. Powell takes up and includes within his description of narrative criticism the specific formulation of structural relationships as articulated by David R. Bauer, and recognizes the work of Traina and Kuist standing behind Bauer. In so doing, Powell explicitly acknowledges the "wealth of information already available" regarding structural analysis now flowing into the

20. Robert A. Traina, *Methodical Bible Study: A New Approach to Hermeneutics* (New York: Ganis & Harris, 1952), 49-55.

21. Howard Tillman Kuist, *These Words upon Thy Heart: Scripture and the Christian Response* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1947). In the Appendix (159-81) Kuist reproduces an abridged version of Ruskin's essay on "composition," defined as "putting things together, so as to make one thing of them" (161). Ruskin names these "laws" of composition: the law of principality; the law of repetition; the law of continuity; the law of curvature; the law of radiation; the law of contrast; the law of interchange, the law of consistency, and the law of harmony. Traina has built upon but modified this list considerably.

22. An illuminating history of the inductive approach and the place in Biblical Seminary of New York in its development can be found at inductivebiblestudy.seedbed.com/inductive-bible-study/history-of-inductive-biblical-study/

23. It is my hope that the recent publication of *Inductive Bible Study* by Bauer and Traina, along with the present launching of *The Journal of Inductive Biblical Study*, combined with significant gathering of resources through Seedbed.com will constitute a surge of interest that ignites wider significance and usage of IBS approaches.

practice of narrative criticism from the IBS movement.[24]

The work of another noteworthy alumnus of Biblical Seminary, Daniel P. Fuller, involved the refinement and elaboration of the same list of structural relationships in a fashion somewhat parallel to Traina's approach.[25] Fuller's proposals, particularly his articulation of how discourses are structured above the level of the sentence through a limited set of relationships, attracted the attention of Joseph E. Grimes, linguist at Cornell University. Grimes was impressed with the methodology Fuller had developed for exposing these "formalized" relationships, and for demonstrating how they enabled not only the analysis of elements within sentences, but of "major segments of texts in terms of the same relationships."[26] Grimes declares that the "Fuller's characterization of the recursive relations that link both clauses and the textual units formed from linked clauses has been a major stimulus to this study [i.e. his book, *The Thread of Discourse*]."[27]

To put the matter succinctly, the disciplines of narrative criticism and of discourse analysis have more than causal contact with the approaches to structural analysis earlier developed within the IBS movement. It seems fair to conclude that the vision of structural analysis espoused by IBS stands on quite solid ground, as suggested by its overlap and interplay with the structural approaches more recently developed and expanded by narrative criticism and discourse analysis.

The Importance of the Structural Analysis of Texts for Interpretation

The last phase of preparation for my own study the structure of John 1:19-4:54 is to underscore the importance of structural analysis for theological interpretation. Structural analysis involves dividing a discourse into segments that can then be shown to form larger units of text. The necessary outcome of forming such clusters of passages is that major breaks are established within the discourse separating one cluster of passages from another. When interpreters differ in how they join or separate the material within a discourse, they usually differ also in what sense they make of the discourse as a whole. Structural analysis and interpretation are closely intertwined.

_____

24. Powell, *Narrative Criticism*, 32-34.

25. Daniel P. Fuller, *The Inductive Method of Bible Study* (3rd ed.; Pasadena: Fuller Theological Seminary, 1959).

26. Grimes, *Thread of Discourse*, 7.

27. Grimes, *Thread of Discourse*, 20.

Jack Dean Kingsbury, for example, has urged a tripartite division of Matthew that articulates his vision of Matthew's theological project. Kingsbury sees the first section as comprising 1:1-4:16; the second as comprising 4:17-16:20; and the third as comprising 16:21-28:20.[28] The transitions between the second and third divisions are marked by the formulaic expression, "From that time on, Jesus began to…." This architectural analysis of Matthew, combined with an assessment of the "story-time" presented by the evangelist, leads Kingsbury to his larger estimation of the overall proclamation of this Gospel: "that in the person of Jesus Messiah, his Son, God has drawn near to abide to the end of time with his people, the church, thus inaugurating the age of salvation."[29] The implication for understanding discourse of all types is that an author's "message" is conveyed not only by aggregate meanings of the words and sentences viewed at the local level of each pericope, but is conveyed simultaneously by the shape and structure of the larger units converging to form the whole discourse.

