

ABSTRACT

“It Is They That Testify about Me”:

The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in the Gospel of John as an Index of John’s Christology

This dissertation studies the explicit OT quotations in the Gospel of John. In John’s narrative, the protagonist—Jesus—insists that the Scriptures bear witness about him (John 5:39). Meanwhile, the quotation formulae are uniquely distributed in John. Starting with said (εἶπεν) mode for the first quotation, the quotation formulae appear in the first half of the book (chs. 1–12) with the form of it is written (ἔστιν γεγραμμένον) and in the second half of the book (chs. 12–21) with the fulfillment-purpose pattern (ἵνα ... πληρωθῇ). The explicit OT quotations then are marked as prominent Scriptural texts to help portray John’s Jesus. This project focuses on why John uses these forms of quotation formulae for the OT quotations, why these quotation formulae are distributed in the narrative in this way, and how these explicit (formulaic) OT quotations contribute to John’s Christology. The methodology employed to learn the OT phraseological influences in the narrative and the phraseological shifts among the narrator and the characters primarily involves a narrative-critical reading of John’s quotations, particularly with Boris Uspensky’s planes of point of view.

Following the introduction of chapter 1, chapter 2 contains discussions on the literary genre and structure of the Gospel. The genre as Jesus’s βίος implies that the center of the Gospel is Jesus. The structure of the Gospel suggests that John’s purpose is to testify about Jesus’s identity in hopes that the readers may have the right belief in him as the Messiah and possess eternal life through him. Chapter 3 surveys the role of the Scripture(s) in the narrative world. The Scripture provides correct description and vindication for Jesus’s identity and ministry and finds

its fulfillment in Jesus's events that also display the Scripture-defined messiahship. Chapter 4 explores the significance of John's forms of quotation formulae by examining the uses of the introductory formulae in the Old Testament, the Qumran literature, the Apocrypha, the OT Pseudepigrapha, Josephus's writings, Philo's works, and the NT writings through a historical-grammatical approach. In that literary milieu, John's stylistic quotation formulae are recognized by his readers/audiences as signifiers evoking their attention to the correspondence between the Jesus's events narrated and the text quoted. Chapter 5 discusses each of John's explicit OT quotations by means of a narrative-critical approach with a special attention to the dynamics of points of view. Chapter 6 summarizes the previous chapters and concludes that the explicit/formulaic OT scriptural texts function as indexes to the precise ideological stance of the Scripture—of God—concerning Jesus, exposing in John's narrative the true definition of the Messiah/Son of God.

“It Is They That Testify about Me”:

The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in the Gospel of John as an Index of John’s Christology

A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of

Asbury Theological Seminary

Wilmore, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements of the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. David R. Bauer, Mentor

Dr. Joseph R. Dongell, Reader

Dr. Craig S. Keener, Examiner

By

Jen-Chieh Wang

March 2018

**Copyright 2018
Jen-Chieh Wang
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 “It Is They That Bear Witness about Me”	1
1.2 Literature Review	5
1.3 Statement of Research Questions	15
1.4 Methodology and Structural Design	18
2 LITERARY DESIGN OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN	27
2.1 Implications of the Genre of the Gospel	28
2.1.1 Greco-Roman Biography	28
2.1.2 Jewish Historical Narrative?	31
2.1.3 John’s Historiographical Features	33
2.1.4 Implications of the Literary Genre of the Gospel of John	35
2.2 The Focused Theme from the Structure of the Gospel	36
2.2.1 The Prologue (1:1–18)	38
2.2.2 The Body of John’s Narrative (1:19–20:29)	41
2.2.3 The Purpose Statement of the Gospel (20:30–31)	45
2.2.4 The Epilogue (21:1–25)	51
2.3 Summary	55
3 THE SCRIPTURE IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN	57
3.1 Γραφή	58
3.1.1 Individual Scriptural Texts and Scriptural Concepts	58

3.1.2 The Plurality of the Scripture	60
3.1.3 Summary	63
3.2 Γράφω	64
3.2.1 Moses and the Prophets Wrote about Jesus	64
3.2.2 Written in the Writings of Moses and the Prophets	65
3.2.3 What Pilate Wrote	67
3.2.4 Wrote the Gospel	70
3.2.5 Summary	71
3.3 Moses and the Law	71
3.3.1 Moses	71
3.3.2 Νόμος	75
3.4 The Prophets and Isaiah	78
3.5 The Word of Jesus	82
3.5.1 The Word of Jesus and the Scripture	82
3.5.2 The Word of Jesus and the Word of God	85
3.6 Summary	87
4 QUOTATION-FORMULA TECHNIQUES	89
4.1 Quotation Formulae in the Jewish Literature	91
4.1.1 Old Testament	91
4.1.1.1 <i>Quotations from Outside of the OT</i>	92
4.1.1.2 <i>God's Commands/Promises Not Written down</i>	92
4.1.1.3 <i>God's Commands Done Correspondingly</i>	95
4.1.1.4 <i>Quotation Antecedents Not Found</i>	96

4.1.1.5 <i>Without an Accompanying Quotation</i>	96
4.1.1.6 <i>Summary</i>	99
4.1.2 Qumran Literature	100
4.1.2.1 <i>Primary Types of Formulae</i>	102
4.1.2.2 <i>Quotation Source</i>	103
4.1.2.3 <i>Topic and Agent</i>	104
4.1.2.4 <i>Combined Quotations</i>	105
4.1.2.5 <i>Summary</i>	106
4.1.3 OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	107
4.1.4 Philo's Selected Works	110
4.1.5 Josephus's Writings	111
4.1.6 Summary	113
4.2 Quotation-Formulae in the New Testament	115
4.2.1 Pauline Epistles	115
4.2.2 General Epistles	119
4.2.3 Synoptic Gospels and Book of Acts	121
4.2.3.1 <i>Formulae in Mark</i>	122
4.2.3.2 <i>Formulae in Luke-Acts</i>	124
4.2.3.3 <i>Matthew's Introductory Formulae</i>	126
4.2.3.4 <i>Luke and Matthew's Freedom</i>	128
4.2.3.5 <i>Summary</i>	131
4.3 The Forms of John's Quotation-Formulae	132
4.4 Summary	137

5 JOHN'S OT QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE	140
5.1 The Significance of John's Distribution of Formulae in John's Narrative	140
5.2 John's Formulaic Explicit OT Quotations	147
5.2.1 John 1:23 Straighten the Road of the Lord, as Isaiah the Prophet Said	150
5.2.2 John 2:17 It Is Written, Zeal for Your House	155
5.2.3 John 6:31 It Is Written, the Bread from Heaven to Eat	161
5.2.4 John 6:45 It Is Written, Being Taught by God	166
5.2.5 John 10:34 It Is Written, You are Gods	171
5.2.6 John 12:13–15 It Is Written, Your King Is Coming	178
5.2.7 John 12:38 That the Word May Be Fulfilled, the Arm of the Lord	186
5.2.8 John 12:39–40 Again, Blinded Eyes and Hardened Hearts	191
5.2.9 John 13:18 That the Scripture May Be Fulfilled, His Heel against Me	197
5.2.10 John 15:25 That the Word May Be Fulfilled, They Hated Me	204
5.2.11 John 19:24 That the Scripture May Be Fulfilled, They Divided My Clothes	207
5.2.12 John 19:28 That the Scripture May Be Completed, I Am Thirsty	212
5.2.13 John 19:36 That the Scripture May Be Fulfilled, Not a Bone Being Broken	217
5.2.14 John 19:37 Again, Look onto Whom They Have Pierced	222
5.3 John's Formulaic Explicit OT Quotations and Christology in the Narrative	228

6 CONCLUSION	239
6.1 The Scripture Witnesses Jesus as the God-Promised/Defined Messiah	239
6.2 The Function of John's QFs as the Narrator's Fixed Epithets for the NPoV	241
6.3 The Explicit OT Quotations as an Index to John's Christology	
—Jesus the Messiah, Giving Life by Delivering up His Own Life	242
 APPENDIX	 247
Chart 1: Quotations in the Gospel of John	247
Chart 2: The Occurrences of γραφή and γράφω in John	248
Chart 3: The Occurrences of "Moses" and "νόμος" in John	250
Chart 4: The Occurrences of "prophet" and "Isaiah" in John	252
Chart 5: OT Quotations in the Qumran Writings	253
Chart 6: OT Quotations in the OT Apocrypha	257
Chart 7: OT Quotations in the NT	258
Chart 8: Quotation Formulae in Synoptic Parallels	271
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 274

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writing of this dissertation was accomplished only through the encouragement and support of many people, through whom God has shown his sustaining grace in many ways. Several groups of people have loved me and my family and prayed for us along this journey: members of the Yonghe Church and the Tzichang Church in Taiwan, and the Wilmore Free Methodist Church. I am grateful to have attended the Coffee Brea Sunday School, in which I have learned so much from Dr. Fredrick Long and Dr. John Oswalt during the years in Wilmore. I am thankful for Holy Light Theological Seminary in Taiwan, where I have obtained a full-time teaching position. Its faculty, staff, and students have shown their supports in various ways.

When I was serving in pastoral ministry, Dr. Rebecca Doyle was the first to inspire me to have a further theological education. The example she set as a passionate OT professor and a missionary in Taiwan has greatly encouraged me. I would like to thank Rev. and Mrs. Tsai for their encouragement in the beginning of this academic journey. I also owe a great deal to Ms. Lee for her financial support that helped me to make the first step into this journey.

Asbury Theological Seminary and its wonderful faculty have nurtured my academic growth. I am also blessed with great professors, classmates, and staff in the Advanced Research Program at Asbury. I express deep gratitude to Dr. David Bauer, who has been a mentor to me since the beginning of my studies. I am appreciative of how he was willingly available to meet with me and patiently discuss my chapters. To Dr. Joseph Dongell, I owe my deep appreciation for his scholarly teaching and pastoral heart. I am thankful for his willingness both to read my dissertation and to contribute to its defense. I am also grateful for my examiner, Dr. Craig Keener, not only for his scholarship but also for his careful and profound comments that helped me to reinforce the arguments in my dissertation.

Special thanks go to Barry and Fran May, who treated us as family when we were far from our home. Their prayer and encouragement have strengthened our life. I also want to acknowledge the friends who walked alongside my family for our years abroad. Luke Hsieh and Tony Chen have always encouraged me helped me to be more confident. The families of Samson Uytanlet, Sinji Nakagawa, Jolita Pieciaite Erbele, and Song Hwa Chae have enriched our life in Wilmore. By the brotherly relationship with Nam Seng Koh and Jeremy Chew, both my life and studies have been enhanced. Also, both their families and our family are tightly knitted in the bond of love, bring much warmth and hope in many of my difficult times.

My parents, and parents-in-law's family have been a great support to my academic pursuits in many ways. I am so thankful for their sustaining love for me. My deepest thanks go to my wife, Aurora, and my son, Ian. Ian has been a constant source of joy to me, and without Aurora's love and encouraging support, I could not have done this. Words cannot express my deep gratitude to them for their great sacrifices. All praise goes to our Lord Jesus Christ, who called me and granted me every insight in this study.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 “It Is They That Bear Witness about Me”

In John’s Gospel, Jesus’s identity is the core of the narrative.¹ Through the narrator’s telling and showing,² the portrayal of Jesus in the narrative may be discerned from several threads.³ First of all, since the narrator is considered omniscient and reliable⁴ and claims himself as one of the eyewitnesses of Jesus’s life (e.g., John 1:14, 16), his statements and comments

¹ R. Alan Culpepper, “The Theology of the Gospel of John,” *RevExp* 85 (1988): 418, “Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God dominates the Gospel of John.” Maarten J. J. Menken, “The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research,” in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. De Boer, JSNTSup 84 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 292, remarks that John’s Gospel is thoroughly Christology.

² See Seymour Chatman, *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990), 85–87, 109–11, 113–23. In this research, the view of the distinction between the narrator and the implied author agrees with Chatman’s more recent definition. The narrator is the *voice* invented by the implied author to convey the narrative. The implied author is a silent source of information, inferred by the text itself, while the narrator is the only subject, the only *voice*, conveying the implied author’s invention by narrating and presenting whether by telling, showing, or some combination of the two. Also cf. Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, BLS 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989), 14; Mark Allan Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* GBS (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 25–27; Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2005), 89–90. Concerning narrator’s *telling* and *showing*, Chatman, *Coming to Terms*, 113–19, considers that they are two ways for the narrator to present the narrative, the invention of the implied author. Also James L. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 126–30, sees telling and showing as two characterization techniques of the narrator. In telling (direct presentation), the narrator directly comments on a character while in showing (indirect presentation), the narrator presents a character’s speeches and exterior/interior conditions, as well as others’ speech about the character. Cf. also Rimmon-Kenan, *Narrative Fiction*, 110–11.

³ Some allusive or implicit indexes may be omitted in this discussion (e.g., Jesus’s titles, messianic symbols, OT imageries, Roman imperial appellations). In this case, cf. James L. Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John*, BibInt 56 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 110–20, for four ways to see Jesus’s point of view and Jeannine K. Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective: The Portrayal and Function of the Matthean Disciples*, AcBib 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 53, for five categories about the portrayal of characters: (1) actions, (2) words, (3) others’ reactions, (4) others’ words, and (5) narrator’s comments.

⁴ Regarding the definition of *reliable narrator*, see Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983), 158–59. Cf. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 132, n. 35. For the Gospel of John, the narrator is reliable and omniscient, truly conveying the norms of the implied author. The intention of the implied author is revealed through the presentation of the delegated narrator. In this regard, the distinction between implied author and narrator becomes blurry. Therefore, the narrator perfectly concurs with the implied author while the former differs from the latter by the nature of definition in literary criticism. Cf. R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 32–34; Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*, JSNTSup 69 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 31–37; Powell, *Narrative Criticism*, 114, n. 11.

about Jesus serve as a direct index of Jesus's identity.⁵ The narrator also names two characters as witnesses to Jesus in his narrative: John the Baptist, the first witness in the Gospel, being sent by God in order to bear witness for the Light (1:6–8) and reveal Jesus to Israel (1:31);⁶ and, the Beloved Disciple, an eyewitness whose testimony for Jesus is acknowledged as true (21:24).⁷

The interactions between Jesus and other characters in the narrative also provide a clue to John's presentation of Jesus.⁸ Their confessions or recognitions of Jesus are particularly striking, for example, "We found the Messiah" (1:41); "You are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel" (1:49); "This is the prophet" (6:14; 7:40); and, "My Lord, my God" (20:28).⁹ Confusion, misunderstandings, or unbelief reflected by others may also be a reference to Jesus's identity.¹⁰ For instance, the Jews are confused about Jesus as the bread from heaven (6:41–42). The Pharisees misjudge Jesus as merely a prophet from Galilee (7:47–52). Pilate does not understand when Jesus mentions his kingship and the truth (18:36–38).¹¹

⁵ E.g., 1:1–18; 2:11, 21–25; 7:30, 39; 8:20; 11:51–52; 12:16–17, 33, 37–43; 18:9; 19:35–37; 20:30–31; 21:14. About narrator's explicit comments on the events, cf. Gary Yamasaki, *Perspective Criticism: Point of View and Evaluative Guidance in Biblical Narrative* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2012), 6.

⁶ See 1:19–36; 3:23–30; 5:33–35 (Jesus's affirmation); 10:41–42 (the effect). John the Baptist is told as Jesus's witness (μαρτυρεῖν: 1:7, 8, 15, 32, 34; 3:26; 5:33; μαρτυρία: 1:7, 19; 5:34, 36). Cf. Maarten J. J. Menken, "Observations on the Significance of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *Neot* 33 (1999): 132–34.

⁷ Martin Hengel, "The Prologue of the Gospel of John as the Gateway to Christological Truth," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 284, notes that the narrator "prepares the Beloved Disciple as the decisive witness for Christ." However, as a character *within* the narrative, the Beloved Disciple has *not yet* testified for Jesus. Cf. 2:17, 22; 13:23, 25; 19:26–27, 35; 20:3–8, 20; 21:7.

⁸ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 102–3, 145–46; Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel*, 115–17. Recently, several scholars argue for the complexity and development in John's characters, such as Susan E. Hylen, *Imperfect Believers: Ambiguous Characters in the Gospel of John* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009).

⁹ Also 1:45; 2:17; 3:2; 4:19, 42; 6:14, 68–69; 7:26, 31, 40–42; 9:31–33, 38; 10:41; 11:27; 12:13; 16:30; 20:16. Cf. Johannes Beutler, "Faith and Confession: The Purpose of John," in *Word, Theology, and Community in John*, ed. John Painter, R. Alan Culpepper, and Fernando F. Segovia (St. Louis: Chalice, 2002), 23–29. The language or the viewpoint of Jesus's adversaries is noteworthy: 2:20; 5:18; 6:42; 7:15, 35, 46; 8:53; 9:24, 29; 10:20–21, 24, 33; 11:49–50; 18:39; 19:7, 10, 15, 19.

¹⁰ Cf. Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, *Mark's Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), 17–19.

¹¹ Also 2:18; 4:12, 29; 5:18; 6:30–31, 52; 7:3–4, 15, 26–27, 35–36, 40–43; 8:22, 33, 52–53; 57; 9:16; 10:20–21, 24,

The words and works of the protagonist, Jesus, can also unveil himself. The narrator underscores the significance of Jesus's works in the conclusion (20:30–31) and in the final word of the Gospel (21:25).¹² In addition, Jesus indicates that his works testify to himself (5:36; 10:25, 37–38; 14:11).¹³ Among Jesus's deeds, the Seven Signs undoubtedly draw attention in the narrative world.¹⁴ Some characters also demand Jesus perform signs so as to prove his identity (2:18; 6:30; 7:3). However, Jesus's sayings, occupying most of the dialogues, are the strongest testimony for himself and, in turn, for the purpose of his works and his relationship with the Father.¹⁵ Especially so are the “I am” sayings which come most forthrightly from John's Jesus.¹⁶

Moreover, Jesus himself appeals to “the witness [τὴν μαρτυρίαν] greater than John the Baptist” when he defends against the hostility of the Jews in the narrative (5:16–36).¹⁷ In addition to his work, Jesus's reference to the greater witness contains the Father (5:37–38) and the Scriptures (5:39–47).¹⁸ Jesus's work testifies (μαρτυρεῖ) that the Father has sent the Son, and

33; 11:49–53; 12:34; 18:33–36; 19:6–7, 8–11, 15.

¹² Leon Morris, *Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 1–19, mentions that the purpose statement draws one's attention Jesus's *signs*. Also, Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 79–140, Jesus's “symbolic actions.”

¹³ D. Moody Smith, “The Presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel,” *Int* 31 (1977): 371.

¹⁴ Cf. R. Alan Culpepper, “Cognition in John: The Johannine Signs as Recognition Scenes,” *PRSt* 35 (2008): 251–60. Some assert more than seven signs in John, such as Brian Neil Peterson, *John's Use of Ezekiel: Understanding the Unique Perspective of the Fourth Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 76–96.

¹⁵ See 5:24–25, 47; 7:16–18; 8:14, 28, 45–46; 10:36; 12:49; 13:19; 14:10, 24, 29; 17:8; 18:37. Also cf. 3:11–13; 4:42; 5:18; 7:46; 19:7.

¹⁶ Seven *metaphoric* “I am” sayings: 6:35; 8:12; 10:7, 11; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1; seven *absolute* “I Am” sayings: 4:26; 6:20; 8:24, 28, 58; 13:19; 18:5–8. Also cf. David Mark Ball, *‘I Am’ in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*, JSNTSup 124 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996); Richard Bauckham, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 243–50.

¹⁷ The terms with the root form μάρτυς (μαρτυρέω/μαρτυρία) appear eleven times (23.4% in John) in 5:31–39. Additionally, the Paraclete and the disciples are designated as Jesus's witnesses but only after his departure (15:26–27).

¹⁸ F. F. Bruce, *The Time Is Fulfilled: Five Aspects of the Fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New*, The Moore College Lectures (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 35; Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 91.

the Father through his word has testified (μεμαρτύρηκεν) for his Son (5:37–38). Because of the Jews’ unbelief in Jesus whom God has sent, Jesus accuses them of not having the word of God remaining in them. That is, they fail to understand their Scriptures, the words of God, which also bear witness to Jesus, the path to eternal life (5:39–40). Hence, the greater witness implied by Jesus is twofold—the *works* that the Father handed to him and the *words* that God has spoken in the Scripture, which include Moses’s writings (5:46–47).¹⁹ Jesus here enunciates that the Scriptures are his effective witnesses: “It is they that bear witness about me” (5:39). In John’s narrative, such an explicit declaration of Jesus points to the Jewish Scriptures (αἱ γραφαί) as Christological witnesses.²⁰

The most marked scriptural texts in this Gospel are these explicit OT quotations.²¹ As many scholars have asserted, OT themes/stories, as background, pervade John’s Gospel.²² The scriptural languages and imageries are woven into the narrative with presentation of the life of its

¹⁹ Cf. Ruth Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture: ‘The Jews’ and the Scriptural Citations in John 1:19–12:15*, BibInt 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 2. Also, Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), §16, “Come and See,” emphasizes the significance of the passage for understanding John’s OT texts.

²⁰ Cf. Martin Hengel, “Die Schriftauslegung des 4. Evangeliums auf dem Hintergrund der urchristlichen Exegese,” in »Gesetz« als Thema Biblischer Theologie, ed. Ingo Baldermann et al., Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie 4 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 269, “Der Hinweis auf die γραφαί steht als Klimax am Ende des Argumentationsganges...” Cf. also Michael Labahn, “Scripture Talks because Jesus Talks: The Narrative Rhetoric of Persuading and Creativity in John’s Use of Scripture,” in *The Fourth Gospel in First-Century Media Culture*, ed. Anthony Le Donne and Tom Thatcher, LNTS 426 (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 140–45. Labahn argues, “Scripture ... is an authoritative character that takes an active role in ‘speaking’ in advance of Jesus.”

²¹ According to Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 26–27, “An explicit quotation is any verbal parallel of at least two words which is explicitly identified by a quotation formula or other means.” However, I will decide the quotations later in the paper. Also cf. Andrew W. Pitts, “Source Citation in Greek Historiography and in Luke(-Acts),” in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, TENTS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 355–56. Pitts believes that direct citations are *marked* elements in the narrative.

²² E.g., Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), 271; Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*, ed. Francis J. Moloney, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 2003), 142–43. Also, Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, “John’s Use of Scripture,” in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 370–9, accents the significance of the use of OT in the whole Gospel, and Hengel, “Prologue,” 271, “the Fourth Gospel is grounded throughout in the Old Testament.”

protagonist, Jesus. Among these OT elements, the scriptural quotations vocalize as accentuated by John's narrator through his introductory formulae. They draw the attention of the implied audience to the scriptural texts, which are presumably acknowledged as the authoritative writings for both the characters inside the narrative world and the audience outside.²³ The use of an OT quotation expresses the quoter's perspective on the related event or speech. It also reflects the narrator's point of view in the narrative as a whole. The scriptural quotations stand prominently as Jesus's witnesses. Just as Jesus declares, the Scriptures are testifying for himself. Therefore, in this study, I am seeking to discuss the use of the OT quotations in the Gospel of John and the way they help present Jesus and shape John's Christology.²⁴

1.2 Literature Review

In past decades, many works have been written on the use of the OT in John. Concerning John's use of the Scripture in general, scholars have discussed in various ways. Firstly, in the hermeneutic category, some scholars provide general treatments on exegetical presuppositions, interpretive methods, and functions of John's use of the OT.²⁵ Numbers of scholars agree that

²³ Ken M. Penner, "Citation Formulae as Indices to Canonicity in Early Jewish and Early Christian Literature," in *Jewish and Christian Scriptures: The Function of "Canonical" and "Non-Canonical" Religious Texts*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Lee M. McDonald, *Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies* 7 (London: T&T Clark, 2010), 78, "the formulae used to introduce the quoted text ... are in fact useful for indicating the *divine origin or scriptural status* of writings quoted by early Christian and Jewish authors."

²⁴ Smith, "Presentation," 367, rightly distinguishes John's presentation of Jesus from Johannine Christology; yet, in this paper, I see John's presentation of Jesus as his narrative Christology.

²⁵ E.g., C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 48 (1947): 155–69; C. H. Dodd, *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953); Richard L. Morgan, "Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations," *Int* 11 (1957): 155–65; Mark William Woods, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel: The Hermeneutical Method Employed in the 'Semeia' and Its Significance for Contemporary Biblical Interpretation" (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980); Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983); D. A. Carson, "John and John Epistles," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 254–64; Hengel, "Schriftauslegung," 249–88; Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, *JSNTSup* 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 380–95; Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991); Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, "John's Use of Scripture," 358–79; Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical*

while John's hermeneutic is centered on the Christological event, his exegetical techniques in treating the scriptural texts adapted Jewish methods (e.g., midrash, *peshet*, and typology),²⁶ more closely resembling Philo and Qumran literature than rabbinic.²⁷ The OT texts in John's Gospel function as *proof-texts* for evangelical use or apologetic purpose.²⁸ Secondly, in the literary area, some have been interested in OT book backgrounds/motifs in John or text forms of the quotations.²⁹ Some have paid attention to certain OT book(s) or passages employed in the Gospel.³⁰ Others have only analyzed parts of OT scriptures in John's narrative.³¹ In theological terms, many have discussed the influence of the OT on the Gospel and various OT themes in it.³²

Exegesis in the Apostolic Period, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), esp. 135–39; Paul Miller, “‘They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him’: The Gospel of John and the Old Testament,” in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 127–51; Francis J. Moloney, “The Gospel of John: The ‘End’ of Scripture,” *Int* 63 (2009): 356–66.

²⁶ Miller, “They Saw His Glory,” 127–33; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 137; Carson, “John and John Epistles,” 249–51; Hanson, “John's Use of Scripture,” 359–61; Cf. Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture*, 12–15.

²⁷ Esp. Hengel, “Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” 395.

²⁸ Carson, “John and John Epistles,” 257; Barnabas Lindars, “The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology: Prolegomena,” *NTS* 23 (1976): 65.

²⁹ For scriptural background, e.g., Catrin H. Williams, “Isaiah in John's Gospel,” in *Isaiah in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken, NTSI (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 101–16; Georg Fischer, “Wie geht das Johannesevangelium mit dem Alten Testamentum?,” in *Im Geist und in der Wahrheit: Studien zum Johannesevangelium und zur Offenbarung des Johannes sowie andere Beiträge: Festschrift für Martin Hasitschka SJ zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Konard Huber and Boris Repschinski, NTAbh 2/52 (Münster: Aschendorff, 2008), 3–13; Günter Reim, “Jesus as God in the Fourth Gospel: the Old Testament Background,” *NTS* 30 (1984): 158–60; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*. For text forms, Charles Goodwin, “How Did John Treat His Sources,” *JBL* 73 (1954): 61–75; Édouard Cothenet, “L'arrière-plan vétérotestamentaire du IV^e évangile,” in *Origine et postérité de l'évangile de Jean: XIII^e Congrès de l'ACFEB Toulouse (1989)*, ed. Alain Marchadour, LD 143 (Paris: Cerf, 1990), 43–69.

³⁰ E.g., Andrew C. Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John*, WUNT 2/158 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Gary T. Manning, *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*, JSNTSup 270 (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

³¹ Johannes Beutler, “The Use of ‘Scripture’ in the Gospel of John,” in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 147–62; Judith M. Lieu, “Narrative Analysis and Scripture in John,” in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*, ed. Steve Moyise, JSNTSup 189 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 144–63.

³² E.g., Merrill C. Tenney, “Literary Keys to the Fourth Gospel: Old Testament and the Fourth Gospel,” *BSac* 120 (1963): 300–308; Ulrich Busse, “Die Tempelmetaphorik als ein Beispiel von implizitem Rekurs auf die biblische Tradition im Johannesevangelium,” in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. C. M. Tuckett, BETL 81 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 395–428; Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of*

Some works, according to a socio-scientific aspect, try to determine how John uses the Scriptures to shape Johannine community's social identity.³³ All this research contributes rich insights to the subject of the use of the OT in John's Gospel in general.

Some researchers focus on the explicit OT quotations in John.³⁴ Most of these works center around forms, sources, and historical functions or focus on the theological implications of the OT quotations. Alexander Faure is probably the first to discuss the phenomenon of John's distinct introductory formulae of the OT quotations, pointing out that the Gospel has a different perception of the Scriptures between the use of quotation formulae before 12:15 and after 12:38.³⁵ He considers that this switch from one quotation formula to another is an implication of the existence of two different sources and several authors.³⁶ A few decades later, Edwin D. Freed, paying attention primarily to the sources of John's quotations, argues for the quotation forms as a

the Psalms, AGJU 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2000); Christine Schlund, »Kein Knochen soll gebrochen werden«: *Studien zu Bedeutung und Funktion des Pesachfests in Texten des frühen Judentums und im Johannesevangelium*, WMANT 107 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2005); Paul M. Hoskins, *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*, Paternoster Biblical Monographs (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006).

³³ E.g., Jaime Clark-Soles, *Scripture Cannot Be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel* (Boston: Brill, 2003).

³⁴ Alexander Faure, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese," *ZNW* 21 (1922): 99–121; Edwin D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*, NovTSup 11 (Leiden: Brill, 1965); John J. O'Rourke, "John's Fulfillment Texts," *ScEccl* 19 (1967): 433–43; Günter Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*, SNTSMS 22 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974); Roger J. Humann, "The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John," *Lutheran Theological Review* 1 (1988): 31–54; Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*, SBLDS 133 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Andreas Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium: eine Untersuchung zur johanneischen Hermeneutik anhand der Schriftzitate*, WUNT 2/83 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1996); Lieu, "Narrative Analysis," 144–63; Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, CBET 15 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996); Hans-Josef Klauck, "Geschrieben, erfüllt, vollendet: Die Schriftzitate in der Johannespassion," in *Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannesevangelium*, ed. Michael Labahn, Klaus Scholtissek, and Angelika Strotmann (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), 140–57; Andreas J. Köstenberger, "John," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 415–512; Alicia D. Myers, *Characterizing Jesus: A Rhetorical Analysis on the Fourth Gospel's Use of Scripture in Its Presentation of Jesus*, LNTS 458 (London: T&T Clark, 2012); Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture*.

³⁵ Faure, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate," 99, 101.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 105–13.

result of a “study of written texts” of the Johannine school rather than from a single OT textual source or a *testimonia*.³⁷ According to Freed, the Hebrew and Greek OT texts, the Targumic traditions, and the Synoptic tradition may all have been used by John as sources.³⁸ On the contrary, Günter Reim contends that John did not employ “schriftlichen alttestamentlichen Text,”³⁹ but some other tradition from a large part of the OT material, which is influenced by the Synoptic tradition, the *Semeia*-source, the contemporary Jewish-Christian debate, a Johannine Wisdom material, a special pre-Johannine tradition, and oral tradition.⁴⁰

In the following years, Roger J. Humann, Bruce G. Schuchard, and Maarten J. J. Menken also contributed to this subject. For Humann, John’s OT quotations appearing “in the context of controversy with the Jews” imply that the quotations serve an *apologetic* function of showing Jesus’s being rejected by his contemporaries.⁴¹ John’s introductory formulae serve to focus on the rejection as God’s purposive plan for the hour of Jesus’s glorification.⁴² Humann also considers that the text-form of the quotations does not account for “a single OT text tradition.”⁴³ Schuchard, adopting Menken’s methodological presupposition that John’s quotations are “products of his editorial activity and therefore as reflecting his authorial intent,”⁴⁴ contends that

³⁷ Freed, *Quotations*, 128–29. Also, O’Rourke, “John’s Fulfillment Texts,” 433–43, agrees with Freed’s conclusion although he deals only with fulfillment quotations.

³⁸ Freed, *Quotations*, 129–30.

³⁹ Reim, *Hintergrund*, 188, “Johannes keinen schriftlichen alttestamentlichen Text benutzt hat.” Also cf. 189, “aus der Unkenntnis des schriftlichen Textes des AT bei der Abfassung des Evangeliums...”

⁴⁰ Ibid., 189; cf. 94–95. Reim also considers that John had general knowledge of the Jewish scripture and better knowledge of Deutero-Isaiah.

⁴¹ Humann, “Function and Form,” 34; also, 35–39, 49.

⁴² Ibid., 37–38.

⁴³ Ibid., 49.

⁴⁴ Schuchard, *Scripture*, xiv (n. 18). Schuchard consults Menken’s earlier articles on the subject published in the years of 1985–90. Also cf. Menken, *Quotations*, 13.

the Greek OT is the *only* textual source from which John derived his quotations.⁴⁵ Menken, however, believes that the evangelist mainly had the LXX but consulted purposefully the Hebrew text for 12:40 and 13:18 and Christian *testimonium* for 19:37.⁴⁶ While Menken implies that the use of OT quotations is intended for the Johannine community to confront the contemporary Jewish environment,⁴⁷ Schuchard concludes that John's reference to the OT serves two functions: illustrating Jesus's identity and his fulfilling God's purposes and indicating Jesus's contemporaries with the synagogue background misunderstanding the OT.⁴⁸ These three scholars have contributed their efforts to the form and potential scriptural sources of quoted texts. They all judge that John's scriptural quotations function apologetically in some degree against opposition or rejection from Jewish/synagogical contemporaries.

Andreas Obermann's work gives more attention to John's literary structure than the previous studies.⁴⁹ While noticing John's use of the HB and the LXX as textual sources,⁵⁰ Obermann focuses on the theological significance of *the Scriptures* in John,⁵¹ and on the distinctive use of the different formulae.⁵² He observes that *the Scriptures* in John demonstrate a "hohe theologische Bedeutung" and function as an authoritative "Christuszeugen."⁵³ Obermann,

⁴⁵ Schuchard, *Scripture*, xvii, 151–54.

⁴⁶ Menken, *Quotations*, 205–9; cf. 121, 138, 185.

⁴⁷ Maarten J. J. Menken, "Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John," in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament: An Introduction*, ed. John M. Court (Grand Rapids: SPCK, 2002), 29–45, implies that the use of OT quotations is for the Johannine community to confront the contemporary Jewish environment.

⁴⁸ Schuchard, *Scripture*, 154–56. However, Schuchard fails to identify "the interrelationship of form and function" in each OT quotation. Cf. Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture*, 21–22.

⁴⁹ Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 371–73, also considers John 5:39 as the hermeneutic key to the Gospel of John.

⁵⁰ E.g., *ibid.*, 332–33.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 37–63.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 78–89.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 62–63.

unlike Faure, claims that the two distinct citation formulae (“ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” und “ἵνα πληρωθῇ”) correspond to Jesus’s two phases of ministry—Jesus’s public ministry (“παρρησία-Wirkens”) *before* his departure from the Jews (11:54; 12:36), and his private ministry to the disciples *after*.⁵⁴ The formulae then signal the Scriptures as background witnessing for the meaning of Jesus’s ministry as *implicit* fulfillment of Scripture in the first half of the Gospel and for the Christ event as *explicit* fulfillment in the second half.⁵⁵ For Obermann, the original OT context of each quotation is important to the evangelist. Obermann’s work successfully turns the trajectory to the theological/Christological focus of the use of OT quotations in John. However, not all his analyses are completely discussed according to the motif of the OT context as he claims.⁵⁶ Obermann’s work contributes to the role of *the Scripture* in John and the interpretive meaning of the shift of John’s quotation formula forms.

Andreas J. Köstenberger’s section in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* offers the most systematic discussion on each of John’s uses of the OT.⁵⁷ In addition to surveying every possible OT allusion, he deals with every quotation in John by answering six exegetical questions on the following respects, (1) the NT context of the citation, (2) the OT context of the cited text, (3) early Jewish use of it, (4) the textual issues, (5) how the NT writer uses the quotation, and (6) the NT writer’s theological implication.⁵⁸ Köstenberger also notices John’s familiarity with “both the Hebrew text and the LXX” and the usage of Jewish exegetical

⁵⁴ Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 215–17.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 80, 348–50.

⁵⁶ Cf. Catrin H. Williams, review of *Die Christologische Erfüllung Der Schrift Im Johannesevangelium*, by Andreas Obermann, *JTS* 49 (1998): 239.

⁵⁷ G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

⁵⁸ Beale and Carson, *Commentary*, xxiv–xxvi. Also cf. the nine steps in G. K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 41–54.

practice.⁵⁹ His work contributes to the subject not only in terms of the scrutiny of the connection between the original OT context of each quotation/allusion and the NT context but also in light of the attention given to the theological implication of each quotation.

Two recent studies on this subject are the monographs of Alicia D. Myers⁶⁰ and Ruth Sheridan, published in 2012.⁶¹ The former focuses on the characterization of Jesus through John's rhetorical function of the use of the OT, while the latter looks at the character portrait of *the Jews* in John's narrative. Myers, taking into consideration the fact that the NT writers lived in a Greco-Roman environment affected by its rhetorical practices, investigates the rhetorical function of Scripture in the narrative. She pays attention to three rhetorical practices, *synkrisis* (comparison), *ekphrasis* (vivid description), and *prosopopoiia* (speech-in-character), as characterization techniques in order to explore their intertextual aspects in the Gospel as a *bios*, trying to answer how Israel's Scripture *rhetorically* contributes to the characterization of Jesus.⁶² By examining the rhetorical presentation in John's prologue, Myers judges that "Jesus's origins and his relationship with the Father" are the essential presuppositions which connect to John's quotations in the rest of the book.⁶³ She says, such rhetorical techniques in the prologue are key to understanding the characterization of Jesus through Scriptures in John. her survey of ancient authors' use of *narrator voice* as a rhetorical device is helpful in seeing John in its contemporary literary milieu.⁶⁴ However, Myers's methodology is not totally convincing. Her rhetorical

⁵⁹ Köstenberger, "John," 418. For Jewish exegetical method, also cf. 477.

⁶⁰ Myers, *Characterizing Jesus*.

⁶¹ Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture*.

⁶² Myers, *Characterizing Jesus*, 14–16, 47–55, 180.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 61–77; cf. 20–21, 181.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 27–39.

categories do not always help to penetrate John's message while the original context of an OT quotation/allusion can clarify understanding in her discussion.⁶⁵

Sheridan claims that "the rhetorical design of John's Gospel encourages an ideal reader to construct a particular characterization of 'the Jews.'"⁶⁶ Her work builds upon Obermann's conclusion that the Scripture is regarded as a witness to Jesus in the first half of the Gospel.⁶⁷ Recognizing *the Jews* as the consistent audience of the citations in the first part, she argues that the citations "serve not only to characterize *Jesus*, but also to characterize 'the Jews.'"⁶⁸ However, the Jews are *not* always the immediate audience of the cited texts (cf. [1:23;] 6:45; 7:37–39; 10:34). The focus of Sheridan's research is not primarily on Christology although it contributes to the narrative characterization of Jesus's antagonist.

The most recent work on John's use of OT texts is the fourth chapter of Richard Hays's *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*,⁶⁹ published in 2016. As the work that he has done in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*,⁷⁰ Hays deals with OT echoes, allusions, and quotations intertextually and intratextually for each canonical Gospel.⁷¹ He believes that every evangelist, John in this case, practiced *figural hermeneutic* for the Scripture and read *backwards* in light of

⁶⁵ Examples can be found in her dealing with John 6 in ch. 3 and John 2 in ch. 4. For Myers, the distinctions between Exodus story and John 6 and the connection in John 2 with the Temple scene and the Coming King imagery in Ps 69 are enough to illuminate the quoted text in the narrative. Rhetorical techniques may be unnecessary. See Myers, *Characterizing Jesus*, 104–12, 140–47.

⁶⁶ Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture*, 235. She deals only with the OT citations in the first half of the Gospel (1:19–12:15).

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 29, esp. n. 148. Also see pp. 47, 252.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 47, 49.

⁶⁹ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016), Kindle ed.

⁷⁰ Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).

⁷¹ Although does not mention intratextuality, Hays correlates the texts within John's narrative in discussion. Cf. Jean Zumstein, "Intratextuality and Intertextuality in the Gospel of John," in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*, ed. Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore, SBLRBS 55 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 122–25.

the Jesus event.⁷² For Hays, “[i]t is particularly important to see that the sort of figural interpretation practiced by the canonical Evangelists is not a rejection but a retrospective hermeneutical transformation of Israel’s sacred texts.”⁷³ Considering that Israel’s Scripture is the *encyclopedia* of production and reception of the text,⁷⁴ he attends to Jesus’s identity from Israel’s story in John’s narrative by investigating briefly some OT figures, the Law, and Israel’s festivals. In his conclusion of the chapter, Hays emphasizes Jesus’s word in John 5:46 and states that “John’s figural hermeneutic allows him to articulate his extraordinary (and polemical) claim that all of Israel’s Scripture actually bears witness to Jesus.... John understands the Old Testament as a vast matrix of symbols prefiguring Jesus.”⁷⁵ Although he pays close attention to John’s textural echoes as well as the evoked OT contexts, Hays does not seem to clarify how the *figural* hermeneutic precisely works to have the two events/persons—the first event/person in the OT and the second in the NT—correspond.⁷⁶ Despite the fact that he is able to have some fresh insights for the identity of John’s Jesus, he reads *backwards* through the NT perspective much more than from the perspective of the original scriptural texts.

As already shown, the previous researchers paid attention to the text form and source of the OT citations that John might have employed, his hermeneutic method, the socio-rhetorical function of the quotations in the Greco-Roman milieu, backward-figural reading, as well as the Christological implications of his use of OT texts. Generally speaking, most of the previous

⁷² Hays, *Echoes*, e.g., “Introduction”; §20, “The Figural Web.”

⁷³ Ibid., “Introduction,” in italics originally.

⁷⁴ Ibid., §17, “Salvation is from the Jews.”

⁷⁵ Ibid., §20, “The Figural Web.”

⁷⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, “Introduction.”

researchers agree that John uses the OT quotations to illustrate Jesus.⁷⁷ They have contributed important studies on the OT use in John. However, to those who tried to decode the inconformity of John's quotations to the original texts and detect from which source John derived his quotations, the articles by David Carr and Andrew Montanaro concerning "memory variants" can give a fair response that in oral-primary culture John was recalling the scriptural text from memory.⁷⁸ According to Carr's examination of "the interplay of memory recall and written technology in ancient Israel and surrounding cultures,"⁷⁹ Montanaro observes John's quotation and concludes that "the occurrence of variation through memory ... in the OT quotations in the gospel of John" is allowed.⁸⁰ Thus, to unveil the source (HB, LXX, or other potential form of the OT) from which John cited his scriptural texts may not be as vitally necessary as the previous scholars thought. The later researchers on the subject notice the motifs of the OT contexts for John as figural reference or rhetorical *synkrisis* language in order to present the protagonist in the Gospel. However, questions concerning the quoted scriptural texts as Christological witness in John as narrative, such as (1) "What is the narrative role of *the Scriptures* in John's Gospel?" (2) "Why does John employ these OT citations in his narrative as they are?" (3) "How does each citation function within the immediate and broader narrative contexts?" and, (4) "How do these

⁷⁷ E.g., Carson, "John and John Epistles," 246; Beutler, "Use," 157; Schuchard, *Scripture*, 154, "John's references to the Old Testament consistently touch on the identity of Jesus..." In addition to these works, most major commentaries on John also indicate this Christological purpose or interest, such as George R. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2nd ed., WBC 36 (Nashville: Nelson, 1999), lix–lx.

⁷⁸ David Carr, "Torah on the Heart: Literary Jewish Textuality within Its Ancient Near Eastern Context," *Oral Tradition* 25 (2010): 17–40; Andrew Montanaro, "The Use of Memory in the Old Testament Quotations in John's Gospel," *NovT* 59 (2017): 147–70. In Montanaro's discussion, memory variants are "the omission or addition of minor words such as articles or prepositions, omission of lines or stanzas between breath pauses, substitutions of equivalent words or phrases, addition or loss of suffixes, and changes in prepositions, inflection, word order, or section order." (150)

⁷⁹ Carr, "Torah on the Heart," 17.

⁸⁰ Montanaro, "Memory," 169–70.

quotations relate to John's Christological themes in the Gospel as a whole?" need to be examined and answered more explicitly.

1.3 Statement of Research Questions

Many scholars have pointed out the features of John's use of scriptural quotations.⁸¹ Compared to the Synoptics, John's employment of OT quotations has several distinctions.⁸² Firstly, the number of quotations is relatively less in John than in any of the other Gospels.⁸³ John has fourteen OT citations (in fourteen places) while Matthew has forty-seven (in fifty-three places),⁸⁴ Mark has twenty-two (in twenty-seven places), and Luke has twenty-three (in twenty-six places). Secondly, about two-thirds of John's OT quotations are unique to his Gospel. Only three quotations in John (1:23; 12:13, 39–40) appear in all the Synoptics, and one other (12:14–15) is found only in Matthew.⁸⁵ Thirdly, John quotes from the Pentateuch much less frequently than the Synoptics.⁸⁶ Only the quotation in John 19:36 seems to be from the Pentateuch (Exod

⁸¹ Esp. Craig A. Evans, "On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel," *BZ* 26 (1982): 79–81; Carson, "John and John Epistles," 246–49; and Köstenberger, "John," 415–19.

⁸² Some similarities appear between John and the Synoptics. E.g., like the Synoptics, John has combinations of quotations (i.e., sets of dual or serial quotation; e.g., Matt 19:4–5; Mark 7:10; Luke 2:23–34; John 19:36–37). John's OT quotations, as those in the Synoptics, are spoken by various narrative characters (cf. Lieu, "Narrative Analysis," 145). Also cf. Brown, *Introduction*, 133–34.

⁸³ The statistics are based on UBS⁵, 860–63. The criteria used to identify a *quotation* adopted by UBS⁵ are not unanimous among scholars. E.g., NA²⁸, 836–69, shows 57 direct citations in Matthew, 31 in Mark, 26 in Luke, and 16 in John; Gleason L. Archer and Gregory Chirichigno, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1983), xix–xx, list 50 quotations in Matthew, 31 in Mark, 30 in Luke, and 14 in John. The criteria employed in this research will be defined later.

⁸⁴ Some quotations are used more than once in each Synoptic Gospel. E.g., Ps 110:1 (109:1 LXX) appears in both Matt 22:44 and 26:64.

⁸⁵ Psalm 118:25–26, Isa 6:9–10, and 40:3 occur in all Gospels as quotations in almost the same narrative context (if Ps 22:18 is not accounted). Zech 9:9 appears in both Matthew and John in the same context. Cf. Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*, Continuum Biblical Studies Series (London: Continuum, 2001), 63. In fact, every Gospel has its own unique quotations. Relatively speaking, John has more unique quotations than others. John has ten unique ones out of fourteen quotations (71.4%) while Matthew has 18 of 47 (38.3%), Mark has 1 of 22 (4.5%), and has Luke 6 of 23 (26.1%). Cf. David S. New, *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis*, SBLSCS 37 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 89–115.

⁸⁶ This phenomenon can be attributed to Jesus's debates on the Law in the Synoptics. In contrast to the Synoptic Gospels, John does not cite any OT texts by which Jesus gave his *moral* teachings.

12:46).⁸⁷ Other quotations are either from the Psalms or the Prophets.⁸⁸ Therefore, John's distinctive use of *these* OT quotations in his narrative is believed to fulfill his purpose.

Furthermore, the way John's OT citations are set forth is striking.⁸⁹ Firstly, the forms of the quotation introductory formulae, which bridge quotations to their immediate contexts, are *regularly* distributed in John's Gospel. The quotation formulae in the first half of the book are obviously distinct from those in the second half. In the first part (John 1–12), the verb form “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” (it is written) appears almost constantly (2:17; 6:31; 6:45; 10:34; 12:14–15). In the second part (John 12–21), the fulfillment-purpose statement “ἵνα ... πληρωθῇ” (in order that ... may be fulfilled) shows up as the typical formula (12:38–40; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28 [τελειωθῇ]; 36–37). Scholars have noticed this phenomenon of distribution and provided some suggestions correspondingly as well.⁹⁰ However, the reason why John employs these *forms* of formulae and distributes them in this manner, and the way John employs these particular quotation formulae and their narrative function behind this phenomenon, do not seem to be answered satisfactorily.

Secondly, the Gospel of John has some *semi-quotations*. A *semi-quotation* can be either a quotation clearly cited from OT *without* a quotation formula attached (e.g., 1:51), or an obscure quotation *with* a preceding quotation formula (e.g., 17:12).⁹¹ Among the quotation formulae that

⁸⁷ The verb form suggests that it is more likely from Ps 33:21 LXX than Exod 12:46. See Menken, *Quotations*, 165; Köstenberger, “John,” 503.

⁸⁸ The phenomenon does *not* mean John's narrative has no allusion or echo. For example, the wording of John's prologue obviously echoes the creation in Genesis (John 1:1–3) and the tabernacle in Exodus (John 1:14). Also, John's quotation in 6:31, although from Ps 78:24, reflects the story in Exod 16 and Num 11.

⁸⁹ See Chart 1.

⁹⁰ For example, source theory by Faure, “Die alttestamentlichen Zitate,” 112–21; theological function by Carson, “John and John Epistles,” 248, and Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 215–17; theological and literary/structural function by Craig A. Evans, “The Structural and Theological Significance of the Quotation Formulas of John,” *Evangelical Theological Society Papers: ETS-1107* (1987): 9, and Lieu, “Narrative Analysis,” 162–63.

⁹¹ Cf. Evans, “Quotation Formulas,” 80; Carson, “John and John Epistles,” 247–48; Moyise, *The Old Testament in*

precede *semi-quotations*, the form of “it is written” occurs in the first half of the book (8:17)⁹² and the pattern of fulfillment-purpose appears consistently in the second (17:12; 18:9, 32). This phenomenon of John’s use of *semi-quotations* suggests some intentionality in narrative structural and theological implication in the Gospel.

Jesus, as the protagonist in John’s narrative, declares before the Jews that the Scriptures bear witness to him (5:39, 46; cf. 2:22). Despite the fact that one can find scriptural imprints suffusing the Gospel as scholars have observed,⁹³ those explicit quotations accompanied by an introductory formula are most notable. Hays remarks, “Precisely because there are relatively few quotations, each citation that does appear in John’s uncluttered narrative assumes proportionately greater gravity as a pointer to Jesus’ identity.”⁹⁴ These formula-marked scriptural quotations then serve as indices in helping to amplify the identity of the protagonist, Jesus. Moreover, as Stefan Alkier notes, “no text is produced and received in isolation from other texts.”⁹⁵ John’s text involves intertextuality, as well as intratextuality. Intertextually, the OT citations, along with permeating allusions, echoes, and imageries, show that John’s narrative text is highly rooted on the Scripture (e.g., 1:1–18), which is also observed as *the* writings well-known to the Jewish people inside the narrative world (e.g., 7:15). Thus, Jesus’s identity is in close relation to the Scripture (cf. 1:45; 5:46). Intratextually, John’s OT materials interplay with Jesus’s discourses,

the New, 64. Also see Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 24–29. In Lange and Weigold’s definitions, our “semi-quotations” can be categorized into *explicit reference*, which shows explicit referral without specifically quoted text, and *implicit reference*, which “refers to easily identifiable elements of a given text without naming that text.”

⁹² The mode of “the Scripture said” is used in 7:38 and 42.

⁹³ E.g., Köstenberger, “John,” 419–20.

⁹⁴ Hays, *Echoes*, §16, “Come and See.”

⁹⁵ Stefan Alkier, “Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts,” in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, ed. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), 3.

deeds, and debates with others, within the narrative. Scriptural materials are blended into the narrative; however, the quotations led by introductory formulae are enunciated more strongly. The scriptural quotations are not in isolation; but rather, they are interwoven with and interdependent to the whole narrative wherein they are cited. Accordingly, Jesus's identity in John's portrayal can be discerned through understanding the narrator's display of the OT texts in his account, particularly, the formula-introduced OT quotations.

The purpose of this study was to argue that the use of the explicit OT quotations in the Gospel of John forms a critical index to John's Christology.⁹⁶ This study intends to fill the gap of previous studies by focusing on three aspects. These aspects are related to the questions mentioned previously and at the same time link to one another in the narrative. The first is the role of the Scriptures in the Gospel of John. This aspect helps reveal the points of view of the narrator and the characters on the scriptural writings and quotations in the narrative world. The second is John's uses of the introductory formulae. This angle helps discern the literary functions of the quotation formulae in contributing to the portrait of Jesus in John's narrative. The third is the implications of explicit OT quotations in John. This dimension serves to expose John's evaluative ideology in using the OT quotations in the narrative context for his Christology.⁹⁷

1.4 Methodology and Structural Design

In fulfilling the purpose of this study, I examine the literary features of John's Gospel in the second chapter of this study. The literary genre and the structure of John are discussed.

⁹⁶ By OT here, I do not mean a *fixed* collection or version of Jewish scripture during the first century. The OT is a general way to refer to the Old Testament from which the reader recognizes some texts excerpted.

⁹⁷ Undeniably, OT allusions or echoes have significant impact on the whole Gospel. However, they will not be discussed specifically in this paper. See Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic*, 271. He mentions that the OT allusions in John are numerous and significant for him to develop his theological themes. Also cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St. John*, 3 vols. (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 1:119.

Concerning the Gospel's genre and structure, I build on the scholarship of previous works.⁹⁸ This discussion on the literary type of the writing presents the primary concern of the Gospel author. The genre of the Gospel as a Greco-Roman βίος suggests that the hermeneutical key to understanding the Gospel and its theological focus is the person of its subject, Jesus.⁹⁹ In other words, the whole Gospel is about *Jesus*.¹⁰⁰ Regarding the structure of the Gospel, the commonly accepted conclusion in 20:30–31 articulates that the audience should hold the belief statement that *Jesus* is the Messiah, the Son of God.¹⁰¹ In the epilogue,¹⁰² the final authorial comment in 21:24–25 affirms that *Jesus* is the subject of the whole book according to the true witness of the Beloved Disciple.¹⁰³ John's prologue, as Köstenberger remarks, "orients and introduces the reader to the identity of the Gospel's main protagonist, the Word (1:1), Jesus Christ (1:17)."¹⁰⁴ Thus, the prologue serves as an orientation for Jesus's events in the body of the narrative (1:19–20:29), which is the means to fulfilling the purpose marked in the conclusion.

⁹⁸ E.g., Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004); Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Genre of the Fourth Gospel and Greco-Roman Literary Conventions," in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, TENTS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 435–62.

⁹⁹ Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 213–32, 249. Also cf. Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John's Gospel*, New Testament Readings (London: Routledge, 1994), 62. In addition, Bauckham, *Testimony*, 95–112, argues that John as a biography is closer than the Synoptics to historiography.

¹⁰⁰ Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 290, "The point of each passage is to tell us **not** about the disciples, but about the biography's subject—namely, Jesus of Nazareth—in this case..." (original emphasis).

¹⁰¹ Barnabas Lindars, *John*, NTG (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990), 68–69, indicates that having life as salvation is the very purpose of the Gospel's presentation.

¹⁰² Zumstein, "Intratextuality and Intertextuality," 124–25, indicates that John 21 functions as the epilogue of the Gospel according to the theory of paratexts.

¹⁰³ Compared with the Synoptics, the frequency of Jesus's direct Christological identity (i.e., you are/he is...) is higher. In addition, Jesus's self-identification phrase "ἐγώ εἰμι" (14 occurrences) is featured in John.

¹⁰⁴ Andreas J. Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters: The Word, the Christ, the Son of God*, Biblical Theology of the New Testament Series (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 118–19. Also cf. Zumstein, "Intratextuality and Intertextuality," 123–24.

In the third chapter, I devote attention to the role of the Scripture(s) in John's narrative world. In the narrative, although John the Baptist serves as Jesus's major witness,¹⁰⁵ Jesus appeals to the greater witness (5:34–47). When Jesus's deeds testify about himself (5:36), the Father testifies about him (5:37). However, in John's narrative world, the perspective of God as a character is not presented in the same way as that of other characters. Only his voice is *heard* (1:33; 12:28). All characters seem to judge things, although imprecisely, according to the Scriptures (or their understanding of the Scriptures), which are acknowledged as the word of God (cf. 5:38–39). The Scriptures, as the protagonist's effective witnesses (5:39), are able to represent God's evaluative point of view. Therefore, the examination of the narrative role of the Scriptures will help reveal the function of the OT quotations in John's narrative world. In this chapter, literary-critical investigation is adopted in order to acquire the sense of how the Scripture is deemed by the characters, that is, the characters' points of view on the Scripture.¹⁰⁶

In the fourth chapter, I explore John's use of quotation formulae. This work pays attention to the meaning and the function of the introductory formulae in John's narrative. To do so, a literary comparison of the use of quotation formulae in John with the uses in the NT writings and Jewish literature is needed. They presumably share a similar perspective on the Scriptures as the most authoritative religious or national writing and akin quotation techniques.¹⁰⁷ The Old Testament, the Qumran literature, the Apocrypha, the OT Pseudepigrapha, Josephus's writings,

¹⁰⁵ Cf. n. 6.

¹⁰⁶ Some previous works on this topic are helpful. E.g., Beutler, "Use," 147–62; Lieu, "Narrative Analysis," 144–63; Francis J. Moloney, "The Gospel of John as Scripture," *CBQ* 67 (2005): 454–68; Labahn, "Scripture Talks," 133–54.

¹⁰⁷ The Jewish people are literarily most influenced by their Scripture. Concerning Greek mode of introducing a quotation, cf. Robert Renehan, "Classical Greek Quotations in the New Testament," in *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky*, ed. David Neiman and Margaret A. Schatkin, *OrChrAn* 195 (Rome: Pont Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1973), 17–46.

Philo's works,¹⁰⁸ and the NT writings are consulted.¹⁰⁹ This comparative examination is performed through a historical-grammatical-literary approach.¹¹⁰ The examination will reveal (1) how the quotation techniques (forms and methods) that John's author applies are related to his literary milieu, which is mostly of Jewish scriptural background, and (2) how quotation formulae function in order to bridge former scriptural texts to the narrative and signal certain significances regarding them in the narrative. This examination will also help discern whether John, by adopting and arranging his formulae in this way, differentiates hermeneutically and theologically from other contemporary writers who may share the same quotation-formula pattern.

Scholars find the citation formula of fulfillment (ἵνα ... πληρωθῇ ... [in order that ... may be fulfilled]) only in Matthew's and John's Gospels.¹¹¹ However, the way that John uses this formula seemingly differs from how Matthew does in form, distribution, and attribution.¹¹²

¹⁰⁸ Stanley E. Porter, review of *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, by Christopher D. Stanley, *JETS* 41 (1998): 493, suggests that Philo is better categorized as a Greco-Roman writer. Naomi G. Cohen, *Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings*, JSJSup 123 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), will be helpful to the survey.

¹⁰⁹ Those scriptural commentaries (e.g., *Pesher on Habakkuk*), translations (e.g., *Targum to Job*), and retellings of OT history in Jewish literature will be excluded since they do not fit the research purpose in terms of the nature of quoting scriptural texts.

¹¹⁰ This study is built on previous helpful works. E.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1961): 297–333, is the most valuable work although it lacks attention to some scrolls that are published later. Cf. also Bruce M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307. Moreover, both Dietrich-Alex Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*, BHT 69 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986), and Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS 74 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), have already investigated in detail Paul's handling of OT citations in different ways.

¹¹¹ See O'Rourke, "John's Fulfillment Texts," 433, n. 3; Metzger, "Formulas," 306. In fact, some formulae are alike in the NT (e.g., Acts 13:33 [ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν]; Jas 2:23 [ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή]; 1 Cor 15:54 [γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος]).

¹¹² Matthew uses the formula "ὥπως ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος." Matthew's fulfillment quotation appears three times in the beginning of the Gospel about Jesus's birth, and five times in Jesus's ministry narrative. One occurrence is not related purely to Jesus but to Judas's death (27:9–10). Cf. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 124–27. In Matthew, this formula is used only by the narrator, while in John is used both by the narrator and Jesus.

Similarities and dissimilarities between their uses of OT quotation formulae (particularly the fulfillment quotations) provide more understanding about John's literary design and narrative function of introductory formulae related to the presentation of Jesus.¹¹³

In the fifth chapter, the discussion turns to every explicit OT quotation in John.¹¹⁴ A thorough investigation of the use of explicit quotations in the Gospel of John is accomplished by means of a narrative-critical approach. The discussion in this chapter is not about the source or the technology of citation wording adaptation.¹¹⁵ Neither is it about the domination of memory or written texts by which the author composed the Gospel.¹¹⁶ Rather, it is specifically about the narrator's evaluative point of view concerning the protagonist, Jesus, by the formula-marked quotations employed in the narrative.¹¹⁷ The OT quotations in John, although attributed to different quoters, are recognized as chosen scriptural texts by the narrator in order to expose his evaluative point of view. According to the narrative purpose in his conclusion (20:31), John's showing and telling are centralized primarily to Jesus's identity. As Mark A. Powell points out, the narrator of the Gospel is reliable and the narrator's evaluative point of view, the dominating ideology, is always *true*.¹¹⁸ Therefore, John's whole narrative displays the dominating ideological

¹¹³ Several related works may be helpful: Hays, *Echoes*; John J. O'Rourke, "The Fulfillment Texts in Matthew," *CBQ* 24 (1962): 394–403; Robert Horton Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*, NovTSup 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1967); Krister Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew, and Its Use of the Old Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968); Penner, "Citation Formulae," 62–84.

¹¹⁴ In addition to the works previously mentioned, some other studies have defined "quotation." E.g., Christopher A. Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*, BibInt 96 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 15–24; Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 24–27.

¹¹⁵ Concerning the quotation technique that the NT writers may have used, Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, has done helpful research on this topic. However, Stanley only focuses on the technique of wording adaptation.

¹¹⁶ Regarding memorization of John's quotations, cf. Montanaro, "Memory," 147–70.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Boris Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form*, trans. Valentina Zavarin and Susan Wittig (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973), 5. Uspensky mentions the importance of investigating the points of view in literature.

¹¹⁸ Powell, *Narrative Criticism*, 54.

stance on a macro level while the scriptural quotations in the narrative contribute points of view on a micro level to support the ideological stance.¹¹⁹ A survey of the narrator's point of view on each use of OT quotation is crucial to understanding the scriptural witness about Jesus.

Accordingly, in pursuing the investigation, I look at the dynamics of points of view on each occurrence of explicit quotation expressed by a character or by the narrator.¹²⁰ An OT quotation in John can be seen as a speech adopted intertextually by the quoter from the Scripture, which is understood as familiar to the characters in the narrative world. At the same time, a quotation has an original context and that original context cannot be isolated from the new context in John's narrative.¹²¹ Thus, in the discussion of each quotation, the original OT context will be investigated. This investigation will help identify the original OT writer's implied point of view (OPoV). This OPoV is what the narrator deals with *intertextually* in the narrative context where he adopts the quotation. The narrator, by using each explicit quotation as a marked scriptural witness to Jesus, expresses his Christological point of view.¹²² In the narrative, although the narrator has the scriptural texts spoken by various characters and himself, the use of

¹¹⁹ See Yamasaki, *Perspective Criticism*, 98.

¹²⁰ In traditional historical method, one would see the NT writers as interpreters doing exegetical work on OT scriptural texts quoted in their books. The ways they adopted and interpreted the texts and the concept of whether the OT writers have perceived the eschatological significance that the NT authors articulate are crucial for understanding the NT writers' use of OT quotations. Cf. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*; Kenneth Berding and Jonathan Lunde, eds., *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008). Concerning the point of view in a biblical narrative, cf. Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*, Indiana Literary Biblical Series (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 131.

¹²¹ Scholars have debates on whether the NT writers saw the OT contexts. Cf. Berding and Lunde, eds., *Three Views*, and Steve Moyise, "Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament," in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*, ed. Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009), 23–24. Also, Peter Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 115–17; Beale, *Handbook*, 1–27.

¹²² Cf. Meir Sternberg, "Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse," *Poetics Today* 66 (1990): 108. Sternberg considers that the transplanting and framing of the original discourse (the quoted text) "in a new environment would impose on it a new mode of existence."

quotation formulae is shown as regularly contributed by the narrator. Thus, at the same time, the narrator copes with the quotations *intratextually* to his narrative purpose. This work is concerned with the narrator's point of view (NPoV) on Jesus by using OT quotations in his narrative. Therefore, the dynamics of points of view from OPoV to NPoV on the quotation is given attention in the discussion.

If the quoter is the narrator (i.e., the narrator uses the quotation as his narratorial comment), then the narrator directly expresses his point of view (NPoV) through the way he quotes. Since John's narrator does not play a role in the narrative (third-person narration),¹²³ the NPoV is an *external* perspective, that is, the point of view from *outside* of the narrative world.¹²⁴ If the quotation is attributed to *Jesus*, then the narrator presents his point of view through Jesus's point of view (JPoV) in using the quotation.¹²⁵ In the Gospel, the narrator and Jesus the protagonist share the same evaluative point of view.¹²⁶ Although NPoV is identical to JPoV in the narrative, a nuance still exists between them in terms of their standpoint to the narrative world. While NPoV represents an external view, JPoV is *internal* since Jesus is a character *within* John's narrative world.¹²⁷ Thus, NPoV on Jesus's quotation is expressed in the narrator's showing Jesus's quoting.¹²⁸ If the quotation is on the lips of a *character* other than Jesus, the character's

¹²³ Only in the prologue (1:1–18), the conclusion (20:30–31), and the very end of the epilogue (21:24–25), can one observe first-person narrations. Although the narrator may be once one of those with Jesus (e.g., 2:17; 12:16), the narrator's point of view is seen as external perspective from his flashback point of view.

¹²⁴ About "external narrator," cf. Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 130–31; Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978), 151–58; Wolf Schmid, *Narratology: An Introduction*, trans. Alexander Starritt (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 95–96.

¹²⁵ Cf. Chatman, *Story and Discourse*, 153–55, about different points of view between a character and the narrator.

¹²⁶ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 36; Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel*, 21–22. Cf. Powell, *Narrative Criticism*, 26.

¹²⁷ Or, in Uspensky's language, it is the author's/narrator's internal point of view.

¹²⁸ Cf. Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 12–13.

point of view (CPoV) on the quotation may or may not parallel NPoV.¹²⁹ NPoV on the quotation has to be defined through the way in which the narrator shows the character's/characters' understanding or misunderstanding of the Scripture. Even in the misunderstanding situation, the narrator employs the scriptural text to be Jesus's witness (John 6:31). Hence, to look at the dynamics of points of view is important while the Scripture is quoted in the narrative.

In noticing the dynamics of the points of view, Boris Uspensky's famous four planes of point of view will serve in the discussion.¹³⁰ These planes of point of view have been broadly mentioned by biblical narrative critics; however, biblical scholars scarcely look at the dynamics of points of view in detail.¹³¹ With Uspensky's model, which is described more fully in the fifth chapter, one can observe the dynamics of the points of view on the OT quotations in John, by different quoters, in various viewpoint *planes*. Thus, this discussion on the points of view regarding the scriptural quotations will help to determine the narrative function of each quotation. The attention is focused on the NPoV of each quotation within the immediate narrative context and then the broader context. I then discuss the contribution of the substance of quotation to the narrative, viewing the way the introductory formula works to bridge the gap between the OT and Johannine contexts. After the survey of every quotation, I look at John's

¹²⁹ In fact, in John's narrative, only John the Baptist, as Jesus's witness, shares the same evaluative point of view with the narrator. All other characters in the narrative world do not show concord with Jesus until the end of the narrative.

¹³⁰ Uspensky's four planes of point of view are: 1) ideological; 2) phraseological; 3) spatial and temporal; and 4) psychological. Also cf. brief summaries of theories of point of view in Schmid, *Narratology*, 91–99; Gary Yamasaki, *Watching a Biblical Narrative: Point of View in Biblical Exegesis* (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 28–40.

¹³¹ E.g., Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel*, 4–21; Powell, *Narrative Criticism*, 52; Yamasaki, *Watching*, 68–149. Gary Yamasaki is a scholar carefully reading the NT text in perspective criticism. Yamasaki points out biblical scholars' misunderstanding of Uspensky's theory, particularly on his *phraseological* plane of point of view (70, 80, 105–6, 107). According to Uspensky, the *phraseological* plane involves the incorporation of speech characteristics of other speaker(s) in the narrative rather than just the vocabulary expression. The latter belongs to *ideological* plane of point of view. However, Yamasaki adds the *informational plane* in his perspective criticism. In my opinion, Uspensky's four planes are certainly appropriate.

distinctive use of quotation formulae by which he weaves his OT quotations in the narrative of the book as a whole in order to see how John's explicit quotations contribute to the presentation of Jesus.

The conclusion of this research focuses on three points: (1) the role of the Scriptures as Jesus's witness in John's narrative; (2) the narrative function and implication of quotation formulae; and (3) the Christological implications resulting from John's use of explicit OT quotations in the narrative. The contribution of this work is thus a demonstration of narrative-critical survey on explicit OT quotations with regard to Christology in John, particularly through examining the dynamics of the point of view.

2 LITERARY DESIGN OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

The Gospel according to John is in form a first-century literary production.¹³² Literary critics see the Gospel of John as a whole, seeking the meaning of the final form of the text.¹³³ My focus firstly is on the genre and literary structure of the Gospel. By identifying the genre of a literary piece, one can learn the core interest of the writing.¹³⁴ A lengthy writing may consist of various materials sharing different genres.¹³⁵ However, the writing itself belongs to a specific genre by which the written text communicates with the reader. Richard Burridge notes, “Genre is a system of communication of *meaning*. Before we can understand the meaning of a text, we must master its genre. Genre will then be our guide to help us re-construct the original meaning, to check out interpretation to see if it is valid and to assist in evaluating the worth of the text and communication.”¹³⁶ In other words, as the genre of a literary work is determined by the writer, a reader or an interpreter is able to obtain the direction to the core interest of the work.¹³⁷

¹³² Robert A. Traina, *Methodical Bible Study* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 10. In addition, the discovery of Papyrus 52 fragment suggests that the origin of John’s Gospel can be dated to the first century.

¹³³ In this study, the final text form of the Gospel is the Greek text, excluding the passage 7:53–8:11. Some Johannine scholars approach the Gospel by looking at various sources from which the Gospel was composited (source critics) or traditions that would imply religious community’s *Sitz im Leben* (form critics). E.g., Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist, 1979); Robert T. Fortna, *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988). On the contrary, Vern S. Poythress, “Testing for Johannine Authorship by Examining the Use of Conjunctions,” *WTJ* 46 (1984): 350–69, through surveying the use of conjunctions in John, argues that the Gospel as a whole is written by one author.

¹³⁴ James L. Bailey and Lyle D. Vander Broek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A Handbook* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992), 93–97; Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 48–51.

¹³⁵ Cf. Harold W. Attridge, “Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel,” *JBL* 121 (2002): 3–21.

¹³⁶ Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 51. Also “the proper recognition of genre is absolutely basic to the interpretation and appreciation of written communications” (101). See Jeannine K. Brown, *Scripture as Communication: Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 140.

¹³⁷ Petr Pokorný, *From the Gospel to the Gospels: History, Theology and Impact of the Biblical Term ‘euangelion’*, BZNW 195 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 108, “A literary genre ... helps readers (or hearers of a public reading) to orient themselves in the text.”

While the literary genre indicates the *type* of a form so as to inform the primary *interest* of writing, the structure shows the *framework* of the text so as to denote the focused *theme* of the content by its relationships between the units in that framework. Therefore, an examination of the literary structure of John's Gospel will allow the reader to comprehend the main theme and the primary purpose of the book as a whole.¹³⁸

2.1 Implications of the Genre of the Gospel

2.1.1 Greco-Roman Biography

Although differing from the Synoptic Gospels in terms of the literary arrangement of most of Jesus's events, the Gospel of John shares with the Synoptics in describing Jesus's earthly work and life. The four Gospels "are generally categorized under the same rubric of genre."¹³⁹ About the beginning of the twentieth century, Ernst Renan and C. W. Votaw suggest that the Gospels belonged to a subgroup of the wide genre of Greco-Roman biography.¹⁴⁰ However, under the influence of the development of form criticism, scholars such as Karl Ludwig Schmidt and Rudolf Bultmann argue against the view that the Gospels are classified as biographies. While Schmidt considers the Gospels as *Kleinliteratur* (folk literature) within cultic communities, Bultmann asserts that the Gospels are simply the products of Christianity, unlike any other known literary genre (i.e., *sui generis*).¹⁴¹ As Burridge observes, Bultmann's judgment that the Gospels are "completely subordinate to Christian faith and worship" had significant impact on biblical scholars' view on the literary feature of the Gospels.¹⁴² Nevertheless, decades later, since

¹³⁸ Cf. Traina, *Methodical Bible Study*, 37; George Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*, AnBib 117 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987), 1.

¹³⁹ Köstenberger, "Genre," 436.

¹⁴⁰ Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 4–5.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 7–11.

¹⁴² Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. John Marsh, rev. ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1972),

Philip Alexander properly suggests that the origin of the Gospels' genre has to be searched within the Greco-Roman world, scholars then turn back to the Gospels' original literary environment within which the Gospels were produced.¹⁴³

Recently, many scholars align with Burridge's suggestion on the genre of the four Gospels. In his book *What Are the Gospels*, Burridge convincingly argues for the proper understanding of the genre of the Gospels. According to Burridge, the Gospels cannot be classified as unique writings in terms of genre (*sui generis*). The Gospels have to be compared with their contemporary literature.¹⁴⁴ Based on the recognition of a wide range of similarities between the Gospels and Greco-Roman βίοι, Burridge asserts that the Synoptic Gospels "belong within the overall genre of βίοι,"¹⁴⁵ and "the Fourth Gospel clearly is the same genre as the synoptic gospels, namely βίοι."¹⁴⁶ He indicates, particularly, that the Gospels all belong to the same subgenre, βίοι Ἰησοῦ.¹⁴⁷

Having surveyed some early and later Greco-Roman βίοι,¹⁴⁸ Burridge observes several major generic features that are able to encompass this type of work within a family resemblance of genre.¹⁴⁹ Of all the examples investigated, the subjects in these works concentrate on *one*

374; Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 11.

¹⁴³ Ibid., 16–20.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., 51.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 212. Cf. Paul J. Achtemeier, Joel B. Green, and Marianne Meye Thompson, *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 75. They categorize Matthew, Mark, and John in biography and Luke-Acts in historiography.

¹⁴⁶ Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 232.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 239, 247. Also, the generic features of the canonical Gospels make them distinctive from noncanonical gospels (240–43).

¹⁴⁸ Burridge's examples include Isocrates's *Evagoras*, Xenophon's *Agesilaus*, Satyrus's *Euripides*, Nepo's *Atticus*, Philo's *Moses*, Tacitus's *Agricola*, Plutarch's *Cato Minor*, Suetonius's *Lives of the Caesars*, Lucian's *Demonax*, and Philostratus's *Apollonius of Tyana*.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. David E. Aune, "Greco-Roman Biography," in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*, ed. David E. Aune, SBLSPS 21 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 109–10.

individual. In external features, these works share similar mode of representation, structure, appearance, length, and literary units of composition. Internal features of content are alike in terms of setting, topics, and motifs. These Greco-Roman βίοι also begin with certain opening features such as the subject's title or name, prologue, or preface.¹⁵⁰ BurrIDGE then concludes that "there is an overall pattern or family resemblance of generic features which identify this group as the genre of βίος."¹⁵¹

When turning to look at the canonical Gospels,¹⁵² BurrIDGE observes that they share many common features with the Greco-Roman βίοι he has investigated and then he judges that the four Gospels belong within the overall genre of βίοι.¹⁵³ The Gospels lack any biographical title, but Luke and John begin with a formal preface/prologue (Luke 1:1–4; John 1:1–18), while Mark and Matthew start with their subject's name, that is, Jesus (Mark 1:1; Matt 1:1). These are common opening features in βίοι. Verbal analysis of the Gospels also reveals that Jesus is the subject of around one-fifth of the verbs used with a major portion occurring in passages concerning his deeds and teachings.¹⁵⁴ In addition, all four Gospels devote a large amount of their length to the events of Jesus's Passion and Resurrection. Such an uneven allocation of space is also common among Greco-Roman βίοι. Regarding external features, the Gospels have a similar mode of representation (prose narrative), size/length, structure (chronological sequence with topical materials), scale (the person of Jesus), and use of literary units to those found in βίοι. All four Gospels share with Greco-Roman βίοι similar internal features of settings, topics, and

¹⁵⁰ BurrIDGE, *What Are the Gospels*, 105–83.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 184.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 185–232.

¹⁵³ Cf. Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, 108.

¹⁵⁴ Matthew: 17%; Mark: 24%; Luke: 18%; and John: 20%.

atmospheres. Their quality of characterization is roughly comparable with βίοι. Although the style and social setting of the Synoptics are probably further down the social scale/level than βίοι, the didactic, apologetic, and polemic purposes of information of the four Gospels are typical of Greco-Roman βίοι.¹⁵⁵

2.1.2 Jewish Historical Narrative?

However, that the Gospels still look different in some degree from other ancient Greco-Roman biographies cannot be easily ignored.¹⁵⁶ Being concerned about the dissimilarities between ancient biographies and the Gospels, Köstenberger seems to be convinced that the Gospels are more like *Jewish historical narrative* in the Hebrew Scripture although the dissimilarities may not separate the Gospels from the Greek biographical genre.¹⁵⁷ He emphasizes the theological purpose of the Gospels:

The evangelists carefully selected and arranged material that most effectively conveyed God's message of salvation, employing a Christ-centered approach issuing in a theologically grounded account of the life and work of Jesus. Similar to Old Testament historical narrative, the Gospels focus on God's salvific activity in history and demand a faith response from the readers.¹⁵⁸

For Köstenberger, the Gospel of John is more like a literary convention written in Greco-Roman biographical techniques and Jewish historical narrative of salvation-theological message.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁵ Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 205–7.

¹⁵⁶ Köstenberger, “Genre,” 439, mentions five differences between the Gospels and ancient biography. Cf. D. A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 116.

¹⁵⁷ Köstenberger, “Genre,” 438–44, 461.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 441.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002), 301, “the Old Testament historical narratives never seem to describe the events or teachings of God's spokespersons with an eye to focusing specifically on the nature of those prophets or leaders, as the Gospels do with Jesus. Instead, attention is diverted beyond the individual to God's dealings with his covenant people more generally...”

John's affinities with Greco-Roman βίοι on internal and external features "represent John's attempts to contextualize the Gospel message for a Greco-Roman audience."¹⁶⁰

On the contrary, Craig S. Keener suggests that John, like the Synoptics, reflects Greco-Roman rather than strictly Jewish literary conventions.¹⁶¹ However, the Jewishness of the Gospel must not be overlooked, nor should the Jewish narrative techniques in the Gospel be ignored.¹⁶² The Jewish narrative techniques show how the Gospel authors relate Jesus's narrative with their OT traditions and Jewish backdrops.¹⁶³ Nonetheless, in terms of literary genre, the Gospel of John should be more appropriately described primarily as ancient Greco-Roman biography despite their Jewish salvation-historical content.¹⁶⁴ The theological concern and salvation-historical interest of the Gospels are not a *type* or *subgroup* of genre¹⁶⁵ but the significant purpose of the content that the Gospels intend to convey and communicate in the literary form of βίος of Jesus, through whom God's message of salvation in history is revealed.¹⁶⁶ Therefore, the genre of the Gospel of John, like the other Gospels, is better understood as "comparable ... to ancient 'life descriptions' and were also understood as such in antiquity,"¹⁶⁷ which is a Greco-Roman βίος.

¹⁶⁰ Köstenberger, "Genre," 461.

¹⁶¹ Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 25.

¹⁶² Ibid., 25–29.

¹⁶³ Stibbe, *John's Gospel*, 62.

¹⁶⁴ Internal features of content in Greco-Roman biographies sometimes may vary in atmosphere, social setting, and compositional style. E.g., Tacitus's *Agricola* vs. Lucian's *Demonax*. Cf. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 183–84.

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Cornelis Bennema, "The Historical Reliability of the Gospel of John," *Foundations* 67 (2014): 19, "The Gospel of John is both a historical and theological document in which theology is rooted in history and history informs and serves theology."

¹⁶⁶ Cf. David E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*, LEC 8 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 22, "the canonical Gospels constitute a distinctive type of ancient biography combining ... Hellenistic form and function with Jewish content." David E. Aune, "Greco-Roman Biography," 122, "The Gospels, then, represent an adaptation of Greco-Roman biographical conventions used to convey a life of unique religious significance for Christians." Aune also mentions that the uniqueness of the Gospels lies in their content/protagonist, not in the form.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Martin Hengel, "Eye-Witness Memory and the Writing of the Gospels: Form Criticism, Community Tradition and the Authority of the Authors," in *The Written Gospel*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 72.

The core interest of such a genre is the subject of the writing, as in the case of the canonical Gospels, this is Jesus.

2.1.3 John's Historiographical Features

Based on Burridge's argument that all canonical Gospels belong to the broad genre family of Greco-Roman biography, Richard Bauckham goes a step further to argue that the Gospel of John more closely resembles Greco-Roman *historiography* than the Synoptics do.¹⁶⁸ This assertion is able to explain some dissimilarities between the Synoptics and John. According to Bauckham's observation, John's Gospel has two major historiographical features. First, it has a high frequency of *topographical* references as do the ancient historians' narratives. Compared with the Synoptics, almost half of these topographical references are unique to John. They are regarded as being accurate both in general and in detail, more precisely or specifically located than the Synoptics (e.g., Cana [2:1; 4:46], the pool of Bethesda by the Sheep Gate [5:2]).¹⁶⁹ Second, *chronological* indication is the other major historiographical feature. In John, these indications are mainly the named Jewish festivals, Passovers (2:13; 6:4; 12:55), Tabernacles (7:2), and Hanukkah (10:22) between the second and third Passovers.¹⁷⁰ Since a large part of Jesus's events is related to these festivals in John's Gospel, a large part of the narrative is more precisely dated than any of the Synoptics.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁸ Bauckham, *Testimony*, 93–112. Originally, Richard Bauckham, "Historiographical Characteristics of the Gospel of John," *NTS* 53 (2007): 17–36.

¹⁶⁹ Bauckham, *Testimony*, 95–100.

¹⁷⁰ David R. Bauer and Robert A. Traina, *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 84, identify that the content materials of John are *chronological*. Cf. also Burridge, *What Are the Gospels*, 220.

¹⁷¹ Bauckham, *Testimony*, 100–101.

Bauckham also mentions other historiographical features that make John distinct from the Synoptics. John's *selectivity* of Jesus's events and sayings in his narrative is prominent (cf. 20:30).¹⁷² For example, John has only eight miracles (if including ch. 21) while Matthew, Mark, and Luke about twenty each. John's use of the dual ἀμὴν ἀμὴν formula is distinct from the single ἀμὴν read in the Synoptics. Jesus's frequent familial reference to himself as "Son" and to God as "my Father" is seldom found in the Synoptic sayings (cf. Mark 13:32; Matt 11:27). The phrase "kingdom of God" is common in the Synoptics, but appears only twice in John (3:3, 5). Contrariwise, John frequently employs its parallel term, "eternal life," which is rarely read in the Synoptics (Mark 9:43; 10:17). These examples by no means suggest that John digresses from the Synoptic Gospels but are an indication of "John's extreme selectivity,"¹⁷³ which sets John's account much closer to the Greco-Roman historiographies. In addition, for Bauckham, John's abundant explanatory parenthesis (e.g., 2:21–22),¹⁷⁴ his firsthand testimony of eyewitness (e.g., 19:34),¹⁷⁵ and his way of presenting Jesus's speeches (e.g., chs. 13–17) are common characteristics in ancient historiography.¹⁷⁶ Therefore, while all four Gospels belong to the genre

¹⁷² Bauckham notices that judicious selectivity is a hallmark of a good Greco-Roman historian. See Bauckham, *Testimony*, 103–4, 106–12. Here, I include John's distinctive characteristics of Jesus's speech as part of John's selectivity while Bauckham discusses it separately. Also Paul N. Anderson, "Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel: Consensus and Convergences," in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, ECL 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 382–83.

¹⁷³ Bauckham, *Testimony*, 112. Also, Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, Eng. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 697, "20.30f ... in which the selective character of the narrative is stressed."

¹⁷⁴ Bauckham prefers Steven M. Sheeley's term "narrative asides." Bauckham, *Testimony*, 104–5, n. 39.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 105–6. Also see Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitness: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 358–468.

¹⁷⁶ Bauckham, *Testimony*, 106–9. Bauckham mentions that John's longer and unique speech of Jesus could be reckoned in the ancient world as more realistic than Jesus's teaching in Synoptic presentation.

of βίος, by virtue of these features John more closely resembles a historiography. In terms of witnessing of Jesus's events, John's Gospel is thus intended to be read as a more reliable account.

2.1.4 Implications of the Literary Genre of the Gospel of John

Regarding the hermeneutical significance implied with an understanding of the literary genre, Burrige says, "Genre ... provides a set of expectations for the reader about the author's intentions, which helps in the construction of the meaning on the page and the reconstruction of the author's original meaning, as well as in the interpretation and evaluation of the communication contained within the work itself."¹⁷⁷ The genre of the Gospels as Greco-Roman biographies itself then guides the access into the Gospels. Burrige emphasizes that the central key to the interpretation of Gospels as βίος is *the person of the subject*, Jesus of Nazareth.¹⁷⁸ Likewise, Köstenberger concludes, "Similar to popular Greco-Roman *bioi*, John evinces a strong focus on the protagonist."¹⁷⁹ In short, the whole of John's Gospel is about Jesus. This generic property, that the subject of the Gospel of John—Jesus—is the core interest and the core key for understanding the meaning and the theological concern of the narrative as a whole leads the audience to focus on the protagonist as the narrative events unfold.

In the Greco-Roman world, historiographical practices would reinforce the historical reliability of the events recorded in a writing.¹⁸⁰ The historiographical features found in John imply that the Jesus-centered biographical narrative is presented in the way in which the historical background and references of Jesus's deeds and words would be deemed reliable. In

¹⁷⁷ Burrige, *What Are the Gospels*, 247.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 247–51, "The centrality of the person of Jesus arising from the βίος genre of the gospels needs to become the central key to their interpretation: Christology, the portrait by each evangelist, affects every area" (249).

¹⁷⁹ Köstenberger, "Genre," 461. Also cf. Pokorný, *From the Gospel*, 111; James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 131.

¹⁸⁰ Bauckham, *Testimony*, 100, 106; Köstenberger, "Genre," 462; Keener, *John*, 18–22.

John's Gospel, not only are the stories about Jesus's life communicated, but Jesus's events are also narrated in the historical sense through historiographical characteristics.¹⁸¹ This implication makes sense of John's Jewish salvation-historical content in the narrative that the salvation promised in the Scripture by God in history is being fulfilled in Jesus's events historically.

Accordingly, the genre of the Gospel as a Greco-Roman biography coupled with the historiographical features in it connotes not merely the reliability of Jesus's events as read in John but also the Jewish salvation-historical content in the narrative. Jesus's life is linked to God's salvation history. Moreover, with regard to the Scriptural quotations in the Gospel as Jesus's witnesses, one can conclude that John's scriptural usage for witnessing to Jesus is his historiographical technique to make clear Jesus's events referred back to God's word written in the Jewish Scriptures in the past ages, which just happened according to the Scripture at the present time.

2.2 The Focused Theme from the Structure of the Gospel

The literary structure of the Gospel of John, providing an interpretative basis,¹⁸² will also help a reader learn the narrative plot and the core concern of the book as a whole. Some Johannine scholars have devoted their attention to the structure of the Gospel.¹⁸³ George

¹⁸¹ Also, Bennema, "Reliability," 9, "Historical reliability has more to do with the *ipsissima vox* ('the exact voice') than the *ipsissima verba* ('the exact words') of the protagonist. Hence, the Gospel of John is historically reliable to the extent that it faithfully testifies to the things Jesus said and did, and their significance."

¹⁸² Cf. Birger Olsson, *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1–11 and 4:1–42*, ConBNT 6 (Lund: Gleerup, 1974), 6.

¹⁸³ Most commentators in their works attempt to outline the structure of the Gospel despite the variety. E.g., J. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*, 2 vols. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1953), xxx–xxxiii; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 289; C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 11–15; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, I–XII*, AB 29 (New York: Doubleday, 1966), cxxxviii–ix; Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), 65–69; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 24–27; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 103–8; Gerald L. Borchert, *John 1–11*, NAC 25A (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 98; Thomas L. Brodie, *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (New York:

Mlakuzhyil's work in 1987 reviews many structures that scholars proposed for John's Gospel until his time.¹⁸⁴ He then argues that the *Christocentric scope of the Gospel* is realized in and through the development of the literary structure of the Gospel.¹⁸⁵ He views John 11–12 as the “Bridge-Section,” concluding the Book of Jesus's Signs (2:1–12:50) and introducing the Book of Jesus's Hour (11:1–12:29).¹⁸⁶ His work reflects the hermeneutic relationship between literary structure and Christology of the Gospel. A few years later, Gunnar Østenstad proposes his seven-section structure of the Gospel's main body by using the criteria of cross-references, which presuppose the literary unity of the Gospel.¹⁸⁷ He considers John 10:30 in the fourth section as the peak of John's Gospel. Armand Barus in his recent work,¹⁸⁸ however, points out that both Mlakuzhyil and Østenstad do not make a division at John 13:1 as most scholars do,¹⁸⁹ and that they fail to show clearly “the inseparability of the structure and the prominent themes of the Gospel.”¹⁹⁰ Barus correctly indicates that John 20:31 serves as narrative explicit conclusion and also as the key verse for determining the outlines of the Gospel. “[I]t is clear that *faith* and *its*

Oxford University Press, 1997), 72–75; Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, SP 4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 23–24; Beasley-Murray, *John*, xc–xcii; Gary M. Burge, *John*, NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 45; Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John*, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 10–11; J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 30–37; C. Marvin Pate, *The Writings of John: A Survey of the Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 36–37.

¹⁸⁴ Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Literary Structure*, 17–85. He classifies those structures into 24 categories according to the criteria used by different scholars.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 350.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 181–82, 238–42. Mlakuzhyil's structure has five divisions: I. Christocentric Intro. (1:1–2:11); II. Book of Jesus Signs (2:1–12:50); III. Book of Jesus's Hour (11:1–20:29); IV. Christocentric Conclusion (20:30–31); and V. Appendix (21:1–25).

¹⁸⁷ Gunnar Østenstad, “The Structure of the Fourth Gospel: Can it be Defined Objectively?” *ST* 45 (1991): 33–55. Østenstad's main structure: The Prologue (1:1–18); Book of Testimony (1:19–10:42; containing three sections); Book of Jesus' Hour (11:1–21:24; containing four sections); Epilogue (21:25).

¹⁸⁸ Armand Barus, “The Structure of the Fourth Gospel,” *AJT* 21 (2007): 96–111.

¹⁸⁹ E.g., Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John*, Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 14, also does not have a division on John 13:1.

¹⁹⁰ Barus, “Structure,” 99.

object are two themes that form the Gospel. In other words, faith and Christology are essentially the focus of the narrator in composing the Gospel as a whole.”¹⁹¹ Barus’s observation then will be found appropriate in the following discussion.

In this chapter, I do not devote myself to a detailed structure analysis but only examine the major divisions of John’s Gospel that most scholars have suggested,¹⁹² through which the primary concern of the Gospel narrative may be grasped:

1:1–18	Prologue
1:19–12:50	First Part (Jesus Revealed in Public: The Hour Not Yet Come) ¹⁹³
13:1–20:29	Second Part (Jesus’s Death and Resurrection: The Hour Already Come) ¹⁹⁴
20:30–31	Conclusion ¹⁹⁵
21:1–25	Epilogue.

2.2.1 The Prologue (1:1–18)

The prologue directly and unambiguously introduces the identity of the protagonist of the narrative: the Word, God, the Creator, the true light, the source of life, the unique Son of the

¹⁹¹ Barus, “Structure,” 99.

¹⁹² Cf. Köstenberger, *Theology*, 167–70. Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 36, honestly says about his structural outline of the Gospel, “This outline, like all the others, is far from perfect. It does justice to some but by no means all of the evidence.” Scholars agree on the division for the main units with some variations in the subunits. Earlier, Bernard, *John*, xxxiii, has observed a conclusion in each major section: 1:18 (end of the prologue); 12:36b–50 (end of Jesus’s public ministry); 20:30–31 (conclusion of the passion narrative and the Gospel); and 21:24–25 (end of the epilogue).