To illustrate the intersection between structural analysis and interpretation in a different NT genre altogether, consider Markus Barth's analysis of the structure of Ephesians. Barth became convinced that the "Indicative-Imperative" slogan arising out of Protestant theology had been foisted by many interpreters upon Ephesians with dire consequences, with chs. 1-3 consequently characterized as "the Indicative," and chs. 4-6 characterized as "the Imperative." But according to his own analysis, 1:15-2:22 portrays God's perfect work in establishing the church comprised of both Jews and Gentiles; 3:1-4:21 praises God's ongoing work of revelation in and through (all) his people; while 4:25-6:20 encourages readers to "let their light shine" throughout the world. The net effect of Barth's structural assessment and exegesis is to expand the church's role as a lighthouse for the salvation of the whole creation,

_____

28. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 38. The titles he supplies to these three section are, respectively: The Figure of Jesus Messiah; The Ministry of Jesus Messiah to Israel, and Israel's Repudiation of Jesus; and The Journey of Jesus Messiah to Jerusalem, and his Suffering and Death and Resurrection. The demarcation of these sections and the characterization of their contents express Kingsbury's assessment of Matthew as focusing on the story of Jesus as set within larger story of God's dealing with Israel and the church over time.

29. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 40.

rather than as an institution of limited scope and purpose.[30] Barth's re-envisioning of the theology of Ephesians goes hand-in-hand with his re-envisioning of its literary architecture.

PART TWO: TOWARDS STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF JOHN 1:19-4:54

Current Proposals and Their Problems

Having laid a foundation for the value of the structural analysis of discourse as a constituent part of the whole interpretive process, I turn now to a portion of the Fourth Gospel (1:19-4:54) that has proven somewhat problematic in terms of assessing its narrative movement and logic of development. My goal in this study is not the analysis of the entire Gospel, or even a major section of it. I offer this work as only a part of what would be involved in a full-scale "segment survey" of these verses.[31] I am attempting to answer this limited question: How might the material between 1:18 and 5:1 be organized?

On the one hand, there is broad agreement among Johannine scholars that 1:1-18 stands as a clearly identifiable unit called the Prologue that introduces the whole of the Gospel. So distinctive is its style, content, and construction that some suspect that it was created independently of the Gospel.[32] On the other hand, there is also broad agreement that 5:1 marks a significant new departure for the narrative.[33] At 5:1 the scene shifts back to Jerusalem, the atmosphere darkens with the onset of sustained hostility to Jesus, and what appears to be a narrative strategy of relating the person and ministry of Jesus to the

---

30. Markus Barth, *Ephesians: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary on Chapters 1-3* (AB 34; Garden City: Doubleday, 1974), 54-56. My point here is not to endorse Barth's thesis, but to illustrate the interconnectedness between structural analysis and theological interpretation.

31. For a description of "Segment Survey" as a distinct process advocated by the IBS method as taught at Asbury Theological Seminary see Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 143-58.

32. See Keener, *John*, 333-41, for a survey of this issue.

33. R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 91. Culpepper expresses it this way: "John 5 brings a fresh development. The conflict over Jesus' identity intensifies sharply, the Jews become important for the first time, and the basis of the conflict is explained."

Jewish feasts has begun.[34] If we accept 1:18 as the terminus of a clear unit of text consisting of 1:1-18, and accept 5:1 as beginning a new unit of text, we are left with the task of discerning the character and arrangement of the materials lying between these boundaries at 1:18 and 5:1, which now we tentatively designate simply as 1:19-4:54.[35]

Some analysts find 1:19-4:54 displaying its own unity, allowing it to stand as a meaningful whole for interpretive purposes. John Painter judges the components of this section to be revolving around the theme of quest: John and his disciples seek the Messiah (1:19-51); Mary seeks her son (2:1-11); God seeks true worshippers (2:12-22); Nicodemus seeks the Kingdom (2:23-3:15); both Jesus and the Samaritan Woman are seeking (4:4-42); and a royal official seeks life (4:46-54).[36]

Indeed certain of these stories are nicely illuminated when viewed against the backdrop of "inquiry and quest" stories found in the Synoptic Gospels and other Hellenistic literature. Jesus is, in fact, being sought out by a variety of folk, whether to ascertain his identity or to seek his help. But I doubt that the questing theme adequately binds all of these materials together. For example, it is difficult to detect in the actual narration of the temple incident (2:12-22) any quest for True Worshippers. Painter has obviously imported his title "The Quest for True Worshippers" from the story of the Samaritan Woman (especially 4:23), and in so doing has demoted the themes of judgment, scripture and remembrance patent in 2:12-22.