¹⁹³ This unit is bracketed by Isaiah’s messages (1:23; 12:38–41) and God’s voices (1:33; 12:28). Cf. also Lieu, “Narrative Analysis,” 149.

¹⁹⁴ This unit can be further divided by three subunits: Jesus’s Farewell Discourse (13:1–17:26 [bracketed by *love* in 13:1; 17:23–26]), Jesus’s Death (18:1–19:42 [bracketed by *κῆπος* (garden) in 18:1; 19:41]), and Jesus’s Resurrection (20:1–29).

¹⁹⁵ Some scholars see 20:30–21:25 as the conclusion or epilogue of the Gospel, e.g., Hartwig Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, HNT 6 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 4, 772–73; Fernando F. Segovia, “The Final Farewell of Jesus: A Reading of John 20:30–21:25,” in *The Fourth Gospel from a Literary Perspective*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and Fernando F. Segovia, Semeia 53 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991), 167–90; Bauckham, *Testimony*, 277.

Father, who then became human flesh, living among the eyewitnesses and being witnessed by John the Baptist in advance as the higher and greater coming one.¹⁹⁶ Although a few elements in the prologue do not find their explicit counterpart in the subsequent narrative (e.g., the Word, grace),¹⁹⁷ most scholars believe that the prologue is the key for a reader to access understanding (John's presenting) Jesus's deeds and discourses in the rest of the narrative.¹⁹⁸ In fact, the elements/themes in the prologue will have their elaboration of meaning throughout the book (e.g., belief, life, glory). Thus, the prologue is the key to the narrative events which follow; meanwhile, the narrative accounts also precisely elaborate what is firstly mentioned in the prologue.

In the prologue, the witness language indicates that Jesus Christ is *the* object for whom both John the Baptist and the implied author of the Gospel are testifying. John the Baptist is the one whom God sends as a witness in order to testify about Jesus for the purpose that all may believe (vv. 6–8, 15; cf. v. 12).¹⁹⁹ As a result, those who receive Jesus become children of God, born of God. The fact that the terms μαρτυρία and μαρτυρέω appear only with John the Baptist in the prologue (four times in total) indicates that the sole mission of John the Baptist is to

¹⁹⁶ A number of researchers have focused on John's Prologue although in different ways, e.g., C. K. Barrett, "The Prologue of St. John's Gospel," in *New Testament Essays* (London: SPCK, 1972), 27–48; R. Alan Culpepper, "The Pivot of John's Prologue," *NTS* 27 (1980): 1–31; Jeff Stanley, "The Structure of John's Prologue: Its Implications for the Gospel's Narrative Structure," *CBQ* 48 (1986): 241–64; Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*, JSNTSup 89 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993); Elizabeth Harris, *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist*, JSNTSup 107 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994); Peter M. Phillips, *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Sequential Reading*, LNTS 294 (London: T&T Clark, 2003); Martinus C. de Boer, "The Original Prologue to the Gospel of John," *NTS* 61 (2015): 448–67.

¹⁹⁷ Some elements in the following narrative are not mentioned in the prologue, such as Holy Spirit, love, coming persecution of the disciples, etc.

¹⁹⁸ E.g., R. Alan Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, Interpreting Biblical Texts (Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 125; Hengel, "Prologue," 289; Fernando F. Segovia, "John 1:1–18 as Entrée into Johannine Reality," in *Word, Theology, and Community in John*, ed. John Painter, R. Alan Culpepper, and Fernando F. Segovia (St. Louise: Chalice, 2002), 33–64; Zumstein, "Intratextuality and Intertextuality," 123–24.

¹⁹⁹ This purpose indicates that the content of the testimony by the one who bears witness will become the content of the belief of the one who receives it (cf. 19:35; 20:31).

witness about the Light, Jesus (vv. 7–8).²⁰⁰ The author’s first person plural pronoun *we* is also corporative witness language representing a witnessing group (1:14, 16), which is supposed to be Jesus’s disciples who once lived with Jesus for some years.²⁰¹ The accompanying experiential verbs (ἐθεασάμεθα and ἐλάβομεν) also boldly accent the *we* as the eyewitnesses to the incarnated *logos*, Jesus Christ, who lived among them (cf. 20:18, 25). John the Baptist, as a character inside the narrative, is said to be the witness before Jesus was revealed (1:15) while the *we-group*, to which the outside-the-narrative narrator belongs, becomes eyewitness in their retrospective of Jesus’s events in which they have participated (1:16; cf. 21:24).

John’s prologue provides the ultimate introduction of the *logos* as the creating and life-giving God. This supreme quality of the incarnated *logos* is the content of the testimony of both John the Baptist and the *we-group* (ἐμπροσθέν/πρῶτος in v. 15; μονογενῆς in vv. 14, 18).²⁰² The rejection and ignorance of the world to the *logos* also explains the necessity of their testimony for the *logos* with an anticipation that the world may believe in his name and have life from him (vv. 10–13; cf. 5:24; 20:31). Therefore, the prologue of the Gospel is obviously centered on the incarnated *logos*,²⁰³ Jesus Christ, for whom both the sent Baptist and the *we-*

²⁰⁰ The verb κέκραγεν in v. 15 implies that John’s witness is public and striking (cf. Jesus’s *crying* in 7:28, 37; 12:44). Structurally, two sets of A-B-A’ can be seen in 1:3–18 as following:

- 1) A Creation, life, and light (1:3–5)
 B John the Baptist—a witness sent from God (1:6–8)
 A’ Creation, life, and light (1:9–13)
- 2) A *We*, grace & truth, and μονογενῆς (1:14)
 B John the Baptist—a witness sent from God (1:15)
 A’ *We*, grace & truth, and μονογενῆς (1:16–18)

²⁰¹ Also cf. P. H. R. van Houwelingen, “John and the Others: To Whom Does the ‘We’ in the Fourth Gospel’s Prologue and Epilogue Refer?” *Fides Reformata* 19 (2014): 100, 103.

²⁰² Cf. Werner H. Kelber, “The Birth of a Beginning: John 1:1–18,” in *How Gospels Began*, ed. Dennis E. Smith, Semeia 52 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991), 131–32. He notices three beginnings in the prologue: of the *logos*, of John the Baptist, and of Jesus’s earthly beginning.

²⁰³ The twofold chiasm in 1:1–2 is centered on *logos*:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------|
| A In the beginning (1:1) | A God |
| B was | B was |

group (cf. 21:24–25) purport to present their testimonies.²⁰⁴ Such an introduction and its witness language prepare the reader for access into the following narrative body.²⁰⁵

2.2.2 The Body of John's Narrative (1:19–20:29)

This section of the narrative (1:19–20:29) starts with the witness of John the Baptist and then succeeds to the narrator's testifying account about Jesus's deeds and discourses. In the beginning, John the Baptist's μαρτυρία, by transparently rejecting the messianic identity (1:19–28) and articulately announcing Jesus as the Lamb of God and the Son of God (1:29–36), turns the spotlight to Jesus successfully. The encountering of John the Baptist's disciples with Jesus also provides their initial recognitions and leads to Jesus's revelation of his identity (1:37–51).²⁰⁶ The narrative that follows therewith concentrates upon Jesus's signs and discourses/dialogues with others, as well as people's believing/unbelieving responses. The scene in John 2 that presents Jesus's first sign (ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων) in Cana with the disciples' belief (ἐπίστευσαν, v. 11) and more of his signs (τὰ σημεία) in Jerusalem with the belief of many people (ἐπίστευσαν, v. 23) also leads to the subsequent narrative consisting of Jesus's works and words (witnessed by the narrator) as the witnesses for his own identity and others' reactions to it.²⁰⁷

C the *logos*
C' the *logos*
B' was
A' with God

C the *logos*
C' *this* (= *logos*) (1:2)
B' was
A' in the beginning with God

²⁰⁴ Cf. Culpepper, "Pivot of John's Prologue," 31. Culpepper contends that the pivot of John's prologue is v. 12b that "he gave them authority to become the children of God." Even if Culpepper's chiastic analysis is right, it can *only* mean that the result of the belief is emphasized.

²⁰⁵ The structural relationship between 1:1–18 and what follows may be described as preparation/realization. Cf. Bauer and Traina, *Inductive*, 114–15. As the prologue, by providing the key understanding of the true identity of the protagonist, prepares for the rest narrative, the rest narrative also reveals how the incarnated Word lived and exposed (ἐξηγήσατο) God himself.

²⁰⁶ Here, Jesus is recognized as the Messiah, the one about whom was written in the Law and the Prophets, and the Son of God and the King of Israel; and who reveals himself as the Son of Man.

²⁰⁷ For the narrator, the precise belief does not happen until Jesus's death and resurrection (2:22; 12:16; cf. 20:9).

The second chapter of John's Gospel likely brings up indications to the twofold predication that Jesus hints to Nathaniel in 1:50–51, regarding the real meaning of the claim in 1:49: "You are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel." Nathaniel's claim seems to be the climax of the first disciples' recognition of Jesus, resonating with John the Baptist's in 1:34. Jesus's interrogation "πιστεύεις" in 1:50 implies that the recognition of Nathaniel is a content of belief concerning Jesus's identity. But, Jesus's further ὃς σε (you [sg.] will see) and ὃς σε (you [pl.] will see) indicate that Nathaniel and the disciples need a deeper comprehension of the identity of Jesus as the Messiah.²⁰⁸ The term *believe* links the dialogue between Nathaniel and Jesus to the two events that follow in John 2 (1:50; 2:11, 22–25).

Likely, Jesus's two predications, "you [i.e., Nathaniel] will see greater things than these" (1:50) and "you [i.e., the disciples] will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of Man" (1:51) respectively, connect to the Cana miracle (2:1–11) and the Temple cleansing (2:12–25). The first predication of seeing greater things is for the singular *you*, that is, Nathaniel. The things greater than what Jesus just performed before Nathaniel are alluding to the signs Jesus will do subsequently, from the first, one by one. The first miracle that happens in the narrative is at Cana, the hometown of Nathaniel (21:2). Thus, Jesus is likely saying that Nathaniel will see greater things (i.e., miracles) that the Son of God and Israel's king will perform to which the first sign at Cana leads. The passage of Cana's sign itself also anticipates the *hour* and the glory brought about by Jesus (2:4, 11).²⁰⁹

²⁰⁸ Cf. Köstenberger, *John*, 84.

²⁰⁹ The Cana sign *officially* starts the journey of understanding Jesus's *hour* in John's narrative. Cf. Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 63, "the narrative moves relentlessly toward Jesus's 'hour'..."

The second predication of seeing some image echoing Jacob's dream at Bethel in Gen 28:12,²¹⁰ though told to Nathaniel (αὐτῷ), suggests that the disciples are present in the scope.²¹¹ The wording of Jesus's second predication is almost identical to the LXX text of Gen 28:12 about what Jacob saw in his dream. Apparently, Jesus replaces "the stair" with "the Son of Man," indicating that now the Son of Man, Jesus himself, is the place of "mediation between God and human beings."²¹² The disciples will see Jesus himself as the Beth-El, the House of God.²¹³ This imagery is then shown by John in the passage of the Temple cleansing, 2:12–25. As the Jews request of a significant sign, Jesus's answer denotes not only that he himself is *the* temple of God rebuilt but also that his body as a temple, destroyed and raised, is *the* sign to which all signs point. The one who finally becomes the temple of God on the hour in glory is the one whom all "these things" will reveal. As in John's second chapter, in which the first sign (2:1–11) anticipates the restoration of the Temple of God (2:12–22), Jesus's great things/signs reported in the first part of the narrative also anticipates Jesus's glorious hour unfolding in the second part.²¹⁴ Therefore, the body of John's narrative starts with John the Baptist's testimony for Jesus and the disciples' immature recognitions of Jesus, and then through Jesus's predication of seeing further about his identity, enters the account of the greater things/signs and the hour of Jesus becoming the Temple of God.

²¹⁰ Hays, *Echoes*, §18, "Jesus as the Temple."

²¹¹ Köstenberger, *John*, 85.

²¹² Hays, *Echoes*, §18, "Jesus as the Temple."

²¹³ In Gen 28:19 (cf. 28:17), MT reads בֵּית־אֵל while LXX οἶκος θεοῦ.

²¹⁴ Structurally, this may be illustrated in this way:

A—1:50 (greater things)	B—1:51 (Bethel / Son of Man)
A'—2:1–11 (the first sign)	B'—2:12–25 (Temple of God)
A"—3:1–12:50 (Jesus's public signs)	B"—13:1–20:29 (Jesus's hour of glory)

In the end of both the first part (1:19–12:50) and the second part (13:1–20:29) of the body of John’s narrative, Jesus’s sayings denote the expectation of believing in him when one has seen his work and heard his word (12:44–50; 20:24–29; cf. 1:51).²¹⁵ In both parts, people are described as wondering about Jesus’s identity though having seen/heard what he did/said (cf. 2:23–25). Until the end of the twelfth chapter, Jesus’s ministry is *in front of* the Jews *publicly* (“ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν” in 12:37; cf. “οὐκέτι παρησίᾳ” in 11:54).²¹⁶ While Jesus’s signs and speeches signify his origin and identity, the Jewish people do not seem to understand but wonder *who he is* (e.g., 6:42; 7:40–43; 10:24).²¹⁷ The people’s ignorance reveals either their failure to recognize who Jesus *really* is or their opinionated belief of whom Jesus would be. After chapter 13, not all of Jesus’s disciples comprehend his real identity and what he has foretold them (e.g., 13:7; 20:25) until his resurrection and their reception of the Spirit (cf. 14:25–26; 16:12–14; 20:9).²¹⁸ In addition, in the narrative of Jesus’s Passion (chs. 18–19), the Jewish people and chief priests do not appreciate the implication of Jesus’s identity from his previous teachings (18:19–21). Similarly, Pilate, the Roman prefect, does not justly handle Jesus’s witness about himself, his kingdom, or the truth.²¹⁹ Finally, the narrator’s comment referring to the paschal lamb in the end forms an *inclusio* with John the Baptist’s claim in the beginning (19:36; 1:29, 36). Therefore,

²¹⁵ Murray J. Harris, *John*, Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2015), 10–11, suggests that John 12:37–50 summarizes the first part.

²¹⁶ Evans, “Quotation Formulas,” 9; Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 215–17.

²¹⁷ Cf. Rudolf Schnackenburg, *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology*, trans. O. G. Dean (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 232.

²¹⁸ The narrator’s comment in 2:22 foretells that the disciples who believed Jesus finally understood Jesus after his resurrection.

²¹⁹ Commentators notice the inside/outside movement of Pilate in this scene: outside (18:29), inside (18:33), outside (18:38b), inside (19:1), outside (19:4), inside (19:9), and outside (19:13). E.g., Brodie, *John*, 532–39; Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, XIII–XXI*, AB 30 (New York: Doubleday, 1970), 857–59. Also, Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel*, 73–75, considers that this inside/outside movement is not about “a struggling Pilate” but “hearing the voice of the good shepherd.”

in the body of the narrative, the question of Jesus's identity, or "who is this Jesus?" is apparently the primary issue for other characters when Jesus the protagonist keeps disclosing his origin to them.²²⁰ This issue also involves the accurate understanding of that identity. That is to say, Jesus witnesses for himself in his works and words throughout the narrative.²²¹ Meanwhile, the description of Jesus's identity is according to the witness from God (i.e., the words of God). The answer to the question of Jesus's identity also anticipates an appropriate response—devotedly believing in him and an eventual result—possessing eternal life in him (12:44–50; 17:2–3).²²² This anticipation corresponds to the purpose of the witness language in the prologue (1:12–13) as well as the purpose statement of the Gospel in 20:30–31.

2.2.3 The Purpose Statement of the Gospel (20:30–31)

The Jesus-centered witness language shown in the prologue and the narrative body is more obviously marked in the purpose statement of the Gospel, 20:30–31. As is agreed among most Johannine scholars, these two verses serve as the conclusion and the explicit purpose statement of the Gospel.²²³ The language in these two verses is also parallel to the testimony of the *we-group*. First, the plural noun *the disciples* (τῶν μαθητῶν), before whom Jesus performed many other signs, in 20:30 implies that the narrator's witness is supported by the *we-group*, the very eyewitnesses, among whom the protagonist has lived (cf. 1:14–18). Second, the selective

²²⁰ E.g., 8:46; 10:25; 12:37; 14:9; 18:21. Also, the most striking phrases are Jesus's "I am" sayings (see n. 16) and what he ἔκραξεν (7:28, 37; 12:44).

²²¹ Also, Mary and the eleven disciples finally have witness language on their lips (Ἐώρακα 20:18; Ἐωράκαμεν 20:25).

²²² In almost all his discourses in the Gospel, Jesus unambiguously indicates that those who believe will possess eternal life: 1:4, 6–13; 3:14–16; 5:24, 40; 6:40; 8:12; 10:10, 26–28; 11:25–26; 12:44–50; 17:3. Cf. 4: 14; 6:47–58; 7:37–38; 8:24, 51–52; 10:15; 14:1–3, 6.

²²³ E.g., Brown, *John XIII–XXI*, 1051–61; Keener, *John*, 1215–16; James D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 3rd ed. (London: SCM, 2004), 27.

Jesus events written down hold a twofold end:²²⁴ (1) believing who Jesus is, and (2) having life through belief.²²⁵ Third, the content of such a belief statement is about Jesus's identity, which makes up the content of the testimony of the narrator and of John the Baptist as well.

Particularly, in the second conclusion 21:24–25, the selective things about Jesus written down in this book are forthrightly told as the true witness of the disciple. Therefore, 20:30–31, together with 21:24–25, forms an *inclusio* with the prologue in terms of the witness language,²²⁶ while the belief statement forms another *inclusio* with the Christological indications by John the Baptist and the disciples in 1:19–51.

Among scholars, the verse 20:31 has evoked some debates, especially on the nature of the audience due to the uncertainty of the tense form by the subjunctive verb πιστεύω²²⁷ and on the meaning of the belief statement that follows ὅτι due to the anarthrous Ἰησοῦς. Concerning the tense form of πιστεύω, the aorist form would suggest that the Gospel is written to convert nonbelievers (evangelistic purpose), while the present form would imply that John wants to refine the faith of believers (edification purpose).²²⁸ Externally, as D. A. Carson and some scholars note, the textual evidence (present subjunctive [πιστεύητε] or aorist subjunctive [πιστεύσητε]) is finely balanced.²²⁹ Internally, investigating the subjects in all eleven instances

²²⁴ “ταῦτα” in 20:31 refers to Jesus's events that the narrator has written down. One does not need to take “ταῦτα” merely as *signs*. Note “τούτων” and “ταῦτα” in 21:24.

²²⁵ This twofold end involves Christological and soteriological significance. Cf. Boer, “Original,” 466. He points out that John 1:1–5 serves “exclusively Christological (vv. 1–2) and soteriological (vv. 3–5) ends.”

²²⁶ Keener, *John*, 1221. Cf. Derek Tidball, “Completing the Circle: The Resurrection according to John,” *Evangelical Review of Theology* 30 (2006): 169–83; Köstenberger, *John*, 583–86.

²²⁷ Cf. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 219.

²²⁸ Cf. Won-Ha Hwang and Jan van der Watt, “The Identity of the Recipients of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of the Purpose of the Gospel,” *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 63 (2007): 963; Barus, “Structure,” 100.

²²⁹ πιστεύητε: $\text{P}^{66\text{vid}} \text{S}^* \text{B} \Theta 892^s. l 2211$; πιστεύσητε: $\text{S}^2 \text{A C D K L N W } \Gamma \Delta \Psi f^{1.13} 33. 565. 700. 1241. 1424. l 844 \text{ M}$. D. A. Carson, “The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 640. Also see his further discussion in D. A. Carson, “Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20:30–31: One More

where the subjunctive πιστεύω follows after ἵνα,²³⁰ Carson concludes, “[T]he evidence emphatically shows that it is not exegetically possible to tie one tense to unbelievers ... and the other to believers.... Both tenses can be applied by John to both unbelievers and believers.”²³¹ In other words, the textual-critical determination of the verb tense in this statement does not provide decisive evidence for the nature of the audience (or, for the purpose of the Gospel, whether it is evangelistic [to unbelievers] or edificatory [to believers]).²³²

Carson then turns his eye on the meaning of the belief statement that Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. In support of Lane C. McGaughy’s observation on the syntactical use of the verb εἶναι in the Greek NT,²³³ Carson argues that the understanding of Ἰησοῦς as the subject and ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ as the predicate for the clause is syntactically wrong. On the contrary, the phrase ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ should be understood as the subject because of the presence of its definite article and the anarthrous proper noun Ἰησοῦς.²³⁴ Hence, the statement reads, “The Christ, the Son of God, is Jesus.”²³⁵ According to Carson, this reading answers the question, “Who is the Christ/the Son of God?” rather than, “Who is Jesus?”²³⁶ It also

Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 703–8. However, Gordon D. Fee, “On the Text and Meaning of John 20:30–31,” in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*, ed. F. Van Segbroeck et al., 3 vols., BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 2194–98, suggests that the present subjunctive reading is more likely by both external evidences and transcriptional probability.

²³⁰ Carson has a response to Gordon Fee’s article on this use in John. Cf. Fee, “On the Text,” 2193–2205.

²³¹ Carson, “John 20:30–31,” 708. Also cf. Joseph R. Dongell, *John: A Bible Commentary in the Wesleyan Tradition* (Indianapolis: Wesleyan Publishing House, 1997), 243.

²³² Carson, “Purpose,” 640. Cf. Beutler, “Faith,” 29. However, Harris, *John*, 5, is likely right when he notes that the aorist tense form does not specify “the nature of the action involved, whether it be progressive, iterative, or punctiliar.”

²³³ Cf. Lane C. McGaughy, *Toward a Descriptive Analysis of εἶναι as a Linking Verb in New Testament Greek*, SBLDS 6 (Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972).

²³⁴ Carson, “Purpose,” 643.

²³⁵ Carson appeals to E. V. N. Goetchius, review of *Toward a Descriptive Analysis of εἶναι as a Linking Verb in New Testament Greek*, by Lane C. McGaughy, *JBL* 95 (1976): 147–49.

²³⁶ Carson, “Purpose,” 643–46. Cf. Goetchius, review of McGaughy, 148.

implies that the book is for readers of Jewish background who were already aware of the *concept* of the Messiah as an information which was already known and the *person* Jesus as a new piece of information.²³⁷

However, the question may not be either/or in this case. In John's account, the notions of Messiahship are at the same time ambiguous and diverse among the people, whether Jewish leaders or normal people.²³⁸ The concepts of Messiah, grasped by the Jews, did not help them at all to recognize Jesus's *true* identity and what actually he has to do. Most people either doubt or deny Jesus though they might appreciate his works (e.g., chs. 6–8). For them, the concepts of Messiah concepts seem even clearer than Jesus's widely seen works and broadly heard words as what they themselves have experienced (cf. 3:14–15; 12:32–34). In such a situation, Jesus does not fit himself into their Messianic categories (e.g., 2:23–24; 6:14–15). One does not need to define the question that the author tries to answer as *either* “Who is Jesus?” *or* “Who is the Messiah?” The Gospel likely focuses on the identity of Jesus and at the same moment redefines Messiahship as what has to be according to *Jesus* and the Scripture.²³⁹ Therefore, only to say “the Christ is Jesus” is not enough at all for the Gospel. Without correct illustration of Jesus as the Christ, one cannot define who Jesus is or what kind of Messiah Jesus is. The OT texts as the words of God, quoted and echoed in the Gospel, are likely to carry this mission to bridge the identity of Jesus and the definition/kind of the true Messiah.²⁴⁰ Only when Jesus is ontologically

²³⁷ Cf. Carson, “Purpose,” 644, 647.

²³⁸ E.g., the Jews' question to John the Baptist (1:19–27); the Samaritan woman's view (4:19–25); the crowd's wondering (7:25–31, 40–43).

²³⁹ The question of the kind of Messiah is the critical issue to the characters in the Gospel.

²⁴⁰ The final statement in 20:30–31 implies that the writing of the Gospel has the similar function of a witness as the Scriptures. See Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 48–50.

the Messiah, *the* unique Son of God, the identity of the Messiah can be pointed to Jesus. Jesus is *the* Messiah, *the* Son of God, which has to be the Scripture-described Messiah, Son of God.

Moreover, while Carson suggests syntactical rigidity on this belief statement in 20:31, McGaughy, from whom Carson adopts the idea, actually reckons this case as one of five exceptions in the NT due to its formulaic character.²⁴¹ John's narrative has at least nine significant confessions or recognitions about Jesus that are highly analogous to the formula of the belief statement in 20:31 (i.e., a copula verb followed by an articular word or word cluster).²⁴² Three of them are expressed in the second person pronoun σὺ εἶ ὁ... (you are the...; 1:49; 6:69; 11:27; cf. 18:33).²⁴³ The other six instances appear with a demonstrative pronoun as οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ... (this man is the...; 1:34; 4:42; 6:14; 7:26, 40, 41).²⁴⁴ The narrator presents Nathaniel and Martha's confessions in almost the same way as 20:31 (1:49; 11:27) by employing *you* (σὺ) to point to their recognition of Jesus's identity.²⁴⁵ In John the Baptist's witness (1:34) and the crowd's conjecture (7:26, 41), *this man* (οὗτός) is found on their lips for Jesus. The σὺ and the

²⁴¹ McGaughy, *Descriptive Analysis of ἜΙΝΑΙ*, 51–52, considers John 20:31 as one of five exceptions (1 John 2:22; 4:15; 5:1, 5). Carson, "John 20:30–31," 695, nevertheless, agrees with Goetchius's suggestion that one has no reason to take them as exceptions. However, Carson (711–12) fails to observe other instances in John where the anarthrous proper noun is better understood as the subject (John 11:2; 18:14). Also, the language in 1 John 2:22, for example, suggests that the denial statement is "Jesus is not the Messiah" rather than "the Messiah is not Jesus."

²⁴² Cf. James V. Brownson, "John 20:31 and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," *RefR* 48 (1995): 213–14.

²⁴³ "You" as the subject:

1:49 σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ

6:69 σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ

11:27 σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος

18:33 σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων

²⁴⁴ "This" as the subject: (Also cf. Matt 21:11; 27:37; Acts 9:20; 18:5, 28)

1:34 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

4:42 οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου

6:14 οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφῆτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον

7:26 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός

7:40 οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφῆτης

7:41 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός

²⁴⁵ Cf. Francis J. Moloney, "Can Everyone be Wrong? A Reading of John 11.1–12.8," *NTS* 49 (2003): 505–27 (esp. 513–15) proposes that Martha's confession shows her misunderstanding of Jesus's identity.

οὗτός in these instances and the anarthrous Ἰησοῦς in 20:31 denote that the articular cluster after the copula verb (to be) apparently is to identify Jesus (i.e., *you* or *this man*).²⁴⁶ In other words, these instances about who Jesus is, frequently read in the narrative, show that both the narrator and the characters are pointing their fingers to *Jesus*, indicating Jesus's identity, whether in confession, conjecture, or testimony. One has no need to pull the articular cluster in 20:31 off its predicate place. Therefore, the content of belief is more likely "Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God." The content of the narrative is not to introduce who the Messiah is; rather, the narrative is to present Jesus as the true Messiah.

However, the issue of John's readership is not the primary concern of this paper and is still debatable among scholars.²⁴⁷ What is certain about the purpose statement is that Jesus is the central figure of the Gospel.²⁴⁸ His Messiahship and Sonship are the object of belief.²⁴⁹ The question whether John's Gospel is evangelistic to unbelievers or deepening the faith of believers cannot be solved by only appealing to textual-critical debates or linguistic arguments on one verse. In John's Gospel, *belief* is not fixed in one category (e.g., 2:22–25), whether an initial belief or a refined belief. For some characters, Jesus anticipates their initial belief in him (e.g., the Samaritan woman in ch. 4; the blind man in ch. 9); for others, a further deeper belief/trust (e.g., the official in ch. 4; the crowd in ch. 6). Therefore, the concept of belief in John's narrative

²⁴⁶ McGaughy, *Descriptive Analysis of ἸΝΑΙ*, 51–52. Historically, as McGaughy estimates, the formulaic character of the statement is probably an early Christological confession.

²⁴⁷ Cf. Richard Bauckham, "The Audience of the Fourth Gospel," in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 106–11.

²⁴⁸ Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*, SNTSMS 73 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 17.

²⁴⁹ Cf. Barus, "Structure," 99, "it is clear that *faith and its object* are two themes that form the Gospel ... faith and Christology are essentially the focus of the narrator in composing the Gospel as a whole."

can be described as a growing and persistent belief/faith in Jesus.²⁵⁰ The function of the narrative is for both initiating and strengthening faith in Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God.²⁵¹ Again, in John's conclusion (20:30–31), the ultimate purpose of the belief is the same as given in 1:12–13 in the prologue. The witness language eagerly leads a reader to see Jesus through the lens from John 1 (Jesus's origin), throughout the whole book, to John 20 (Jesus's death and resurrection). By such a belief that corresponds to the content of the narrator's witness, one will possess eternal life, that is, the God-given life.

2.2.4 The Epilogue (21:1–25)

Many scholars regard John 21 as *add-on* material to the original gospel narrative, either by one hand or another, and some even question the unity of the chapter itself.²⁵² However, at least three points support the literary unity of the entire book, including ch. 21.²⁵³ First, textual evidence shows no interruption or split between John 21 and what precedes it.²⁵⁴ Second, terminological links between ch. 21 and the previous chapters are obviously positive.²⁵⁵ Third,

²⁵⁰ Brownson, "John 20:31," 215, "[Faith] is an experience into which one grows, and never stops growing." Dongell, *John*, 243, "John's gospel narrative paints portraits of persons whose faith is 'on the move.'"

²⁵¹ Barus, "Structure," 101.

²⁵² See e.g., Bultmann, *John*, 700–706; Brown, *John XIII–XXI*, 1077–82; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 395–96; Burge, *John*, 579–81; Udo Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 12–15; Frederick Dale Bruner, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 1202. Cf. Morris, *John*, 757–58; Gerald L. Borchert, *John 12–21*, NAC 25B (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2002), 320–22.

²⁵³ Cf. John Breck, "John 21: Appendix, Epilogue or Conclusion?" *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 36 (1992): 27–49; Houwelingen, "John and the Others," 104–6. The literary unity of the Gospel may indicate at least the Gospel narrative as a whole text with coherent themes and ideas throughout the book.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 546; Keener, *John*, 1220; Cotiso Mărgulescu, "Die Stellung von Joh 21 innerhalb des Johannesevangeliums," *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai, Theologia Catholica Latina* 58 (2013): 106.

²⁵⁵ Cf. Brown, *John XIII–XXI*, 1080, lists the noticeable Johannine features and those features that do not match Johannine style. The former ones seem to trump the latter. See also Köstenberger, *John*, 585 (n. 9); Breck, "John 21," 28–36; Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference*, 263.

the ideas and theme found in ch. 21 suggests its coherence with the whole narrative.²⁵⁶ Moreover, the epilogue (ch. 21) balances the prologue (1:1–18). The prologue (1:1–18) tells the things that set the background knowledge for the following events of the Son of God, while the epilogue (ch. 21) provides a sequential scene about the successors of the Son of God in his returning to the Father.²⁵⁷ At the same moment, 21:24–25 finds a striking linkage with the prologue, as well as with 20:30–31, by the *witness* language.²⁵⁸ The author as the center of the witness-group (disciples as *we-group*) is marked. The things written down selectively by the disciple are clearly his testimony about Jesus in the whole narrative.²⁵⁹ The witness language also eagerly leads a reader to see Jesus through the lens of the narrator.

In terms of narrative progress, the sequential prepositional phrase μετὰ ταῦτα, the adverb πάλιν in 21:1, and the timing reference phrase τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον in 21:14 perfectly connect the chapter to the previous narrative (cf. 20:19–28).²⁶⁰ Moreover, like some ancient writings, the purpose conclusion in 20:30–31 does not necessarily preclude a further ending narrative.²⁶¹ One has no obligation to take ταῦτα in 20:31 in exclusion of John 21 that follows or

²⁵⁶ Köstenberger, *John*, 586, “both the prologue and the epilogue can be shown to be integrally connected to the body of the Gospel by way of anticipation and resolution.” Also see Segovia, “The Final Farewell,” 167–90; M. Franzmann and M. Klinger, “The Call Stories of John 1 and John 21,” *St Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 36 (1992): 7–15.

²⁵⁷ See Brown, *John XIII–XXI*, 1079, mentions only literary balance in terms of form.

²⁵⁸ Houwelingen, “John and the Others,” 104–13, argues John 21 belongs to the whole of the Gospel by examining the *we* form in John.

²⁵⁹ Note the similar phrases “Πολλὰ ... καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς” in 20:30 and “καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς” in 21:25. Cf. Colin Roberts, “John 20:30–31 and 21:24–25,” *JTS* 38 (1987): 409. He considers “these things” as referring to ch. 21.

²⁶⁰ The phrase “μετὰ ταῦτα” in fact appears as a marker of narrative sequence in John 2:12; 3:22; 5:1, 14; 6:1; 7:1; 11:7; 19:28. Also, the accusative terms “τοῦτο ἤδη τρίτον [lit., this time as already the third time]” in 21:14 come under the accusative use of extent of period (cf. 4:54), providing a specific number of Jesus’s appearances to the disciples.

²⁶¹ For a biographical farewell narrative, see Segovia, “The Final Farewell,” 173–76; for abrupt endings in ancient books, see Keener, *John*, 1219–21 (nn. 3, 22). Bauckham, *Testimony*, 277, considers that John’s Gospel has a two-stage ending.

to restrict τοῦτων and ταῦτα in 21:24 only within the chapter.²⁶² Again, the we-group confirms that the things written down in the book are the true testimony of the Beloved Disciple.²⁶³ This language strikingly reinforces the witnessing language in the conclusion 20:30–31.²⁶⁴ Thus, the twenty-first chapter is belonging to the unity of the entire Gospel.

The narrative in John 21 witnesses the third revelation of Jesus to his disciples after his being raised from the dead (vv. 1, 14). Unlike former chapters, the narrator does not explicitly spell out Jesus's identity and the belief concerning him in the last chapter. Instead, through the fishing and breakfast events and Jesus's subsequent dialogue with Peter, the narrator still recalls some significances about Jesus that are narrated in the previous accounts. Although Peter and the Beloved Disciple seem to be the key figures in this chapter,²⁶⁵ Jesus's identity as the Lord of life and of all is likely the center of the narrative (cf. 1:1–5) and the ultimate reason for the disciples succeeding Jesus (21:19–20).²⁶⁶ First, the story is about Jesus, the one who again comes to reveal himself to the disciples (21:1, 14).²⁶⁷ He is the risen living Lord (14:18–19; 16:16–22). Second, Jesus gives a miraculous direction of fishing, providing for the disciples' need, and invites them, "Come! Eat!" (21:3–13). This scene recalls that Jesus is the bread of life (6:48). Third, in his dialogue with Peter (21:15–17), Jesus reveals that he is the Lord of the sheep. This dialogue

²⁶² The perfect indicative verb "γέγραπται," though indicating a completed action according to some traditional grammars, may not need to be limited to the past reference. In several places in John, the perfect tense form is referring to an incomplete action, e.g., Jesus's "λελάληκα" 14:25; 15:11; 16:1, 25, 33. Cf. Paul S. Minear, "The Original Functions of John 21," *JBL* 102 (1983): 87–90. Minear argues that "these things" refer to Jesus's resurrection events in ch. 20 alone and that ch. 20 serves only as the conclusion of the chapter itself.

²⁶³ Cf. Houwelingen, "John and the Others," 113–14.

²⁶⁴ Köstenberger, "John," 605.

²⁶⁵ Several scholars consider that the twenty-first chapter focuses on mission and ecclesiology. E.g., Ben Witherington III, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 1995), 354; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 396; Burge, *John*, 599–600; Zumstein, "Intratextuality and Intertextuality," 124–25.

²⁶⁶ See Bruner, *John*, 1200.

²⁶⁷ In these three times, "happening to stand" is the way Jesus revealed himself to the disciples ("ἔστη" in 20:19, 26; 21:4).

echoes the imagery that Jesus is the life-giving Shepherd (10:10, 28). Fourth, Jesus's words concerning Peter and the Beloved Disciple (21:18–22) show that he himself is the Lord of their lives (cf. 15:15; 17:14–19). Fifth, the previous chapter ends with Thomas's confession, "My Lord, my God," and Jesus's identity as the Messiah, the Son of God, which echoes the unique Son revealing God himself (1:18). John 21 also ends with Jesus as the coming Lord who is supreme to the whole world,²⁶⁸ which implies the divine Word from the very beginning (1:1–3). From this perspective, the narrator in this chapter illustrates a vivid relationship between the risen Lord and his believing disciples (cf. 14:18–21), which also provides a narrative solution to the previous undetermined status of the disciples.

The narrator's description that the disciples at this moment know Jesus as the Lord (21:7, 12; cf. 20:14; 21:4) is telling the reader of the final status of the disciples' faith. When Jesus calls the disciples to come and eat (21:12), the disciples have no more question about his identity as before (e.g., 13:36–14:24).²⁶⁹ The text explicitly indicates that they do not inquire of Jesus "Who are you?" as the Jews do with doubt (16:23; cf. 8:25; 1:19). The reason is that they now know that he is the Lord though they did not at dawn (21:4).²⁷⁰ Thus, John's narrative reaches its end where the disciples know their Lord (cf. 1:26). They are sent to the world by him in order to glorify God in the same way he was sent by the Father (17:18; 20:21; 21:19). The disciples will continue the witnessing mission to fulfill the same purpose that the Gospel has (15:17; 17:20).

²⁶⁸ Narrator's hyperbolic statement that the world could not contain the written books that include all Jesus's works implies Jesus's exceeding transcendency over the world. Cf. Köstenberger, *John*, 606.

²⁶⁹ The verb "ἐτόλμα" in 21:12 is not a negative use but a positive expression (cf. Acts 7:32) with a exclusive pronoun οὐδεὶς preceding. See J. A. Motyer, "τολμάω," *NIDNTT* 1:364–65.

²⁷⁰ The participle εἰδότες in 21:4 indicates the reason why no one dares inquire of Jesus.

In summary, the twenty-first chapter has the same witness language, corresponding to that in the prologue and the body of the book, and the short ending narrative as testimony about Jesus's third appearance to the disciples with equivalent topics occurring in the previous account. *Believing* is not mentioned in this chapter since the scene presents that the disciples finally know the living Lord who reveals himself as the one having eternal life and giving eternal life to the believers.

2.3 Summary

This chapter briefly examined two literary features of John's Gospel in order to learn the primary concern of the gospel narrative. One can conclude that the center of John's Gospel is Jesus; the purpose of John's Gospel is to testify for Jesus's Christological identity in hopes that the readers may have right belief in him and have eternal life through him.²⁷¹ Petr Pokorný indicates, "[T]he Gospels belonged to Greek literature from the very beginning, ... their Hebrew heritage acted as a specific element within the framework of the (Greek) genres of that time."²⁷² The literary genre of the Gospel as a Greco-Roman biography implies that the whole biographical narrative is about the person of Jesus. Meanwhile, the theological concern and Jewish salvation-historical interest come through as Jesus's βίος unfolds. The features of ancient historiographies in the Gospel also make Jesus's events more vivid and reliable. By that feature, John's selectivity of OT elements, which consist of Israel's salvation-historical promises of God, accounts for the historical fulfillment through Jesus's events.

²⁷¹ Also, T. W. Simpson, "Testimony in John's Gospel: The Puzzle of 5:31 and 8:14," *TynBul* 65 (2014): 103–8, indicates the centrality and varieties of testimony in John.

²⁷² Pokorný, *From the Gospel*, 108–9.

The examination of the Gospel's literary structure shows that the witness language for Jesus is strikingly used throughout the whole narrative. Such witness language tunes the pitch of the Gospel as a witnessing narrative for its protagonist, Jesus. The purpose of the Gospel is shown throughout the narrative, particularly in the prologue and the conclusion. The purpose is that the readers of the book may believe (come to believe or deepen their belief) in Jesus and by such a belief may possess the life granted by God. In the prologue and the beginning of the narrative, the narrator appeals to John the Baptist, who is the witness from God, in order to reveal Jesus as the coming One, the Son of God, and the Lamb. The narrator then witnesses to Jesus in the whole narrative by presenting Jesus's deeds and speeches, by which Jesus himself intends to reveal his own identity in the narrative world. Therefore, the content of the entire book is about Jesus, or more specifically, about Jesus's true identity as the life-giving Messiah, the Son of God (1:14; 12:50; 20:31), who is ontologically beyond historical time (1:1–2) and space (21:25), above all creature and human beings (1:3; 12:47–48), and fleshly within earthly time and space for a period among the Jews. Such messiahship is *not* defined by the concepts of the early Jews or incorrect understandings of the Jewish people, but by the Father who sends his Son and witnesses about him through the word read in Israel's Scripture.

This focus of the narrative on witnessing to Jesus then ensures that the OT quotations employed by the narrator in the Gospel are also assisting in bearing witness to Jesus. Particularly, Jesus himself in the narrative declares that the Scripture is his witness (5:39), and he does not need witness from any (5:34; cf. 2:24). Therefore, the Scripture in Jesus's view is the place where one can find the most reliable testimony about himself in John's narrative.

3 THE SCRIPTURE IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

The literary genre and structure of the Gospel suggest that Jesus is the primary subject of John's narrative, which is written in order to bear testimony for Jesus's identity as the Messiah and the Son of God for the purpose that all may believe in him and have God-given life through him. As mentioned previously, in John's narrative Jesus himself appeals to the Scriptures as one of his most valid witnesses (5:39), not only for his identity but also for the precise identity description. Relatively, the most prominent scriptural texts are those OT quotations in John.²⁷³ Thus, John's OT quotations are marked places where one can learn the scriptural witness to Jesus as the Christ in the narrative. Before looking at the OT quotations, I first examine the role of the Scripture (ἡ γραφή) in John's narrative world.²⁷⁴ The examination includes not only the noun γραφή and its verb γράφω but also the terms or phrases appearing to refer to the scriptural writings or shown to be parallel to the Scripture in John's narrative. They include ὁ νόμος, οἱ προφῆται, γράμματα, as well as the frequently employed names Moses and Isaiah as scriptural writers. Since "the word of Jesus" is described by the narrator as *being fulfilled*, I will also pay attention to it.

²⁷³ Cf. Christopher D. Stanley, "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigation and Proposals*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 148 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 56, the quotations are highlighted by the author.

²⁷⁴ Some have contributed to the subject according to various focuses. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 37–63, primarily surveys the theological meaning of the terms 'Schrift'/'Schriften' and νόμος in the Gospel. He considers that when interpreting the Scripture, the Evangelist has in view both the words of a scriptural text and the Scripture as a whole. The verb γράφω is related to the Christ-witnessed writings, including Pilate's inscription for Jesus as God's will and the Gospel itself. The use of "νόμος" reflects the Jewish understanding of the Law, of which Moses is the mediator and the writer, and the theological perspective of the Evangelist. Beutler, "Use," 147–62, investigates the Scripture and the references to "Scripture" of Jesus and the Evangelist in John. He argues that John is more interested in the fulfillment of Scripture as such than in the fulfillment of individual OT texts. Lieu, "Narrative Analysis," 144–63, by narrative analysis, seeks the explicit use of Scripture found on the lips of the various characters in John. She observes that the relationship between Jesus and the written words in the Law and the Prophets has prepared by the narrator as the ground for the following use of Scripture. Moloney, "Scripture," 454–68, (and "End," 356–66) suggests that the scriptural citations serve to support the narrator's claim of Jesus's identity before ch. 12, and in the rest of the chapters show the Scriptures, as well as ὁ λόγος, are fulfilled/perfected in Jesus's death. For John's author, the word of Jesus is Scripture (2:22) and the narrative sees itself Scripture (20:9).

3.1 Γραφή

The noun γραφή occurs twelve times in John's Gospel. Nine times it is related either to a quotation (10:35; 13:18; 19:24, 28, 36, 37) or a semi-quotation (7:38, 42; 17:12).²⁷⁵ The other three occurrences (2:22; 5:39; 20:9) appear as an object of believing (ἐπίσταντες), understanding (ἤδυναντο), or searching (ἐραυνᾶτε) without any explicit scriptural reference but all with relation to Jesus. Of these twelve times, five times are on Jesus's lips (5:39; 7:38; 10:35; 13:18; 17:12), six as narratorial comments (2:22; 19:24, 28, 36, 37; 20:9),²⁷⁶ and one in crowd's puzzling about Messiah's origin (7:42). In all cases, the employment of ἡ γραφή in the Gospel of John implies that Scripture, either an explicit text read within it or a scriptural concept derived from it, finds itself tightly connected to Jesus. In addition, its highly frequent use by the protagonist and the narrator denotes the significance of the Scripture in the narrative for the witnessing purpose of John's Gospel.

3.1.1 Individual Scriptural Texts and Scriptural Concepts

In preliminary analysis, three different references for the use of γραφή can be identified in John's Gospel.²⁷⁷ First, the singular ἡ γραφή can refer to a scriptural text (13:18; 19:24, 28, 36, 37). In this category, all scriptural texts are described as *fulfilled*, either by Jesus or by the narrator. Second, the singular form can also mean the Scripture as a whole (10:35), and from it some important knowledge/belief is derived (2:22; 7:38, 42; 17:12; 20:9). Jesus's statement in 10:35, “καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή,” alludes to the fact that the Scripture, *the Writing*,²⁷⁸

²⁷⁵ The noun appears twenty-three times in all four Gospels and occurs twelve times in John (see Chart 2), which is more than 50% among the Gospels.

²⁷⁶ Those cases as narratorial comments are all associated with Jesus's death/resurrection.

²⁷⁷ Cf. Gottlob Schrenk, “γράω, γραφή, γράμμα,” *TDNT* 1:749–55.

²⁷⁸ Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 501.

has unchangeable and unbreakable content. When Jesus described the scriptural text as written in “your Law” in 10:34 (though quoted from Psalms), it means that the written text of the Law is *in* the Writing or *part* of the Writing. Ἡ γραφή in the narrator’s comments in 2:22 and 20:9 connotes Scripture, from which the specific awareness/belief concerning Jesus’s death/resurrection can be derived.²⁷⁹ Jesus in 7:38 talks about the promise of living water flowing from him,²⁸⁰ which originated from Scripture.²⁸¹ In 7:42, the knowledge among the crowd about Messiah’s origin as David’s offspring and Bethlehem is also attributed to the Scripture.²⁸² In his prayer to the Father in 17:12, Jesus’s affirmation about his protecting the disciples also refers to a scriptural fulfillment. Jesus’s words, as in 7:38, imply that a promise found in the Scripture is *now* fulfilled.²⁸³ However, according to the phrase “the word that he said” (ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν) in 18:8–9 (cf. 6:37–39), *the Scripture* here is parallel to Jesus’s word.²⁸⁴ In this category, the narrator’s retrospective comments in 2:22 and 20:9 suggest that the concept of the Messiah’s death/resurrection in the Scripture does not seem to be grasped by the disciples (and other characters) until the end of the narrative. While the Jewish people appear to be aware of the

²⁷⁹ The first occurrence of “ἡ γραφή” in John is in 2:22 and the last in 20:9. See more discussion in p. 82.

²⁸⁰ This verse involves two grammatical issues: the position of the first substantival participle phrase and the reference of the pronoun “αὐτοῦ.” Cf. recent discussions: Maarten J. J. Menken, “The Origin of the Old Testament Quotation in John 7:38,” *NovT* 38 (1996): 163–67; C. Scott Shidemantle, “The Use of the Old Testament in John 7:37–39: An Examination of the Freed-Carson Proposal” (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2001), 1–54; Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 400–404. Here, I am not to spend length on these issues but accept the view that the source of the living water is Jesus (i.e., αὐτοῦ = of Jesus). Also see discussion in Hays, *Echoes*, §18, “Jesus as the Temple.”

²⁸¹ Menken, “Origin,” 167–75, suggests Ps 77:16, 20; 114:8 and Zech 14:8 as the source of this quotation. Shidemantle, “John 7:37–39,” 295–98, concludes the possibility of Neh 9. Joel Marcus, “Rivers of Living Water from Jesus’ Belly (John 7:38),” *JBL* 117 (1998): 328–30, proposes that Isa 12:3 is the major contribution of this verse.

²⁸² This knowledge of the crowd is likely derived from 1 Sam 16:1; 2 Sam 7:12; Ps 89:3–4; Mic 5:2. Cf. Matt 2:4–6.

²⁸³ Cf. Lieu, “Narrative Analysis,” 157.

²⁸⁴ Moloney, “Scripture,” 460–61.

sayings about living water and the Messiah's origin within the Scripture (7:38, 42), the meaning seems to be blurry to them.

3.1.2 The Plurality of the Scripture

The third reference of ἡ γραφή is shown in plural form. Jesus's mention of *the Scriptures* in 5:39 is the only occurrence of the plural form in the Gospel. As mentioned, Jesus appeals to the Scriptures as his valid witness when he defends his testimony (5:31). At this moment, Jesus's word, "You search the Scriptures" (ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς) implies the ultimate importance of the Scriptures in the narrative world among the Jews who consider that eternal life would be found in those Scriptures.²⁸⁵ In the context, the Scriptures are not only shown to be the object of Jewish study for their life benefit but more significantly also the subjects that bear witness to Jesus. In the verse, the plural αἱ γραφαί, along with the plural demonstrative ἐκεῖναί and participle μαρτυροῦσαι, emphasizes the *plurality* of the Jewish sacred writings.²⁸⁶ As Jesus insists, they all are bearing witness to Jesus. Such a collection of scriptural writings is commonly known as the Scripture both to Jesus and the Jews in John's narrative world (e.g., 10:34–35). Thus, the nature of the plural form here is identical to the singular ἡ γραφή, which means the entire Scripture.

The *plurality* of the Scripture, in fact, can also be observed in two other places in John. The first is in Jesus's dialogue with Nicodemus. Jesus says to Nicodemus in 3:12, "εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς ἂν εἴπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύσετε;" (If I have told you about earthly things and you do not believe, how can you believe if I tell you about

²⁸⁵ The verbal form is identical to imperative mood. But, it is unlikely that Jesus is urging them to study the Scripture. The present tense-form ἐραυνᾶτε indicates the Jews' constant working on these writings in order to gain their life benefit. Also, Beutler, "Use," 152–53, "The 'searching' again refers to scripture."

²⁸⁶ Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 39;

heavenly things?). Most translations for this verse, such as NRSV, treat the verb εἶπον in first person singular: “I [i.e., Jesus] have told.” Such a reading leaves a serious interpretive problem whether Jesus’s teachings can be found two natures—an earthly part and a heavenly part. However, Joseph R. Dongell convincingly proposes that the verb should be understood as being in the third person plural: “they have told.”²⁸⁷ This reading suggests that the earthly things, contrastive to the heavenly things that Jesus proclaims, have been delivered to Nicodemus and his Jewish fellows through the words of prior servants of God.²⁸⁸ According to this understanding, God’s prophetic servants were from the *earth* proclaiming *earthly* things, while Jesus is the only one from *above* preaching *heavenly* things (3:31). Both parties, of which the *we* in 3:11 consists, bear witnesses to Israel for what they have perceived and seen from God (cf. 3:32; 12:41).²⁸⁹ Jesus, though, “in solidarity with the Israel’s prophetic heritage,”²⁹⁰ is the unique Son of God (1:18, 34), superior to God’s spokespersons coming before him (cf. 1:15, 30; 8:51–58). Without believing/receiving what the former spokespersons have said, Nicodemus and his Jewish fellows will certainly fail to believe/receive what the latter—Jesus—has declared. Thus, the *they* encoded in the verb εἶπον in 3:12 is construed as the writers of the Jewish sacred writings or, more practically, the multiple writings in the Scripture. In both 5:39 and 3:10–12, the scriptural writings function as witnesses, testifying for God’s truth and for Jesus’s identity.²⁹¹

²⁸⁷ Joseph R. Dongell, “Reconsidering the Puzzle of ‘Earthly Things’ in John 3:12,” in *Kingdom Rhetoric: New Testament Explorations in Honor of Ben Witherington III*, ed. T. Michael W. Halcomb (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2013), 89–112. His reading is supported by the larger theology/Christology in John’s Gospel and grammatical and stylistic analysis on the verse. This proposal benefits the meaning of the conversation in 3:10–12. It also reduces readers’ task of distinguishing earthly and heavenly elements in Jesus’s teaching.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 101.

²⁸⁹ This *we-group* is not the narratorial witnessing group in the prologue and the epilogue. Jesus’s “we-group,” also as a witnessing group, includes scriptural writers as God’s servants in Israel’s history and himself.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 110.

²⁹¹ Cf. Morgan, “Fulfillment,” 160.

The second place that shows the plurality of the Scripture is in 5:47, where some parallel to 3:12 can be observed:

“εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν [his writings] οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς ῥήμασιν [my words] πιστεύετε;” (5:47)

“εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον [they have told] ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς ἐὰν εἴπω [I have told] ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύετε;” (3:12).

In both occasions, Jesus rebukes the Jews’ unbelief of what they have heard or read from the sacred writings and of what he says, in turn, as the result. In 5:47, only Moses is marked. Moses, as the Lawgiver (1:17; 7:19), is commonly seen as the greatest carrier of God’s word (cf. 9:29) upon whom, Jesus indicates, the Jews’ hope has been placed (5:45).²⁹² From the immediate and larger context, as just mentioned, in John, Moses represents the multiple prophetic writers/ writings that are preceded by him,²⁹³ together as the “they” in 3:12.

Jesus in this verse uses γράμμασιν for what Moses has written down (5:47).²⁹⁴ The lexical meaning of this plural term may refer to written letters, an epistle or a book, or written works.²⁹⁵ Here, its use likely emphasizes the multiple of Moses’s writings or the letters in Moses’s works rather than the singularity of the law. In addition, the plurality in John is associated with the understanding of the Scripture according to the use in 7:15 where the term γράμματα is employed for the Jews’ puzzle about Jesus’s teaching in the temple (7:14–15):

²⁹² The Jews’ hope on Moses is likely that being Moses’s believers, they will have eternal life granted before God. Moses is their advocate before God. Cf. Keener, *John*, 661–62.

²⁹³ Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 233.

²⁹⁴ Stanley Harstine, *Moses As a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques*, JSNTSup 229 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002), 59, considers both 5:39 and 5:46–47 speak of Moses’s writings. However, I judge that the argument movement here is from general (the Scriptures) to particular (Moses’s works). Moses represents the whole prophetic lineage.

²⁹⁵ “γράμμα,” BDAG, 205–6. Also cf. Keener, *John*, 712, n. 87.

“πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδεν μὴ μεμαθηκώς.” The Jews’ interrogation unlikely refers to Jesus’s literacy only.²⁹⁶ Instead, what keeps astonishing them is Jesus’s knowledge about their scriptural writings in his public teaching without having had a previous rabbinical education as they had.²⁹⁷ Jesus’s immediate reply to their astonishment in 7:16–19 implies that the Jewish authorities’ understanding of their sacred writings is incongruent with Jesus’s. The term γράμματα then is contextually related to “Israel’s heilige Schriften.”²⁹⁸ Therefore, contrary to the singular form signifying the wholeness of the Scripture, the plural use in John emphasizes the plurality of the writings/writers that, particularly, are valid witnesses to Jesus in John 5.

3.1.3 Summary

In sum, the investigation of *the Scripture* in John’s narrative shows not only the Scripture as a whole but also the multiplicity of the scriptural writings. It is also used to indicate a scriptural text or a scriptural messianic/eschatological knowledge derived from it because ἡ γραφή undertakes speaking and witnessing as the prophets who wrote it on behalf of God and then becomes the object of believing, understanding, and (re)searching. Some occurrences denote their fulfillment in Jesus’s events; some wait to be known until Jesus’s resurrection. The plurality of the Scripture then appears as the witnesses of Jesus. Strikingly, in John’s narrative, all of the cases are related to Jesus. For the narrator, the Scripture is the source that explains Jesus’s events and his identity.²⁹⁹ Jesus as the protagonist also appeals to the Scriptures as his witnesses for his identity and his work/word. However, the Jewish leaders possess a different

²⁹⁶ Carson, *John*, 311.

²⁹⁷ The verb μεμαθηκώς may imply Jewish official education system. Keener, *John*, 712.

²⁹⁸ Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 392.

²⁹⁹ In the Synoptic Gospels, ἡ γραφή appears once in the context of Jesus’s debating resurrection doctrine with the Sadducees (Mark 12:24 // Matt 22:29).

perspective on what they read from the Scripture while laypeople may still puzzle with the meaning of the writings. Therefore, the narrative presents ἡ γραφή in one sense as the Jewish holy writings, which have described *the* Messiah in advance and now is fulfilled in Jesus's events. For the narrator, the Scripture and Jesus share the identical point of view, which is what the narrator intends to show.

3.2 Γράφω

In John's narrative, the verb γράφω occurs twenty-one times.³⁰⁰ Eight times it is related either to a quotation (2:17; 6:31, 45; 10:34; 12:14,16; 15:25) or a semi-quotation (8:17). Of these eight instances, one is in connection with the Prophets (ἐν τοῖς προφήταις; 6:45), and three with the Law (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; 8:17; 10:34; 15:25). In the other thirteen occurrences unconnected to quotations, two refer to Moses and the prophets' writings about Jesus (1:45; 5:46), five of them are about the literary work of the Gospel author of Jesus's account (20:30–31; 21:24–25), and the other six times are Pilate's inscription for Jesus's charge (19:19–22). In John, the use of the verb, like its noun γραφή, is attributed to various characters. Except those cases in the last three chapters related to the writing work of the Gospel author and Pilate's inscription, all denote the scriptural writings. First, I survey the instances associated with the Scripture.

3.2.1 Moses and the Prophets Wrote about Jesus

In 5:45–47, as discussed in the last section, Jesus indicates that Moses will accuse the Jews of unbelief. The reason is that the believing Moses and his writings will bring the belief in Jesus. The fact that they do not believe in Jesus reflects their unbelief of what Moses wrote (cf.

³⁰⁰ See Chart 2. Also cf. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 46.

5:38).³⁰¹ The basic reason for this argument is that Moses wrote about Jesus (5:46).³⁰² The Greek text (περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν) has *about me* (i.e., Jesus) fronted as an emphasis on the regard of Moses's writing. According to Jesus, while *the Scriptures* bear witness to Jesus in a broader view (5:39), *Moses*, representing the writers of the Scriptures, indeed wrote about Jesus in a particular sense (5:46).³⁰³ In the context, Jesus is the life giver (5:21, 24–29, 39–40), and the Son of God who is practicing exactly God's will (5:16–23). Moreover, not only Moses wrote about Jesus in John's narrative. In 1:45, Philip indicates that Jesus is *the one* whom "Moses in the Law and the prophets wrote [ἔγραψεν]." It is certainly understood in the context of 1:19–51 that by *the one* (ὅν) Philip means the Messiah, the Son of God, and the King of Israel, about which Moses and the prophets wrote in their writings, of which the Scripture consists.³⁰⁴ Von Martin Vahrenhorst emphatically states that for John in these two places (1:45; 5:46) not only do Jesus's person and work stand with the Law but Jesus also belongs to the content of the Law.³⁰⁵

3.2.2 Written in the Writings of Moses and the Prophets

The other eight instances of the verb associated with the Scripture are all in the forms of the *perfect passive* (2:17; 6:31, 45; 8:17; 10:34; 12:14,16; 15:25).³⁰⁶ Each of them is related to a quotation or a semi-quotation. The use of the verb highlights the immediate quoted text as

³⁰¹ Their unbelief of Moses also can be seen from Jesus's accusation about their inner motive in 5:42–44. They do not have God's love in them and they do not seek the glory from God.

³⁰² Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture*, 2, "Jesus himself is presented as the subject of the Torah, about whom 'Moses wrote.'"

³⁰³ The mention of Moses alone here is because in the earlier context they judge that Jesus broke the Law (5:1–18). Also, from the perspective of the Jews, they are Moses's disciples, having nothing to do with Jesus (9:28–29).

³⁰⁴ Lee Martin McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 194, "For most Jews in the first century, the two-part canon of Law and Prophets included all of their Scripture."

³⁰⁵ Von Martin Vahrenhorst, "Johannes und die Tora: Überlegungen zur Bedeutung der Tora im Johannesevangelium," *KD* 54 (2008): 26.

³⁰⁶ They are γεγραμμένον, γεγραμμένα, and γέγραπται.

written in the Scripture, which the Jewish people consider as given by God (1:17; 9:29). Such use of a quotation introductory formula tends to draw attention to the authority of the immediate scriptural texts by virtue of their nature as the *written* word of God in their writings.

In the narrative, when Moses and the prophets are confirmed to be the witnesses who fore-wrote about Jesus (1:45), Jesus also particularly refers to their writings, the Law and the Prophets, but Jesus does *not* seem to be always in a strict way of using the titles of the writings. The quotation in 6:45, found in Isa 54:13, is said by Jesus to be written in the Prophets (ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις). In 8:17, Jesus mentions a Jewish standard legal procedure about the quantity of witnesses. Jesus affirms that the procedure is written in the Law (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ... γέγραπται). Here, *the Law* refers to the Pentateuch as Jesus addresses the legal procedure from Deuteronomy (Deut 17:6; 19:15; cf. Num 35:30). However, in the other two cases in 10:34 and 15:25, Jesus uses the term *the Law* in a looser sense. In the context of Jewish accusation against Jesus's blasphemy (10:30–36), Jesus quotes from the Psalms (Ps 82:6) but identifying it as “written in your Law [γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν].” In 15:25, when Jesus remarks the hatred from the world, he again cites the text from the Psalms (Ps 69:4 or Ps 35:19) by noting “written in their Law [ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος].” Jesus also believes that this text is *fulfilled* in their hatred toward him. In these two cases, apparently Jesus employs *the Law* in the sense of *the Scripture*. By adding genitive personal pronouns (*your* in 10:34 and *their* in 15:25) after the Law, John's Jesus likely speaks the quoted texts in the perspective of the Jews

who reckon the Scripture is *their* Law,³⁰⁷ which they see as authoritative for them.³⁰⁸ This use can also explain Jesus's mention of *Moses's writings* in 5:45–47.

Therefore, “the written in the Law/Prophets” means the word written in the Scripture in John's narrative world, in a more or less specific sense. Just as *Moses* represents the whole prophetic lineage, *the Law* can represent the Jewish sacred Scripture that all the Jewish people need to observe and obey. In John's narrative, since Moses and the Prophets wrote about Jesus, what have been written in their writings now become witness to Jesus. Again, the occurrence of the verb associated with scriptural quotations also appears in the context where Jesus's events are shown.

3.2.3 What Pilate Wrote

Concerning Pilate's written charge in John 19:19–22, Obermann suggests that the perfect tense form γεγραμμένον in 19:19 reminds the reader of the scriptural quotations previously introduced and signals the significance of the title “The King of the Jews” (19:19, 21) as scriptural texts.³⁰⁹ However, the Greek pluperfect periphrastic structure ἦν γεγραμμένον in 19:19–20 may contradict this suggestion. In the former quotation formulae (2:17; 6:31; 6:45; 10:34; 12:14; 15:25), the use of the verb form is in the *perfect* periphrastic expression (i.e., ἔστιν γεγραμμένον) rather than in the *pluperfect* as present in 19:19–20.³¹⁰ The perfect periphrastic structure conveys the sense that the quotation that follows *was* written down in the past and *is* still seen and read in the Scripture in the present. In addition, this perspective can be observed in

³⁰⁷ Cf. Morris, *John*, 442 (and n. 22), by adding the possessive adjective (τῷ ὑμετέρῳ, “your [Law]”), Jesus sets himself from the Jewish opponents (also 10:34; 15:25). Also Köstenberger, *John*, 256.

³⁰⁸ Cf. Keener, *John*, 741.

³⁰⁹ Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 48, 50.

³¹⁰ The terms for periphrastic expression follows Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 647–48.

the way the quotation formula is adopted. Both the characters inside of the narrative (i.e., Jesus, the disciples, the Jewish crowd) and the narrator outside of the narrative employ the *perfect* periphrastic structure to introduce their quotations. Thus, the different use of the periphrastic expression indicates that Pilate's written word on the plate for Jesus cannot be seen as equal to John's mention of scriptural texts.³¹¹

The *pluperfect* form in 19:19–20 is more likely just the narrator's storytelling regarding Pilate's inscription. However, the different form does not mean that the significance of what Pilate inscribed about Jesus is denied. The reason for the high frequency of the use of γράφω in 19:19–22 (six times) is because Pilate wrote *something* both unusual for a Roman prefect and unacceptable to the Jews on the plate for Jesus's charge.³¹² In this scene, *what* Pilate wrote then becomes a focus. Many scholars notice the spatial dynamic of Pilate's inside/outside movements in 18:28–19:16.³¹³ It shows Pilate's struggle with the case between the Jews' voice outside and Jesus's word inside. In addition, the narrator tells that Pilate claims his failure to find Jesus's sin and intends to release Jesus (18:38–39; 19:4, 6, 12).³¹⁴ However, a simple religious issue (18:31, 33) does not move Pilate as effectively as a political warning concerning royalty (19:7–8, 12–13,

³¹¹ Cf. Matt 27:37.

³¹² Three times are attributed to the narrator, one time to the chief priests, and two times to the Pilate. All are associated to the title Pilate wrote for Jesus's cross plate.

³¹³ E.g., Brown, *John XIII–XXI*, 857–59; Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 493–97; Stibbe, *John as Storyteller*, 105–6. They consider the inside/outside movement reflects Pilate's internal struggle (cf. n. 219 in this paper). However, Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel*, 73–75, suggests the spatial movements is more about hearing “the voice of the good shepherd”; while Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Gospel of John in Cultural and Rhetorical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 421–32, sees an honor challenge has been put on the trial.

³¹⁴ Pilate's imperatives for the chief priests to take (λάβετε) Jesus and crucify (σταυρώσατε) him in 19:6 is a sarcasm (also notice the contrast between two personal pronouns ὑμεῖς and ἐγώ). Pilate emphasizes that he found *no sin* against Jesus. Cf. Carson, *John*, 599; Dongell, *John*, 222.

15).³¹⁵ Thus, without any charge against Jesus, Pilate finally delivers Jesus to the Jews for crucifixion. What he wrote as Jesus's charge then catches attention.

Obviously, in this narrative, after Pilate's first inquiry (18:33), he begins to address Jesus as "King of the Jews" (18:39; 19:14, 19).³¹⁶ Since the narrative says that Pilate cannot find any legal case, such a title is certainly not a true charge against Jesus.³¹⁷ Additionally, though ironic, only Pilate keeps addressing Jesus as *King* in this judicial scene. Even when a dissent comes from the chief priests (19:21), Pilate still refuses to discard the inscribed title by saying, "What I have written, I have written" (19:22). Pilate does not admit Jesus's kingship. However, Pilate as a character in the narrative plays a vital role to reiterate it without being willing to make any alteration. Therefore, what Pilate has written, ironically but also truly, becomes an official phrase as a witness to the crucified Jesus in the narrative, though it is not as equal to the written scriptural text as Obermann suggests. Particularly, the narrator says that many Jewish people in the town read the written public title (19:20). In addition, such a title for Jesus's kingship in the narrative echoes coherently Nathaniel's confession in the beginning (1:49) and the crowd's shout in Jesus's entry into Jerusalem (12:13; cf. 6:15; 12:31). For this reason, although the use of the verb does *not* suggest Pilate's written title as a scriptural quotation, it indeed helps emphasize Jesus's identity.

³¹⁵ Cf. Keener, *John*, 1128; Warren Carter, *John and Empire: Initial Explorations* (New York: T&T Clark, 2007), 307–10.

³¹⁶ Craig S. Keener, "'What Is Truth?': Pilate's Perspective on Jesus in John 18:33–38," in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 3: Glimpses of Jesus Through the Johannine Lens*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, ECL 18 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 86–87, the title "Judean King" implies politically revolutionary challenge against Rome.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 88–89, Jesus's claim of "Kingdom of Truth" may not be politically harmful to Pilate.

3.2.4 Wrote the Gospel

The last part of the occurrence of the verb appears in the implied author's two-stage conclusion, 20:30–31 and 21:24–25. In these two authorial comments, the verb is associated with the author's written book, the Gospel itself (20:30–31; 21:24), and to the imaginable literary works that would include all Jesus's events (21:25). As mentioned in the last chapter, the author articulates that the entire book is the Beloved Disciple's witness about Jesus, which is authentic. Though the materials in the book are selective, they are written for a twofold purpose: that the reader may believe Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and have eternal life through this belief.

In his two similar articles,³¹⁸ Francis J. Moloney suggests that the use of the verb γράφω in 20:30–31, along with the employment of its noun in the Gospel, signals that the author delivers his written story of Jesus as *Scripture*. For Moloney, since Scripture is fulfilled in Jesus's word and his words become Scripture, Jesus's story is *word* and Scripture (20:9).³¹⁹ However, as in the use of γράφω in Pilate's scene, *not* all the "written" things in the narrative are equal to the Scripture *but* what was written down in John's narrative witnesses about Jesus, the Scripture (the Law and the Prophets), the individual scriptural texts, and even the title plate on the cross written by Pilate. The author may not consider that he was writing the narrative as *equal to* or as *a part of* the sacred Scripture.³²⁰ However, he indeed believes that what was written down in the book has the same goal as the Scripture. Both, one in prospect (i.e., the Scripture) and the other in retrospect (i.e., John's Gospel), are to witness to Jesus in order that the reader may believe in him and through him possess eternal life (5:39; 20:31).

³¹⁸ Moloney, "Scripture," 454–68; and Moloney, "John," 356–66.

³¹⁹ Moloney, "The 'End' of Scripture," 365. His view is built upon his exegetical result that "the Scripture" in 20:9 refers to the Gospel itself.

³²⁰ Cf. Moloney, "Scripture," 467.

3.2.5 Summary

In John's narrative, all *written words* are about Jesus as witnesses of Jesus's identity, words, and works. The author claims that what he has written in the book, which includes selected texts from the *written* Scripture, is an authentic testimony for Jesus. Even what Pilate inscribed on the plate as Jesus's charge ironically becomes an oblique witness in the narrative. They function similarly, but not equally, to the written Scripture in telling about Jesus. More importantly, in Jewish sacred Scripture, Moses and the prophets wrote about Jesus. The scriptural texts from the Law and the Prophets are also seen as happening in Jesus's event. Within the narrative world, these writings are not only for the characters to read/hear but also for them to understand/believe concerning Jesus. As for the narrator, they are the *written* witnesses he employed to show Jesus. John's use of the verb γράφω suggests that Jesus is the object and the subject of all the written words in the Gospel.

3.3 Moses and the Law

3.3.1 Moses

In the Gospel of John, the terms *Moses* and *law* together occur more than twenty times.³²¹ Except for two places (3:14; 6:32), all occurrences of *Moses* relate to the Law or the scriptural writings (1:17, 45; 5:45, 46; 7:19, 22, 23; 9:28, 29). However, not once does the name Moses connect to a quotation, albeit allusions (e.g., 3:14). The narrator in the prologue clearly indicates the origin of the Law, which "is given through Moses" (1:17). Presumably, it is given (ἐδόθη) *by* and *from* God, *to* the people of Israel *through* Moses's hand (διὰ Μωϋσέως).³²² In addition, for

³²¹ See Chart 3.

³²² The backdrop of John 1:14–18 is the narrative in Exod 20–34, which describes that the Lord gave Moses the commandments at Sinai. Also John 7:19; 9:29.

the characters in the narrative, Moses is the one who conveys the Law from God. Jesus, with a positive rhetorical question (Οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον), confirms that Moses gave the Law to the people but with a clarifying emphasis that the Father is the original giver (7:19–23). The Jewish authorities also affirm that God has spoken to Moses (9:28–29). In both instances in John 7 and John 9, the direct cause for the conflict between Jesus and the Jews is Jesus’s healing action on the Sabbath, which is seen by the Jews as doing violence to the Law. The same conflict happens earlier in John 5 where Moses is finally mentioned (5:45–47). The reason why Jesus particularly mentions Moses is that the Jews accuse Jesus of breaking the Sabbath (5:9–18).³²³ Thus, in the narrative world, Moses is tightly related to the Law in the forensic contexts, and the people believe that he is the one to whom God gave the Law and the one who conveyed the Law to the Jewish people. What Moses has conveyed is seen as the norm, which all the people have to observe. Therefore, Moses in the narrative obviously stands for the authority behind all Jewish regulations, commandments, and festivals and doubtless the Law.³²⁴

However, both Jesus and the Jewish authorities appeal to Moses in these forensic contexts. In John 7, Jesus judges that the Jews practice circumcision on the Sabbath in order that Moses’s law may not be broken (7:22–24). The fact is, Jesus insists that neither they follow Moses’s Law (7:19; cf. 7:25), nor do they have just judgment (τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν),³²⁵ which should be according to Moses’s law (7:24).³²⁶ Jesus is not to do violence to Moses’s law but keeps the will of God (7:19), who is the origin of Moses’s law. Ironically, the Jews’ astonishment

³²³ Cf. Exod 20:8–11; Deut 5:12–15; Jer 17:21–22.

³²⁴ William Loader, “Jesus and the Law in John,” in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*, ed. G. Van Belle, Jan van der Watt, and P. Maritz, BETL 184 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), 136.

³²⁵ Cf. Clark-Soles, *Scripture Cannot Be Broken*, 251.

³²⁶ Carson, *John*, 316, suggests that Jesus’s challenge has OT parallels (cf. Deut 16:18–19).

at Jesus's teaching and knowledge about the scriptural writings (7:15) suggests the fact that Jesus's judgment is rightly in accordance to the Scripture and theirs is not (cf. 5:30).³²⁷

The same circumstance appears in John 9. The Jews again accuse that Jesus does not keep the Sabbath (9:16). They claim that they are disciples of Moses, the observer of the word of God (9:28–29). The Jews put Jesus in the party that opposes the party of Moses and God (9:16, 29). However, they, in fact, stand in the party opposite to Moses and God. The narrator has shown in John 5 that the protagonist, Jesus, insists that he is from God and doing the work of the Father and that he has authority of judgment and life as the Father does (5:17–29). Jesus also indicates that Moses is the one who accuses them (5:45). The conflict between Jesus and the Jews does not suggest Jesus's violence against Moses's law but Jewish unbelief and ignorance of the word of God given through Moses to them (5:37–38; cf. 3:10–12; 8:44–47). The very reason is addressed straightforwardly by both Jesus and the narrator in 5:44 and 12:43 that the Jews love glory from men instead of from God.

Therefore, Moses and his Law in John's narrative stand with Jesus in the same party. The *contrast* between Moses and Jesus seen in 1:17 does not negate the significance of Moses's revelation from God.³²⁸ As mentioned previously, in John's description, God's revelation found in prophetic lineage that Moses represents is aligned with Jesus's word (3:12; 5:46–47).³²⁹ What is more striking is that Moses's Law was a grace from God, in which God reveals himself, but

³²⁷ Cf. Keener, *John*, 717–18; Vahrenhorst, "Johannes und die Tora," 24.

³²⁸ Concerning the contrast in degree between God's revelation through Moses and Jesus Christ, see Carson, "John and John Epistles," 256. Also, Keener, *John*, 422, "the contrast of John 1:17 is between something good and something better, which are not mutually exclusive." Vahrenhorst, "Johannes und die Tora," 30, points out that the Law is also a grace of God, whose origin is God.

³²⁹ In 1:14–18, the narrator articulates that Jesus Christ is the "unique one" in the bosom of the Father, revealing grace and truth, which are the glory of God. He is regarded the fullness of God's revelation. On the contrary, Moses, though, as the Law carrier did not see God. He is in the same inferior category as John the Baptist. Cf. Evans, *Word and Glory*, 80.

Jesus *is* the grace beyond and the truth (1:14, 18)³³⁰ who fully reveals the Father. After encountering Jesus, Philip is the first character to say that Moses wrote “the One” in the law (1:43–45). This passage appeals to Moses and his law together with the prophets. Even though not really perceiving who the One is, Philip has met Jesus as the promised coming one in the Scripture (cf. 1:19–21). In 5:36–47, Jesus employs not merely the Scriptures, but also particularly Moses’s writings in his argument as his witnesses (cf. 6:14).

Hence, Moses is read in the narrative not only as the one who has conveyed the words of God as the Law to the people but also as the one who in his writings wrote about Jesus. John shows that Moses is an effective witness of Jesus’s identity and more that Jesus’s work and word are totally in accordance with Moses’s Law.³³¹ However, Moses should *not* be regarded as a character playing in John’s narrative³³² but at most as a character *within* the Jewish Scripture in Israel’s history as a backdrop in the narrative world. In two places, Jesus appeals to Moses for exposing what the Son of Man is and is to do. In John 3:14, the mention of Moses’s lifting up the serpent (cf. Num 21:8–9) is not to show Moses’s traits *in* the narrative. Rather, it is to recall the account in Moses’s writing which brings in the lifted-up Son of Man as the ultimate means of God’s life-giving salvation (John 3:15–16).³³³ In John 6:32, to elaborate that the Son of Man is the life-giving bread from God, Jesus remarks that *not* Moses *but* God is giving the bread of life from heaven (6:27–51). In addition, Jesus’s *source* is mentioned in all the contexts where *Moses*

³³⁰ Notice the phrases “πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας” and “ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο.” The parallel between “πλήρης ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια” and “וְיָרַב־הַקֹּדֶשׁ וְאֵמֶת” (Exod 34:6) is also noteworthy. Also cf. Vahrenhorst, “Johannes und die Tora,” 27–29; Bauckham, *Glory*, 52.

³³¹ Vahrenhorst, “Johannes und die Tora,” 24–27.

³³² Cf. Harstine, *Moses As a Character*, 40–75. Harstine considers that Moses functions as a character in John. However, in John’s narrative world, Moses is an ancient character in their scriptural narrative, *not* a character playing a role among John’s characters.

³³³ The same use of recalling Moses’s story happens in John 6:32.

appears, whether as clearly addressed from God/the Father (1:1–5; 3:13–17; 5:36–43; 6:29–58; 7:28–29; 9:33) or as puzzled among the Jews (6:42; 7:27; 9:29–30). Therefore, since all Jesus’s deeds and words are in harmony with Moses’s writings, Jesus’s source being God is then crystal clear.

3.3.2 Νόμος

The narrator in the prologue has clearly indicated that ὁ νόμος was given through Moses.³³⁴ As mentioned, it is given by/from God to the people of Israel through Moses’s hand. The Law exists in every aspect of the events described as happening in the narrative, from the Jewish rites of purification (2:6), Jacob’s spring (4:6), Sabbaths, to Jewish Festivals (except Hanukkah, 10:22).³³⁵ John has eight occurrences of νόμος without being accompanied by “Moses.” Three of them, accompanying the verb *written*, are respectively in a quotation formula employed by Jesus (8:17; 10:34; 15:25). As mentioned, νόμος refers to Moses’s Torah in 8:17 and represents the Jewish Scripture as a whole in 10:34 and 15:25 (both quotations are apparently from the Book of Psalms).³³⁶ In these three instances, the possessive genitive pronouns are present: *your* (8:17 [equivalent adjective ὑμέτερος]; 10:34) and *theirs* (15:25). Such terms function in the context with conflictive sense and suggest that the Law/Scripture is *written for* the Jewish people and fulfilled among them, but neither do they really observe nor understand. The other five times occur on the lips of different characters (7:49, 51; 12:34; 18:31; 19:7). The instances can be put into two categories. First, νόμος in 12:34 is used by the crowd as

³³⁴ The term “νόμος” does not appear in the Gospel of Mark. Mark’s preference for Moses’s commandment is “ἐντολή,” which mostly, however, refers to the Father’s commandment to Jesus and Jesus’s to the disciples in the Gospel of John (except Pharisees’ orders in 11:57). Also cf. Harris, *Prologue and Gospel*, 76.

³³⁵ Vahrenhorst, “Johannes und die Tora,” 16–20.

³³⁶ Cf. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 62.

the scriptural source where they have heard about the predication of Messiah's continuation. However, the scriptural derivation of the text, "the Christ remains forever," in their mind is difficult to determine from the Pentateuch (the Law) and even from the other writings.³³⁷ Despite the obscurity of its parallel, the narrative demonstrates that νόμος means the Scripture (as ἡ γραφή in 7:42), from which the people have their ideas about Messiah.

Second, νόμος is found used in the forensic contexts as the norm for judgmental discrimination for the Jewish leaders. In 7:49 the Pharisees, regarding Jesus as a lawbreaker (7:23, 32, 45–48), judge that the people who believe Jesus as *somebody* are ignorant of the Law (ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον) and then are accursed. The similar judgment can be also seen in ch. 9 (esp. 9:28, 34). At the moment, however, Nicodemus appeals to the law ("our law") for a prompt of just judgment (7:51). Nicodemus's rhetorical question, "μὴ ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν κρίνει τὸν ἄνθρωπον," suggests that his Pharisee fellows in Jesus's case do *not* actually follow the principles in their law of judgment. Following a caustic rhetorical question "μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶ," the Pharisees' immediate imperative reply "ἐραύνησον" (search) seems to declare that their judgment is based on their error-free scriptural research/examination (7:52; cf. 5:39).³³⁸ In the conflicts of the Pharisee members, νόμος for them is a legal reference to which they appeal to judge and practice their judgments.³³⁹ This use can also be seen in the dialogue

³³⁷ Carson, *John*, 445. Many proposals are made by scholars, cf. Francis J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man*, Biblioteca di scienze religiose 14 (Roma: LAS, 1976), 182–83. Also, some suggest Targumic source, e.g., John L. Ronning, "The Targum of Isaiah and the Johannine Literature," *WTJ* 69 (2007): 265–66; Brian McNeil, "The Quotation at John xii 34," *NovT* 19 (1977): 22–33. McNeil believes that it is quoted from *Tg. Isa.* 9:5 (קַיִם עַל־מֵיָּהּ מְשִׁיחָא, lit. "the Messiah is alive for the ages"). Köstenberger, *John*, 386, considers that the closest parallel to it is Ps 89:37 MT (88:37 LXX). Cf. Loader, "Jesus and the Law," 136.

³³⁸ Beutler, "Use," 152–53. The verb "ἐραυνάω" (search/examine) also appears in 5:39 where Jesus speaks of the purpose of scriptural research of the Jewish authorities. By their scriptural research, the Jews deny not only Jesus's work (healing on the Sabbath) but also his identity as a prophet, or the prophet that the people believe (7:40–42, 52; cf. 1:21; 4:19; 6:14).

³³⁹ The reason for it is that in the story world they believe that the Law is God's word (9:29; cf. 7:23; 10:35).

between Pilate and the Jews in 18:31 and 19:7. Both Pilate and the Jews agree that the Jewish law is the legal norm for the judicial judgment of Jewish people,³⁴⁰ yet they all understand that only Roman legal authority can sentence a death (18:31; 19:10). In his argument against the Jews, Jesus agrees that the Law has to be observed (7:19, 22). Therefore, not only does the Torah normalize the behavior of all characters in the narrative world, as Von Martin Vahrenhorst marks,³⁴¹ but the Law is also the source where something about the Messiah can be heard and found.

One wonders if νόμος in these forensic contexts refers to a Jewish tradition other than Moses's Law in John's narrative. The answer is likely negative. In John's narrative, Moses's Law is also a God-granted gift according to the narrator (1:17). Ὁ νόμος with other scriptural writings, is the *word* that the Jewish people ought to believe (3:12; 5:38, 47) and observe (7:19), whether about the coming One or about their daily life.³⁴² The problem of the controversy between Jesus and the Jews has its roots in the Jewish attitude towards God. Both the narrator and the protagonist mark that the Jews do *not* seek and love the glory from God (5:44; 12:43; cf. 3:10), which results in their failure to discern and accept what Moses's Law says. In John's narrative, the Jews become opponents of both Moses and Jesus when they believe that they keep the Law by judging and planning to kill Jesus, even considering such actions as serving God (16:2). The narrative point of view on this issue is that the Jews essentially *fail* to believe

³⁴⁰ In 8:31, Pilate says to the Jews, “λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν κρίνατε αὐτόν [you *yourselves* take him and judge him *according to your law*].” In 19:7, the Jews reply to Pilate, “ἡμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν [we *ourselves* have law and he ought to die *according to the law*].”

³⁴¹ Vahrenhorst, “Johannes und die Tora,” 20.

³⁴² In John 2:6, the purification of the Jews (τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων) is also something that the narrator shows about Jewish people's regulations of daily life.

Moses's Law although they reckon and claim they do (cf. 7:19). Thus, in John's narrative, the νόμος is identical to Moses's Law, which is given through Moses.

Therefore, νόμος without being attached to Moses connotes the Jewish scriptural writings as a whole, given by God, that (1) the Jews are obligated to obey it as the norm of every perspective in life, and (2) in it the knowledge about the coming One is recorded. In these instances, one can observe that in the narrative world a law is addressed as Moses's Law. It is given *through* Moses (from the point of view of the narrator) and so seen as given *by* Moses (from the points of view of narrative characters). The characters in the narrative acknowledge the significance of Moses's Law as the authoritative norm that all should keep. All characters in the narrative believe that Moses and God are in the same party. What Moses wrote is seen as God's word for them (5:38–47; 7:17–19; 9:29). Moreover, the “ἵνα ... πληρωθῇ” formula is adopted for both the word in the Law (15:25) and the word of Isaiah the Prophet (12:38).

3.4 The Prophets and Isaiah

Alongside Moses's Law, what is addressed as written or told by prophets are also noteworthy in John's narrative. It includes four occurrences of *the prophet(s)* that refer to scriptural source (1:23, 45; 6:45; 12:38–40).³⁴³ Again, on Philip's lips (1:45), Jesus of Nazareth is excitedly described as the One about which both Moses and the prophets wrote in their writings.

The accompanying subject οἱ προφῆται can mean either the personal prophets or the writings of

³⁴³ This section focuses only on the prophet(s) referring to the Scripture. See Chart. 4. The other uses of the term *prophet* in John refers to a prophetic title, for a prophet or former prophets in general or for *the* messianic prophet in particular. Jesus in the narrative is considered as a prophet by some characters. The Samaritan woman, having her immoral life revealed, recognizes Jesus as a prophet (4:19). After Jesus feeds the five thousand people, the crowds then suppose Jesus is *the* prophet (6:14). The crowds in Jerusalem during the Tabernacles, hearing Jesus's word, also think that he is *the* prophet (7:40). However, the following dialogue among the crowds shows that Jesus's identity is actually ambiguous for them (7:7:40–43). The Pharisees do not even believe that Jesus is a prophet according to his birthplace, misunderstood as Galilee (7:52; cf. 1:46). The healed blind man, before the Pharisees, also acknowledges that Jesus is a prophet from God (9:17, 33), comparable to Moses (9:27). Therefore, through his marvelous signs and teaching, Jesus is considered as a prophet, or even superior, *the* prophet who is coming to the world (6:14; 7:40).

the Prophets in the Scripture,³⁴⁴ or perhaps both at once in Philip's mind. In this case, the character or the narrator does not provide any quotation but a general understanding about the Jewish knowledge that in *the Scripture* the coming of the Messiah is recorded (cf. 7:42; 12:34). As previously mentioned, in the narrative the written Scripture (even the Law) is the source from which the Jewish people have their ideas about the Messiah though they are not precise. Philip's indication of "Moses and the prophets wrote" in the beginning of the narrative presumably suggests the whole Scripture in scope,³⁴⁵ and the implication of it apparently is understandable not only to Philip's fellow Nathaniel but also to the characters in the narrative world. However, for the true meaning of the One about which the Scripture wrote is still blurry to them (2:22; 20:9; cf. 14:8). Among the five occurrences, this instance is the only one not related to any explicit quotation.

Compared to the other two instances, the case in 6:45 is the only one attributed to Jesus and the only one not referring specifically to Isaiah. In 6:45, addressing its source "in the prophets [ἐν τοῖς προφήταις]," Jesus quotes a text. Plainly, τοῖς προφήταις here points to the writings of the Prophets in the Scripture though the quotation can be identified as from the Book of Isaiah (Isa 54:13). Jesus in this place uses the more general term for the prophetic text, not specifying Isaiah. The pattern of the quotation formula in this case is analogous to the one in 10:34, which is also attributed to Jesus:

6:45—ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις·

10:34—οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι...

³⁴⁴ Cf. Köstenberger, *John*, 80; Keener, *John*, 482, n. 496. Even though "οἱ προφῆται" refer to personal prophets, they are the writers of the prophetic writings.

³⁴⁵ See Lukan expressions: "ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν" in Luke 24:27 and threefold "ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς" in Luke 24:44.

The parallel between these two quotation formulae may reflect *the Law* and *the Prophets* used in a general way by Jesus as referring to the Scripture though in 6:45 he may refer to the more specific section of the Prophets. Therefore, these two instances, 1:45 and 6:45, in John's narrative show that the plural οἱ προφῆται is used as scriptural source from which a messianic knowledge is learned or Isaiah's text is cited. Despite Jesus's omission of a specific name or title for his sources in his quotations,³⁴⁶ the reference is always to the Scripture.

The remaining two places where *the prophet* appear is precisely fixed with Isaiah the prophet. Like 6:45, they appear in quotation formulae. When "Isaiah the prophet" is mentioned, the immediate scriptural text quoted is detected from the Book of Isaiah (1:23; 12:38–40).³⁴⁷ Thus, the term *prophet* here, although meaning a prophetic person, Isaiah, implies the specific scriptural source. In the beginning of the narrative, John the Baptist quotes Isaiah's word (Isa 40:3) in order to clarify his identity to those who were sent by the Jews (1:19–23). "Isaiah the prophet" is articulately employed here as the one who described the voice of the wilderness. At the end of the first part of John's narrative, such an epithet appears again in the narrator's conclusive comment (12:36b–43). In John 12:38, the narrator tells that the word of Isaiah the prophet (ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου) is fulfilled in the situation of the Jewish unbelief in Jesus. He then instantly in 12:39–40 quotes another of Isaiah's saying (πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας) as the reason for their unbelief. In his telling, the narrator explains the phenomenon of the Jewish unbelief in Jesus by evoking Isaiah's messages (Isa 53:1; 6:10). The mentions of Isaiah the

³⁴⁶ When quoting a scriptural text, Jesus does not specify the writer's name but only the general title of the *section* (either the Law or the Prophets) though roughly (6:45 "ἐν τοῖς προφήταις" [Isaiah]; 8:17 "ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ" [Deuteronomy]; 10:34 "ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν" [Psalms]; 15:25 "ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν" [Psalms]).

³⁴⁷ These four quotations and their formulae will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5.

prophet is likely the narrator's rhetorical device in the beginning and the end of the first part of the narrative.³⁴⁸

In these two instances, the verbal terms for Isaiah's messages are striking. John the Baptist in 1:23 uses the verb $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ for what he cites from Isaiah as what Isaiah vocalized (cf. 3:12). In the narrator's comment in 12:38–41, Isaiah's texts are cited as what Isaiah $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ (vv. 38–39, 41) and $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$ (12:41).³⁴⁹ In addition, the narrator straightforwardly gives the reason why Isaiah said so and unhesitatingly indicates that Isaiah $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\nu$ the glory (12:41). Seemingly, Isaiah is a vivid witness not only for Jesus's event but also for Jesus himself.³⁵⁰ Hence, as witnesses to Jesus, Moses and the prophets *wrote* in their writing, but Isaiah *saw* and then *spoke*. Such a verbal use with its structural arrangement deserves more attention in the fifth chapter.