But Painter can assist one in moving forward in a quest for structure within 1:19-4:54, since he also accepts the widely-held view that the first sign in Cana (2:1-11) and the second sign in Cana (4:46-54) constitute an inclusio that forms a unified subsection between them (2:1-4:54). The monumental Johannine scholar Raymond Brown promoted this vision of (geographical) inclusio, and entitled this span

---

34. Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (I-XII): *Introduction, Translation and Notes* (New York: Doubleday, 1966), CXLI. Brown views 5:1-10:42 as dealing successively with the Sabbath, the Passover, the Feast of Tabernacles, and the Dedication.

35. By identifying this span as 1:19-4:54, I am not at this point assuming or implying any particular kind of unifying theme at work, or the boundaries of any subunits within it. It is purely a "negative" denotation: "Material not belonging to the Prologue (1:1-18), and not yet part of the new narrative project beginning at 5:1."

36. John Painter, *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community* (2nd ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 163-75.

of text "From Cana to Cana (Various responses to Jesus' ministry in the different sections of Palestine)." [37]

A majority of analysts seem to have followed this tact in charting out the flow of John's narrative, and have often characterized this section in highly theological ways. Carson, for example, speaks of 2:1-4:54 as developing the theme of 2 Cor 5:17, "The old has gone, the new has come."[38] Here the influence of Dodd can be detected, who discerned a replacement theology working its way through the first Cana miracle and beyond: new wine, new temple, and new birth. "[The miracle of Cana and the cleansing of the temple] signify the same fundamental truth: that Christ has come to inaugurate a new order in religion."[39]

But as attractive as such an analysis may appear, several significant difficulties with it must be noted. First, it is not at all clear that the geographical notices of 2:11 and 4:54 (this was the first/second sign Jesus did when he had come from Judea to Galilee) should signal the particular arrangement of inclusio. How do we know that these two notices, which do in fact impress all readers as standing in some relationship to each other, ought to be seen as marking the *beginning* and the *end* of a span of text? Why shouldn't we construe these very notices as forming the climactic conclusions of two separate spans, say 1:19-2:11 and 2:12-4:54, thereby forming something of a parallelism? To push the matter even further, why should we infer that any symmetry pattern is at work in these two notices of Jesus' signs (2:11; 4:54)? Might not the narrator have been aiming only to set the first notice simply within one segment, and the second notice somewhere within a second segment? Proponents of the Cana-to-Cana structure tend not to entertain these questions at all.

Second, many have noticed overt linkages binding the wedding event (2:1-11) to *preceding* narrative of 1:19-51. The opening words, "on the third day" (2:1), surely harken back to the series of days in which several of John's disciples meet Jesus: "on the next day" (1:29), "the next day" (1:35), and "on the next day" (1:43). Even if these cannot be demonstrated to form a symbolic whole of, let's say, a "creative week" of seven days, they still tie the wedding event to the stories of the first

37. Brown, *John*, 95.

38. D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 166.

39. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954), 297.

disciples coming to faith in Jesus (1:19-51).[40]

Related to this very point we must notice the conclusion that the narrator supplies to wedding story: not that the steward believed, or that the wedding guests believed, or that his mother believed, but that his *disciples* believed (2:11). This selective focus in naming the payout of this story only tightens its connection with the preceding stories that portray the faith development of the apostolic band (1:19-51).

Third, Brown's rather nebulous characterization of the content of 2:1-4:54 calls into question the view that it stands as a cohesive span. It is hard to imagine a foggier title than "Various responses to Jesus' ministry in the various sections of Palestine."[41] Such a title fails to identify anything distinctive about this section, since nearly any span across the Fourth Gospel could answer to the same characterization.

Fourth, even if we were to return to the idea of "newness" for help in discerning cohesion within 2:1-4:54, we should remember that Dodd himself did not envision that theme extending beyond 4:42. As he saw it, the story of the healing of the royal official's son (4:43-54) belonged with the subsequent material of ch. 5 which he characterized as presenting "The Life-Giving Word."[42] It is indeed difficult to find in 4:46-54 anything that answers to the idea of the "old" giving way to the "new." In other words, the claim that the whole of 2:1-4:54 is united around the theme of "newness" should be doubted, which in turn calls into question the notion that 2:1-4:54 ought (in the first place) be treated as a unified whole.

Fifth, I note the strange paradox that emerges if one embraces the "From-Cana-to-Cana" structure. That structure impresses the image of circular motion, beginning in Cana, passing from Galilee down to Jerusalem (2:1-3:36) and then back northward through Samaria (4:1-42) and finally back to Cana again (4:43-54); that is, from Cana to Cana. But these famous geographical notices of the first and second miracles performed by Jesus (2:11; 4:54) do not themselves suggest circular motion. The first notice is static, simply declaring that Jesus performed the

40. It does seem to me that a highly symbolic schema of seven days, as if to establish the onset of a "new creation" cannot be satisfactorily demonstrated here. In this negative assessment I agree with Ridderbos, *John*, 102-4.

41. Brown, *John*, 95. Similarly ambiguous is Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (SP; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1998), 64. Moloney characterizes the material as follows: "[The reader] moves systematically through episodes that report the meetings between Jesus and others."

42. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 318.

miracle "at Cana in Galilee" (2:11), while the second is linear, describing a unidirectional journey for Jesus "from Judea to Galilee" (4:54). To put it differently, the notice at 2:11 speaks of a beginning of *signs*, not necessarily the beginning of a particular *journey*, or the beginning of a *textual unit*. If one were to acknowledge the strong connection between 2:1-11 and the preceding material of 1:19-51, one could just as easily conclude that a double *south-to-north movement* is created by the south-to-north movement of 1:19-2:11 and subsequently of 2:13-4:54. In other words, the narrator may be more interested in mapping out two trips from Jerusalem to Galilee (1:19-2:11; 2:13-4:54), than in presenting one circular trip (and one thematic unity) beginning and ending Cana (2:1-4:54).[43]

Sixth, of course several of these difficulties were not unrecognized by Brown and others who have supported the Cana-to-Cana (2:1-4:54) analysis. When the undeniable chronological and thematic linkages between the wedding story (2:1-11) and the foregoing stories (1:19-51) are duly acknowledged, it is commonly conceded that the wedding story (2:1-11) must stand as a "bridge" serving both as the closure to the previous series of stories and as the opening event of the Cana-to-Cana cycle. The two segments, in effect, are often said to overlap each other (1:19-2:11; 2:1-4:54) by sharing a common element of the wedding story (2:1-11).[44]

Now I have no reason to reject such a "bridge" analysis in principle, there being no grounds for denying that narrators might choose to organize their materials in just such an overlapping fashion. But I hesitate in this case to buy into the notion of overlap precisely because I have come to lose confidence in the integrity of 2:1-4:54 as a formal or thematic unity. As it becomes clearer that the wedding story in 2:1-11 belongs with the preceding material, it becomes less clear just how 2:1-11 relates to what follows, and what necessity would remain for insisting that it retain an equal foothold there in a following segment

---

43. It is interesting to note, in this connection, the south-to-north (and beyond) movement laid out in early Acts [from Jerusalem, to Judea, to Samaria…].

44. Brown's obvious exasperation with the challenge of discerning the logic of the narrative movement comes to the surface when he speaks of "endless arguments" about such matters (*John*, cxliii). But could it not be that Brown's (pre-?) commitment to seeing the Cana miracles as forming an inclusio is part of the problem? If one accepts the idea of inclusio here, then the clear connection between the wedding story (2:1-11) does become problematic, and does require one to conclude that 2:1-11 belongs both with the foregoing material and with the following material.

(i.e., in 2:1-4:54).[45]

If a formal and thematic unity is emerging for 1:19-2:11—formal in providing a series of days; thematic in describing the disciples' coming to faith—the way forward might lead us to investigate 2:12-4:54 to see if we can find any features that bind its materials together. In other words, if one subtracts 2:1-11 from the rest of the material in chs. 3-4 and create out of the remainder a different set of ingredients with which to work, what new vision for 2:12-4:54 might emerge?

A Methodological Interlude

The bane of such structural analysis has always been the (overly active?) imagination of readers and ambiguity of texts like the Fourth Gospel. Given a long series of stories laden with diverse characters and rich symbolisms, would it not be possible to invent connections and patterns operating among even an arbitrarily chosen set of stories? Are there any controls to guide our reading and arbitrate between various proposals?

The simple answer is, "No." There is no agreed upon methodology that would produce an authoritative architectural analysis of a text. For Mathias Rissi and Francis J. Moloney, for example, chronological or geographical shifts in the progress of the narrative appear as an unambiguous signs of major narrative caesurae.[46] For others it would appear that the symmetrical patterns (e.g. inclusio, chiasm, parallelism) rank above all other structuring devices.[47] In other words, one easily gets the impression that narratives are overly abundant in textual phenomena, and that these phenomena can be selectively gathered to

---

45. Barrett is among those who have gone ahead and set 2:1-11 with the preceding material in their structural analyses of the Gospel's narrative architecture, with 2:12/13 beginning the next large span of narrative. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 13.