From these instances, one can observe that the use of *the prophets* as scriptural source seems stricter than the use of *the Law* in John's narrative. The former refers only to the section of the Prophets (1:45; 6:45), while the latter can point broader to the Pentateuch (8:17) or the Psalms (10:34; 15:25). In addition, the quotations indicated as *the prophets* pertain only to Isaiah's texts.³⁵¹ Among the OT prophets, only Isaiah's name is mentioned in John's narrative. It is perhaps that as Moses is treated as the presentative of the prophetic lineage, Isaiah the prophet may be seen as the head of his prophetic clan. In John's narrative, the characters do not appeal to Isaiah in the controversial contexts as Moses (e.g., 5:45–47). This fact may allude to that the

³⁴⁸ See n. 193.

³⁴⁹ In Uspensky's terms, this is the narrator's point of view on the phraseological plane that the influence of narrator's speech is on John the Baptist's speech. See Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 41–43.

³⁵⁰ Cf. Hays, *Echoes*, §17, "Salvation is from the Jews." Hays considers that Isaiah's passages in John are significant because they refer to "Isaiah" not merely as the source of a prophetic oracle but also as a character in Israel's story, whose prophetic declaration about Jesus is based on a particular event."

³⁵¹ Two quotations in John (12:14–15; 19:37) are from the Book of Zechariah but the quoter (the narrator) does not indicate their prophetic source.

characters in the narrative world see Moses and his Law as the authoritative norm for their lives since God spoke to Moses and gave the Law to him. Therefore, they are able to represent the writers of the Scripture and the Scripture as a whole. On the contrary, prophets (προφῆται) in the narrative, as historical persons mentioned by the characters in the narrative world, may be reckoned as God's spokesmen who are significant since they would convey the word of God and perform miracles as great as Abraham (8:52–53; cf. 4:19). However, among the Prophets (προφῆται), although not only Isaiah's texts are quoted in the narrative, Isaiah seems significant to the narrator.

3.5 The Word of Jesus

3.5.1 The Word of Jesus and the Scripture

In the Gospel of John, Jesus's word is described *parallel* to the Scripture in some ways. In 2:22, the narrator tells two sequential actions of the disciples after Jesus was raised from the dead. The first is that they recalled (ἐμνήσθησαν) that Jesus was saying (ἔλεγεν) *this*. The imperfect tense form of ἔλεγεν in this verse is likely to show Jesus's in-the-past saying *unfolding* in the disciples' minds.³⁵² “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up” (2:19). Then the narrator discloses the meaning of Jesus's word by saying, “Jesus was speaking [ἔλεγεν] about the temple of his body” (2:21). Hence, the *this* (τοῦτο) in 2:22 clearly refers to Jesus's words in 2:19, which predicts his death and resurrection. The second action is that the disciples believed (ἐπίστευσαν) the Scripture and *the word* that Jesus had spoken. *The Scripture* in this verse is the first occurrence in John, and in 20:9 the last. Both concern the narrator's

³⁵² In terms of point of view, this flashback describes the disciples' point of view in the psychological plane. Concerning the verbal perspective of the imperfect tense-form, see Constantine R. Campbell, *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*, Studies in Biblical Greek 13 (New York: Lang, 2007), 84–98.

particular comments on the disciples' attitude towards the Scripture with respect to Jesus's death and resurrection. Although the γραφή that they believed is not specified in both comments.³⁵³ It connotes some scriptural texts from which the specific awareness/belief concerning Jesus's death/resurrection is derived. Just as Jesus's word foretells his own death and resurrection and is remembered and believed, the Scripture that predicts Jesus's death and resurrection is also understood and believed when Jesus's death and resurrection came to happen.

"Being fulfilled" is also a vital significant description for the Scripture in John's narrative. The OT quotation in the second part of the Gospel is always accompanied with a πληρωθῆ in its introductory formula. In addition to the Scripture, the word of Isaiah (12:38), and the word written in the Law (15:25), the narrator tells that the word of Jesus came to be *fulfilled* in 18:9 and 18:32. In both instances, the resultant ἵνα-clause followed by πληρωθῆ conveys the sense that what Jesus said in advance just now finds its happening.³⁵⁴ In 18:3–9, when he shows Jesus's reply to those arresters asking that they let his disciples leave (18:3–8), the narrator promptly comments that what Jesus said previously about the imperishableness of anyone of those whom the Father gave to him (17:12; cf. 10:28–29; 6:37–40; 3:16) is *fulfilled* in this event (18:9). Interestingly, the narrator reports Jesus's prayer to the Father in 17:9–12 that Jesus considers his protection of his disciples from perishing as the word in the Scripture to be fulfilled, albeit with unspecified text.³⁵⁵ Again, Jesus's word is depicted similarly to a scriptural promise. Moreover, in 18:29–32, right after showing the Jews handing Jesus over to Pilate, the

³⁵³ Also cf. Moloney, "Scripture," 464. He suggests the exegetical use of καὶ in 2:22. That is, the Scripture is identical with the word Jesus spoke. He also asserts that "the Scripture" in 20:9 refers to the Johannine narrative itself (466).

³⁵⁴ Grammatically, in both cases, the main clause "it happened" before the ἵνα-clause is omitted.

³⁵⁵ Cf. Keener, *John*, 914, 1059, considers that the text refers to John 13:18 (Ps 41:9).

narrator instantly comments that Jesus's indication of the way of death he would die is *fulfilled*. This indication apparently refers to Jesus's word in 12:32: "I shall be lifted up from the earth" (cf. 2:19; 3:14; 19:6, 15). In both 12:33 and 18:32, the narrator's comments are identical.³⁵⁶ Therefore, Jesus's word, just like the Scripture, is described as *fulfilled* in the narrative, particularly in these three semi-quotations.

However, this parallel between Jesus's word and the Scripture is probably not saying that the narrator sees Jesus's word as *identical* to the Scripture. In the narrative, Jesus's word is never opposed to the Scripture; rather, his word will find true harmony in the Scripture. Those who believe the word in the Scripture will also believe Jesus's word (3:12; 5:46–47). These three verses are the three semi-quotation instances in the second part of the narrative. The appearance of "ὥνα ... πληρωθῇ" in them, like other quotation formulae in the second half, likely suggests a point-of-view concurrence between Jesus and the Scripture. The narrator does not see his narrative as Scripture, as Moloney proposes, but as *a book* written about Jesus (20:31; 21:24–25), in which one can find Jesus's work and word corresponding to the Scripture, and the Scripture is fulfilled in Jesus.

John's Gospel has several places where the narrator likely signals that Jesus's word is *fulfilled* in some events without marking the phrase "in order that the word may be fulfilled." For example, in 18:15–27, the narrator describes Peter's denial of Jesus. At the end of event, the narrator does not employ the ὥνα-clause in order to highlight the fulfillment of Jesus's prediction of Peter's denial in 13:38. Rather, his narrative description "and suddenly, a rooster crowed" would sound in the ears of the audience as referring to the fulfillment of what Jesus foretold.

³⁵⁶ John 12:33—"σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν."
John 18:32—"σημαίνων ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν."

3.5.2 The Word of Jesus and the Word of God

While the word of Jesus is described as the Scripture in some ways by the narrator, in Jesus's discourse, the word of Jesus is also claimed to be accordant with the word of God in its nature. First, in his prayer to the Father in 17:17, Jesus says, "Your word is truth [ἀλήθεια]." Jesus also prays that the Father may sanctify (ἀγιάσων) in the truth (ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ) those believers who belong to Jesus and to whom the word of Father is given by Jesus (17:14).³⁵⁷ Then, in v. 19, Jesus affirms that the purpose of his self-consecrating (ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἑμαυτόν) is that they may also be sanctified in truth (ὥσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ). Jesus's prayer implies that he is fully a keeper of the word of God and precisely conveys the word of God (3:34). The anticipation is that those who belong to Jesus will be his imitators. In fact, when Jesus passes on exactly the Father's word, the word of Jesus also makes the followers clean (καθαροί; 15:3). In the scene of Pilate's court, Jesus also asserts that he was born for the purpose to bear witness to the truth (μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ) or the king of the truth kingdom (18:36–37).³⁵⁸ Jesus tells the truth heard from God (8:40); his word leads to knowledge of the truth (8:31–32). He also marks that he himself is truth (14:6; cf. 1:14, 17; 5:33).³⁵⁹ Therefore, in the narrative, Jesus's own word confirms that he is the truth speaker, the faithful carrier of the word of God, the very one from God (3:34). In Jesus's word, one cannot find any inconsonance against

³⁵⁷ Cf. also Stanley E. Porter, *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 176–91.

³⁵⁸ Cf. Keener, "What Is Truth," 88–90.

³⁵⁹ In the narrative, several things are shown to be true. God is true (3:33; 7:28; 17:3), and those who worship him in the way God wants are true worshipers (4:23). Honest/rational words are seen as true (4:18, 37). John the Baptist's witness about Jesus is true (5:23; 10:41). What the Beloved Disciple testifies/writes in John is true (19:35; 21:24). Finally, Jesus's testimony/judgment is true (8:14, 16). He is the true light (1:9); the true heavenly bread (6:32), food, and drink (6:55); the true vine (15:1).

the words of God; rather, one can only find full unison with the words of God, the truth (cf. 14:9).³⁶⁰

In John's narrative, God is the one who is willing to give life to the world and the one who can grant life (cf. 20:31).³⁶¹ In his debate with the Jews in ch. 5, Jesus alludes to his equality with God in the ways that he does the work of God (5:17, 19), having the power and being just to judge as God does (5:22, 27), giving life as God does (5:21, 25), and having life in him as God does (5:26). In fact, later Jesus insists that what he says is taught exactly by the Father (8:28; 12:49). This *equality* implies Jesus's lordship of all. The way to possess the eternal life given by God is to *hear* the word of Jesus and believe him (5:24–25; cf. 3:15–16; 6:40, 47; 10:27–28). Obviously, Jesus's word is tightly related to eternal life. His word is life (6:63, 68), for he claims that he himself is life (11:25; 14:6).³⁶² When he mentions the Jews' motive for studying the Scripture, Jesus, without denying, agrees that the Scripture, as the word of God, has eternal life in it (5:39). However, the fact that the Jews do not believe in Jesus reveals that they do not have the words of God in them nor do they believe the writings of Moses (5:38–47).³⁶³ Such an unbelief of what Moses wrote also results not observing the Law of Moses (7:19).

³⁶⁰ In John's narrative, the Spirit sent from the Father is also the Spirit of Truth who speaks the word of Jesus and the Father (14:1–17, 26; 15:26; 16:13–15).

³⁶¹ God intends to give life: 1:12–13, 33; 3:16–17; 4:10; 5:20, 26; 6:35–40; 12:50; 17:3. Also cf. n. 222.

³⁶² And he is the good shepherd, laying down his life for the sheep in order that they may abundantly have life (10:10–11, 14–15)

³⁶³ Concerning 5:38, Hays, *Echoes*, §16, "Come and See," suggests a loop of believing Jesus and understanding what Moses wrote. He seems to take the "ὅτι" as causal, by which it reads that the reason why the Jews do not have the word of God in them is that they do not believe Jesus. However, what Jesus argues in this context is the Jews' unbelief of what Moses wrote, which reflects on their unbelief in Jesus (5:42–47). The real reason is that they do not love God (τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ, 5:42) and they do seek the glory from God (5:43–44). Hence, the "ὅτι" should be taken as resultant, by which their unbelief in Jesus is the visible fact that is caused by their not having the word of God in them. See Harris, *John*, 118.

However, in John's narrative, hearing Jesus's word and believing in him means keeping or abiding in his word. Since he speaks the word of God, Jesus urges an option for the Jews to abide in his word that they may be his disciples (8:28–31) who belong to him. In 8:52, Jesus emphatically declares to the Jews that whoever keeps his word will never see death. The purpose of Jesus's ministry is that Jesus speaks what the Father has told him (12:50). In Jesus's farewell discourse, keeping Jesus's word is the practice of his true disciples who have real relationship with Jesus and the Father with Jesus's word abiding in them (14:15, 21, 23; 15:7, 10, 14). The very reason to keep Jesus's word is what Jesus says to the disciples in 14:24: "The word that you hear is not of me but of the Father who sent me." Jesus is the one who keeps the word of the Father (14:10; 15:10). Whoever keeps Jesus's word keeps the word of the Father and belongs to the Father.

3.6 Summary

In John's narrative, the use of the noun ἡ γραφή/αἱ γραφαί and its verb γράφω together lays out a backdrop for all activities of characters on the narrative stage.³⁶⁴ The Scripture, signifying whether narrowly a text/regulation within it or a concept about eschaton/Messiah from it or broadly the sacred writing as a whole or the collective writings that consist of what Moses and the prophets wrote, serves as the authoritative word from God and the standard value in the narrative world. As the narrative plays out, the Scripture and its writers spotlight Jesus the protagonist—what he does, what he says, where he is from, what he would be—so that the identity of the protagonist may be known and understood correspondingly and correctly.³⁶⁵

³⁶⁴ Cf. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 63, "Die Schriften bilden den Hintergrund, vor dem der Evangelist Jesus als den Christus versteht und in seinem Evangelium darstellt."

³⁶⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, 50.

Inside the narrative world, the Scripture is acknowledged as the word of God, written by Moses and the prophets, supposed to be read and observed by all Jewish characters. Their rites, festivals, purifications, judiciary, and daily regulations and behaviors are all according to the Scripture, which can be noted as ὁ νόμος of Moses. The Jewish authorities consider themselves to be the disciples of Moses and experts in the Law, looking for eternal life by studying the Scriptures. However, the narrative shows their failure to comprehend their Scripture because they are merely seeking their own glory. The Jewish people, though knowing some scriptural tales, cannot recognize clearly the identity of Jesus and the precise messiahship from their scriptural understanding. In the narrative setting, the Scripture seems dim to all characters. Jesus is the only one who in every aspect accords with the Scripture, practicing the will of God and speaking the word of God. Thus, the Scripture provides correct description and vindication for Jesus's identity and ministry. As far as the narrative goes, the Scripture finds its fulfillment in Jesus's events that also display the Scripture-defined messiahship.

The narrator presents the Scripture witnessing to Jesus's life and signals Jesus's death and resurrection as the hermeneutical key to the Scripture (2:22; 20:9). In this way, what is written or said in the Scripture finds its accordance with Jesus's events in the narrative. The narrator's insistence of both the Scripture and Jesus's word being fulfilled suggests the total concurrence between them. While the scriptural materials as the backdrop are set everywhere in the narrative, the quotations appear to be highlighted by the use of formulae, where the terms *written*, *the Scripture*, and *fulfilled* are frequently employed.

4 QUOTATION-FORMULA TECHNIQUES

In 1922, observing John's unique pattern of using quotation formulae, Faure pointed out that the Gospel has a different perception of Scripture between before 12:15 and after 12:38.³⁶⁶ Faure is right when he marks John's distinctive use of quotation formulae. However, his view about John's perception of Scripture may be faulty. As mentioned in the second chapter, the literary evidences, such as witnessing language and the Gospel's structure, suggest that John's Gospel is a literary unity. John's pattern of using quotation formulae is likely then a literary device to convey his theology.³⁶⁷ In this chapter, I will discuss John's quotation-formula techniques by examining the meaning of his formulae, which introduce or accompany quoted scriptural texts.

Looking at the use of introductory formulae for quoted scriptural texts in Second Temple Jewish literature and the NT writings that share similar techniques with John will help elucidate the use of citation formulae in the Gospel of John.³⁶⁸ John in that scripture-based literary tradition likely shares the same quotation traits of using introductory formulae with other authors. The discussion in this chapter does not concern the textual sources or wording adoption/adaption of cited texts. Neither is it about the domination of memory or Jewish exegetical methods in the use of scriptural texts. Rather, the discussion focuses on the forms and the implications of the introductory formulae that an author employs for his text in order to introduce a scriptural text. For the specificity of the survey, only explicit quotations are included in the discussion. However, flexibility will be granted to some significant phenomena.

³⁶⁶ Faure, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate," 99–121.

³⁶⁷ As discussed, John's Gospel is not *purely* about theology. Its historiographical features suggest its historical accounts based on reports of eyewitnesses. Bennema, "Reliability," 18–21.

³⁶⁸ This work is built upon former research. See n. 110.

In defining the terms for scriptural uses, Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold in their book, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, provide helpful criteria.³⁶⁹ According to Lange and Weigold, “An *implicit quotation* is any uninterrupted verbal parallel of at least four words which does not alter the quoted text but is not introduced by a quotation formula or otherwise explicitly identified.... An *explicit quotation* is any verbal parallel of at least two words which is explicitly identified by a quotation formula or other means.”³⁷⁰ Devorah Dimant, however, has a slightly different criterion, noting that explicit quotations “are biblical phrases of at least three words, more or less accurately reproduced, and introduced by special terms and explicit references.”³⁷¹ Determining a standard among the scholars’ criteria is not practical for the purpose of this paper. For recognizing an explicit quotation, an *introductory formula* or *referral* is required (although what types of *means* or *special terms* are considered as introductory formulae have not been clarified by scholars),³⁷² whether at least two or three words in a quotation are found verbally parallel to its antecedent. Hence, examining the lists of explicit quotations that scholars already recognize will be very helpful for the following discussion.

³⁶⁹ Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011).

³⁷⁰ Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 26–27.

³⁷¹ Devorah Dimant, “Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 385.

³⁷² Cf. Steve Moyise, “Quotations,” in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley, SBLSymS 50 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 15. Also cf. Richard B. Hays and Joel B. Green, “The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers,” in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 126. Hays and Green may have another understanding concerning “*direct citation*, which may or may not be introduced with an introductory formula.”

Accordingly, allusions or echoes will not be included in the discussion due to their lack of having a formula or referral and the large amount of texts found in the Jewish literature.³⁷³ In addition, ancient commentaries (*pesharim*) on OT writings and retellings of OT stories will also be excluded.³⁷⁴ Since John has two sets of combined quotations, the cases with combined quotations in the materials that are accompanied with or without an introductory formula will also be visited. The investigation helps to learn (1) how the quotation techniques (forms and methods) that John's author applies are related to his literary milieu, which is mostly of Jewish scriptural background, and (2) what those quotation formulae mean or how they function in order to bridge former scriptural texts to the narrative.

4.1 Quotation Formulae in the Jewish Literature

4.1.1 Old Testament

Several texts in the OT have their counterparts elsewhere. For instance, David's poetic work in Ps 18 can be found duplicated in 2 Sam 22:1–51. Micah 4:1–3 and Isa 4:2–4 share the same oracle. The ending of 2 Chronicles (36:22–12) is identical to the beginning of Ezra (1:1–3a). Those cases of scriptural quotations are not of interest to this paper. In fact, few *scriptural* quotations are found in the OT.³⁷⁵ Nonetheless, quotation formulae, or the *prototypes* of introductory formula, do exist in the OT. Some significant observations concerning such uses of introductory formulae can be observed.

³⁷³ Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 24–29, also distinguish among allusions, references, and reminiscences. For Lange and Weigold, semi-quotations can be categorized into *explicit reference*, which shows explicit referral without specifically quoted text, and *implicit reference*, which “refers to easily identifiable elements of a given text without naming that text.”

³⁷⁴ See nn. 97 and 109.

³⁷⁵ In Lange and Weigold's definition, they would be categorized as *explicit allusions*. See *ibid.*, 26, 199–224.

4.1.1.1 Quotations from Outside of the OT

First, quoted texts are indicated as derived from outside of the OT itself. Three passages are extracted by their writers either from the Book of the Wars of the Lord or the Book of Jashar. For the passage in Num 21:14–15, the formula **יֵאמֵר בְּסֵפֶר מִלְחֻמַּת יְהוָה** (it is said in the Book of the Wars of YHWH) introduces the quote, which illustrates the geography of Moab. In the formula, the passive verb form of **אָמַר** (to say) is used with a prepositional phrase specifying the source. The other two passages are in Josh 10:13 and 2 Sam 1:18–27. In the former text, the formula **הֲלֹא־הִיא כְּתוּבָה עַל־סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר** (Is that not written *on* the book of Jashar?)³⁷⁶ comes as a rhetorical question *after* the quoted poem in order to accent the authenticity of the miraculous war at Gibeon. In the latter passage, the formula **הִנֵּה כְּתוּבָה עַל־סֵפֶר הַיָּשָׁר** (behold, it is written *on* the Book of Jashar) introduces David’s lament for Jonathan. Both formulae in Josh 10:13 and 2 Sam 1:18 employ the passive participle form of the verb **כָּתַב** (to write) plus the source of the quotations. Although the three instances are not from the Torah, their sources are presumably well-known to the contemporary people of Israel as historical accounts.³⁷⁷

4.1.1.2 God’s Commands/Promises Not Written down

Second, some passages refer to the words of God, though not being written down, which God commanded or promised before and are repeated or remembered now. The Serpent of Gen 3:3, probably the very first quoter, quotes God’s prohibition in the Eden in Gen 2:17. The quotation formula is simply “God said” (**אָמַר אֱלֹהִים**). In addition, Moses repeats God’s commands several times to the people. By the formula “YHWH said” (**יְהוָה אָמַר** or **יְהוָה**)

³⁷⁶ This quotation formula is lacking in LXX.

³⁷⁷ In the OT, several *proverbs* are mentioned as seeming to be circulated among the people (Gen 10:9; 22:14; 1 Sam 10:12; 19:24; 24:13; 2 Sam 5:8; Ezek 12:22; 16:44; 18:2). The verb **אָמַר** is primarily used in their introductory formulae. Sometimes, the verb **נִשֵּׁל** (to speak a proverb) or its noun is employed. They are not discussed in this research. Another similar case would be that the song in 1 Sam 18:7 is cited by others in 21:11 and 29:5.

אָמַר), he cites God's words (e.g., Deut 9:12; 17:16; 31:2). As for God's promises, Abraham's Promise (Gen 12:7; 13:15–17; 15:5; 26:4; 28:13–15) is often reiterated in the Pentateuch.³⁷⁸

Gen 24:7—Abraham quoted, “who swore to me, saying...” (וַאֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּע־לִי לֵאמֹר);

Gen 48:4—Jacob retold, “he said to me...” (וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי);

Exod 32:13—Moses reminded God, “you swore to them by yourself and said to them...”

(וַנִּשְׁבַּעְתָּ לָהֶם בְּךָ וַתִּדְבֹר אֲלֵהֶם);

Exod 33:1—God repeated, “I swore to ... saying...” (וַנִּשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְ ... לֵאמֹר);

Num 10:29—Moses quoted, “of which YHWH said...” (אָמַר יְהוָה); and,

Deut 34:4—God affirmed, “This is the land of which I swore to ... saying...”

(זֹאת הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי לְ ... לֵאמֹר).

Caleb, in Josh 14:9–12, prompts Joshua about God's earlier promise in Deut 1:36 (cf. Num 14:24), which he also considers as Moses's oath by saying, “Moses swore on the day, ... saying” (וַיִּשְׁבַּע מֹשֶׁה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא לֵאמֹר). Caleb believes that God has kept him alive for forty-five years just *as* God spoke (כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר [Josh 14:10]). The comparative preposition כִּי (*as* or *in accordance with*) expresses that what Caleb has experienced presently is consistent with what God said before.

David's Promise is also reiterated more than once by Solomon in the book of 1 Kings. Before and after the completion of the temple, Solomon in 1 Kgs 5:5 and 8:15–20 retells/ summarizes God's promise for David (2 Sam 7:6–13) by the formula, “YHWH said to David, my father” (1 Kgs 5:5 [5:19 MT]; 8:18).³⁷⁹ After his quoting in 1 Kgs 8:15–20, Solomon states in 8:20 that “YHWH has established his word that he said” (וַיִּקְּם יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר). Such a

³⁷⁸ The Abrahamic Promise is not often quoted verbatim.

³⁷⁹ “וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־דָּוִד אָבִי” in 1 Kgs 5:5; “כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה אֶל־דָּוִד אָבִי לֵאמֹר” in 1 Kgs 8:18 (=2 Chr 6:8).

statement expresses the promise-fulfillment or David's promise.³⁸⁰ Moreover, Solomon continues to cite a promise of God that David told him in his will in 1 Kgs 2:4 where a fulfillment-purpose formula is read:³⁸¹ “that YHWH may establish his word what he spoke about me, saying” (לְמַעַן (יָקִים יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר עָלַי לֵאמֹר). In 1 Kgs 8:25, Solomon thus quotes it in order to remind God to keep his word, using the formula, “keep what you have said to him, saying” (שָׁמַר אֶת אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ לוֹ לֵאמֹר ...). Then, in 9:5 God responds by reaffirming his promise with an additional warning. The formula in this case is read, “as what I said to David your father, saying” (כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי עַל־דָּוִד אָבִיךָ לֵאמֹר).³⁸² In God's response, the preposition כִּי clearly expresses the meaning of correspondence between what God promised/said in advance and what he keeps saying concerning the enthronement in Israel (כִּסֵּא יִשְׂרָאֵל in 8:25; 9:5). Such an expression definitely conveys the sense of fulfillment of God's word, which can be evidently seen in 8:24: וַתִּבְרַךְ בְּפִיךָ וּבְיָדְךָ מְלֵאתָ (you said with your mouth and by your hand you fulfilled).³⁸³

In his prayer in Neh 1:8–9, Nehemiah also reminds God of his words, which Nehemiah adopts from several Pentateuchal passages (i.e., Lev 26:33; Deut 30:2–4; 12:5). He puts in 1:8, “Remember the word that you commanded your servant Moses, saying” (זְכֹר־נָא אֶת־הַדְּבָר אֲשֶׁר וְיָמַר מֹשֶׁה עַבְדְּךָ לֵאמֹר (צִוִּיתָ אֶת־מֹשֶׁה עַבְדְּךָ לֵאמֹר). In addition, Moses in Num 14:17–18 also quotes God's revelation of his divine character (in Exod 34:6–8) in order that God may withdraw his wrath from the people of Israel.

³⁸⁰ The preposition כִּי in 1 King 5:5 also expresses this sense.

³⁸¹ God's promise in 1 Kgs 2:4 does not obviously appear in 2 Sam 7. It is only read in Ps 132:11–12.

³⁸² The formula in 2 Chr 6:16 is identical to 1 Kgs 8:25. However, the formula for the parallel of 1 Kgs 9:5 in 2 Chr 7:18 changes the verb דִּבֶּר to כָּרַת (“to covenant”).

³⁸³ Also see 1 Kgs 8:15: וַיֹּאמֶר בְּרוּךְ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּפִי אֶת דָּוִד אָבִי וּבְיָדוֹ מְלֵא לֵאמֹר.

4.1.1.3 God's Commands Done Correspondingly

Third, God's command is cited in order to show his word done/kept correspondingly. Joshua 8:31 is quoted from Deut 27:5 as a proof-text for Joshua's building an altar to God. The introductory formula is twofold:

“as Moses the servant of YHWH commanded the people of Israel” (כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה מֹשֶׁה) (עֲבַד-יְהוָה אֶת-בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), and

“as that is written in the Book of the Torah of Moses” (כַּכְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה).³⁸⁴

The latter one is likely to emphasize what Moses commanded has been *written* in the Torah.³⁸⁵

This is the first OT introductory formula using “it is written” (הַכְּתוּב, lit., “the written”) to refer back to the written text. Furthermore, in 2 Kgs 14:3–6 (cf. 2 Chr 25:4), the writer cites the text from Deut 24:16 to approve King Amaziah's execution of his father's murderers and the preservation of their children in obedience to the Law. The quotation formula in this case is “as that is written in the Book of the Law of Moses, which YHWH commanded, saying” (כַּכְּתוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה אֲשֶׁר-צִוָּה יְהוָה לֵאמֹר). It is striking that both instances have a similar formula while quoting from Deuteronomy as a proof-text. The Torah of Moses as a *written* work is also marked in both cases.³⁸⁶ Again, the comparative preposition כִּי plays a significant role in the formulae conveying the sense of correspondence between God's commands and the people's practices.

³⁸⁴ In LXX, it reads, “καθὰ γέγραπται ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωυσῆ.”

³⁸⁵ Cf. Deut 30:10; 31:24; Josh 1:8

³⁸⁶ In Josh 10:13 and 2 Sam 1:18–27, the Book of Jashar is also noted as *written*.

4.1.1.4 Quotation Antecedents Not Found

Fourth, some *quoted* passages are found with no explicit antecedent or read like summaries. The authorial annotation in Num 21:16, for example, reports that God made an imperative to Moses at Beer before, using the formula “where YHWH said to Moses” (אֲשֶׁר אָמַר (יְהוָה לְמֹשֶׁה). However, such an event cannot be identified in any account although the author even quotes the song about it (Num 21:17–18). In addition, the words quoted in 2 Sam 3:18 and 5:2 find no antecedents in the OT although both of the formulae imply that the words came to David from God.

2 Sam 3:18—“YHWH has said to David, saying” (כִּי יְהוָה אָמַר אֶל-דָּוִד לֵאמֹר), and

2 Sam 5:2—“YHWH has said to you” (וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה לְךָ).

In another case, the passage in Judg 2:1–3 records the rebuke of God’s representative messenger against the people of Israel with two citations in first person formula: “I [=God] said.... Again, I say...” (וַיֹּאמֶר ... וְגַם אָמַרְתִּי ...). The quotations are more like words summarized from God’s former warnings. In these cases, the formula, such as “YHWH said,” is used to emphasize the vital significance of God’s word though not being specifically verbatim or not found in a written text.

4.1.1.5 Without an Accompanying Quotation

The last phenomenon is about the *formulae* that almost resemble the introductory formulae mentioned previously in form but accompany *no* quoted text. This case occurs hundreds of times in the OT. These occurrences are more like a *statement* than an introductory formula. Those instances can be briefly categorized into two groups. A great amount of them, as the first group, appears in the contexts regarding the obedience to God’s commandment, the Law, or to the word of a prophet. In this group, the preposition **בְּ** is often found prefixed in the

beginning of the formulae, signifying the present action/speech corresponding with what has been commanded before. Four basic forms are found. The first form is the most frequent one, happening almost in the Pentateuch. It reads, “as what YHWH commanded” (כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה). Usually, the object of the command is Moses.³⁸⁷ At times, the verb דָּבַר (to say) replaces צִוָּה (to command).³⁸⁸ The second is, “as what Moses commanded.” This form appears only several times and usually indicates in the immediate context Moses as the servant of YHWH/God (עֲבָד יְהוָה); e.g., Josh 11:12; 1 Chr 6:49). The use in both Josh 11:15 and 2 Kgs 21:8 suggests that what Moses commanded is *identical* to what God commanded. The third type is, “as/according to the word of YHWH” (כְּדִבְרֵי יְהוָה). At times, it takes an additional phrase to show the recipient (e.g., “to Israel” [עַל-יִשְׂרָאֵל] in 1 Chr 11:10), or the agent (e.g., “by the hand of Moses” [בְּיַד-מֹשֶׁה] in 2 Chr 35:6). The fourth mode is, “as the written” (כְּכָתוּב). This expression is usually followed by a prepositional phrase to indicate the source, which always refers to the Torah (הַתּוֹרָה).³⁸⁹

The second group concerns the passages that indicate the coming-to-pass of God’s word. Just as the previous group, the comparative preposition כִּי appears in most occurrences. The formulae “as what YHWH said” (כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה) and “as the word of YHWH” (כְּדִבְרֵי יְהוָה) are the primary types. In the cases where the word is marked as foretold by an agent, mostly a prophet, these two types would be combined and the prepositional phrase “by/through...” (בְּיַד-,

³⁸⁷ Moses can also be the agent. One can find two instances in Joshua with the phrase, “by the hand of Moses” (בְּיַד-מֹשֶׁה; in 14:2; 21:8; cf. 2 Kgs 17:13).

³⁸⁸ A passive form “as what I was commanded” (כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי) can be observed in Ezek 12:7; 24:18; 37:7.

³⁸⁹ The Law is shown in various phrases, “in the Law of the Lord” (בְּתוֹרַת יְהוָה; e.g., 1 Chr 16:40), “in the book of the Law” (בְּסֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה; e.g., Josh 8:34), “in the book of Moses” (בְּסֵפֶר מֹשֶׁה; e.g., 2 Chr 35:12), or “in the Law of Moses” (בְּתוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה; e.g., Ezra 3:2).

lit., “by the hand of,” or בְּפִי, lit., “by the mouth of”) is added.³⁹⁰ The following are two examples:

1 Kgs 14:18—“in accordance with the word of YHWH, which he spoke through his servant Ahijah the prophet” (כַּדְבַר יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד-עַבְדּוֹ אֲחִיהוּ הַנָּבִיא)

2 Kgs 24:2—“in accordance with the word of YHWH, which he spoke through his servant the prophets” (כַּדְבַר יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר בְּיַד עֲבָדָיו הַנָּבִיאִים)

Furthermore, in several instances the writers enunciate the coming-to-pass of God’s word more clearly. In the Book of Joshua, both the author and Joshua claim that nothing God had spoken to the people of Israel has failed; *all has come to pass* (הַכֹּל בָּא in Josh 21:45; 23:14; cf. 1 Kgs 8:56; Jer 25:13). In other historical books, the writers even pronounce the fulfillment-purpose of God’s word. The following list shows such an expression:

1 Kgs 2:27—“to fulfill the word of YHWH that he spoke about the house of Eli” (לְמַלֵּא (אֶת-דְּבַר יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר עַל-בֵּית עֲלִי),

1 Kgs 12:15—“that he may establish his word, which YHWH spoke through Ahijah the Shilonite” (לְמַעַן יִקְיֶם אֶת-דְּבָרוֹ אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יְהוָה בְּיַד אֲחִיהָ הַשִּׁילֹנִי),

2 Chr 36:21—“to fulfill the word of YHWH by the mouth of Jeremiah” (לְמַלֵּאוֹת) (דְּבַר-יְהוָה בְּפִי יִרְמְיָהוּ), and

2 Chr 36:22—“that the word of YHWH by the mouth of Jeremiah may be completed” (לְכַלּוֹת דְּבַר-יְהוָה בְּפִי יִרְמְיָהוּ).³⁹¹

³⁹⁰ “יָד,” HALOT, 2:388, marks בְּיַד as intensifying expression of the preposition בְּ. Cf. “בְּ,” HALOT, 1:105. In the contexts of the examples mentioned, it does not seem appropriate to read בְּיַד as “by the hand of.”

³⁹¹ The formula is also identical to the one in Ezra 1:1. However, in LXX, “לְכַלּוֹת” is translated as “μετὰ τὸ πληρωθῆναι” in 2 Chr 36:22 and “τοῦ τελεσθῆναι” in Ezra 1:1.

For this phenomenon, therefore, those formulae build a bridge connecting a contemporary event and the word of God despite the absence of an explicit quotation of the word. The word that God said before finds its fulfillment in the present event.

4.1.1.6 Summary

In sum, these five phenomena show that the formulae in the OT are probably prototypes of quotation formulae despite the fact that a large portion does not include quoted text.³⁹² In the OT, the word of God, either said by God himself or conveyed by Moses or prophets, is reckoned as the ultimate principle and promise. Those formulae are used in order to evoke God's word or commands³⁹³ and to show the obedience of the recipient of God's commands or the coming-to-pass of God's promises. The formulae are basically two types in verbal form. The first is formed with a speech verb, **צוה** or **דבר**, preceded by **כִּאֲשֶׁר**, sometimes combined with the phrase **דִּבֶּר יְהוָה**. The second takes the verb **כתב**, mostly in the passive participle form **הִכְתוּב**. At times, decorations (e.g., the carrier of the word, the source) would be added to a formula of either type. In some cases, the term *saying* (**לֵאמֹר**) is inserted right before a virtual quotation. The expression of the word of God as *what is written* (**הִכְתוּב**) can be likely traced back to the source of God's commandments at Sinai. In the Torah, the two Tablets are reiterated as *written* with God's finger (e.g., Exod 31:18; Deut 29:21). In addition, what is written on the Tablets is identical to the words that God has *spoken* to the people (Deut 9:10). Hence, the people are instructed to obey all the words that are written in the Torah (Deut 28:58),³⁹⁴ which is also called the Book of Torah (**סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה**; e.g., Josh 1:8) or the Book of the Law of Moses (**סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה**; e.g., Josh 8:31).

³⁹² For those quoted texts, they are *not* always identical to the original verbatim.

³⁹³ Only instances in 4.1.1.1. are quoted for historical events (Num 21:14–15; Josh 10:13 and 2 Sam 1:18).

³⁹⁴ Deut 28:58–**לַעֲשׂוֹת אֶת כָּל־דִּבְרֵי הַתּוֹרָה הַזֹּאת הִכְתוּבִים בְּסֵפֶר הַזֶּה** (“to do all the words of this Law that are written in this book”).

These typical verbs in those introductory formulae also suggest that God's word is to be perceived by the people in listening through the carriers of God's word (e.g., Moses and the prophets).

Besides the two verbal types, the comparative preposition כִּי plays a significant role in many formulaic phrases to communicate the congruence between God's former word and the latter event. In fact, most formulae found in the OT are in the sense to convey some sort of expression of correspondence. The quotation formulae relate the text or the word of God to the situations about which the quoter is concerned, particularly God's commandment being fully obeyed and God's promise being reminded or fulfilled. Primarily, in the OT through formulaic quoting, the word of God is retold in relation to the historical events of God's people. Furthermore, the fundamental part of such correspondences is not the latter events but rather the former word spoken by God.

4.1.2 Qumran Literature

In the mid-last century, the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered at the northeast coastal area of the Dead Sea. Among the hundreds of scrolls are a great amount of sectarian texts, including community rules (supposedly from the Essenes), commentaries on some OT books, hymns and prayers, calendars, and wisdom literature.³⁹⁵ In addition to many scriptural texts found in scriptural commentaries (*pesharim*),³⁹⁶ some quotation formulae introducing scriptural texts are read in other sectarian writings. Concerning OT quotations in Qumran writings, Joseph A.

³⁹⁵ Cf. John J. Collins and Craig A. Evans, eds., *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 9–14; John J. Collins, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013), 20–30. Many scrolls of biblical books (all the books of the Hebrew Bible except Esther) and biblically based apocryphal works were also discovered.

³⁹⁶ The Qumran *peshet* presents exegesis for scriptural book verse by verse. E.g., Commentary on Habakkuk (1QpHab), Commentary on Psalms (4Q171).

Fitzmyer and Geza Vermes have contributed their findings respectively.³⁹⁷ Both of them examine primarily the rule-texts in the Qumran sectarian works (i.e., the Rule of the Community [1QS], the Damascus Document [CD], and the War Scrolls [1QM]).³⁹⁸ Fitzmyer's exhaustive work mainly focuses on the forms of the introductory formulae found in those Qumran writings and on the aspects in which the OT texts are adopted in a new situation.³⁹⁹ Vermes, however, is interested in the literary structures (or layouts of the arguments) of biblical proof-texts, which are those texts with OT citations, and in the exegetical purpose of proof-texts used in the Qumran works.⁴⁰⁰ Both Fitzmyer and Vermes point out that the OT quotations in the Qumran rule-texts are employed as *proof-texts* (though in various ways) for doctrinal or legal arguments of the community.⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁷ Fitzmyer, "Quotations in Qumran," 297–333; Geza Vermes, "Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature," *JSS* 34 (1989): 493–508.

³⁹⁸ Fitzmyer also includes the Florilegium (4Q174) partially (only four quotations) in his work because 4Q174 had not yet been published fully before his work.

³⁹⁹ Fitzmyer's categories of quotation formula are threefold: (1) those with the verb "to write" (כתב); (2) those with the verb "to say" (אמר, רבר, והניד); and, (3) other kinds. In the discussion of the formula, he also shows possible Greek equivalent(s) for each Hebrew formula. Concerning the aspects of quotation employment, he classifies them into four groups according to the degree the original sense of an OT text is respected. They are (1) "Literal or Historical class," in which an OT text is quoted in its original sense; (2) "Modernization," in which an OT text is understood for some new historical event in the sect; (3) "Accommodation," in which the meaning of an OT text is wrested from its original context; and, (4) "Eschatological class," in which a quotation is used for an event deemed to be accomplished in the *eschaton*. See Fitzmyer, "Quotations in Qumran," 300–304; 305–30.

⁴⁰⁰ As Fitzmyer mentions, the Qumran literature has "a body of isolated explicit quotations of the Old Testament, which are introduced by special formulae and are cited to bolster up or illustrate an argument, to serve as a *point de départ* in a discussion or to act as a sort of proof-text" (ibid., 299). According to Vermes, the literary structures of the biblical proof-texts are more than one type in the Qumran literature. In the War Scrolls, he observes bipartite or tripartite arguments, and in the Rule of the Community, tripartite and fourfold. In the Damascus Document, however, the structures vary. Moreover, he divides the explicit quotations into four classes by their purpose: (1) eschatological actualization, (2) direct proof, (3) reinforced proof, and (4) proof of historical fulfillment. See Vermes, "Biblical Proof-Texts," 495–502; 502–5.

⁴⁰¹ Fitzmyer, "Quotations in Qumran," 299; Vermes, "Biblical Proof-Texts," 493, 502.

4.1.2.1 Primary Types of Formulae

More than seventy OT quotations from recent Qumran literature are in the examination.⁴⁰² In addition to about fifty quotations from rule texts (1QS, CD [and its manuscripts], 1QM, and Miscellaneous Rules [4Q265]), four quotations are found in *halakhic* writings (4QMMT^{a,d} [4Q394, 4Q397] and Toḥorot A [4Q274]) and twenty are from exegetical works (Florilegium [4Q174], Melchizedek [11Q13], and Catena^a [4Q177]). They belong to the compositions dated from the beginning of the first century BCE to the beginning of the first century CE. The basic elements of quotation formula are “it/he said” (אשר אמר or אשר דבר [rare]) and “it is written” (אשר כתוב).⁴⁰³ In a few cases, the former can be shortened to “said” (אמר) or “saying” (לאמור), while the latter “it is written” (כתוב). More instances show various extended versions by adding some elements. In general, the אמר-type is more frequently seen in CD and 11Q13,⁴⁰⁴ and the כתוב-type is almost the only type in 1QS, 4QMMT, 4Q174,⁴⁰⁵ and 4Q177. This phenomenon implies that an author would have his preference of using a certain type of quotation formula.

The two verbal forms that occur primarily in the OT also appear in the Qumran writings. The preposition כ (with the relative אשר) frequently seen in OT formulaic phrases also appears in the beginning of some Qumran quotation formulae, signifying the corresponding relation between the word said/written formerly by God or the carriers of God’s word and the circumstance/rule stated presently. Moreover, in several cases, the causal כי (for) precedes the

⁴⁰² See Chart 5.

⁴⁰³ The phrase “אשר אמר” is not always introducing a scriptural quotation in Qumran literature (e.g., CD 4:15; 8:20), while almost every “אשר כתוב” happens to precede a quotation.

⁴⁰⁴ The author of 11Q13 prefers alternative verbs, נגד and דבר, with לאמור. Therefore, it seems to be an author’s characteristic in using introductory formula in his work.

⁴⁰⁵ There is an exception in 4Q174 1–2 I 7.

introductory *said* or *written* verbs in order to provide a scriptural text as the reason for a certain rule/circumstance stated.⁴⁰⁶

4.1.2.2 Quotation Source

For those formulae with the passive verb **כתוב**, the subject *it* is always refers to the following quoted text. For the formulae with the verb **אמר**, some variations appear by simply adding a specific *speaker* as the attribution. In the instances, God (**אל**) is the speaker most frequently mentioned more than Moses, Isaiah, and Daniel.⁴⁰⁷ However, the specified speaker is not always the original contributor of the quoted word. For example, in CD VIII 9–10, the quotation formula **אל אשר אמר אל** (what God said) marks the speaker of the quoted text (Deut 32:33) as God. However, Moses is the original voice in the Song of Moses (Deut 32). Again, Balaam's oracle in Num 24:17–19 is considered God's word in 1QM XI 5–7 by the formula **לאמור ... כאשר הגדתה** (as what you [God] told, ... saying).⁴⁰⁸ On the contrary, in CD V 8–9, the formula **ומשה אמר** (Moses said) indicates that the following text (Lev 18:13) is Moses's word, which in the original context is God's commandment. Nonetheless, this phenomenon may not indicate the ignorance of the writers but that the scriptural word is just treated as God's word and God's command is what Moses conveyed.

Concerning the cases without a speaker indicated in the formula, Fitzmyer considers that “it is not often possible to determine who or what the subject is in these formulae.”⁴⁰⁹ The subject of the phrase **כאשר אמר** can be either *it* (the Scripture) or *he*.⁴¹⁰ In some cases, however, the

⁴⁰⁶ Mostly the use appears in the Damascus Document.

⁴⁰⁷ CD V 8–9; VI 7–8, 13–14; VIII 9–10, 14–15; 1QM XI 5–7 (“you”=God), 11–12 (“you”=God); 11Q13 II 18–19.

⁴⁰⁸ Also in both CD IV 13–14 and 1QM XI 11–12, Isaiah's voice is deemed as God's word.

⁴⁰⁹ Fitzmyer, “Quotations in Qumran,” 301.

⁴¹⁰ This can be observed by comparing translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls. E.g., the preference of “it” in Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 5th. ed., Penguin Classics (London: Penguin Books, 2011), and

subject can be determined from the context. For example, in CD VII 8, the subject of **אמר** is better considered as *it*, which refers to the Torah (**התורה**) that precedes. The subject of **אמר** in the formula in CD IX 8–9 cannot be the original speaker, Abigail (1 Sam 25:26), who entails a female verb form. Thus, it is naturally understood as *it*, which denotes the word of Abigail, or, better, *the Scripture*.⁴¹¹ In 4Q174 1–2 I 7, the speaker is obviously God due to the following phrase **לדוד** (to David). In other cases, then, sometimes the subject is ambiguous. For example, in 4Q266 6 I 8–9, the subject in the formula **ואשר אמר** can be either *it* (the Scripture or the Torah) or *God*. The speaker to which the formula refers in CD-B XX 16 is either *it* (the Scripture) or *Hosea*, who spoke the quoted text. However, due to the phenomenon of ambiguity just mentioned in the last passage, to point out exactly the *original speaker* of a quoted text may not be so important. If the authority of the source of the citations has been confirmed in the community, the ultimate speaker then is God himself whether indicated either as God, one of the servants of God's word, or the Scripture itself, as long as the quoted is from the authoritative scriptural writings. It is presumably the same sense conveyed by the **כתוב**-type formulae.