46. Moloney argues that the movement from 1:51 to 2:1 signals a major break in the narrative because of change of place, among other things; "In 1:43 Jesus decided to go to Galilee, and in 2:1 he is there" (*John*, 63). Mathias Rissi, in proposing a structural analysis of the Fourth Gospel, maps the chronological and geographical shifts in the narrative without establishing that these two categories of measure are adequate (or even primary) for determining that Gospel's architecture ("Der Aufbau des vierten Evangeliums," *NTS* 29 [1983]: 48-54).

47. Charles Talbert, "Artistry and Theology: An Analysis of the Architecture of Jo. 1,19-5,47," *CBQ* 32 (1970): 341-66.

support nearly any conclusion one might wish.

But before yielding to despair, it will be helpful to consider again the work of Mlakuzhyil, who has laid out dozens of types of devices employed by biblical writers for structuring texts. He helpfully balances the abundance of structural possibilities with a prioritizing of some as more important for discerning narrative structure than others: namely, conclusions, introductions, and inclusios.[48] Through these, he concludes, we gain surest traction when attempting to discern the design of a text, especially when the import of other textual clues could lead analysts to contradictory conclusions.

The peculiar value of introductions and conclusions should be plain to see, once one considers the insights of narrative criticism. In these devices (introductions and conclusions) one hears, most directly, the narrator's voice offering guidance to the (implied) reader for discerning the narrator's point of view. These devices, whenever present in a narrative, should offer greatest help in identifying and characterizing various spans of text, and should be granted greater importance than other narrative devices that require more subjective input from analysts.[49]

Discerning a Second Theme in (the Latter Portion of) 1:19-4:54

To this point I have argued that 2:1-11 (the wedding story) belongs with the foregoing material (1:19-51), which is dominated by the theme of Jesus' disciples attaching themselves to him. I am now wondering what to do with the remaining material (2:12-4:54).

Even some subscribing to the Cana-to-Cana analysis have noticed that the stories in chs. 3-4 depict Jesus as encountering persons from different segments of society.[50] Nicodemus appears as a Jew of the

---

48. Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Structure*, 112.

49. An example of the subjectivity often required when proposing symmetrical structures can be seen in Talbert's work, when he sets the Nicodemus story (3:1-21) in balanced relation to the story of the healing of the royal official's son (4:46-54) because both of the leading characters are "officials" (Talbert, *Artistry and Theology*, 346-66). I judge this to be rather arbitrary selection of features, and therefore unconvincing.

50. See, e.g., Andreas J. Kostenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 191-93. It is odd, in my view, that Kostenberger embraces the Jew-Samaritan-gentile sequence, but also retains a Cana-to-Cana construal of 2:1-4:54. In my view, the strength of the Jew-Samaritan-gentile sequence, combined with the sobering weaknesses of the Cana-to-Cana construal call for abandoning the latter altogether.

highest order, and indeed seems to speak for many other Jews: "We know that you are a teacher from God" (3:2b). The woman Jesus meets at the well in Sychar is a Samaritan, and becomes the avenue through which Jesus encounters "the Samaritans" (4:40). Anyone familiar with the NT thought-world should be forgiven for immediately wondering if this sequence (from Jew to Samaritan) might find its natural culmination in Jesus meeting a non-Jew, thereby establishing the satisfying series of *Jew-Samaritan-gentile.*

This possibility rests, in large measure, on the identity of the "royal official" in 4:46-54. The narrator does not identify him explicitly in terms of his ethnicity or religion, which, in the judgment of some interpreters, squashes the likelihood of the sequence I would have us consider.[51] We might imagine that, if the narrator had aimed at creating the Jew-Samaritan-gentile sequence, the narrator has failed miserably by not clarifying this character's identity at this critical point. But the historical clues available to original readers appear sufficient to establish his gentile identity. An officer in the Herodian court would have found it impossible to follow a clearly Jewish lifestyle, and would have been exposed repeatedly to all sorts of materials and circumstances rendering him unclean. Even if the man himself were in fact a Jew, Keener suggests that the narrator might have been using such a Jew to stand for (pagan) Hellenism.[52] The exhaustive study by A. H. Mead goes further, establishing (sufficiently, in my judgment) that the royal official was in fact a (pagan) gentile, *and that the narrator would have thought of him as such.*[53] Another factor appearing to confirm this sequence is the way in which these three characters are correlated, in the narrative itself, with distinctive geographical locations: Nicodemus is in Jerusalem; the woman of Sychar is in Samaria; and the royal official is in Galilee. The correlation between ethnic identity and geography adds to the attractiveness of the approach

---

51. Ben Witherington III, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 128. Witherington is open to the idea that historical evidence points to the likelihood that the royal official is a gentile, but concludes that "the evangelist makes little or nothing of the fact."