4.1.2.3 Topic and Agent

Of all the quotation formulae, more than ten instances have **על** (about) attached in order to indicate the topic (e.g., oath in CD IX 8) or the object (e.g., him [the divine being] in 11Q13 II 23) about which the quotation is mentioned. Furthermore, an addition of the agent or the source is found in many formulae. The Qumran works have two types of prepositional phrases: (1) “by/

the preference of “he” in Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

⁴¹¹ The possible general title of the three parts of the Scripture in the Qumran community is shown in 4Q397 (MMT^d) 14–21 10, [-- **ד**] **בספר משה** [ו] **בספר** [י] **הנביאים** **ובדברי** [ד] -- “in the book of Moses, [and] in the book[s] of the P[ro]phets, and in the books of Davi[d...]”

through [the hand of]” (בִּיד),⁴¹² which is usually seen in the rule texts (CD and 1QM); and, (2) “in the book/scroll of” (בְּסֵפֶר), which appears in the exegetical texts (4Q174 and 4Q177). For example, in CD IV 13–14, the formula reads, “as God said by [the hand of] Isaiah the prophet [בִּיד יִשְׁעִיָּה הַנְּבִיא], son of Amos, saying.” In 4Q174 1–2 I 15, it notes, “as what is written in the book of Isaiah the prophet [בְּסֵפֶר יִשְׁעִיָּה הַנְּבִיא].” Both kinds of prepositional phrases convey the similar fact that the quotations that follow are from the community’s authoritative scrolls, the sacred Scripture *written* by Moses and other prophets.

4.1.2.4 Combined Quotations

Moreover, several groups of combined quotations (two or more quotations in a series) are found.⁴¹³ They are either with citation formula(e) attached or without any.⁴¹⁴ Examples of this phenomenon can be seen as following. In a discussion in CD V 13–17 concerning lawbreakers, four quotations (from Isa 50:11; 59:5; 27:11; Deut 32:38) are in a row, without any introductory formulae attached (except a כִּי in V 16).⁴¹⁵ In another case in 1QS V15–17, both quotations (from Exod 23:7; Isa 2:22) employed for the rule of “departure from the wicked” are preceded by the formula כְּתוּב. One final example is that the formula joined with כְּתוּב and אֲשֶׁר אָמַר is twice followed by כֹּאשֶׁר אָמַר in CD VII 10–16 where the topic “the day for God’s judgment” is mentioned. In this final case, the second and third quotations (Amos 5:26–27; 9:11) support their antecedent Scripture (Isa 7:17).⁴¹⁶

⁴¹² Cf. n. 390.

⁴¹³ Following H. Gabrion, Andrew Chester, “Citing the Old Testament,” in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 145, calls this style “anthological.”

⁴¹⁴ Almost all the quotations without an introductory formula are in this category.

⁴¹⁵ Also, there are three quotations in CD-B XX 19–22 without any formula.

⁴¹⁶ Isaiah 7:17 is quoted in CD VII 10–12, supported by Amos 5:26–27 in CD VII 14–15; while Amos 5:26–27 is interpreted by Amos 9:11 in CD VII 16.

4.1.2.5 Summary

In sum, some observations can be drawn from this investigation.⁴¹⁷ First, the types of quotation formulae found as prototypes in the OT are also present in Qumran literature as the primary types. An author of the Qumran literature would have his preference of using a certain type of quotation formula. Second, some introductory formulae show that God, or the Scripture itself, is the *speaker* of the scriptural text. Others then note a human name as the *writer* or the agent of the written Scripture. Third, scriptural quotations appear as the authoritative words that guide the life of faith of the Qumran community and provide some contemporary meanings to happening events.⁴¹⁸ The prepositional terms כּ and על in the citation formulae imply that the formulae bridge the quoted text to their contemporary context. Fourth, those quotations that do not take any introductory formulae usually occur grouped in the series of quotations. Furthermore, the purpose of quoting OT texts in Qumran literature can be briefly categorized into two groups: (1) as proof-texts for theological/interpretive statements, religious rules, and historical/contemporary/future events; and, (2) as liturgical language in prayers, hymns, or psalms, supplicating God and encouraging the readers and author himself. For such purposes, a quotation formula is often employed in order to highlight the significance of the quoted text to the immediate argument. A citation formula can easily help the author reference authoritative Scripture's point of view as his support despite the author's method of exegesis.

⁴¹⁷ Fitzmyer, "Quotations in Qumran," 304, also notes similar features concerning introductory formulae in Qumran.

⁴¹⁸ Cf. Vermes, "Biblical Proof-Texts," 502.

4.1.3 OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

The period of the works of OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha can be very long. For the purpose of this research, those writings dated later than the first century CE are excluded.⁴¹⁹ However, not every work has OT quotations (e.g., Judith, Epistle of Jeremiah [= Bar 6]).⁴²⁰ For those that have OT quotations,⁴²¹ an introductory formula is *not* always present.⁴²² In this case, OT quotations are mostly embedded into their texts.⁴²³ For instance, in the Testament of Job, the writer has an account of Job's words. In another case, several OT texts are found in the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach as blended into the wisdom hymns. In addition, scriptural texts are welded to prayers in the Prayer of Manasseh. Thus, such quotation phenomena will be omitted from this discussion.

The quotation formulae in the selected materials are found in various expressions.⁴²⁴ Most of them primarily have a *say* pattern. This pattern appears in the simplest phrases, such as “Moses *said*” (4 Ezra 7:129; 4 Macc 17:19), “the Lord *said*” (T. Ab. A 8:5; Sus 53; 3 Macc 6:15), and “the Law *says*” (4 Macc 2:5; Aristob. 2.12), to the more decorated ones,⁴²⁵ such as

⁴¹⁹ For example, 3 Enoch, which is dated later than the end of first century CE, has many quotation formulae of “it is written.” Cf. Craig A. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 9–47; James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983).

⁴²⁰ Dimant, “Use and Interpretation,” 382, categorizes the use of biblical elements in post-biblical literature into two: *compositional* and *expositional*. “In compositional use biblical elements are interwoven into the work without external formal markers; in expositional use they are presented explicitly as such, with a clear external marker.”

⁴²¹ Relatively, explicit quotations are few. Cf. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 321; Dimant, “Use and Interpretation,” 385; Chester, “Citing the Old Testament,” 150–64.

⁴²² Cf., James Keith Zink, “The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1963), 151–63.

⁴²³ Dimant, “Use and Interpretation,” 401.

⁴²⁴ However, since some works could only be accessed in translation (cf. discussions in Charlesworth, ed., *OTP*), we have primarily shown the texts in English here.

⁴²⁵ Also see Tob 2:6; 2 Macc 7:6; Let. Aris. 155.

Aristob. 2.8—“Now Moses indicates this also in our Law when he *says* thus,” and

Bar 2:20—“just as you *said* by the hand of your servants, the prophets, *saying*.”⁴²⁶

As for the *written* mode, one can observe the phrase “in accordance with the word that was *written*” in 1 Macc 7:16 and the sentence “behold it is *written* in the section where the Lord says” in Mart. Ascen. Isa. 4:21.⁴²⁷

More strikingly, authorial stylistic features in the use of quotation formulae can be observed in the selective materials. The five formulae in the conclusion of 4 Macc, in which the author describes how the mother of the seven children told them about their father’s scriptural teaching, show a similar structure ending with participial forms of λέγω.⁴²⁸

18:14—“He even reminded you of the scripture of Isaiah, which *says*” (ὑπεμίμνησκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν Ησαιοῦ γραφὴν τὴν λέγουσαν);

18:15—“He sang to you the psalmist of David, *saying*” (τὸν ὕμνογράφον ἐμελώδει ὑμῖν Δαυιδ λέγοντα);

18:16—“He recited the proverb of Solomon, *saying*” (τὸν Σαλωμῶντα ἐπαροιμιάζειν ὑμῖν λέγοντα);

18:17—“He confirmed the word of Ezekiel, who *says*” (τὸν Ιεζεκιηλ ἐπιστοποῖει τὸν λέγοντα); and,

18:18—“Nor did he forget the song that Moses taught, which *says*” (ὥδῃν μὲν γάρ, ἣν ἐδίδαξεν Μωυσῆς, οὐκ ἐπελάθετο διδάσκων τὴν λέγουσαν).

⁴²⁶ This form is like the ones in 2 Kgs 17:23 and 24:2 LXX in the way of using “by the hand” (ἐν χειρὶ).

⁴²⁷ The section of Mart. Ascen. Isa. 3:13–4:22 is suggested as a later Christian addition composed at about the end of the first century CE. See Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, 32; OTP 2:149–50.

⁴²⁸ Seven OT quotations are found in 4 Macc. The Book of 4 Maccabees is considered as originally composed in Greek. See George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A History and Literary Introduction*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 258.

In addition to the participles, the mother (in the author's account) uses stylistically various verbs for the father's citing. In another case, in *Jubilees*, which is deemed as a midrashic rewriting of Genesis-Exodus,⁴²⁹ the clause of "it is written" is the author's preference in all eight quotation formulae.⁴³⁰ Half of them (four times) show the phrase "in the heavenly tablets" in the formula, indicating the location of the written Scripture (cf. Jub. 23:32). For example, the author in Jub. 4:5, by using "therefore it is written in the heavenly tablets," applies Deut 27:24 to Cain's curse. Hence, the phrase "in the heavenly tablets" also reveals the reason for the author's preference of the *written* type. Accordingly, the quotation formulae in 4 Maccabees and *Jubilees* not only demonstrate the various expressions of the formula in both *say* and *written* types but also imply the fact that an author would have some degree of stylistic freedom with this quotation formula to express his view or emphasis on a quoted text.

Furthermore, Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* (or *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*), though another midrashic retelling of OT stories in the first century CE, reveals an additional characteristic use of quotation formulae. In a large portion of duplicate and fabricated texts of biblical stories, five passages show the term *fulfilled* in the quotation formulae (9:3; 12:3; 21:9; 56:1; 58:1). Such expressions reveal that the words of God or Moses have come to pass in the biblical narrative.⁴³¹ This use is more likely an authorial work even though four of them are on the lips of narrative characters. Therefore, the quotation formulae found in OT Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, although few, do not depart from the formula types seen in the Jewish literature

⁴²⁹ Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, 31; Dimant, "Use and Interpretation," 402. Since *Jubilees* is a rewriting of Genesis-Exodus narratives, the focus is on the quotations that appear in the author's midrashic comments rather than in the characters' dialogues or monologues.

⁴³⁰ *Jubilees* 3:10; 4:5, 30; 5:17, 18; 6:17; 33:10, 12. In 3 Enoch, many quotation formulae are formed by the verb "written." However, since 3 Enoch is considered to be written by Rabbi Ishmael around 132 CE, it is omitted in the materials. Evans, *Noncanonical Writings*, 24.

⁴³¹ The sense of fulfillment can also be seen in LAB 40:4; 51:6.

so far. They also present the authors' characteristics, as well as how the authors understand and use their OT quotations in their works. In narratives, author's phraseological influence can be observed by use of quotation formulae.

4.1.4 Philo's Selected Works⁴³²

According to F. H. Colson, Philo's work has some 1,200 OT citations observed.⁴³³ Colson calls the OT citations that serve as *lemmata* in Philo's commentary writings *direct*, and those that Philo uses for supporting his exposition *illustrative*.⁴³⁴ Since the *direct* quotations stand as *lemmata*,⁴³⁵ they do not take any introductory formula. The *illustrative* ones are the places where the introductory formulae will be examined. It is not practical to examine Philo's whole works in the present research. Therefore, two pieces of Philo's writings, the *Allegorical Interpretation* and the *On the Virtues*, are selected for survey.⁴³⁶

Both works have some quotations without a quotation formula attached but fused in the context (e.g., Deut 33:9 and 10:9 in *Alleg. Interp.* 2:51; Deut 4:39 in *Alleg. Interp.* 2:82; Deut 25:4 in *Virtues*. 145). Some paraphrased texts accompany a formula (e.g., “φησὶν ὅτι” *Alleg. Interp.* 1:17; “φησιν” *Alleg. Interp.* 3:95; “πάλιν φησί” *Virtues*. 96).⁴³⁷ However, the focus here

⁴³² Cf. E. Earle Ellis, “The Old Testament Canon in the Early Church,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 655–58. Ellis points out the similar descriptions of the tripartite Scripture as the Jewish sacred writing in Philo and Josephus.

⁴³³ F. H. Colson, “Philo's Quotations from the Old Testament,” *JTS* 41 (1940): 237–39. Colson suggests adjusting the amount (about 2,000) in Cohn and Wendland's standard text, to which Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 323, refers.

⁴³⁴ Colson, “Philo's Quotations,” 239.

⁴³⁵ Occasionally, a *lemma* quotation would repeat partly in this exposition of it. This type of use of biblical elements also exists in the Qumran *peshet*, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha. Cf. Dimant, “Use and Interpretation,” 382–83.

⁴³⁶ The former work is the second largest (after *On the Special Laws*) piece, showing Philo's elaborate allegorical exposition on Gen 2:1–3:19. The latter one is a topical study on virtues. They offer two different approaches to the scriptural text.

⁴³⁷ Philo also quoted from other literature (Theognis) in *Virt.* 162 by using the formula “ὧς ὁ τῶν παλαιῶν λόγος.”

is more on the quotation formulae that introduce any OT *illustrative* citations. While his *Allegorical Interpretation* contains about 115 citations with an introductory formula, Philo's *On the Virtues* has only five. Most of the formulae fall into the *say* type and not many of them have decorative phrase(s) attached. In the survey, Philo leans much more on φημί (60 times) as the *say* verb than on λέγω (31 times).⁴³⁸ The verb φημί is mostly used in present indicative form (φησι) while λέγω can be found in various tenses, moods, and voices. In addition, Philo also employs the verb μαρτυρέω in his introductory formula (8 times). However, as Christopher D. Stanley points out,⁴³⁹ the formulaic expression of *it is written* is almost absent. For those quotations that Philo uses as an additional support, he would simply use the phrase “ἐν ἑτέροις” (in another [9 times]).

In sum, Philo has his preference for using the simple *say* type, particularly the form φημί, in both his commentary work *Allegorical Interpretation* and his exposition *On the Virtues*.⁴⁴⁰ Even though the OT, especially the Pentateuch, occupies most of Philo's quotations and *Moses says* appears frequently as the introductory formula, Philo's method of introducing quotations, Stanley concludes, is more related to what is observed in non-Jewish literature.⁴⁴¹

4.1.5 Josephus's Writings

Josephus's work has no OT quotation. In Josephus's retelling of Jewish history (*Jewish Antiquities*), one can observe some discourses, of which nearly all are paraphrased (e.g., Gen 2:7

⁴³⁸ In fact, most *say* types in Philo's *direct* quotations are of “φημί.”

⁴³⁹ Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 334.

⁴⁴⁰ Yehoshua Amir, “Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the Writings of Philo,” in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 432–33, also observes, “In all the writings he devoted to Scripture, he treats Moses as the author. When he quotes a Bible verse, he says: Moses says.”

⁴⁴¹ Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 334.

in *Ant.* 1:34; 1 Sam 18:7 in *Ant.* 6:193; Neh 1:5–11 in *Ant.* 11:162).⁴⁴² They show differences in some degree from the text of the OT (either HB or LXX) despite Josephus himself claiming to have given a precise account (*Ant.* 1:17).⁴⁴³ Even for some commandments in the Pentateuch, Josephus always reports them in different terminology and sentence structure instead of quoting them verbatim (cf., *Ant.* 4:199–301). Accordingly, quotation formulae for the OT materials may not be available in Josephus’s works.

However, in Josephus’s works, quotation formulae are not absent. Rather, in both *Jewish Antiquities* and *Against Apion*, quotation formulae can be found in passages where he cites other ancient writers.⁴⁴⁴ *Jewish Antiquities* has twenty-three quotation formulae, and their forms are regular.⁴⁴⁵ Almost every ancient quotation is preceded by the phrase “λέγων οὕτως.” In most cases, such a phrase is preceded by a main verb, just like the formulae in 4 Macc 18, which is mainly “he mentions” or “he witnesses.” The following examples from *Jewish Antiquities* illustrate this pattern:

Ant. 1:158—“Μνημονεύει δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβράμου Βηρωσός ... λέγων δ’ οὕτως·”;

Ant. 7:101—“ὑμνῆται δὲ τούτου τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ Νικόλαος ... λέγων οὕτως·”;
and,

Ant. 13:286—“ὥς μαρτυρεῖ καὶ Στράβων ἡμῖν ὁ Καππάδοξ λέγων οὕτως·”.

⁴⁴² Cf. Philip S. Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 113.

⁴⁴³ Louis H. Feldman, *Josephus’s Interpretation of the Bible*, HCS 27 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 14–15, 37–46. Also cf. Alexander, “Retelling the Old Testament,” 113–16.

⁴⁴⁴ E.g., Berossus the Chaldean, Nicolaus of Damascus, and Strabo of Cappadocia. Two instances are exception: *Ant.* 1:34; 11:49. There, Josephus paraphrastically reports Moses and Zorobabel’s words.

⁴⁴⁵ There are two instances having “λέγει οὕτως” (*Ant.* 1:159; 14:139).

In Josephus's works, the formula type of "λέγων οὕτως" is unique to his *Jewish Antiquities*. Interestingly, for those quoted texts from ancient writers in *Against Apion*, Josephus inclines to use another *to say* verb in the indicative form, φησὶ, similar to Philo's use. In few instances, Josephus uses *to be written* (γέγραφεν/γεγραμμένον) for his quotations. The difference of the formulaic type between the two works may be due to the apologetic nature of the *Against Apion* and the narrative nature of the *Jewish Antiquities*.

Therefore, although no actual OT quotation appears in Josephus's works, some quotations that are extracted from ancient writers can be found using an introductory formula. Josephus employs a different type of formula in *Jewish Antiquities* compared to *Against Apion* and uses almost one kind in each work.

4.1.6 Summary

Several important observations can be made when reviewing the discussion on the citation formula in the selected Jewish literature. First, the OT likely provides the prototypes of introductory formula forms, particularly, the primarily verbal types *say* and *written* and the preposition *like/as*. With respect to the formats of introductory formulae, the Qumran literature has had more influence from the OT. Philo's and Josephus's use of introductory formulae may have reflected influence from non-Jewish literature. In the OT, those formulae, though not always referencing a scriptural text, are mostly to bring God's former words to the people and to signify the correspondence between the words foretold and the occurring event in various ways. In the OT, the words of YHWH are in the life and history of his people, allowing obedience of God's commands and fulfillment of God's promises. Hence, in the Jewish literature, except the retellings of the biblical story in the selected works, the writers also duplicate the same perspective, especially in the Qumran community.

Second, the quotation formulae show that the Scripture is reckoned as authoritative writings; God is the source of the Scripture, in which Moses and the prophets wrote and from which the word of God is still speaking. At times, the expression “what Moses says” is not different from “what God commands.” Therefore, some decorations added to the verbal forms *says* or *written* mark the source or the relation, which may emphasize the quotation’s significance. Third, the survey shows that the use of introductory formulae reflects authorial stylistic character. A writer has his preferred form of formula and is not obligated to maintain only one kind (as Josephus). Fourth, an author can express his point of view on the quoted text through the form of a quotation formula (e.g., the fulfillment theme seen in LAB in various narrative characters).

Moreover, some phenomena are noteworthy. In the survey, a group of combined quotations is not infrequent. On occasions, no formula or reference appears for the second or the ones following (e.g., CD-B XX 19–22). Philo has “in another [place]” to introduce his further textual support. Whether the comparative preposition *like/as* (כִּי) appears or not, quotation formulae convey the meaning of correspondence between God’s former word and the recent event, which can be a rule/principle or an action that shows observance to God’s commands, or a circumstance or an event that is deemed as the fulfillment of God’s promise.⁴⁴⁶ Although the quotation formulae that Philo and Josephus use may in some degree reflect different characteristics or tradition of technique,⁴⁴⁷ the quotation formulae found in the Qumran literature and the selected Apocrypha/Pseudepigrapha imply a Jewish literary feature of using formulae.

⁴⁴⁶ Cf. Stanley, “The Rhetoric of Quotations,” 46–56.

⁴⁴⁷ Christopher D. Stanley, “Paul and Homer: Greco-Roman Citation Practice in the First Century CE,” *NovT* 32 (1990): 55–56.

4.2 Quotation-Formulae in the New Testament

The NT writings have more than 300 occurrences of OT citations.⁴⁴⁸ About 115 occur in the Gospels, as we mentioned in the beginning,⁴⁴⁹ with more than 40 in the Book of Acts, approximately 112 in the Pauline Epistles, and nearly 70 in the General Epistles (Hebrews, 1 Peter, and James). Unlike those in the Gospels and Acts (biographical/historiographical works), which can be attributed either to the authors or the characters who quote OT texts in the narratives, the OT citations in the epistles are directly ascribed to the writers, who excerpt the texts from the OT into their letters. For example, most OT quotations in Acts are reported as cited by Peter, Steven, or Paul in the narrative accounts; however, those scriptural quotations in the Pauline epistles are generally accredited to Paul. The latter cases (the epistles) are more similar to those seen in the previous sections where the use of quotations and introductory formulae can be considered as the direct citing work of the writer. In the former cases (the Gospels and Acts), an author would either report what a figure in his story quotes from the OT himself cites from the OT as his authorial comment. Thus, this chapter surveys the use of OT quotations, first in the NT epistles and then in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts.

4.2.1 Pauline Epistles

More than a hundred OT quotations appear in Paul's epistles in the NT.⁴⁵⁰ More than half of them are in Romans. In his OT citations, Paul has three primary types of quotation introductory formulae. The first type is the phrase “καθώς γέγραπται” or “γέγραπται γάρ”

⁴⁴⁸ The list is in Chart 7.

⁴⁴⁹ See n. 83.

⁴⁵⁰ Cf. Archer and Chirichigno, *Quotations*, xx–xxi; D. Moody Smith, “The Pauline Literature,” in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 267–72; E. Earle Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1981), 11. Ellis has a number of ninety-three. Cf. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 252. In Stanley's research, only quotations in Romans, 1 & 2 Corinthians, and Galatians are counted.

(i.e., *written* type).⁴⁵¹ In such an expression, the grammatical subject of the perfect passive verb γέγραπται is the quotation that follows.⁴⁵² The verbal phrase appears twice accompanied by a prepositional phrase that indicates the source of the quoted text (“ἐν τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ” in 2 Cor 9:9; “ἐν τῷ νόμῳ” in 1 Cor 14:21). In the other two instances, with the *written* phrase before the quotation, the phrase “λέγει κύριος” is added right after the quotation (Rom 12:19; 1 Cor 14:21).⁴⁵³ This phenomenon suggests that Paul reaffirms what is *written* in the Scripture as quoted is the word that the Lord has *spoken*.

The second type are those introductory formulae that have the verb λέγω (i.e., *say* type).⁴⁵⁴ Most of them have the form λέγει.⁴⁵⁵ In this way, the original *speaker* of the quoted text, which is the subject of the verb in the formula, can be promptly highlighted. The most frequent references of the *speaker* are ἡ γραφή and God.⁴⁵⁶ In five instances, ἡ γραφή is clearly indicated as the one who *utters* the quoted text. In three cases, the term γραφή does not appear, but the verbal form itself implies it (e.g., Rom 15:10–11). The term ὁ χρηματισμός is employed once to mark the quotation as God’s response to Elijah the prophet. For Paul, as well as other Jewish writers, the Scripture is able to *utter* the word in it. What is written in it still *speaks*. In terms of

⁴⁵¹ Rom 1:17; 2:24; 3:4, 10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:13, 33; 10:15; 11:8, 26; 12:19; 14:11; 15:3, 9; 15:21; 1 Cor 1:19, 31; 2:9; 3:19–20; 9:9; 10:7; 14:21; 15:45; 2 Cor 8:15; 9:9; Gal 3:10, 13; 4:27. Cf. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 253; Smith, “The Pauline Literature,” 272.

⁴⁵² Two participle forms of it appear in 1 Cor 15:54 (ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος) and 2 Cor 4:13 (κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον). In one instance, the indicative verb “to write” is employed in other forms (Μωϋσῆς γράφει in Rom 10:15).

⁴⁵³ Cf. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 173. He suggests that Paul possibly adopts the phrase *into* his quotations.

⁴⁵⁴ Rom 4:3, 6, 18; 7:7; 9:12, 17; 9:25; 10:11, 16, 19, 20, 21; 11:4, 9; 12:19; 15:10–11, 12; 1 Cor 6:16 (φησὶν); 14:21; 2 Cor 6:2, 16; Gal 4:30; Eph 4:8; 1 Tim 5:18.

⁴⁵⁵ Few instances show other verbs with a similar meaning. E.g., Rom 4:18 (κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον); Gal 3:8 (ἡ γραφή ... προεγγεγέλυστο).

⁴⁵⁶ “The Scripture”: Rom 4:3; 9:17 (to Φαραω); 10:11; 11:2–3; 15:10–11 (it); 1 Cor 6:16 (it); Gal 4:30; Eph 4:8 (it); 1 Tim 5:18. “ὁ χρηματισμός”: Rom 11:4 (to Elijah). “He”: Rom 9:15 (to Moses), 9:25 (in Hosea); 10:21 (to Israel); 2 Cor 6:2. “κύριος”: Rom 12:19; 1 Cor 14:21; 2 Cor 6:16 (God).

referring to God as the speaker, Paul uses κύριος or θεός, and sometimes the pronoun *he* is embedded in the verbal form. Moreover, Isaiah (Rom 10:20; 15:12), David (Rom 4:6; 11:9), and even the Law (ὁ νόμος, Rom 7:7) are also marked as those who are verbalizing the quoted text.

In addition, several groups of combined quotations are preceded by these two types of verbal forms.⁴⁵⁷ Some do not need a conjunction to connect with another quotation,⁴⁵⁸ others take a series of conjunctions.⁴⁵⁹ For example, in Rom 3:10–18, a single introductory formula leads seven quotations, and no connective term is found between them. On the contrary, the series of four scriptural quotations in Rom 15:9–12 start with “καθὼς γέγραπται,” and then one connects another quotation basically by “καὶ πάλιν.” Therefore, this phenomenon can be seen as another type (or sub-type) of quotation introductory formula.

Besides those quotations attaching with the previous two types of introductory formulae, the rest of the quotations are mostly preceded *without* an introductory formula. They are either smoothly embedded in Paul’s texts as Paul’s own words⁴⁶⁰ or accompanied by a preceding conjunction, mostly as a casual conjunction (e.g., γάρ).⁴⁶¹ Stanley observes that the quotations without any formulae attached show *in form* a similar pattern with the *formulaic* quotations that appear either verbatim or as highly adapted wording.⁴⁶² This phenomenon does not suggest that introductory formulae do not have any function. On the contrary, the use of a quotation formula implies that the author intends the quoted text that follows to be treated in light of the scriptural

⁴⁵⁷ Cf. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 253, n. 4.

⁴⁵⁸ Rom 3:10–18; 9:25–26; 11:26–27; 14:11; 1 Cor 15:54–55;

⁴⁵⁹ Rom 10:5–8; 12:19–20; 15:9–12; 2 Cor 6:16–18; Gal 3:10–13; 1 Tim 5:18.

⁴⁶⁰ Rom 2:6; 9:20; 11:2; 1 Cor 15:25, 32; 2 Cor 9:10; 10:17; 13:1; Gal 3:16; Eph 1:22; 5:31; 6:2–3; 2 Tim 2:19.

⁴⁶¹ Rom 4:22 (διό); 9:7 (ἀλλά); 10:13 (γάρ), 18 (μενοῦνγε); 11:34–35 (γάρ); 13:9 (γάρ); 1 Cor 10:26 (γάρ); 15:27 (γάρ); 2 Cor 9:7 (γάρ); Eph 4:25–26 (διό).

⁴⁶² Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 253–54.

quotation.⁴⁶³ In Paul's case, those nonformulaic quotations presumably are well-known to his audience, particularly pertaining to the specific topic, then he may introduce them in his argument without any introductory reference at all and the audience may still recognize his quotations.⁴⁶⁴

Moreover, in Paul's quotation formulae, three instances, Rom 9:9, 1 Cor 15:54, and Gal 3:8, obviously show the implication of promise-fulfillment of the Scriptural texts. Paul's argument in Rom 9:6–9 suggests that the children of the promise are counted as Abraham's offspring. Paul uses the phrase “ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος” as a reminder of God's past promise and its fulfillment (cf. Gen 18:10, 14). Again, Paul in Gal 3:7–14 speaks of Abraham's offspring. He even considers that ἡ γραφή *foresaw* (προῖδοῦσα) God justifying the Gentiles in Christ (3:8, 14) and *foretold* the gospel (προεσηγγέλισατο) to Abraham, saying, “All the Gentiles shall be blessed in you.” When talking about the resurrection of the believers at the last trumpet in 1 Cor 15:50–57, Paul believes that the written scriptural text “Death was swallowed up in victory” (Isa 25:8) will come to pass (τότε γενήσεται). In addition to these three explicit expressions, several instances also convey the sense of promise-fulfillment, though without any relative terms found.⁴⁶⁵ For example, in Rom 9:25–26, Paul quotes from the Book of Hosea as proof for his statement that God also calls the Gentile people (9:24). In this case, Paul implies that the word of Hosea (Hos 2:23; 1:10) has seen its fulfillment by a simple formula, “ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὁσηὲ λέγει” (Rom 9:25).

⁴⁶³ Cf. Moyise, “Quotations,” 28.

⁴⁶⁴ Ibid., 15.

⁴⁶⁵ Rom 9:25, 33; 11:26–27; 14:11; 1 Cor 2:9; 15:25, 27; 2 Cor 6:16; Gal 3:8; Eph 1:22.

Therefore, in Paul's letters, a quotation formula for citing a scriptural text is not required. Paul could either employ γέγραπται pattern or λέγει type to highlight an OT citation and sometimes clarify its source or embed a scriptural quotation smoothly into his own speech without a formula. Such Greek verbs are found in the LXX with the equivalent Hebrew כָּתוּב and אָמַר. The function of Paul's quotations is more as proof-text in his arguments and exhortations. Some of them find a correspondence, logically, morally, or even allegorically, between a contemporary issue/doctrine and the scriptural narrative/teaching. Some serve to elucidate the fulfillment of the scriptural promises in God's salvation plan through Christ. Moreover, in Paul's use of quotation formulae, the adverbial comparative particles καθὼς/ὥς also plays a role to show the corresponding sense between the biblical text and his immediate argument. Such a use is parallel to the preposition כִּי seen in the OT and Qumran writings. Therefore, in terms of form, Paul's use of introductory formulae for his quoted text is much more similar to what is found in the OT and in the Qumran writings.

4.2.2 General Epistles

The General Epistles have approximately forty quotations in Hebrews,⁴⁶⁶ eleven in 1 Peter,⁴⁶⁷ and five in James.⁴⁶⁸ Contrary to the use of quotation formulae in the Pauline letters, in these three epistles, only one quotation formula uses *written* mode (γέγραπται; 1 Peter 1:16). However, primary formulaic type found in both Hebrews and James is the form *say* (λέγω). In

⁴⁶⁶ This amount includes several passages that NA²⁷ and NA²⁸ recognize as citations. Also cf. George H. Guthrie, "Hebrews' Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research," *CurBR* 1 (2003): 272–74; Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 37.

⁴⁶⁷ Cf. D. A. Carson, "1 Peter," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 1015; Peter H. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 24.

⁴⁶⁸ Cf. Dale C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*, ICC (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), 51.

Hebrews, as George H. Guthrie observes, more than half of the quotations have God, Christ, or the Holy Spirit as the *speaker* of the quoted text.⁴⁶⁹ In Hebrews, one can hardly find a name or a title as the source of a scriptural text, except Moses in 9:19–20 and 12:21.

The author of Hebrews uses the verb *to testify* (μαρτυρεῖν) three times with the quoted OT passages. In Heb 2:6, the author considers the word from Ps 8:4–6 as being what someone has testified (διεμαρτύρατο δέ ποῦ τις λέγων) for his statement in the previous verse. The author in 10:15–17 also regards God’s covenant foretold by the prophet in Jer 31:33–34 as the Holy Spirit’s witness for the believers (μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον). In these two cases, however, the term that comes before the quotation is actually λέγων in 2:6 and τὸ ἐρηκεῖναι in 10:15. As seen in other literature, Hebrews also has several sets of combined quotations. In this case, the author of Hebrews mostly uses πάλιν to add a citation that speaks of the same topic as the previous one.

The Epistle of James has five OT quotations, and all have introductory formulae before them. As in Hebrews, the *say* pattern, shown in four introductory formulae, is the favorite one used in James.⁴⁷⁰ In Jas 2:11, the uttering subject of both the participle εἰπών (followed by Exod 20:14) and the indicative εἶπεν (followed by Exod 20:13) is understood as God who will perform the judgment (cf. 2:12).⁴⁷¹ In both 2:23 and 4:6, ἡ γραφή is the one that utters. Moreover, the author in 2:23 considers that the scriptural text, cited from Gen 15:6 regarding Abraham’s belief in God and being considered righteous, was fulfilled (ἐπληρώθη).⁴⁷²

⁴⁶⁹ Guthrie, “Hebrews’ Use of the Old Testament,” 274.

⁴⁷⁰ The introductory phrase in 2:8, which does not take “to say,” is “κατὰ τὴν γραφήν.”

⁴⁷¹ The prepositional phrase “διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας” in 2:12 means the standard by which the believers are to be judged. Therefore, the passive verb “κρίνεσθαι” is understood as divine-passive.

⁴⁷² Peter H. Davids, *The Epistle of James*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 129, suggests that James’s *fulfillment* is not the form of prophecy-fulfillment but that the text in Gen 15:6 “says the same thing that James has been arguing.” Also cf. Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids:

First Peter, unlike Hebrews and James, does not have any *say* formula preceding his scriptural quotations. Peter prefers using simple causal conjunctions as his regular introductory marker. The term διότι is used for OT quotations only by Peter. It occurs three times in 1 Peter. The term accompanies “γέγραπται” in 1:16 and precedes the phrase “περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ” in 2:6, but in 1:24, it stands alone, just as γάρ and ὅτι do in 3:10 and 5:5, respectively. Moreover, the other six citations are mostly dependent on a simple conjunction, such as καί, δέ, or εἰ, fitting smoothly into the immediate context. One can also observe that the passage of 1 Pet 2:7–8, on the topic of “the rejected stone,” combines two quotations from Ps 118:22 and Is 8:14 with a connective conjunction καί.⁴⁷³

In sum, the uses of quotation formulae in the General Epistles are found distinct from the uses observed in Pauline writings in terms of the type of form. The preferred formulaic forms observed in each book of the General Epistles are also not the same with one another. Thus, the use of quotation introductory formulae apparently is an authorial stylistic characteristic.

4.2.3 Synoptic Gospels and Book of Acts

The Synoptic Gospels and the Book of Acts together have more than a hundred OT quotations. Due to the narrative nature of the genre, the scriptural texts are mostly cited by the characters in the Gospels and Acts. This section first discusses the preferred form(s) that each book uses. Since some agreements exist among/between the Synoptics, this section will also compare their uses of quotation formulae for some parallel passages.

Eerdmans, 2000), 138.

⁴⁷³ In fact, the *stone* topic starts in 1 Pet 2:4.

4.2.3.1 *Formulae in Mark*

The Gospel of Mark has approximately thirty quotations.⁴⁷⁴ Most of them occur in the contexts where Jesus has debates with others. Among Mark's quotation formulae, these two basic introductory formula types are found: the *written* type (four times) and the *say* pattern (three times). Two instances of the *written* type formulae use a preceding comparative conjunction *καθώς/ὥς* and the source of the quotation is indicated (both are from the Book of Isaiah). One is attributed to the author (1:2) and the other to Jesus (7:6).⁴⁷⁵ The other two *written* type formulae, both on Jesus's lips, are independent from any addition (11:17; 14:27). However, all three instances that adopt the *say* type indicate the speaker. The formula in 7:10 simply shows “Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν.” The one in 12:26 finds God as the speaker (πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων) and Moses's book as the source (ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως), while the other in 12:36 specifies what David said (Δαυὶδ εἶπεν) through the Holy Spirit.

However, Mark has about twenty quotations independent of any specific formulae.⁴⁷⁶ More than half of them occur in combined quotation groups. For instance, the quotations in 1:3 and 7:10b, in fact, are the second quotations in their own group, sharing the formulae with their antecedents respectively. Mark 10:6–8 is another case, in which Jesus cites two passages from Genesis (Gen 1:27; 2:24) about the original relationship between a husband and a wife, without appealing to any introductory formula. However, the implicit references, “Moses commanded” and “from the beginning of creation,” may refer to Moses's writings. In addition, the dialogue

⁴⁷⁴ UBS^{4/5} recognizes the scriptural summaries in 10:4, 12:19, 14:62a, and 62b as citations. However, they are more like allusions.

⁴⁷⁵ In 7:6–7, Jesus believes that what Isaiah said is a *prophecy* of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and scribes.

⁴⁷⁶ Mark 1:3; 4:12; 7:10 (x2); 9:48; 10:6–8 (x2), 19; 11:9–10; 12:10–11; 12:29–33 (x6); 13:24–25 (x2), 26; 14:27, 62 (x2); 15:24, 34.

between Jesus and a scribe concerning the greatest commandment in Mark 12:29–33 shows a series of six quotations, without any formulae but only two conjunctions, καὶ. The scribe simply repeats the two greatest commandments Jesus just mentioned (from Deut 6:4–5 and Lev 19:18) with an additional description about God’s uniqueness (Deut 4:35). In his debate, yet, Jesus sometimes concludes his argument by bringing a scriptural quotation accompanying “οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε” as a rhetorical question to his opponents. In Mark 12:10–11, Jesus simply uses the phrase “οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε” to reference Ps 118:22–23. In Mark 12:26 he exhaustively indicates the source “ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου,” plus a *say* type formula with God as the speaker, for his citation from Exod 3:6. These instances usually appear in contexts of debate.

At times, a scriptural quotation is articulated in a certain way. In the case of Mark 13:24–25, Jesus quotes from Isaiah (Isa 13:10; 34:4) regarding the final days. There is one more scripture from Dan 7:13 cited as a prophecy, which is preceded by Jesus’s statement “τότε ὄψονται” (then they will see). This use of the future tense of *to see* preceding a scriptural prophecy implies that Jesus is reaffirming the future fulfillment of a past prophecy (cf. Mark 13:14; 14:62). Otherwise, verbs expressing loud utterance are also used to mark a scriptural citation escaping from one’s lips. In Mark’s description, the crowd *shouted* (ἔκραζον) toward Jesus the praise of Ps 118:25–26 (Mark 11:9–10). Jesus himself on the cross *cried out* in a great voice (ἐβόησεν ... φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) the word of Ps 22:1.

To sum up, Mark’s account has no regular or preferred introductory formulae, whether for the author or for Mark’s Jesus. One still can notice that in the story, the *written* (*wrote* in 12:19) and *say* patterns are employed outside of those contexts where some combined quotations are found detached from any formula (e.g., 12:29–33; 13:24–27). Although Mark does not use

the term of *fulfill/fulfillment* explicitly to indicate the motif of fulfillment of God's word,⁴⁷⁷ several quotations imply such a theme, whether in the sense of *already* fulfilled (e.g., 1:2–3; 7:6–7) or *not-yet*, will fulfill (e.g., 13:26; 14:62).

4.2.3.2 *Formulae in Luke-Acts*

The amount of OT quotations in Luke's Gospel is about twenty-five;⁴⁷⁸ however, only five quotations are peculiar to Luke among those that appear in the Synoptic Gospel(s).⁴⁷⁹ The first two are Luke's descriptions about the event of infant Jesus being presented to the Lord in Jerusalem (2:22–24). Both quotation formulae introduce the following scriptural texts as “in the Law of the Lord” (ἐν [τῷ] νόμῳ κυρίου). One is “being written” (καθὼς γέγραπται; 2:23) and the other “being told” (κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον; 2:24). Both the connecting terms καθὼς and κατὰ exactly function to communicate the meaning of the correspondence between the Law and what Jesus's parents did, in the sense of obedience.

What is noteworthy is that the other two instances of the five quotations show a fulfillment theme in their contexts. In the occasion of Jesus's reading Scripture (Isa 61:1–2) in a Nazarene synagogue (Luke 4:16–21), while Luke first has “ἦν γεγραμμένον” as the formula to introduce what Jesus is about to read, Jesus adds, “Today this scripture has been fulfilled [πεπλήρωται] in your hearing” after his reading. This suffixed comment on the quotation does not show less emphasis. Such a use also has its counterpart in Luke 22:37. By using “τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί,” Jesus refers to Isa 53:12 to predict the necessity of his

⁴⁷⁷ Hays, *Echoes*, §5, “Hidden in order to Be Revealed.”

⁴⁷⁸ Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts,” *SBLSP* 31 (1992): 526, n. 5. Fitzmyer fails to consider Luke's use of quotation formulae from Mark and Q.

⁴⁷⁹ Luke 2:23, 24; 4:18–19; 22:37; 23:30. Cf. C. K. Barrett, “Luke/Acts,” in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 235–37.

arrest. Jesus then insistently emphasizes the fulfillment/complement of what has been written concerning him by adding the subsequent quoted texts, “γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.”⁴⁸⁰ Therefore, in Luke’s use of quotation formulae in the Gospel, the *written* type appears to be preferred. The prophecy-fulfillment/complement statement occurs twice on Jesus’s lips right after a formulated quotation, while the terms καθὼς and κατὰ help to convey the circumstantial correspondence.

In the Book of Acts, OT quotations are recorded as mostly spoken by Peter (chs. 1–4), Steven (ch. 7), and Paul (chs. 13–28). According to Luke’s record, Steven’s speech in Acts 7 is more like a retelling of Israel’s story, which is about God’s words for Abraham and Moses. At nearly the end of his speech, Steven appeals to the words in the Prophets as proof-texts by adopting the formulae “καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν” (7:42) and “καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει” (7:48). As in Luke 2:23–24, the terms *say* and *written* are used in parallel. In Peter’s instances, except the first two quotations about Judas’s apostleship in Acts 1:20, all of Peter’s scriptural citations focus on explaining first the eschatological phenomenon (2:17–21) and then God’s salvation through Jesus the Messiah. Only in Acts 1:20 is Peter reported as using the *written* type formula for two quotations combined by καὶ. For the remaining instances, *say* pattern is preferred by Peter when he cites passages from Joel (2:16–21), David (2:25–28, 30, 31, 34–35), and Moses (3:22, 23a-b). Similarly to Peter, Paul uses more *say* formula than the *written* type in the account of Acts. In both 13:34 and 13:35, Paul considers God, who made a promise in the Book of Isaiah (Isa 55:3), as being the *speaker* of David’s psalm (Ps 16:10). The word cited from Habakuk (Hab 1:5) in Acts 13:41 is noted as *spoken* by God.⁴⁸¹ In addition, the Holy Spirit

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. Luke 18:31.

⁴⁸¹ The passive participle “εἰρημένον” in 13:40 is understood as divine passive.

has *uttered* through Isaiah (Isa 6:9–10) to the Jewish ancestors (Acts 28:25–27). Paul also uses the verb ἐντέταλται in 13:47 for the Lord’s commission to Israel which is in the Book of Isaiah (Isa 49:6).

In sum, Luke’s use of formulae in his Gospel appears to be more regular than in Acts. In the Gospel, Luke prefers the *written* type to the *say* mode; while in Acts, his narrative characters have their own preferences. Interestingly, the formulaic uses of Paul and Peter in Acts are different from that in Paul’s epistles and Peter’s, respectively, to some degree. This phenomenon may imply that in the Book of Acts Luke does not record the quotation formulae of the characters as verbatim. Rather, Luke, as the author of his history narrative, shows his authorial freedom on selecting introductory formula for his characters.

4.2.3.3 *Matthew’s Introductory Formulae*

The use of the OT in the Gospel of Matthew has attracted many scholars’ attention.⁴⁸² Besides those quotations that also appear in other Synoptic(s),⁴⁸³ some twenty quotations are unique to Matthew.⁴⁸⁴ Most of them regularly have the term *say* in the form of aorist passive participle (τὸ ῥηθὲν, lit., what was said) as the formulaic verbal type.⁴⁸⁵ This use is different from both Luke’s preference and the normal *say* type. The most striking feature of Matthew’s

⁴⁸² E.g., C. F. D. Moule, “Fulfilment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse,” *NTS* 14 (1968): 293–320; Gundry, *Use of the Old Testament*, 317; Graham Stanton, “Matthew,” in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 205–19; Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*. Also cf. a survey of some recent scholars’ works in Donald Senior, “The Lure of the Formula Quotations: Re-assessing Matthew’s Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as Test Case,” in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. C. M. Tuckett, BETL 81 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 89–108.

⁴⁸³ Cf. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 47–96.

⁴⁸⁴ Matt 1:23; 2:6, 15, 18; 3:3; 4:15–16; 5:21, 27, 31, 33, 38, 43; 8:17; 9:13; 12:7, 18–21, 40; 13:35; 21:5; 27:9–10, 43.

⁴⁸⁵ Six of them happen in Jesus’s six Antitheses with introducer “it was said (ἐρρέθη)” in Matt 5. Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 113, mentions that the form of the introducer is “a most unusual way of citing Scripture.”

quotations, as Wilhelm Rothfuchs suggests, is Matthew's ten *Erfüllungszitate* (fulfillment citations).⁴⁸⁶ They all include the phrase of purpose-fulfillment, “ἵνα/ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος.” They are shown as authorial comments in the Gospel. This structure of introductory formula is unique to Matthew's Gospel, which includes two basic elements: the substantival participle phrase of *say* (τὸ ῥηθὲν with the agent phrase “διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος”)⁴⁸⁷ and the leading verb *to be fulfilled* (πληρωθῇ/ἐπληρώθη).⁴⁸⁸ The passive verb of *to say* in all these formulae denotes divine passive, just as the first two formulae specify explicitly by “ὑπὸ κυρίου” (1:22; 2:15). Moreover, between Jesus's event in its context and the content of its quotations, such a formula highlights the connecting concept that conveys Matthew's theology. The occurrence of Jesus's events is identified by Matthew as the *fulfillment* of the word of God spoken through his prophets (cf. 5:17; 26:56).⁴⁸⁹ As Donald Senior concludes, “[T]here is a strong consensus that the introductory formulae themselves are compositions of the evangelist.”⁴⁹⁰ Such a concept is probably rooted in Jesus's sayings (cf. Mark 14:49; Luke 21:22; 24:44).