52. Keener, *John*, 631.

53. A. H. Mead, "The *basilikos* in John 4:46-53," *JSNT* 23 (1985): 69-72.

that I am here exploring.⁵⁴

But as attractive as such Jew/Jerusalem – Samaritan/Samaria – gentile/Galilee sequence may appear at first, is there any other support within the narrative that these three characters were designed to be seen as a meaningful set? The small and easily overlooked paragraph of 2:23-25 could lend support this very possibility, by serving as an able introduction to the full set of characters (a Jew, a Samaritan, a gentile) we will meet in the subsequent narrative of 3:1-4:54. Though the geography and chronology of 2:23-25 are initially limited to Jerusalem and to the Passover feast, the ideas involved in 2:25 quickly move to universal scale and general perspective on all humanity.

How so? The paragraph begins by declaring that Jesus performed signs in Jerusalem, that many (Jews, it would seem) saw them and believed "in his name," but that Jesus did not "entrust himself" to them (2:24). Somehow he perceived that their faith was inadequate, despite their warm reception of him and of his behavior.

But why did Jesus respond only hesitantly to their faith? The reason is supplied in 2:25, where the narrator relates that Jesus "knew all people," that Jesus needed no one "to bear witness concerning humanity," for Jesus "himself knew what was in humanity." Jesus was wisely withholding himself from the adoring Jewish crowds not because he understood Jerusalemites, or Judeans, or Jews in general, but because he understood *all of humanity*. Furthermore, this understanding of all humanity flowed from Jesus' mystic capacity to view even the secret corners of the human heart, to see any underlying ignorance hidden from public view, and to identify any shortcomings of faith.

The generalized nature of Jesus' special knowledge (as presented in 2:25) becomes, then, a perfect introduction for hearing of his subsequent encounters with various representatives of humanity: a Jew, a Samaritan, and a gentile. By reading 2:23-25 as the "front porch" to 3:1-4:54, one has been prepared for how each of these stories will play out: They will put Jesus' perceptive, diagnostic powers on display, and show them to be a potent interlocutor across the spectrum of humanity. Jesus penetrates the defenses of a self-assured Pharisee, ascertains the secrets of the Samaritan woman, and exposes the limited contours of the royal official's faith. If Jesus is to play a central role in God's redemption of the

---

54. I am not suggesting by this schema that Galilee was, or should be, thought of as primarily gentile. The royal official of 4:48-54, even if a gentile as I believe, does not characterize the ethnic makeup of Galilee. In my judgment, the geographical shift to Galilee opens the door to an ethnic shift as well, without invoking the old and inaccurate phrase, "Galilee of the gentiles."

whole world (3:16), and if the Samaritans' declaration that Jesus was the Savior of the whole world is true (4:42), then Jesus must demonstrate a capacity to deal with the whole of humanity. Expressed in terms of semantic relationships, the stories of 3:1-4:54 stand as a particularization of the general claims set forth generally in 2:23-25.

To this point I have claimed that a unified segment runs from 1:19 through at least 2:11, as suggested by chronological references to "days," and by the theme of some of the original disciples coming to genuine faith in Jesus. I have also argued that 2:23-4:54 presents Jesus as Savior of the world, as represented by a recognizable set of characters together representing the whole of humanity: a Jew (Nicodemus), a Samaritan, and a gentile. But this leaves still unaccounted for the incident of the (so-called) temple cleansing (2:12-22).

At first blush the temple cleansing (2:12-22) does not fit easily into either the foregoing material (1:19-2:11) or the following material (2:23-4:54). It would have been ideal, from my perspective at least, if the narrator had left clearer signs of design, supposing some design was at work. If we are supposed to read the temple cleansing as part of the first complex (1:19-54), then we should expect the temple cleansing story to be introduced by a reference to numbered days (e.g. "on the sixth day," or "fourteen days later") as we find at 2:1. If, on the other hand, we are supposed to read the temple cleansing as part of the effort to show his competence in dealing with all of humanity (2:25), we might expect the temple cleansing to be found after these general claims.