In addition to the fulfillment citations themselves, two quotation formulae also show similar pattern. Without the verb *to be fulfilled*, the formula in 3:3 reveal almost the same phrase, “οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος,” to help identify John the

⁴⁸⁶ Wilhelm Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums: eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung*, BWANT 88 (Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1969), 20–26. Some scholars call them “formula quotations” (*Reflexionszitate*). They are Matt 1:22–23; 2:15, 17–18, 23; 4:14–16; 8:17; 12:17–21; 13:35; 21:4–5; 27:9–10. See Senior, “Lure,” 93, n. 10; Stanton, “Matthew,” 206. Also see n. 112 in this paper.

⁴⁸⁷ This phrase as a QF element also appears outside of the fulfillment citations (Matt 3:3; 22:32; 24:15).

⁴⁸⁸ Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 33–44, has four elements.

⁴⁸⁹ Notice the verb “γέγονεν” before the introductory formulae in 1:22 and 21:4. Cf. Senior, “Lure,” 115; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 33–36. David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, JSNTSup 31 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1998), 47, 78, identifies the literary functions of Matthew's quotations in 1:1–4:16.

⁴⁹⁰ Senior, “Lure,” 102.

Baptist.⁴⁹¹ The other formula in 2:5 is among Matthew's unique quotations as being the only one that employs the *written* type (γέγραπται), accompanied by "διὰ τοῦ προφήτου." Therefore, evidently, Matthew has his distinct structure of formula for quotations that are unique to his Gospel though slightly adapted to fit each context.⁴⁹²

In fact, the structure in three of Jesus's other quotations, which are presumed to be from Mark's material, shows Matthew's phraseological tendency. Jesus in Matt 13:14 uses "to be fulfilled" (ἀναπληροῦται) to quote the word from Isa 6:9–10 (cf. Mark 4:12 // Luke 8:10), for describing the spiritual situation of the people. Matthew's "τὸ ῥηθὲν" can also be heard on Jesus's lips in both Matt 22:31 and 24:15. While in the former case Jesus refers to God's self-introduction in Exod 3:6 (cf. Mark 12:26 // Luke 20:37) by "τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος," in the latter he tells the prediction of Dan 11:31/12:11 (cf. Mark 13:14), adding "τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου." These instances, especially the last two, reveal Matthew's phraseological work on his quotation formulae even though Jesus is the one who utters them in the narrative.

4.2.3.4 *Luke and Matthew's Freedom*

What is observed so far is that the synoptic Gospel writers are at liberty to employ any type of formulae for their quotations in their own literary context. However, they, in some cases, would keep the formulaic type from Mark and Q. Among the Synoptic Gospels are many parallel quotations. For those quotations that appear as Mark's material, their quotation formulae may not be identical across the books. In several cases, Luke and Matthew maintain exactly or almost the same introductory expressions as Mark has. In Mark 13:26 // Luke 21:27 // Matt 24:30, the same

⁴⁹¹ The phrase semantically is also signifying the sense of fulfillment.

⁴⁹² Stanton, "Matthew," 214.

prophetic language “ὄψονται” (they will see) is used by Jesus to reannounce Daniel’s vision of the coming of the Son of Man (Dan 7:13). For the account of Jesus’s violence in the temple (Mark 11:17 // Luke 19:46 // Matt 21:13), three evangelists use the normal term *written* (γέγραπται) on Jesus’s lips as the formula for quoting from Isa 56:7, although both Luke and Matthew forego Mark’s use of a rhetorical question. In Mark 15:24 // Luke 21:27 // Matt 27:35, all three evangelists do not use any introductory form for Ps 22:18 (cf. John 19:24). While on the occasion of Jesus’s entrance into Jerusalem (Mark 11:9–10 // Luke 19:37–38 // Matt 21:9), the three Gospels report the crowd’s shouting the praise of Ps 118:25–26 by using “ἔκραζον” or “λέγοντες.”

However, in other cases, Luke and Matthew have more compositional freedom. For instance, Matthew’s Jesus in 13:14 uses a long fulfillment formula, “ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου ἣ λέγουσα,” instead of the simple “ἵνα” as in Mark 4:12 and Luke 8:10.⁴⁹³ However, Luke’s Jesus in 20:17 employs the *written* verb (τὸ γεγραμμένον), which is Luke’s favorite, to evoke Ps 118:22, while Matthew’s Jesus follows Mark’s pattern by using a certain rhetorical question: “οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς” (Mark 12:10 // Matt 21:42).⁴⁹⁴ Moreover, both Luke and Matthew apply their own additions in their quotation formulae when they use Mark’s material concerning God’s self-introduction in Exod 3:6 (Mark 12:26 // Luke 20:37 // Matt 22:31). Their quotation formulae are as listed:

Mark—“οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων·”;

Luke—“Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὡς λέγει”; and,

⁴⁹³ Also cf. Mark 10:19 // Luke 18:20 // Matt 19:18.

⁴⁹⁴ Also Mark 12:28 // Luke 10:26 // Matt 22:36; Mark 12:36 // Luke 20:42 // Matt 22:43.

Matt—“οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος·”

In this case, Luke obviously simplifies the sentence to make Moses the one who made God’s word known. On the contrary, Matthew, although retaining Mark’s rhetorical question, modifies the formula to his own mode (“τὸ ῥηθὲν”).

For Mark’s quotations that are employed only by another evangelist, either by Luke or by Matthew, alterations on the introductory formulae can be found more in Matthew. Matthew in 15:7 changes Mark’s “γέγραπται” (Mark 7:6) into “λέγων” type; in 15:4 he alters the speaker from Moses (Mark 7:10a) to God; and, in 24:15 he adds his favorite “τὸ ῥηθὲν” phrase after the quotation from Dan 11:31 (Mark 13:14).⁴⁹⁵ Nonetheless, in some cases, Mathew keeps the formulae that Mark has used. For example, Matthew does not drop Mark’s “γέγραπται” while quoting the scriptural text from Zech 13:7 (Matt 26:31 // Mark 14:27).⁴⁹⁶

For the quotations that presumably come from Q, both Luke and Matthew appear to preserve their introductory formulae.⁴⁹⁷ In the passage of Jesus’s temptation (Luke 4:1–13 // Matt 4:1–11), the simple *to be written* (γέγραπται) formulae are kept except with an editorial change “εἴρηται” in Luke 4:12. Matthew also uses the formula as Luke does (οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται) when reporting Jesus’s comment on John the Baptist with the prophecy in Mal 3:1 (Luke 7:27 // Matt 11:10).⁴⁹⁸

⁴⁹⁵ Also Mark 10:6–8 // Matt 19:4–5.

⁴⁹⁶ Mark 13:24–25 // Matt 24:29; Mark 14:62 // Matt 26:64; Mark 15:34 // Matt 27:46. Cf. Mark 1:2 // Luke 3:4.

⁴⁹⁷ Cf. Barrett, “Luke/Acts,” 234–35.

⁴⁹⁸ Also see other instances in Luke 13:35 // Matt 23:39.

Therefore, from the observations, it is evident that Luke and Matthew have some degree of freedom to retain or alter, to simplify or embellish the introductory formulae from their sources, for the contexts in their Gospels and the quotations introduced.⁴⁹⁹

4.2.3.5 *Summary*

In the Synoptic Gospels, Mark uses introductory formulae with both the *written* and *say* modes, and many informal formulae as well. Luke and Matthew have their autonomy to treat the formulae that come from Mark or Q. In some cases they retain; in some cases not. Luke appears to prefer the *written* type for the quotations that are unique to him, while Matthew builds his distinctive structure to form a fulfillment-purpose formula for those that are peculiar to his Gospel. In Acts, Luke seems to limit his use of formulae more than he did in the Gospel. He employs quotation formulae more flexibly according to the contexts of his main characters. Basically speaking, the types of quotation introductory formulae in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts are not very far from those found in the Epistles. In addition, many of them can also find their Hebrew counterparts in what the Qumran literature has shown.⁵⁰⁰ The phenomenon of the use of citation formulae in the NT shows that the writers adopted the OT texts in various ways. The two most frequent functions of using OT quotations as proof-text are, first, doctrinal/moral support and, second, eschatological/Christological/soteriological fulfillment. For the NT writers, using a quotation formula is not compulsory when introducing a scriptural text, whether in the Epistles or in the Gospels-Acts.⁵⁰¹ However, while a NT author has his preference or choice of

⁴⁹⁹ Cf. Senior, “Lure,” 102.

⁵⁰⁰ Fitzmyer, “Old Testament in Luke-Acts,” 527–29. Fitzmyer points out that the formulae (in Luke’s case) “are closer to those of Qumran writings than to the Mishnaic forms.”

⁵⁰¹ In terms of intertextuality, it is assumed that the authors of the NT and the readers have knowledge of the OT text/story as their encyclopedia of production/reception. Cf. Alkier, “Intertextuality,” 8–11.

using citation formulae in a certain way, the form(s) of quotation formula employed can help not only to bridge the quotation to the context but also to highlight the author's opinion, or theology, on the relationship between the quoted text and its immediate context. Moreover, similar to the previously observed repetition of quotation formulae found in Jubilees ("in the heavenly tablets") and the narrative in LAB ("fulfilled"), Matthew also employs his peculiar form of formulae in his gospel narrative to communicate his theology of the fulfillment of God's spoken word through the Christ event (cf. Matt 5:17). John has a similar use of citation formulae in his Gospel.

4.3 The Forms of John's Quotation-Formulae

Regarding the use of quotation formulae in the Jewish literature and the NT, John's technique is comparable. Thus, John's types of formulae fall into similar categories that appear in his antecedents in some degree. The first is the *say* type. John has four OT texts introduced by using "Isaiah said" (ἐἶπεν Ἡσαΐας; 1:23; 12:38, 39) or "the scripture says" (γραφὴ λέγει; 19:37). For John's *say* formula, except the one that follows John the Baptist's self-introduction by Isa 40:3 (John 1:23), all are attached to the fulfillment formulaic phrase "ἵνα πληρωθῇ" that appears later in the narrative, either in a relative clause (12:38) or in the combined quotations connected to the previous by the adverb πάλιν (12:39; 19:37).⁵⁰² In addition, the *say* formula also appears in semi-quotations to lead a summarized concept, instead of an explicitly quoted text, derived either from OT scriptures (ἐἶπεν ἡ γραφή; 7:38, 42) or from Jesus's word (ὁ λόγος

⁵⁰² Hays, *Echoes*, §16, "Come and See." Hays points out that the double fulfillment citations signal the close of a section. The use of πάλιν leading the sequent quotations has also been observed at times in the literature (e.g., Judg 2:3 [בָּרָא]; Leg. 3:4; Matt 4:7; Heb 2:13). Also see Evans, "Quotation Formulas," 80, n. 2.

[τοῦ Ἰησοῦ] ὃν εἶπεν; 18:9, 32).⁵⁰³ Particularly, the uses in chs. 7 and 18 suggest a parallel between Jesus's word and the Scripture in terms of fulfillment.

John, however, applies the *written* mode six times for his explicit quotations (2:17; 6:31, 45; 10:34; 12:14; 15:25).⁵⁰⁴ Their verbal forms are all the perfect participle. Leaving the one (adjectival use) with the “ἵνα πληρωθῇ” formula in 15:25, the rest of them are consistently found in the periphrastic perfect, “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” and are found in the first part of the Gospel. Among them, only two cases from Jesus's mouth have an additional phrase to indicate the source of the quoted text (“ἐν τοῖς προφήταις” in 6:45; “ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν” in 10:34). Although the equivalent of the periphrastic perfect “γέγραπται” can be seen frequently as a quotation formula in the NT (esp. in Luke-Acts and Paul's letters) and קָתִיב in Hebrew is also well-known in the Qumran (esp. in 1QS and 4Q174),⁵⁰⁵ the periphrastic perfect as a quotation formula occurs only once elsewhere in Luke 4:17 (ἦν γεγραμμένον).⁵⁰⁶ This phenomenon denotes that the phrase “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” reflects John's characteristic form of quotation formula. Whether or not John's periphrastic construction is an emphatic use,⁵⁰⁷ the periphrastic construction of “ἔστιν/ἦν γεγραμμένον” is definitely John's style (cf. 12:16; 19:19, 20; 20:30).⁵⁰⁸ Given that John also has the most frequent use of the noun γραφή among the NT writings,⁵⁰⁹ the Gospel of John likely regards the *written* Scripture as so significant in its narrative. Therefore, John's use of “ἔστιν

⁵⁰³ Except the *say* in the present form in 19:37, the last quotation formula, all are in the form of aorist.

⁵⁰⁴ The one (γέγραπται) that takes summarized judicial-principle from Deuteronomy (likely 17:6; 19:15) in John 8:17 is excluded.

⁵⁰⁵ Cf. Josh 8:31; 2 Kgs 14:6; 2 Chr 25:4 in LXX; and in *Jubilees*.

⁵⁰⁶ Cf. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 79–80.

⁵⁰⁷ Concerning the emphatic use of periphrastic construction, see J. Gonda, “A Remark on ‘Periphrastic’ Constructions in Greek,” *Mnemosyne* 12 (1959): 97–112.

⁵⁰⁸ See discussion on Pilate's inscription (use of pluperfect periphrastic) in pp. 67–69.

⁵⁰⁹ It is approximately a quarter of the total (twelve out of fifty) occurrences in the NT.

γεγραμμένον” as a quotation formula suggests that the *has-been-written-down* texts that are quoted signal something very important.⁵¹⁰

John’s other characteristic quotation formula is the fulfillment-purpose clause, which is “ἵνα ὁ λόγος/ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ.” Excluding three formulae that carry no OT quotations but allusions to Jesus’s words somewhere in the narrative (17:12; 18:9, 32),⁵¹¹ John has six occurrences of this fulfillment formula (12:38; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28 [τελειωθῇ], 36). Two of them apparently precede a set of combined quotations (12:38–40; 19:36–37) associated with *say* plus *again*. Such a fulfillment-purpose quotation formula can only be detected elsewhere in the Gospel of Matthew,⁵¹² from which John’s form is more nuanced. Instead of Matthew’s “τὸ ῥηθὲν,” John uses either “ὁ λόγος” or “ἡ γραφή” to refer to the cited scriptural text to be fulfilled. In John, only two instances explicitly mentioned the source of the word (“ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου” in 12:38 and “ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος” in 15:25). Among these fulfillment-purpose formulae, only in 19:28 is the verb “τελειωθῇ” instead of “πληρωθῇ.”⁵¹³ This verb can have the meaning *to be fulfilled* but also conveys the sense *to be completed/perfected* (cf. 19:30).⁵¹⁴ Menken probably is right when he suggests, “In the given context, the former verb [τελειωθῇ] is best considered as an intensification of the latter

⁵¹⁰ As well as being regarded as authoritative statement of God’s will. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 80.

⁵¹¹ Cf. pp. 82–84.

⁵¹² However, as we have examined, such an *expression* (without quotation) can be detected in the OT (e.g., 1 Kgs 12:15 [לְמַעַן הָקִים; ὅπως στήσῃ]; 2 Chr 36:21 [לְמַלְאוֹת; τοῦ πληρωθῆναι]; Ezra 1:1 [לְכַלּוֹת; τοῦ τελεσθῆναι]). Also, the fulfillment concept can be seen in some quotation formulae in Qumran literature (e.g., CD III 20 [כַּאֲשֶׁר לָהֶם הָקִים אֵל לְהַשְׁכִּיחַ]; VII 10 [בְּבוֹא הַדְּבַר אֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב]). Also cf. R. Schippers, “πληρώω,” *NIDNTT* 1:731–33; Rothfuchs, *Erfüllungszitate*, 44–54.

⁵¹³ Cf. Bultmann, *John*, 675, n. 2. He suggests that the formula is derived from the Gnostic tradition. Its significance will be discussed in the next chapter.

⁵¹⁴ Gerhard Dellling, “τέλος, τελέω,” *TDNT* 8:49–61. See particularly the Greek translations in 2 Chr 36:22 and Ezra 1:1. Cf. Luke 18:31; 22:37.

[πληρωθῆ].”⁵¹⁵ In addition, the use of the verb τελειωθῆ is likely intended to draw attention to the verb τετέλεσται in both Jesus’s knowing (19:28) and claiming (19:30).⁵¹⁶ The Scripture is declared completely fulfilled in Jesus’s completing of his earthly ministry. Hence, the formula ἵνα τελειωθῆ in 19:28 does not depart itself from the others although it is different lexically.

Both Matthew and John in their gospel narratives communicate the motif of the explicit fulfillment of the Scriptures in Jesus’s event (cf. Mark 14:49; Luke 4:21; 22:31). Although the concept of fulfillment of God’s written word and its expression in some degree already exist in the OT and several Jewish writings (esp. in Qumran literature and LAB), John and Matthew, among other NT writers,⁵¹⁷ display boldly and articulately the scriptural fulfillment in Jesus’s events, through their forms of quotation formulae. Therefore, the use of this fulfillment-purpose formula in John also denotes the author’s characteristic quotation formula and theology. What is more striking is that John’s two primary types of quotation formulae are regularly distributed in the two parts of the Gospel.

Three detectable OT quotations in John’s narrative are not accompanied with John’s regular formula previously mentioned. John 1:51 finds that Jesus’s quotation from Gen 28:12 is introduced by the verb “you will see” (ὄψεσθε). This use of future *to see* as an introduction of scriptural text appears in all the Synoptics on Jesus’s lips as he was revealing his identity by prophesying the fulfillment of the coming and the sovereignty of the Son of Man (Dan 7:13 and

⁵¹⁵ Maarten J. J. Menken, “Fulfilment of Scripture as a Propaganda Tool in Early Christianity,” in *Persuasion and Dissuasion in Early Christianity, Ancient Judaism, and Hellenism*, ed. Pieter W. van der Horst et al., CBET 33 (Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 182.

⁵¹⁶ See Carson, *John*, 620.

⁵¹⁷ This fulfillment language can be seen in several NT writings. See Menken, “Fulfilment,” 180–85. Cf. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 81–89.

Ps 110:1).⁵¹⁸ In John, Jesus's "ὄψεσθε," though no parallel is found in the Synoptics, also introduces a prophecy about the Son of Man (John 1:51). The second is found in John 12:27. Jesus's words "my soul is troubled.... 'Father, save me from this hour'?" (cf. Ps 6:3–4) are not preceded by any introduction. This use of nonformula can be easily observed in other NT writings. Moreover, John 12:13 reveals the third quotation (Ps 118:25–26) reported as being shouted out by the crowds, which occurs during Jesus's entry into Jerusalem. This event is also read in all other Gospels (Matt 21:9; Mark 11:9; Luke 19:38). John's verb "ἐκράυγαζον" does not seem to diverge from what his antecedents have.⁵¹⁹ Therefore, for those quotations disjoining the primary quotation formulae, John's technique of introducing OT text is not unfamiliar to the literature previously surveyed.

In sum, in John's Gospel, those detectable OT texts as quotations fall into two categories in terms of quotation formula: (1) those that bond with the primary quotation formulae that explicitly indicate the quoted text is *of* the Scripture, the written, or the word of a prophet (i.e., "καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας," "ἔστιν γεγραμμένον," and "ἵνα ὁ λόγος/ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ"), and (2) those that bond without any citation formula or with an introducer of discourse (i.e., "cried out" and "you will see"). Generally, the primary verbal modes of introductory formula used in John are found to be similar to the types used by its Jewish antecedents. Meanwhile, John, like the others, also has his own preference on the form of his quotation formulae. Minor modification of the structure and adding decoration for more information of the quoted are also common. The appearance of the comparative καθὼς, as in many Jewish antecedent instances,

⁵¹⁸ Matt 24:30 // Mark 13:26 // Luke 21:27 (ὄψονται); and Matt 26:64 // Mark 14:62 (ὄψεσθε).

⁵¹⁹ John 12:13 (ἐκράυγαζον); Matt 21:9 (ἐκραζον λέγοντες); Mark 11:9 (ἐκραζον); Luke 19:38 (αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ... λέγοντες).

also appears in three quotation formulae. These two categories will help explain the narrative function of John's quotations.

4.4 Summary

From the survey of the OT, the prototypes of introductory formulae can be observed as *say* and *written* types, as well as the use of comparative preposition כְּ and the terms equivalent to establish/fulfill. Despite the many formulae that do not take any scriptural quotations, those introductory formulae that do are used in order to evoke God's (or Moses's) word or commands and to build the bridge between the word/commands and the circumstances mentioned in the sense of correspondence that shows the obedience of the recipient of God's commands or the coming-to-pass of God's promises. The Qumran literature exhibits the most modes of OT introductory formulae. More decorations can be seen added to the basic *say* or *written* verbs in order to elucidate the quoted source or to indicate the topic. Moreover, an author has his preference on the form and the decorations of his quotation formula. Some groups of combined quotations are not rare in Qumran writings. For the combined quotations, a formula can be omitted. As in the OT, some quotation formulae suggest that the scriptural texts are the word of God, despite the fact that they were written or spoken by Moses or prophets.

In the selected Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha writings, one can also see the primary formulaic types, although they are more flexible in form and structure as formulaic phrases. Authorial preference is also clearer in some cases. An author can show his point of view on the scriptural text through the form of his quotation formulae. As in the Qumran writings, the motif of scriptural fulfillment has no lack in the Apocrypha Pseudepigrapha. However, Philo's selected works show more non-Jewish quoting techniques than Josephus's, while Josephus has more flexible use, likely due to the different genre.

For the NT writers, the primary types of quotation formulae are still the same. Pauline Epistles show similar patterns to those found in the former Jewish writings. It is also observed that each Epistle writer has his own formulaic characteristic. What the authors and characters in the Gospels and Acts employ are not alien to their literary antecedents. However, the Gospel writers in some cases altered the forms from their sources. Although a quotation formula may not be necessary for quoting an OT text, a quotation formula in its immediate context can express the point of view of the quoter on the quoted text and the quoting context. A specific use of quotation formulae in a work can also communicate the author's point of view on the relationship between the Scripture and the story told as a whole, as in Matthew's case. Those quotation formulae imply that the NT writers, like their Jewish antecedents, insist that their contexts are in some sense correspondingly related to the *written* Scripture, and the Scripture still *speaks* in their contexts. Moreover, the NT writers' focus is on God's words/promises that have been fulfilled and are being fulfilled through their Lord, Jesus Christ.

Therefore, concerning John's forms of quotation formulae, some observations and implications are important. First, although showing his stylistic feature and freedom of choice, John's quotation formulae still follow the technique of his NT antecedents, as well as his Jewish ancestors. In that Scripture-based milieu, the word of God is the place where those writers found the corresponding meaning of their circumstances, either consistent in the word of God or the coming-to-pass of God's promises. Second, in that literary milieu, John's quotation formulae are recognized by his readers/audiences as signifiers evoking their attention to the correspondence between the events narrated and the text quoted. Given that the literary genre and the book structure suggest that John's Gospel is Jesus-centered and that the formulaic OT texts are all related to Jesus's events, the quotation formulae then become the scriptural index to witnessing

to Jesus. Third, John, like his gospel colleagues, has also made alterations on the formulaic forms of his characters. However, John does it to a further extent. He has his quotation formulae uniformed in his narrative, despite who the formula user is, the crowd, Jesus, or himself. Thus, while Matthew has the fulfillment quotation formulae in his authorial comments to show the motif of fulfillment in his Gospel, John's phraseological works on the quotation formulae attributed to various quoters suggest his point of view on the formulaic quoted texts, as well as on the Scripture as a whole. Such a use emphasizes that the *written* Scripture is the source from where John quotes as the written word of God that relates to Jesus's ministry and that the word of the Scripture finds fulfillment in Jesus's life. This importance was also observed in the discussion in the previous chapter. Finally, John's featured quotation formula techniques in the Gospel help give witness to Jesus by the formulaic OT quotations, just as what his protagonist in John 5:39 remarks: "It is they that bear witness about me." The formulaic quotations in John are signifiers to Jesus.

5 JOHN'S OT QUOTATIONS IN THE GOSPEL NARRATIVE

5.1 The Significance of John's Distribution of Formulae in John's Narrative

The last chapter observed that John's quotation formula (QF) patterns are similar to his antecedent though in form John has his own verbal expressions and phraseological alterations. As mentioned, one of John's distinctive features regarding the OT quotations is the way John distributes his QFs in the Gospel. John the Baptist's quotation from Isaiah for his self-identification seems to stand alone, followed by the formula “καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης.” In fact, such a *say* pattern is used elsewhere for semi-quotations in John (7:38, 42). Apparently, the other two QFs, “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” and “ἵνα ὁ λόγος/ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ,” are then distributed in two parts of the narrative, respectively. Both Craig Evans and Obermann point out that the two kinds of QFs correspond to Jesus's two phases of ministry in the Gospel, which are Jesus's public ministry and his passion after that.⁵²⁰ Evans believes that the arrangement of John's QFs reflects “the theological and structural shift from the public ministry of signs to the passion.”⁵²¹ John's twelfth chapter, in which the pattern of QFs changes from one form to the other, *structurally* ties together the Book of Signs and the Book of the Passion and *theologically* provides a “review of the public ministry of signs noting that Jesus's ministry has resulted, for the most part, in unacceptance and unbelief.”⁵²² Obermann then suggests the theological implications that John's two distinct QFs signal the Scripture to serve as background witness to the meaning of the Christ's ministry in Jesus's public ministry (“παρρησίᾳ-Wirkens”)

⁵²⁰ Evans, “Quotation Formulas,” 81–82; Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 215–17.

⁵²¹ Evans, “Quotation Formulas,” 82.

⁵²² Ibid., 81. Therefore, Evan believes the transition in ch. 12 also reflects the Johannine community's need to explain the Messiah's rejection (82).

and for the Christ event as the explicit fulfillment of Scripture in his later ministry (12:23).⁵²³

According to Obermann, the Scripture is *implicitly* fulfilled in Jesus's public ministry and *explicitly* fulfilled in his Passion.

Looking closer at John's use of the QFs, one can observe two significant phenomena with respect to John's narrative as a whole. First, John keeps using the "ἔστιν γεγραμμένον" formula in Jesus's public ministry for the OT quotations until Jesus's entry into Jerusalem (12:13–36a) and then changes it to the fulfillment formula "ἵνα πληρωθῇ" when Jesus hides from the public (12:36b–40). Such a distribution reflects the two narrative stages of John's Gospel from Jesus's baptism to his death. In the first stage of the narrative, after his baptism and the testimonial introduction of John the Baptist, Jesus starts his public ministry in Jerusalem (2:13–25) and ends it in Jerusalem (12:12–36a).⁵²⁴ As mentioned in the second chapter of the paper, Jewish people are described as wondering about Jesus's identity although they have seen/heard what he did/said. The people's ignorance reveals their failure to recognize who Jesus really is from Jesus's ministry. The *written* (ἔστιν γεγραμμένον) scriptural texts appear in the events of Jesus's entering Jerusalem (2:17; 12:13–15), in the context of the misunderstanding of the crowd and the Jews (6:31), and in the situation of Jesus's arguing against their misunderstanding (6:45; 10:34). These scriptural texts reflect people's lack of understanding from and lack of belief in their *written* scriptures (cf. 1:11; 3:12; 5:47; 7:19; 12:34).⁵²⁵ According to John's narrative, the crowd, the Jews, and even the disciples (cf. 2:22; 12:16) are unaware of the scriptural truth

⁵²³ Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 80, 348–50.

⁵²⁴ Also see n. 193.

⁵²⁵ Cf. Humann, "Function and Form," 34. He considers that almost every quotation occurs in a context of controversy with the Jews.

witnessing about Jesus and even the death of the Messiah.⁵²⁶ From what *is written* in their Scripture, all Jewish people are anticipating the coming of the Messiah (cf. 7:25–52); however, in their unbelief they fail to comprehend their scriptural writings. They fail to perceive that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of Man, the one who has descended from heaven and will be killed, which the narrator points out in the context of the quotation in ch. 2 (2:17–22; cf. 12:32–33; 1:29, 36, 51). Therefore, the appearances of the QF “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” in each context denote the people’s ignorance and misunderstanding of what the scriptural texts really mean when they experienced Jesus’s works among them.

In the declaration of the coming of Jesus’s *hour*, the second stage starts with Jesus’s reclusive departure and the narrator’s comment on the people’s unbelief (12:36b–43), which leads to the following passion narrative until Jesus’s being lifted up and death (19:37–42; cf. 12:32–34). Compared with Matthew’s Gospel, Matthew’s fulfillment citations are scattered from the beginning to the end in his Gospel,⁵²⁷ while John’s are dispensed *only* in his passion narrative. From the people’s unbelief (12:38–40), the disciple’s betrayal and the world’s hatred (13:18; 15:25), to Jesus’s crucifixion and death (19:24, 28, 36–37),⁵²⁸ the narrator marks the necessity of the events by saying, “[it happened] in order that the scripture might be fulfilled.” Accented is Jesus’s passion as the fulfillment of scriptures. Although the Jewish people fail to understand their Scripture and to believe Jesus as the Messiah, as shown in the Gospel, the words of the Scripture do not fail (cf. 10:35). Rather, the scriptural words are fulfilled eventually in Jesus’s

⁵²⁶ Although the disciples claim to be aware of Jesus’s messiahship (1:41–49; 6:68–69; cf. 20:9).

⁵²⁷ Four of ten of Matthew’s fulfillment citations appear in Jesus’s infancy narrative, and five in Jesus’s ministry narrative: in the beginning of Jesus’s ministry (4:15–16), in Jesus’s healing times (8:17; 12:18–21) and his teaching occasion (13:35), and at the end of his ministry (21:5). The last occurrence is then about the thirty pieces of silver and Judas’s death (27:9–10).

⁵²⁸ Morgan, “Fulfillment,” 157, considers that John uses OT at the crucial moment in Jesus’s life. Cf. Lieu, “Narrative Analysis,” 151.

passion as emphasized in the second stage of the Book. Moreover, in the order of quotation distribution, three fulfillment semi-quotations (17:12; 18:9; 18:32), where *the scripture* (ἡ γραφή) and *the word* (ὁ λόγος) possibly refer to Jesus's words, are *enclosed* by John's fulfillment quotations (12:38–40; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28, 36–37).⁵²⁹ This phenomenon suggests that in the second stage of the narrative, John even considers Jesus's word as also fulfilled in his passion (cf. 2:22).⁵³⁰ John's point of view should not be surprising to the readers since the narrative has shown that Jesus speaks what the Father says, whose words are written down in the Scripture (8:26, 40; cf. 5:46–47; 9:29).⁵³¹ Therefore, the QF “ἵνα πληρωθῇ” demonstrates not only the fulfillment of the Scripture in the Gospel but also the realization of Jesus's words.

However, it does not mean that the theme of scriptural fulfillment is absent in the first half of the narrative. Nor does it mean that the theme is in a less sense in the first half than in the second. The immediate contexts of the first and last quotations in the first stage of the Gospel (2:17–22; 12:12–16) are, in fact, apparently anticipating the disciples' understanding of the Scripture after Jesus's death and resurrection. The narrator's foreshadowing parenthesis in 12:16 for the quotations in 12:13–15 is no less a fulfillment expression than the fulfillment quotations that focus on Jesus's passion, which has already been foretold by the narrator in 2:17–22. However, the referent of these quotations is still veiled to the characters of the story. Along with the other three quotations in the first stage (6:31, 45; 10:34), they still express the people's

⁵²⁹ The same arrangement also occurs in the first part. Three semi-quotations that have summarized concepts from the Scripture (7:38; 7:42; 8:17) are also enclosed by “ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον” formulae.

⁵³⁰ Keener, *John*, 1059.

⁵³¹ Jesus is introduced as the Word who alone makes God known, through the Word's dwelling in flesh among people, the written word of God is also made known (cf. 1:17; 3:12, 34; 12:50). Cf. Menken, “Observations,” 127.

ignorance. Therefore, obviously, John's narrator intentionally preserves the fulfillment QFs for the passion stage.

The second significant phenomenon in John's narrative is that the distinct QFs is not pronounced by the narrator alone. One can observe that the same QF can be used by various scriptural quoters (the narrator, Jesus, the crowd, or the disciples). Among the Gospels, this phenomenon is unique to John. In Matthew's Gospel, all of Matthew's fulfillment QFs are uttered by Matthew's narrator alone;⁵³² for Luke, on the contrary, the scriptural fulfillment language is only found in Jesus's mouth (Luke 4:21; 18:31; 22:37; 24:44). In John, the fulfillment QFs can be assigned both to Jesus and the narrator. In narrative analysis, the fact that the same QF is used by the narrator, the protagonist, and other characters indicates dynamics of point of view. Uspensky addresses, "The inclusion of elements of someone else's speech is a basic device of expressing changes of point of view on the level of phraseology."⁵³³ In John, according to Uspensky, phraseological influences exist between the narrator and his characters.⁵³⁴ In view of the use of two distinct QF forms in the narrative as a whole, John's narrator has phraseological influence on the direct discourse of other characters instead of a reverse case.

At the same time, when one cites from the Scripture, then scriptural phraseological influence is expected.⁵³⁵ Within John's narrative world, a character's quoting is showing his point of view on the phraseological plane by use of the quoted text. For the narrator, as standing

⁵³² Although the phrase "τὸ ῥηθέν" in Matthew's fulfillment QF is used by Jesus twice (22:32; 24:15).

⁵³³ Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 32.

⁵³⁴ Ibid., 33–45. However, Yamasaki indicates biblical scholars' misunderstanding on Uspensky's *phraseological* plane of point of view (Yamasaki, *Watching*, 70, 80, 105–6, 107). According to Uspensky, the phraseological plane involves the incorporation of speech characteristics of other speaker(s) in the narrative rather than just the vocabulary expression. The latter belongs to ideological plane of point of view.

⁵³⁵ Sternberg, "Proteus in Quotation-Land," 112, "if direct quotation is indeed reproductive, then it preserves the original speaker's perspective and can hardly lie ambiguously between quotee and quoter."

outside of the narrative, he reveals his own point of view through his own quoting and through the dynamics of point of view in others' quoting. In addition, through his arrangement of the QFs, the narrator demonstrates broader perspective on the relationship between the Scripture and Jesus's event.

However, the relationship between the Scripture and Jesus's event involves hermeneutics. The debates concerning how the NT uses the OT have been taken place among scholars.⁵³⁶ This research does not seek to be involved in or to defend any scholar's theory. The previous chapter explained that the OT texts were adopted in Jewish literature although it did not investigate their methods for interpreting the OT texts. The NT writers, as well as Jesus (as the gospel writers record), consider the OT texts as fulfilled in the Jesus event. On the one hand, Jesus Christ is the key to the OT texts, not only concerning messianic promises (and eschatological events) but also concerning those about ethics and community life of God's people. On the other hand, the Scripture is where one can precisely understand about who the coming Messiah exactly is and what his deeds means. In John's narrative, the narrator builds the bridge for the *gap* between the Jewish Scripture and Jesus as the Messiah over which the Jewish people and leaders fail to cross. John's narrator clearly shows that Jesus is within the written Scripture and that the Scripture is fulfilled in the Jesus event although for the Jews it does not seem to be that way. For the narrator, Jesus is the key to the Scripture and the Scripture is the map where one can find the God-promised Messiah. Therefore, John's formulaic OT quotations are not only intertextually about producing the meaning and repositioning of the text but also more theologically concerning the

⁵³⁶ Cf. Berding and Lunde, eds., *Three Views*; Moyise, "Intertextuality," 23–24; Enns, *Inspiration and Incarnation*, 115–17; Beale, *Handbook*, 1–27; and Darrell L. Bock, "Scripture Citing Scripture: Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *Interpreting the New Testament Text: Introduction to the Art and Science of Exegesis*, ed. Darrell L. Bock and Buist M. Fanning, (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006), 255–76.

narrator's evaluative point of view on God's previous words now occurring and fulfilled in the incarnated life of the Word of God.

When the protagonist articulates that the Scriptures witness about him and the narrator also enunciates that the disciples eventually believe the word in the Scripture about him, then the scriptural texts in the narrative, particularly those with a quotation formula, function as an index to who Jesus is. The Scripture that is reported as “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” is witnessing about Jesus, in whom the Scripture is fulfilled (πληρωθῇ). For the narrator, on the one hand, Jesus's identity and the meaning of his ministry is *written* in the Scripture; the Scripture is *fulfilled/ completed* in his crucifixion. On the other hand, according to the first formulaic quotation in each part (i.e., 2:17; 12:38), the Scripture is *fulfilled* in Jesus's ministry (12:38–41), and Jesus's identity as the destroyed temple is *written* in the Scripture (2:17–22).

Therefore, the narrative function of the QFs is twofold. First, with respect to John's narrative as a whole, the use of distinct QFs marks off two stages of the narrative in understanding the relationship between the Scripture and Jesus. In the first stage, the QF “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” denotes that the quoted texts are from the *written* Scripture that is familiar and considered as the authoritative writings in the narrative world. The first stage illustrates the people's ignorance and misunderstanding of what their scriptural texts are really saying regarding the promised Messiah, which also reflects their unbelief in Jesus. The fulfillment statement regarding their unbelief starts the second stage in which the narrator preserves the QF “ἵνα πληρωθῇ” for the quoted scriptural texts, leaving no room for any other form of QF. The use of fulfillment QF is to provide evidence of the truth that the Scripture is *fulfilled* in Jesus,

giving attention to his passion event, despite the unbelief of the people.⁵³⁷ The word of God is fulfilled in the λόγος; the word of Jesus is also reported as being fulfilled. Evans then is likely correct on the observation that John 12 serves as a transition.⁵³⁸ The last “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” quotations (12:14–15) express the scriptural fulfillment in Jesus’s event of final entry into Jerusalem. The first quotations with “ἵνα πληρωθῇ” (12:38–40) from Isaiah conclude the unbelief status of the people as scriptural fulfillment and transition to the next episode, in which the fulfillment of the Scripture is fully centered on Jesus’s betrayal and crucifixion.

Second, with respect to each quotation context, the QFs mark the quoted texts and signal the narrator’s evaluative point of view on the identity of Jesus by the quoted OT texts. Since the narrator has phraseological influence on each quotation by using his distinctive QFs, dynamics of point of view on the scriptural texts among the characters and the narrator is the point of focus in the next section in order to learn about the witness that comes from the Scripture in the narrative.

5.2 John’s Formulaic Explicit OT Quotations

This section focuses on each formulaic OT quotation in John’s narrative in light of dynamics of point of view. Since the way in which John distributes his quotations in the narrative is distinctive, to discuss John’s quotations in a *mechanical* way is appropriate. In John’s narrative, Jesus the protagonist declares that the Scriptures testify about him. Most of the scriptural quotations in John indeed attach to a QF that indicates that the nature of the quoted text is *the Scripture* or *what was written*. Therefore, the straightest way to identify which quotation witnesses Jesus in John’s narrative is to look at the QFs of the quotations. Those that have “ἔστιν γεγραμμένον” as QF and those that have “in order that the word/the scripture may be

⁵³⁷ Therefore, the narrative pattern of relational movement can be described as preparation/realization.

⁵³⁸ Evans, “Quotation Formulas,” 81.

fulfilled” are qualified. The self-identification of John the Baptist in 1:23 is included since it is followed by a formula frequently seen in the Jewish literature and clearly marks the scriptural source, “καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης” (cf. 7:38, 42).

As previously mentioned, the three semi-quotations, 1:51, 12:13, and 12:27, that do not have a clear QF indicating the Scripture are not included despite the fact that they are detectable OT texts.⁵³⁹ Moreover, the other three semi-quotations that take only a summarized scriptural concept/principle (7:38, 42; 8:17) and the other three that link to Jesus’s predication rather than the OT texts (although using fulfillment QF; 17:12; 18:9; 18:32) will not be treated as formulaic explicit quotations. The quotations in 12:40 and 19:37, since each of them is piggybacked by an immediate *qualified* quotation as a set of combined quotations, are then included in the list of explicit scriptural quotations. Therefore, the quotations to be discussed are: 1:23, 2:17, 6:31, 6:45, 10:34, 12:14–15, 12:38, 12:40, 13:18, 15:25, 19:24, 19:28, 36, 37.⁵⁴⁰

In order to learn how John’s formulaic OT quotations contribute to testifying about Jesus in the narrative context, I will apply Uspensky’s planes of point of view in the discussion.⁵⁴¹ The dynamics of point of view in the context of each quotation is the point of focus. Through the showing and telling of the narrator, the readers/narratees can understand the points of view in the narrative,⁵⁴² as well as the evaluative point of view of the narrative. Furthermore, the original OT context will be briefly mentioned. The OT context will lead to the OPoV on the text cited. This

⁵³⁹ According to the definition in Lange and Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions*, 26–27, John 1:51 may be seen as an explicit quotation since it has a prophetic identifier “you will see,” which happens in all Gospels as used by Jesus. The text the crowd shouts in John 12:13 may be also an explicit quotation. However, in John’s narrative, they are not John’s formulaic quotations.

⁵⁴⁰ Due to the research interest (in textual form), Menken (*Quotations*, 18) presents only eleven quotations. Schuchard (*Scripture*, xiii–xiv) excludes 12:13 (no introduction formula) and 19:28 (no OT text cited). Obermann (*Erfüllung*, 71–76) excludes 19:28 (only one word). Freed (*Quotations*, xii) adds 7:38, 42, and 17:12 in his list.

⁵⁴¹ Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 5–7; Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 169–73.

⁵⁴² Cf. Norman R. Petersen, “Point of View in Mark’s Narrative,” *Semeia* 12 (1978): 102.

OPOV is what the narrator deals with in the narrative context where he adopts the quotation. The narrator, using each formulaic explicit quotation as a marked scriptural witness to Jesus by his arrangement of QFs, expresses his Christological perspective. The focus is on the NPOV on using each quotation. Although NPOV is believed to be identical to JPOV in John's narrative,⁵⁴³ a nuance is still between them in terms of their standpoints to the narrative world. While NPOV represents an *external* view, JPOV is *internal*. Thus, NPOV on Jesus's quotation expresses the narrator's view on Jesus's quoting. If the quotation is found on the lips of a *character* (or a group of characters) other than Jesus, the CPOV may or may not concur with NPOV.⁵⁴⁴ NPOV on the quotation has to be defined through the way in which the narrator shows the character's/characters' understanding or misunderstanding of the Scripture. Hence, what is important is to look at the dynamics of points of view while the narrator or a character appeals to the Scripture. Uspensky's four planes of point of view will serve as a basis for discussion. Using Uspensky's model, one can observe the dynamics of the points of view on the OT quotations, through different quoters, on various viewpoint *planes* that the narrator shows. The attention focuses on each quotation within the immediate narrative context and then the broader Johannine context in terms of a narrative point of view. I then discuss the contribution of the quotation to the narrative while viewing the way the introductory formula functions to bridge the gap between the OT and Johannine contexts.

⁵⁴³ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 36; Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel*, 21–22. Cf. Powell, *Narrative Criticism*, 26.

⁵⁴⁴ Only four quotations are reported as cited by other characters. They are 1:23 (John the Baptist); 2:17 (Jesus's disciples); 6:31 (the crowd); 12:3 (the crowd).

5.2.1 John 1:23 Straighten the Road of the Lord, as Isaiah the Prophet Said

The first explicit OT quotation appears in John 1:23 at the beginning of his whole narrative (i.e., 1:19–51): “Ἐφῇ· ἐγὼ φωνῇ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης” (He said, “I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, ‘straighten the road of the Lord,’ as Isaiah the prophet said”). The spotlight in the plot of this section clearly turns from John the Baptist (1:19–37) to Jesus (1:38–51). The narrator’s ideological point of view corresponds with that in the prologue, clearly reflecting John the Baptist’s witness to Jesus. John the Baptist, as the main character in the first half of this section, displays in his speech his point of view that concurs with the NPoV.

The text quoted from Isa 40:3 is found on John the Baptist’s lips as his reply to the questions of the priests and Levites from Jerusalem.⁵⁴⁵ The series of questions (1:19–25) shows a point of view about John the Baptist’s identity on their psychological plane. The Jewish leaders *do not know* who John the Baptist is and why he is performing baptism (1:25). Having denied being the Messiah, Elijah, and the prophet (1:19–21), John the Baptist answers the question about his own identity (“τί λέγεις περὶ σεαυτοῦ;”) by citing Isaiah’s word.⁵⁴⁶ The Isaiah text cited after John’s first person pronoun ἐγὼ appears to be John the Baptist’s self-introduction. The quotation seems about John the Baptist *himself*. Both the narrator in the prologue and John the Baptist in the following context point out that *this John* is the one sent by God for the very purpose, which is to bear witness about the coming One (1:6–8, 15; cf. 3:28–30; 10:41). In the prologue, the narrator’s language reveals NPoV that *this John* emerges for witnessing (εἰς

⁵⁴⁵ The Synoptic Gospels do not attribute Isa 40:3 to John the Baptist (cf. Matt 3:3 // Mark 1:3 // Luke 3:4).

⁵⁴⁶ Cf. James D. G. Dunn, “John the Baptist’s Use of Scripture,” in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 45, 47.

μαρτυρίαν ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ) about the light (1:6–7). Now, the narrator shows that John is turning over the spotlight onto the one about whom he comes to bear witness (1:26–35) as he even speaks about his identity.