But a closer examination of the text does suggest, in my judgment, a resolution. Although it is not as precise as one may have wished, one finds a reference to "days" in the transitional verse between the wedding at Cana and temple cleansing: "After this he went down to Capernaum with is mother and his brothers and his disciples; and there he stayed for not many days" (2:12). Note that this is not an absolute chronological comment (e.g. in the winter, or at Passover), which would make this chronological comment rather static, but a *relative* chronological comment ("not many days"), which brings into closer position the next event (the temple cleansing). In other words, the narrator is telling us that the Capernaum sojourn between the wedding at Cana and the temple cleansing was not very long at all. Should one then tilt the temple cleansing (2:12-22) "backwards" into contact with the wedding at Cana (2:1-12), and read the temple cleansing with all this foregoing material to form an interconnected whole (1:19-2:22)?

I readily admit that the chronological comment of 2:12 by itself is not quite strong or explicit enough to draw the temple cleansing

(2:13-22) into close orbit with the foregoing section that I have already established (1:19-2:11). But is there any evidence within the story of the temple cleansing itself that would show clear thematic continuity with the topic of the disciples coming to faith that one can discern in 1:19-2:11?

It is instructive at this point to consider Raymond Brown's treatment of the temple cleansing. His first interest is patently historical: he wants to understand the event itself, and he is zealous to look through the text of the Fourth Gospel back to the moment in time when Jesus carried out his shocking action. He is committed to understanding "what the scene meant to those who saw it."[55] Brown devotes significant space to treating the event as a historical event, apart from its placement and function in the Fourth Gospel.

But Brown's second interest is theological: he wants to understand "what the scene meant in within Johannine Theology. To this end, Brown discerns several layers of significance for the event that are exposed in the immediately attached dialogues and comments (2:17-22): there is the hint that Jesus' zeal will somehow eventuate in his death (2:17); and there is a rich theology of the temple being replaced by the body of Jesus (2:18-21).[56]

But after having pointed to 2:22 as warrant for discerning the place of the temple cleansing within John's theology, Brown is surprisingly disinterested in the significance of the particular claims of this verse itself, which claims that after Jesus "was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had spoken" (2:22). It cannot be known with certainty, but it seems to me that Brown has treated this verse essentially as an afterthought, as merely an interesting detail, as something of an aside that does not contribute substantially to what the narrator is prosecuting.

And yet in the light of Mlakuzhyil and Moloney, it may be that we find precisely in the narrator's "comments" (introductions, conclusions, or interpretive comments) the most valuable clues for discerning the design of the narrative. As it turns out, reference to the disciples "remembering" is found not only 2:22 but a few verses earlier in 2:17: "His disciples remembered that it was written, 'Zeal for thy house will consume me.'" In contrast with the Synoptic Gospels (that include no reference to the disciples in the temple incident), the Fourth

---

55. Brown, *John*, 121.

56. Brown, *John*, 123-25.

Gospel twice mentions the reaction of the disciples. Not only does the mere fact of such repetition attract our attention, but also the location of these two notices could be significant. The first occurs at the close of the description of the event itself (described in 2:13-17, with explicit notification of the disciples' memory at 2:17), while the second occurs at the close of Jesus' interaction with his opponents (described in 2:18-22, with the explicit notification of the disciples' memory at 2:22). In other words, one could easily judge that the narrator has twice sharpened the readers' focus towards envisioning the whole affair, i.e. the event and interaction of 2:13-22, in terms of the disciples and their reaction to what they saw and heard. In the words of the final (capstone?) sentence, "[The disciples] believed the Scripture and the word which Jesus had spoken" (2:22c).

If my assessment is valid, then the incident of temple cleansing (2:12-22) should be read with the preceding material (1:19-2:11), and should be viewed as the final installation of the theme of the disciples coming to faith in Jesus. The impact of reading this entire stretch of narrative as unified whole (1:19-2:22) leads me to conclude that the narrator desired to address, in a complete and finished way, the question of the loyalty of the apostolic band to Jesus. In leaping forward in time to a point beyond the resurrection and noting the final confirmation of the disciples' faith, the narrator has diffused the narrative drama that otherwise would have developed as various stories of confusion, uncertainty, and betrayal among the disciples would be read. Instead, the issue of the disciples' faith has been settled at the outset: Whatever the shortcomings and failures of the disciples may be, we learn by 2:22 that the apostolic band will indeed find their faith fully confirmed, and *will effectively serve, when the time comes, as the uniquely chosen and positioned body of witnesses through whom the whole world will come to believe* (17:19).

My analysis of 1:19-2:22 as a meaningful whole (focused on the disciples' faith) seems to be confirmed by my analysis of 2:23-4:54 as a meaningful whole (focused on Jesus as Savior of the World). Each of these segments (1:19-2:22 and 2:23-4:54) as I now have envisioned them (1) prosecutes a distinctive theme, (2) involves all material within its borders in demonstrable ways, (3) does not need to claim ownership of a "bridge" passage shared the other segment, and (4) accounts for all the material between 1:18 and 5:1 together with the other segment.

PART THREE: SUMMARY AND METHODOLOGICAL REFLECTION

Summary Regarding John 1:19-4:54

I began by asking how to analyze structurally the material lying between 1:18 and 5:1, since most scholars view 1:1-18 as a Prologue, and view 5:1 as the onset of a major new narrative development in the Fourth Gospel. I acknowledged that a great many scholars embrace 2:1-4:54 as a meaningful whole, established, in part, by an inclusio formed by notices about Jesus first two signs (2:11; 4:54): a "Cana-to-Cana" cycle of stories.

I then called into question the "Cana-to-Cana" analysis, by noting (among other things) the strong connections between 2:1-11 and *preceding* material (1:19-51), and by showing the difficulty of including the story of the healing of the royal official's son (4:46-54) within the common characterization of the Cana-to-Cana cycle as a section devoted to "Newness."

By way of offering an alternative, I proposed that the thematic interest begun in 1:19 through 1:51, that of *the disciples coming to faith in Jesus*, was explicitly extended (as signaled by the narrator's comments) to include not only the story of the wedding in Cana (2:1-11), but also the story of Jesus' demonstration in the temple (2:13-22). This segment (1:19-2:22) is bound together by explicit interest in Jesus' disciples coming to faith in him, and by a recurring reference to "days" that create chronological cohesion among the various events narrated. I also proposed reading 2:23-25 as an introduction to Jesus as one fully competent in reading the hearts and minds of all humanity, whom he then meets in the representative characters of a Jew (3:1-31), a Samaritan (4:1-42), and a gentile (4:43-54). Jesus is thereby demonstrated as qualified to be Savior of the world.

The clarity of theme within both 1:19-2:22 and 2:23-4:54 together with the neatness of the division between these two proposed segments leads me to have some confidence that I have identified these segments accurately, and have accounted meaningfully (and structurally) for the material lying between the clear terminus point of 1:18 and the clear departure point of 5:1. Therefore I construe the famous notices about Jesus' first two miracles (2:11; 4:54) as appearing in different segments (the first within 1:19-2:22; the second within 2:23-4:54), and not as forming an inclusio (and therefore a single segment) between themselves. The miracle designated as "first" contributes to the maturation of faith among the disciples, and the miracle designated as "second" caps the

presentation of Jesus as fully knowing the hearts of all humanity.

Concluding Methodological Reflections Regarding Segment Analysis

The task of identifying segment boundaries and determining how segments are internally structured begins within the "observation" phase of "segment survey" as described in *Inductive Bible Study*.[57] On many occasions the boundaries of segments and the relationships that adhere between the paragraphs within them will become apparent to the careful reader without the need for follow up research.

But just as often, "biblical passages ... refuse to yield their full sense immediately,"[58] and it becomes necessary to move certain features of sense-making beyond the "observational" phase into the "interpretive" phase where they can be resolved by an appeal to a wider set of evidence and to a more intensive analysis. My work on the material between 1:18 and 5:1 reflects this move, necessitated by my initial conclusion (stated at the outset of this article) that the segment boundaries and structures within 1:19-4:54 are not readily apparent, not even to the careful reader.

Once moving these questions about 1:19-4:54 into the interpretive phase, I committed myself to accessing a wider range of textual data in the service of reaching a resolution. I demonstrated not only the fruit of such a close engagement with the text, but also the fruit of interaction with other interpreters of the text, whose views were neither uncritically accepted nor summarily dismissed.

These moves show several of the important commitments of IBS: a commitment to direct and unassisted attention to the text itself as in initial step; a commitment to structural analysis of texts; a commitment to shifting a resilient question to a more rigorous approach of problem-solving; and a commitment to engage (critically) with the interpretation of others. The conclusion I have reached represents, then, an attempt to surrender to an evidentiary approach to interpreting texts, which is the central concern of IBS.[59]

---

57. Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 143ff.

58. Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 178.

59. Bauer and Traina, *Inductive Bible Study*, 17.