In the context of the quotation in Isa 40:3, the messages turn from judgmental into a new section of comfort. God speaks a comforting message to his people (Isa 40:1). Jerusalem's suffering has ended and her sins are pardoned (40:2).⁵⁴⁷ For Isaiah, Uzziah is dead (6:1); neither Ahaz (7:1–17) nor Hezekiah (39:1–8) is the redeeming king of God's people. Only the coming Lord is the saving comforter of his people (40:10). A crying voice is telling that this comfort of Israel's restoration of Israel will be provided through the appearance of the Lord (40:3–5). In the coming of the Lord, people need to prepare the way of the Lord (40:3–4).⁵⁴⁸ The result of the coming of the Lord is the revelation of his glory and all flesh will see it (40:5).⁵⁴⁹ Then the voice at the end confirms the message as being the word the Lord spoke (40:5, 7–8). Hence, Isaiah tells that the ultimate comfort to his people will come when the Lord appears. The Lord's glory itself will bring the restoration to his people. Isaiah's original text does not explicate who or what the קוֹל or φωνή (voice) is. Its predicate is either “crying” or “crying in the wilderness.”⁵⁵⁰ The voice (or the content of the voice) is to urge people to prepare the way for the coming Lord and to predict the revelation of the Lord's glory after the preparation. Therefore, the OPoV sees that the

⁵⁴⁷ Concerning the argument about the textual sources, cf. Schuchard, *Scripture*, 2–6. In LXX, it shows that the ones who need to tell God's comfort to Jerusalem are priests (ἱερεῖς).

⁵⁴⁸ John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapter 40–66*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 52, “it speaks of an act of faith on the part of the people.”

⁵⁴⁹ In MT, it reads “all flesh will see together” (וְרָאוּ כָּל-בָּשָׂר יַחְדָּו). The LXX reads “all flesh will see *the salvation of God*” (καὶ ὄψεται πάντα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ).

⁵⁵⁰ It depends on whether with the antecedent or the subsequent “in the wilderness” is construed. Qumran literature, following the Hebrew text, prefers to read “prepare the way in the wilderness” (1QS VIII, 12–14; IX, 17–20). But the gospel writers follow the LXX. Also cf. Köstenberger, “John,” 426. Moreover, the LXX text shows that the translator considered a construct relation in קוֹל קוֹרֵא. Therefore, the LXX reads “a voice of one crying,” which John adopts.

voice is not those who prepare the road but the one, as the very first voice for God's comforting message, who prompts others (plural *you*) to prepare and strengthen the way for the Lord's coming who brings the ultimate comfort. In addition, the voice predicts the revelation of the Lord's glory.

In John's narrative, the narrator shows John the Baptist's understanding of self-identity. John the Baptist considers himself as the voice ("ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος") that urges others to straighten the way of the Lord ("εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου").⁵⁵¹ This citation shows straightforwardly the ideological point of view of John the Baptist on himself and the one who comes after him. The following speech also demonstrates John the Baptist's CPoV on himself and Jesus. He claims that someone comes after him and the coming one is greater than him and *before* him (1:27, 30).⁵⁵² John the Baptist explains that the purpose of his baptism is to *reveal* to Israel the coming one who will baptize with the Holy Spirit (1:26, 31–33). The most direct testimony John the Baptist gives for the coming one is, "This is the Son of God" (1:34), and, "The Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world" (1:29, 36). John the Baptist's speech in at least three points concurs with the OPoV in the context of Isa 40:3. First, the supreme one is coming. In Isa 40, the coming one is the Lord, YHWH; while in John, it is Jesus. Second, something/someone is revealed to the people. In Isaiah, the glory of the Lord will be revealed (וְגִלָּהּ) to all; in John, John the Baptist reveals (φανερωθῆ) Jesus to Israel by baptizing him with water. Third, the referenced event is about the removal of sin and judgment. In Isa 40:2, the sin of Jerusalem is carried off (נִרְצָה); in John, John the Baptist points to Jesus and declares twice,

⁵⁵¹ Cf. discussion on textual form in Maarten J. J. Menken, "The Quotation from Isa 40,3 in John 1,23," *Bib* 66 (1985): 190–204.

⁵⁵² The tense forms of "γέγονεν" and "ἦν" in 1:30 (cf. 1:15) suggest a *status* having existed already prior to the verb "ἔρχεται." The causal clause "ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν" is likely to offer an ontological reason.

“Behold, this is the Lamb of God”⁵⁵³ who takes away (αἵρων) the sin of the world (1:29). In John’s narrative, John the Baptist has the true testimony about Jesus (5:33; 10:41) because it is shown that John the Baptist knows the identity of the one coming after him (1:15, 27, 30, 33; 3:28). Therefore, when John the Baptist quotes the text from Isa 40:3 with his introduction of the coming one, his ideological point of view does not diverge from the OPoV. This quotation implies that Jesus, who John the Baptist is revealing, is understood as the coming Lord, who brings the salvation of forgiveness of sin.

But, whether the QF “καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφῆτης” belongs to John the Baptist or the narrator is not clear.⁵⁵⁴ In John’s narrative, a QF is almost found attributed to the quoter.⁵⁵⁵ In addition, John the Baptist’s speech ideologically concurs with Isaiah’s message; hence, the comparative adverb καθὼς makes perfect sense. Then, the QF is a part of the discourse of John the Baptist. However, the narrator puts a series of QFs on the characters’ lips.⁵⁵⁶ Thus, the narrator’s phraseological influence is upon John the Baptist (cf. 12:38–40) while in the immediate context the narrator’s narratorial telling implies the narrator’s omnipresence.⁵⁵⁷ Whether or not the QF belongs to John the Baptist, a perfect concurrence is between NPoV and the point of view of John the Baptist (CPoV). In the narrative, John the Baptist appears to be introducing *himself* with Isaiah’s word; however, John the Baptist’s Isaiah quotation exactly displays the role of John the Baptist as the voice before *the coming One*, just as the narrator

⁵⁵³ In Isa 40:9, the voice of Jerusalem is saying, “Behold, your God.”

⁵⁵⁴ It can be seen among English translations.

⁵⁵⁵ Except the one in 19:28.

⁵⁵⁶ Lieu, “Narrative Analysis,” 149.

⁵⁵⁷ Cf. n. 193, concerning the *inclusio* structure (1:23; 12:38–40). Also cf. Beutler, “Use,” 148.

foretells in the prologue. Introducing the coming One is the goal both for the narrator and John the Baptist.

The main point of the voice in the Isaiah message is the coming Lord and his salvation. John the Baptist shares the same ideological point of view with it. In fact, in the narrator's description, one can observe the accordance of NPoV with Isa 40 in many places (e.g., the everlasting word of God—Isa 40:8; John 1:1; 12:34; the Shepard Lord—Isa 40:11; John 10; and the Creator Lord—Isa 40:26–28; John 1:1–3). Therefore, as the narrator is narrating, with the concurring ideological point of view with John the Baptist, the quotation functions as the vehicle of the NPoV in the narrative. The coming Lord is now referred to as the Son of God, who is revealed in the baptism of John the Baptist, and as the Lamb of God, who is to remove the sins of the world. Along with the coming of the Lord is the display of his glory (Isa 40:5). What has been seen by the narrator and his fellows is the glory of the flesh-become-Word (John 1:14; cf. 2:11) in whom the Father also will be glorified (12:28; cf. 17:5). By the first formulaic OT quotation on John the Baptist's lips, John the Baptist introduces his identity as the voice in Isa 40; and the narrator illustrates the One introduced in the prologue and will reveal him in the following narrative. Therefore, the NPoV on Jesus, through John the Baptist's quotation, is a scriptural high Christology, which the narrator has explicitly stated in the very beginning of the narrative. Jesus the Son of God, about whom John the Baptist witnesses, is the coming Lord himself, bringing the ultimate salvation for his people. At the same time, he is the Lamb that takes away sins. It also implies a Jewish slain sacrifice for sin within the narrative world, which can be seen in the broader context in Isaiah's message (Isa 53:7–8). In the narrative, through the introduction of John the Baptist, it is Jesus about whom the voice foretold in Isaiah's words witnesses and through whom Isaiah's text is unveiled.

5.2.2 John 2:17 It Is Written, Zeal for Your House

John 2:17 reads, “ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν· ὁ ζῆλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγεται με” (His disciples remembered that it was written, “The zeal for your house will consume me”). Jesus’s cleansing of the temple in John’s narrative occurs during Jesus’s first Jerusalem trip (2:12–22) right after the episode of the first miracle/sign in Cana where the narrator reports that Jesus’s glory was revealed (2:1–11). These two incidents begin to fulfill Jesus’s promises in 1:50–51 to the disciples as *of* greater things and *about* the Son of Man.⁵⁵⁸ Jesus promises Nathanael in 1:50 that *you* (sg.) will see (ὄψῃ) greater things, and in 1:51 that *you* (pl.), presumably the disciples,⁵⁵⁹ will see (ὄψεσθε) something like Jacob’s ladder vision about the Son of Man. Jesus’s prophetic languages ὄψῃ and ὄψεσθε create an expectation of *viewing* what Jesus has said.⁵⁶⁰ The narrator’s temporal phrases “the third day” (2:1) and “not many days” (2:12) signal that these two incidents meet the expectation as the first of many that are about to unfold.⁵⁶¹ The Cana Sign ends with Jesus’s glory revealed and the disciples’ belief in him. However, such a faith produced through viewing a miracle, for the narrator, is not perfect (cf. 1:50) *since* he hints the post-Easter belief in 2:22 and the untrustworthy belief produced through viewing miracles in 2:24–25.⁵⁶² Therefore, the narrator in these two incidences conveys

⁵⁵⁸ See pp. 42–43.

⁵⁵⁹ Carson, *John*, 164; Keener, *John*, 489.

⁵⁶⁰ Cf. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 57.

⁵⁶¹ Carson, *John*, 162, and Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 120, suggests that the *greater things* include the unfolding of Jesus’s events throughout the Gospel. Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 150, considers that the fulfillment, starting with the Cana miracle, unfolds step-by-step until Jesus’s crucifixion. Regarding “the third day/three days” in Jewish tradition, cf. Beasley-Murray, *John*, 40. In addition, notice that both paragraphs start with temporal phrases (2:1, 12) and end with the narrator’s comments about belief (2:11, 22), which echoes back to Jesus’s interrogation in 1:50.

⁵⁶² Nicolas Farelly, *The Disciples in the Fourth Gospel*, WUNT 2/290 (Tübingen: Siebeck, 2010), 33–37, also indicates that the disciples do not understand at this time the meaning of Jesus’s action in the Temple.

his NPoV that their belief needs to be complete through perceiving of the meaning of *who* the Son of Man, Jesus, is and of *what* he is to do. Jesus's "cleansing" of the temple is an immediate place among many where the narrator reveals the meaning.

This citation is the narrator's description about the disciples' scriptural recall (ἐμνήσθησαν) during the occasion of Jesus driving the traders out of the temple. In the story, Jesus's abnormal action (2:15–16) finds two immediate reactions. One is the retrospect of the OT text in the mind of the disciples (2:17); the other is a query about Jesus's authority from the Jews (2:18). The former is an *inner* (silent) reflection, only reported by the narrator; the latter an *outer* (loud) spoken question, which is the primary reaction *heard* at the scene.⁵⁶³ Jesus's answer to their question, along with the narrator's later explanation, denotes the nonconcurrence of ideological points of view on the temple and on his identity between the Jews and Jesus (2:19–21).⁵⁶⁴ Later, the narrator in his interim summary tells another retrospect of the disciples from a later timeframe with belief in the Scripture and Jesus's words (2:22). This post-Easter point of view of the disciples must be different from theirs during the time of Jesus's cleansing action. Although the disciples recognized that Jesus is the Messiah (1:41, 45), the Son of God and the King of Israel (1:49), in the narrative they may not have understood the precise meaning (cf. 1:50–51) until Jesus's resurrection. Their point of view does not concur with JPoV, nor with NPoV at this moment.⁵⁶⁵ Therefore, the OT quotation in 2:17, though recalled by the disciples in

⁵⁶³ The subsequent conjunction οὖν, present in this verse and absent in the previous, suggests that the question of the Jews is the primary subsequence. Also, the verb ἀπεκρίθησαν implies that the Jews try to take control of the situation/conversation. See Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*, 2nd ed. (Dallas: SIL International, 2000), 231, 255–56.

⁵⁶⁴ Cf. E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 72.

⁵⁶⁵ This nonconcurrence can also be seen in the narrator's point of view on the spatial plane. The disciples are not mentioned any more after their quotation in 2:17 and can only be understood as being present. The narrator is the only one whose point of view shows concurring with Jesus's on phraseological, psychological, and spatial planes.

the narrative, does not seem to present their understanding of Jesus's action. However, the narrator's QF then suggests NPoV through that quotation.

What the disciples recall in their minds is the text from Ps 69:9 (69:10 MT; 68:10 LXX). Psalm 69 is a part of the second Book of the Psalter (Pss 42–72), in which the psalms show pleas for God's deliverance from enemies with Ps 72 as the climax, anticipating a long-lasting righteous king who will conquer the enemies and deliver the people (cf. Ps 47).⁵⁶⁶ Gerald Wilson rightly points out that Ps 69 introduces a psalm grouping, Pss 69–71, that returns to the earlier theme of lament and pleas for God's deliverance from threatening enemies.⁵⁶⁷ In addition, each psalm in Pss 69–71 starts with the language of calling for God's rescue (Pss 69:1; 70:1; 71:2). In the immediate context of Ps 69:9, the psalmist describes his bearing taunts and scorn from others (69:6–13).⁵⁶⁸ The psalmist carries such humiliation and shame for the sake of God and the zeal for God's house (69:7, 9). However, in this verse, the meaning of “your house” (בֵּיתְךָ) is not clear. It may refer either to the temple⁵⁶⁹ or to the *household* of God, which is the collective people of God.⁵⁷⁰ In the broader context of the Book (Pss 42–72), the theme concerning the temple is not found evident. Instead, the themes of deliverance of God's repentant people from their enemies or unrighteous ones (e.g., Pss 42–43, 55, 64, 70) and the restoration of proper worship (e.g., Pss 50–51, 63, 65–66) are throughout the Book. In Ps 69, although the psalmist's

⁵⁶⁶ Gerald H. Wilson, *Psalms Volume 1*, NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 950.

⁵⁶⁷ Ibid., 664–66, 949.

⁵⁶⁸ Cf. Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, WBC 20 (Dallas: Word, 1990), 196–97.

⁵⁶⁹ Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150: A Commentary*, trans. Hilton C. Oswald, CC (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 62; Wilson, *Psalms Volume 1*, 952. The range of the appropriate implication of “zeal for the temple” can be as wide as from David's eagerness to build God's house, King Josiah's cleansing of God's temple, prophets' worry about the corruption of the temple (cf. Ezek 8; Jer 23:11), to the returning people rebuilding the temple. Also cf. Steven M. Bryan, “Consumed by Zeal: John's Use of Psalm 69:9 and the Action in the Temple,” *BBR* 21 (2011): 479–94.

⁵⁷⁰ Amos Hakham, *Psalms with the Jerusalem Commentary*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Massad Marav Kook, 2002), 2:94, 104; Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 196–97.

pleas seem to focus on *me*, the wording suggests that “[t]he psalmist prays on behalf of the people,”⁵⁷¹ who are humble and poor but seeking God among others (69:6, 32–33, 34–35). Hence, “your house” in Ps 69:9 is more likely to refer to “your household,” the people of God, rather than the building of temple. Therefore, the OPoV in 69:9 is more likely expressing the psalmist’s zeal for the *household of God* like fire consuming him. The psalmist’s zeal anticipates God’s salvation (69:1, 13–14, 18, 35) and a proper worship (69:30–36). In an extended sense, such a zeal may allude to an enthusiastic hope for a righteous king to reign the people (Ps 72).

In John 2:17, the narrator portrays the disciples’ retrospect of the written text of Ps 69:9 in Jesus’s rebuke of the traders: “Do not make my Father’s house a house of trade” (2:16). Jesus’s phrase, “my Father’s house” (τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου), likely stirs the textual echo in the disciples’ minds.⁵⁷² On the surface, it tells the disciples’ CPoV on the psychological plane; however, several planes of point of view are involved in this quotation. Their retrospect of the OT text shows their CPoV on the phraseological plane. Their textual quoting shows that they consider Jesus’s action as a kind of zeal for the house of God, which would burn like fire in his heart. One can find the narrator’s phraseological color dyeing the quote. In addition to the QF mentioned, the future tense of the verb “καταφάγεται” shows the narrator’s phraseological influence on the disciples’ psychological point of view. This future tense *cannot* be the disciples’ phraseology since they have *not yet* known about Jesus’s death at this timeframe. Therefore, this

⁵⁷¹ Hakham, *Psalms*, 2:104. He also concludes, “The wording of the psalm suggests that the distress about which the psalmist laments is not his individual distress, but the distress of the community....”

⁵⁷² Cf. Brown, *John I–XII*, 115, “At this moment, or after the resurrection as in vs. 22?” The disciple’s recall is reported twice in the immediate context, 2:17 and 2:22. In 2:22, their recall happened “when (ὅτε)” Jesus was raised from the dead. However, the recall in 2:17 does not have any temporal adverb/subordinating clause denoting the moment (some later textual manuscripts have conjunction δε [e.g., Codex Alexandrinus] or και [e.g., Codex Washingtonensis] here). John 2:17 should be understood as an immediate reflection on Jesus’s action rather than a post-Easter recall.

future verb involves the NPoV from a different temporal perspective. Since the NPoV here does not concur with the disciples' CPoV, this psychological point of view shows an *irony* that the disciples, though remembering the scriptural text, do not really understand the meaning between it and Jesus's action.⁵⁷³ The recalled quotation, "the zeal of your house will consume me," seems to explain *why* Jesus would have such a violent movement. However, as Carson supposes, "[T]hey probably focused on the zeal, not the manner of the 'consumption.'"⁵⁷⁴ The disciples' quotation is likely just a partial textual correspondence between Ps 69:9 and Jesus's action.

This event is presented from the temporal perspective of the disciples who are not aware of Jesus's death at this moment in the story timeframe. The future tense is the narrator's phraseological influence on the characters' discourse, as well as on the quoted text.⁵⁷⁵ The narrator here, from his temporal point of view, makes the quotation allude to Jesus's death, just as Jesus later speaks about the destruction and rebuilding of the temple. The narrator knows the outcome already. Along with Jesus's dialogue and narrator's foreshadowing comment, the quotation, though it expresses the disciples' psychological recall on Jesus's zealous behavior, is actually used by the narrator to *predict* Jesus's fleshly death (2:21), which Jesus has hinted as the *hour* in the previous event (2:4) and is where John's plot moves toward. In this narrative timeframe, the disciples have not yet understood the Scripture about Jesus as the narrator does when he narrates, until Jesus's resurrection (2:22).⁵⁷⁶ Therefore, the disciples' quoting is adopted by the narrator in order to foreshadow the death of Jesus.

⁵⁷³ An irony occurs when nonconcurrence of points of view shows. Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 103; Yamasaki, *Watching*, 184–85.

⁵⁷⁴ Carson, *John*, 180.

⁵⁷⁵ The verb *consume/devour* in HB is perfect and in LXX aorist.

⁵⁷⁶ Note, after the disciples' quoting, the narrator makes them silent.

The narrator has phraseological influence both on the QF and quotation of the disciples, showing the irony of the disciples' understanding of Jesus's work. Then, the NPoV from this disciples' quoting can be found in the phraseological use for *temple* in the story. As Gary Yamasaki paraphrases Uspensky's word, "a character's phraseological traits can be a means of determining the character's ideological point of view."⁵⁷⁷ In John's Gospel, the narrator's terminology for the *place* of the temple is *ἱερόν*,⁵⁷⁸ which is used in the narrator's description in 2:14–15. However, Jesus called it "τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου" (2:16) which is identical to "τοῦ οἴκου σου" in the OT quotation (2:17). Then Jesus uses *ναός* to talk about his physical body (2:19), with which term the narrator goes on to explain what Jesus means (2:21). The Jews also use the same term to refer to the physical building of the temple following Jesus's word (2:20). On the phraseological plane, the Jews do not misunderstand Jesus's *ναός*, but ideologically, as the narrator comments, Jesus's *ναός* refers to his physical body, which the Jews will *kill* but Jesus will raise in three days.⁵⁷⁹ The *destroy* part concurs with the meaning of "will consume me" in the quotation. By rising from the dead, Jesus will show his right authority to drive out the market people from the temple, which Jesus zealously calls "my Father's house."

Jesus's zeal is for the household of God to have true worship. Just as the context of Gen 28:12, from which Jesus himself adopts and adapts in 1:51, Jacob called the place "the house of God" (*בֵּית אֱלֹהִים*; οἶκος θεοῦ) where he had dreamed of a ladder connecting heaven to earth.⁵⁸⁰ The Son of Man, in Jesus's words, replaces the ladder as being the intermedicator between heaven and earth. For John's narrator, what Jesus is doing is to cleanse the *place* where the people of

⁵⁷⁷ Yamasaki, *Watching*, 33.

⁵⁷⁸ John 2:14–15; 5:14; 7:14, 28; 8:2, 20, 59; 10:23; 11:56; 18:20 (by Jesus to refer to the place).

⁵⁷⁹ Jesus's "λύσατε" in 2:19 is a conditional imperative. See Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 490–91.

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. Carson, *John*, 164; Keener, *John*, 489.

God should have proper worship. Such zeal for the household of God to have true worship, as noted in Ps 69:9 consumes Jesus like fire. According to the narrator's *prediction*, Jesus will be killed in order to raise/restore the true worship in him, the proper place for the people to truly worship God (cf. 3:14–15; 4:21–23). Therefore, it will fulfill what Jesus promises the disciples in 1:50–51. The disciples' belief can only be perfect in understanding Jesus as the *place* where one has true worship.⁵⁸¹

5.2.3 John 6:31 It Is Written, the Beard from Heaven to Eat

In John 6:31, the Jewish crowd quotes, “οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον· ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν” (Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, as it is written, “he gave them bread from heaven to eat”). This OT quotation appears in the dialogue between Jesus and the Jewish crowd (6:22–40) after Jesus's sign of feeding more than five thousand people (6:1–13). Before this sign, the narrator shows another healing sign of Jesus in ch. 5, which results in the Jews beginning to seek (ἐζήτουν) to kill Jesus (5:18). The reason is because of Jesus's frequent violation of the Sabbath and his calling God his father and making himself equal with God. Jesus's response to their hostility, however, is that God and himself are the source of life and willing to give life to the dead (5:21, 26, 40). Such a theme of giving life—eternal life—has been shown by the narrator throughout the previous two chapters in Jesus's dialogues and deeds (chs. 3–4), and in the following chapters.

In the context of the passage, the narrator tells of the crowd seeing many signs done by Jesus on the sick people (6:2) and now they themselves just experienced the sign that fed them

⁵⁸¹ Stanley E. Porter, *Sacred Tradition in the New Testament: Tracing Old Testament Themes in the Gospels and Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016), 138, “Jesus's death is the new temple institution.”

(6:14). Their address to Jesus as “the coming prophet” expresses their ideological point of view. The description in 6:15 immediately shows Jesus’s nonconcurrence with the crowd. The verse shows two layers of psychological point of view: The *knowing* of Jesus is explicitly described by the narrator, and the *motivation* of the crowd is implicitly perceived by Jesus. Jesus, knowing they were *coming* to force him to be their king, *withdrew* (ἀνεχώρησεν) himself from them to go into the mountain *alone*. The narrator displays clearly an increasing spatial distance made by Jesus between the crowd and himself through which the narrator also signifies the divergent ideological points of view between Jesus and the crowd on the understanding of Jesus’s identity.⁵⁸² The nonconcurring ideological point of view between Jesus and the crowd is made clearer through Jesus’s statement in 6:26 that reveals their inner motive, and even through their concurrence with the Jews by the same demand for a sign from Jesus (6:30; cf. 2:18). Therefore, the crowd plays an ironic game in the context even when they identify Jesus as the coming prophet and when they are citing the *written* OT text in 6:31.

Psalm 78, the source of the crowd’s OT quotation,⁵⁸³ is a historical psalm recounting God’s wondrous deeds and the rebellion and testing of the unfaithful people in the history of Israel, from the Exodus to the time of David. The psalmist at the end appreciates God’s restoration through the reign of King David. By this recounting, the psalmist hopes that the people “should set their hope in God, and not forget the works of God, but keep his commandments” (78:7). The account in 78:12–39 then is about the event at the Red Sea and in

⁵⁸² In the later short story of 6:16–21, showing another Jesus’s sign of walking on the sea, the narrator has Jesus declaring *who* he is to the disciples, namely, “ἐγώ εἰμι.” Cf. n. 16.

⁵⁸³ The exact source is disputed. Psalm 78:24 is more likely. See discussion in Glenn Balfour, “The Jewishness of John’s Use of the Scriptures in John 6:31 and 7:37–38,” *TynBul* 46 (1995): 359–64; Maarten J. J. Menken, “The Provenance and Meaning of the Old Testament Quotation in John 6:31,” *NovT* 30 (1988): 41–46. Concerning the technique of quoting, according to Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 341, 343–46, adapting a text is not uncommon in ancient literature.

the wilderness. Psalm 78:24 (77:24 LXX), cited in John 6:31, is the verse where the psalmist says, “He rained down upon them manna to eat,⁵⁸⁴ and the grain of heaven he gave them.” The psalmist reminds the people of God’s abundant provision of food for Israel (78:23–29). In the meantime, the psalmist keeps displaying the unfaithfulness of the people (e.g., 78:22, 32).⁵⁸⁵ Therefore, the OPoV is apparently God’s continuous wondrous deeds in the history of Israel, the unfaithful people.

In John 6:31, the text of Ps 78:24 is cited by the crowd as the response to Jesus’s *imperative* “believe in the one God sent” (John 6:29).⁵⁸⁶ Jesus’s words make clear that to believe in the one whom God sent, the God-sealed Son of Man, is the work that God requires in order to have food that remains unto eternal life (6:27, 29). The crowd’s answer in 6:30 implies that they understand that Jesus is referring to himself as the one in whom they should believe.⁵⁸⁷ However, they have the same ideological point of view with the Jews in 2:18 that Jesus needs to perform some kind of sign so that they can believe in him. For the crowd, “the coming prophet” (6:14) is a Moses-like prophet who is able to perform a Moses-like miracle to give them the bread from heaven, like the manna that their ancestors ate in the wilderness.⁵⁸⁸ It is the reason why their view of “the bread” is still *earthly* bread that would fill their *physical* bodies. Therefore, in replying to Jesus, they quote from Ps 78:24 to support their request about the kind of sign they want (John 6:31). Now, Jesus’s response in John 6:32 again reveals the crowd’s thought on the psychological

⁵⁸⁴ Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 122, suggests that the infinitive “לֶאֱכֹל” is explanatory.

⁵⁸⁵ Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 291, comments that God’s response to Israel’s testing is “to give them what they want and to strike them...”

⁵⁸⁶ Both Arthur W. Pink, *Exposition of the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), 320, and Morris, *John*, 319, suggest that the “word of God” means that which God requires. So, the appositional subjunctive (ἵνα-clause) in 6:29 carries imperative sense. This sense can be also understood from the crowd’s response.

⁵⁸⁷ Compare “ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος” in 6:29 with “ἵνα ... πιστεύσωμέν σοι” in 6:30.

⁵⁸⁸ Cf. Keener, *John*, 678–79.

plane, which then reveals their ideological point of view.⁵⁸⁹ Comparing the two clauses in Jesus's "οὐ ... ἀλλά" construction in the verse, obviously, the crowd demands a sign that replays Moses's giving *physical* bread from heaven to them.⁵⁹⁰ The crowd considers that manna was given to their ancestors; therefore, the Moses-like prophet would give them bread from heaven, too.⁵⁹¹ For the crowd's CPoV, Jesus would give them *that* manna-like bread if Jesus is *that* Moses-like prophet. However, Jesus corrects their misconception of his word by pointing out that the Father himself is the giver who gives (δίδωσιν) the *true* bread from heaven to them.⁵⁹² The bread that God gives (ὁ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ) is the one who comes down from heaven and gives life to the world (6:33; cf. 6:27). Jesus immediately declares, "I am the bread of life" (6:35; also 6:48, 51, 58). Jesus is talking about the Father who *here* and *now* gives the bread of life from heaven, and believing in him is the way to have eternal life.⁵⁹³

As perviously mentioned, the narrator shows that the crowd's CPoV is divergent from JPoV. The crowd wants a Moses-like one to give them manna-like physical bread so that they may not be hungry (or may not need to work; cf. 6:26, 49, 58; also 4:15). However, Jesus means that the Father gives the true bread of life, Jesus, who gives eternal life (6:27, 35, 40, 47–51, 53–

⁵⁸⁹ This is Jesus's second "Amen, amen" saying in the context since 6:26, where Jesus tells their inner motive.

⁵⁹⁰ Notice the pronoun ὑμῖν (after δέδωκεν). The crowd likely considers the *he* in Ps 78:24 to be Moses and Jesus corrects them. Jesus is not talking about *the* past manna event. Rather, he talks about their misunderstanding of Jesus's word about the bread that endures forever (6:27) and how to have the bread (6:29). Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 370, agrees that the crowd knows God is the giver of manna, but he considers the "ὑμῖν" to mean the crowd and their ancestors.

⁵⁹¹ Cf. Schuchard, *Scripture*, 43; Keener, *John*, 680. From an historical view, Menken, "Provenance and Meaning," 46–48, considers that the view of Moses as the author of the manna miracle is the tradition behind the crowd's word. However, the view is not found anywhere by the third/fourth century. Balfour, "Jewishness," 366.

⁵⁹² Cf. Barrett, *John*, 289–90. Brown, *John I–XII*, 262, 266, suggests the true bread is Jesus's teaching.

⁵⁹³ Concerning the midrashic features in this passage, see Peder Borgen, *Bread from Heaven*, NovTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 59; also Paul N. Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*, WUNT 2/78 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1996),

57).⁵⁹⁴ To believe in Jesus is the way to have/eat the bread of life (6:29, 35, 40, 47, 51, 54). The narrator again displays the crowd's point of view on the psychological plane through Jesus's words: "You have seen me but do not believe" (6:36).⁵⁹⁵ The OT quotation in 6:31 is simply used by the crowd to support their ideology that they want a Moses-like person performing a manna-like sign in whom they may believe. They quote the text as proof for the historical event to which they refer. However, their quoting shows ironically their misunderstanding of what Jesus says about *the* bread and their wrong expectation of the Moses-like figure. It shows an irony that the crowd's unbelief is parallel to their ancestors' rebellion in the psalm from which they quote (Ps 78:11, 18, 22, 32).

Jesus does not deny what the quoted text means (nor the wording of the quotation) but the ideological point of view behind the quotation of the crowd.⁵⁹⁶ Moreover, Jesus confirms the text from Ps 78:24 and manifests that God's miraculous deed of giving the bread to Israel from heaven is now present before the people and available to the people through the sending of his Son as the true bread from above (cf. John 3:13–15). The narrator uses the crowd's scriptural quotation to open the window to convey the meaning of the context. Although throughout this dialogue (6:25–40) the narrator does not have a voice, the narrator, as importing his QF "it is written" to the quotation, waves the flag on Jesus's identity as the true bread from heaven that gives life. The narrator has a concurring ideological point of view with his protagonist when the narrator repeatedly exposes the crowd's psychological plane of thought through Jesus. Therefore,

⁵⁹⁴ Hays, *Echoes*, §17, "Salvation Is from the Jews." Hays asserts "Jesus is not portrayed by John as a 'new Moses' or as 'the prophet like Moses.' Instead, he is one far greater."

⁵⁹⁵ A few manuscripts do not have "με" in this verse (e.g., \aleph , A). But a couple of earlier papyri support our text (\mathfrak{p}^{66} and \mathfrak{p}^{75}).

⁵⁹⁶ Cf. Fitzmyer, "Quotations in Qumran," 308.

the narrator through the quotation on the lips of the crowd and its context, particularly Jesus's two "Amen amen" sayings, indicates that Jesus is *the* bread of life (i.e., the bread that gives eternal life) who is sent by the Father from above in order that those who believe in him may have eternal life (cf. 3:16; 20:30). Such themes of being sent by the Father and giving life penetrate the whole Gospel.

5.2.4 John 6:45 It Is Written, Being Taught by God

In his dialogue with the Jewish crowd, Jesus says, "ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις· καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ θεοῦ." (It is written in the Prophets, "And they will all be taught by God." John 6:45). In John's narrative, after Jesus declares that he is the bread of life given by the heavenly Father (6:32–40), the Jews appear at this moment, murmuring against Jesus's words about his origin (6:41–42; cf. 5:18). The narrator displays their murmuring and whispering voices as an *unfolding* action by using the imperfect verbs (ἐγόγγυζον and ἔλεγον).⁵⁹⁷ This synchronization between the narrator and the Jews, in fact, is to show the irony of the Jews. Their word does not seem to be public to Jesus. In the content of the murmur, the emphatic first personal pronoun ἡμεῖς (6:42) referring to the Jews themselves, along with the demonstrative οὗτός and the third person verb λέγει pointing to Jesus,⁵⁹⁸ show that the Jews are talking to the insiders of their group. Jesus also confirms their private discussion by his response with the phrase "μετ' ἀλλήλων" (6:43).⁵⁹⁹ However, Jesus's reply again shows that he, as the omniscient protagonist in the narrative, has *heard* their private murmur that the narrator reports.

⁵⁹⁷ The verbal aspect of the Greek imperfect tense form is imperfective. In this verse, it shows an unfolding action. Cf. Constantine R. Campbell, *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008), 40–45. Also, Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 72–73, suggests that the imperfective aspect of the past tense in Russian (= Greek imperfect tense) may convey the synchronization of two points of view.

⁵⁹⁸ Some manuscripts (e.g., \aleph , A) add the third person singular pronoun οὗτός before or after λέγει.

⁵⁹⁹ The verb "ἀπεκρίθη" again shows Jesus's taking control of the conversation. Cf. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, 231–35.

Their murmuring and its content, in which they do not believe Jesus's heavenly source, imply their ideological point of view is nonconcurring with JPoV. The omniscient narrator also reveals the Jews' dispute (ἐμάχοντο) among themselves later in 6:52. The dispute about Jesus's words again denotes their ideological divergence from Jesus's when Jesus further speaks about the bread of life.

Jesus's OT quotation in 6:45 appears in his reply to the Jews' murmur and dispute (6:43–51), which follows the thread from the last conclusion in 6:39–40, in that he will raise up those who believe in him on the last day (cf. 5:24–25). In 6:44 and 6:47, Jesus reaffirms, “I will raise him on the last day,” and, “he who believes has eternal life.”⁶⁰⁰ Not only does Jesus reiterate about the believers' eternal life and resurrection, but he also in 6:44 rephrases his word in 6:37 that “everyone whom the Father gives me will come to me.” Jesus in his rephrasing, by using a negative conditional sentence (ἐὰν μὴ), indicates that it is possible *only if* the Father draws a person that one is able to come to him (cf. 6:65). In 6:44, Jesus again signifies his origin to be *from* the Father (ὁ πατήρ ὁ πέμψας με; cf. 6:38–39), which has already been explicitly declared in the Prologue by the narrator and testified by John the Baptist. Therefore, vv. 44–47 pick up Jesus's word that has been interrupted by the Jews and offer the reason for Jesus's interdiction of the Jews' murmur. Verses 45–46, beginning with the OT quotation, then provides an explanation for Jesus's word in 6:44.⁶⁰¹

⁶⁰⁰ Again, Jesus's emphatic “Amen amen” saying appears in 6:47.

⁶⁰¹ Asyndeton is a common grammatical phenomenon in the Gospel of John. Both v. 44 and v. 45 mention “coming to me (ἐλθεῖν/έρχεται πρὸς [ἐ]μέ).” However, the relationship between the OT text and 6:44 is not clear. It could explain the way of God's drawing (cf. Carson, *John*, 293; Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 218), the direction to Jesus (cf. Keener, *John*, 685–86; Köstenberger, *John*, 214), or the possibility of God's action.

The OT quotation in John 6:45 is Jesus's first quotation in John's narrative. It is quoted from Isa 54:13. Isaiah 54, within the segment 52:13–55:13,⁶⁰² focuses on YHWH's promise to Israel about its full restoration (54:1–10) and the benefits from the restored relationship (54:11–17). This restoration needs to adhere to the passage 52:13–53:12 as the means by which the restoration comes.⁶⁰³ In Isa 54, for several times, YHWH mentions his relationship with Israel. He is her husband and redeemer (54:5, 8) and the one who has mercy on her (54:10). By restoring the relationship, God will show compassion with everlasting love and rebuild the city with treasury stones (54:8, 11–12). All the city's children will be taught by YHWH and have peace and righteousness, and the city will not be defeated by its enemies (54:13–17). Thus, through the deed of the Servant described in 52:13–53:12, the relationship between YHWH and his people will be restored. The phrase “be taught by YHWH” (לְמוֹדֵי יְהוָה/διδακτοὺς θεοῦ) in 54:13 means that all the people in the restoration will become YHWH's disciples, learning his way and replicating his character as his servants (cf. 51:4, 7; 49:3).⁶⁰⁴ The result of being YHWH's disciples is great peace and righteousness (54:13; cf. 54:10). Such a language can also be found in Isa 48:17–18. There, YHWH, the redeemer of Israel, is described as the one who teaches (מִלְמֹד in 48:17) and leads Israel. Israel's heed (הִקְשָׁבָה/ἡκουσας in 48:18) to God's commandments is expected in order that they may have peace and righteousness (cf. Isa 29:13, 24). This saying of YHWH in the near context is able to explain the *discipleship* of God in 54:13. Therefore, the OPoV of Isa 54:13 sees Israel, in the coming of God's salvation/restoration

⁶⁰² Oswalt, *Isaiah: 40–66*, 413–14. Additionally, in the broad context, Isa 40–66, the coming of the comfort/salvation of YHWH to his people is in view (cf. 40:3–5, 10–11; 56:1).

⁶⁰³ Ibid., 413.

⁶⁰⁴ Ibid., 428; Köstenberger, “John,” 449. Both consider that becoming the disciples of God is the greatest wealth for God's people. Cf. John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 34–66*, WBC 25 (Waco, TX: Word, 1987), 239. Also, John Goldingay, *The Message of Isaiah 40–55: A Literary-Theological Commentary* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 538, points out that “vv. 13–14a restate the vision of 52.13–53.12.”

(through the Servant), becoming the true disciples of God, namely, those who listen to God's word, follow God's guidance, and replicate his character.

In John's narrative, Jesus cites from Isaiah as the word of the Prophets: "All will be taught by God" (6:45a).⁶⁰⁵ Here, the narrator directly shows JPoV in Jesus's quoting, which is to support his word that God's drawing enables people to come to him. For Jesus, the whole process of "God's drawing one and then he/she able to come to Jesus" is related to the meaning of the OT text about the promise of *all* being God's disciples. How this Isaianic text supports Jesus's previous word is not so clear. However, Jesus's sequent words will clarify it. Jesus himself immediately provides a further explication for the quotation and his previous statement: "Everyone who has heard (ἀκούσας) and learned (μαθὼν) from the Father comes to me" (6:45b). Comparing this sentence to the statement in 6:44, the phrase "everyone who has heard and learned from the Father" connotes the action of the Father drawing near a person. Meanwhile, the two verbs, *hear* and *learn*, together convey the similar meaning to what the original context of the OT text has suggested about God's teaching. This Jesus's phraseology shows that Jesus has a corresponding ideological point of view with the OT context, at least on the meaning of "being taught [as disciples]." Here, Jesus does not seem to claim that the Isaianic text has come to pass in terms of people being *directly* taught by God since he instantly says in the next verse that no one has ever seen God. Rather, for Jesus, those heaving heard and learned from the Father (i.e., those who are drawn by the Father) now are able to come to him, the one and the *only* one who is from God and has seen the Father. Thus, the source to which Jesus refers in John 6:45b, from which one has heard and learned, is the word of God, namely, the Scripture.

⁶⁰⁵ The term "the Prophets (נְבִיאִים)" is the general title for the second division of the HB. Köstenberger, *John*, 214. Concerning the textual form of the quotation, cf. Menken, *Quotations*, 67–77.

Dongell comments, “Those who respond properly to the Father’s teaching by listening to and learning from Him *inevitably will come to Jesus*.”⁶⁰⁶ Just as Jesus said in 3:12 to Nicodemus and in 5:38, 47 to the Jews that one would believe in Jesus if one believes the word in the Scripture.⁶⁰⁷ The Scripture is the place where the people can hear and learn from the Father.

Accordingly, Jesus’s quotation shows in the immediate context his point of view on Isaiah’s text that *all* will be taught by God, as long as they properly respond to God’s word (i.e., drawn by God), and that he is the one sent by the Father, the only one who has seen the Father, and is able to convey the will/teaching of God.⁶⁰⁸ In addition, the narrator in the end of this Capernaum passage (6:24–6:59) indicates that Jesus has this speech while *teaching* (διδάσκων) in the synagogue at Capernaum (6:59). He hints that Jesus is the one who performs the promised teaching from God. At the same time, many of Jesus’s learners (ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ) leave him because they think no one can listen (ἀκούειν) to Jesus’s harsh words (6:60, 66). Again, both the narrator and Jesus penetrate the learners’ hearts (6:60, 64). Their point of view on the psychological plane does not concur with Jesus’s. They are not Jesus’s learners/disciples. Rather, their murmurings (γογγύζουσιν) concur more with the Jews (6:61). Thus, the NPoV, concurring with JPoV, shows that only those who have *proper* response to God’s word will become real disciples. Whoever believes has eternal life (6:40, 47; cf. 6:63).

In the broader context, receiving Jesus’s teaching and becoming his disciples are vitally important in the narrative. In the beginning of the narrative, Jesus is described as the only one who can *interpret* the Father (ἐξηγήσατο; 1:18) and speak the word of God (3:34; cf. 4:25, 42).

⁶⁰⁶ Dongell, *John*, 101. Also Williams, “Isaiah in John’s Gospel,” 107.

⁶⁰⁷ See n. 287.

⁶⁰⁸ Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 264, rightly points out that Jesus’s discourse also alludes to Isa 55:1–3 about the free drink and bread God provides.

However, Nicodemus, as a teacher of Israel, does not understand Jesus's word (3:9–11). In chs. 7–8, while the people are wondering about Jesus's origin and teaching, Jesus again declares that the source of his teaching (ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχὴ) is from the Father (7:16–17; 8:28) since he is sent from God. Those who keep his words are truly his disciples (μαθηταί μου in 8:31). However, ironically, the Jews claim that they are the disciples of Moses since they know Moses is from God (9:27–29). Similarly, Jesus repeats his language of 6:36–47 through the Good Shepherd parable in 10:26–29. Jesus then concludes in the striking statement: “I and the Father are one” (10:30; cf. 14:7).⁶⁰⁹ Therefore, in those passages, Jesus's statement tells his point of view, as well as the narrator's, about his teaching and the importance of being his disciple. All who have heard and learned from God's word—the Scripture—and then have come to Jesus are God's disciples. Isaiah's word that “all will become the disciples of God” now is being fulfilled since being the disciple of Jesus is being taught as the disciple of God. Such a relationship is also done through Jesus, the Servant of God (Isa 52:13–53:12).

5.2.5 John 10:34 It Is Written, You are Gods

The narrator records Jesus's quotation in John 10:34: “οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπα· θεοί ἐστε;” (It is written in your Law, “I said, you are gods,” is it not?). The narrator's temporal and spatial information in John 10:22 draws a link between the following section and its previous passage 9:1–10:21. However, while Jesus focuses on the life-giving Shepherd, which is the will of the Father (10:10–11, 28), the Jews redirect the topic to the identity/source of Jesus (10:20–21, 24, 33). In John 9, Jesus's action of healing a man born blind on Sabbath made a series of argument about his identity/source between the Pharisees and the

⁶⁰⁹ In fact, John's Jesus has signified his divine identity as “I Am” for several times in chs. 6–8 (6:20; 8:24, 28, 58).

healed man. In this case, the dialogues between the Pharisees and the healed man (9:15–17, 26–33) show two opposite ideological points of view. The Pharisees deny that Jesus is from God (9:16, 29) and insist that he is a sinner (9:24; cf. 9:16).⁶¹⁰ The narrator also comments in 9:22 about the decision that the Pharisees/the Jews have already made,⁶¹¹ which is to expel from the synagogue anyone who acknowledges that Jesus is the Christ. This decision reflecting their evaluative point of view on Jesus is transparently known by all in the narrative since the last account was about Jesus's healing on Sabbath (cf. 5:18; 7:1, 13; 25–26, 30, 44; 8:40). They also regard those who acknowledge Jesus as Christ are sinners (9:34). The healed one, on the contrary, though having been a beggar since birth (9:8) and been seen as a sinner (9:34; cf. 9:2), boldly acknowledges Jesus as a prophet (9:17, 27) who comes from God (9:31–33).

When Jesus appears again, he first identifies himself as the Son of Man,⁶¹² the object in whom one can believe and worship (9:35–38). After providing his evaluative point of view on both the believer and the Pharisees (9:39–41),⁶¹³ John's Jesus continues to utter the Good Shepherd parable/discourse (10:1–21).⁶¹⁴ In the discourse, Jesus implies that the role of the Jewish leaders (as the robbers and the hired hands) is ravaging the life of the sheep (10:1, 8, 10, 12–13). He also accentuates who he is by the emphatic copular “ἐγώ εἰμι.”⁶¹⁵ Jesus *is* the gate

⁶¹⁰ Although the narrator reports that there was a division among the Pharisees in 9:16.

⁶¹¹ The adverb ἤδη plus the pluperfect verb συνετέθειντο (had decided) shows a past action prior to their inquiring of the parents.

⁶¹² Although many witnesses have θεοῦ (e.g., A K L Γ Δ f^{1,13} m lat), the external witnesses for ἀνθρώπου are better (P^{66,75} B D W). Also, to alter from θεοῦ to ἀνθρώπου is more difficult. Metzger, *Textual*, 194.

⁶¹³ Jesus's immediate response shows that he is aware of the inquiries of the Pharisees and the replies of the healed blind. For the healed one who has been considered as born in sin (9:34; cf. 9:2) and now believes that Jesus is the Son of Man, Jesus states that he is one of those who is able to see (9:35–39); for those who consider they can see, Jesus judges that they still have sin (9:40–41).

⁶¹⁴ Many scholars point out that no division is between 9:41 and 10:1. Cf. Köstenberger, *John*, 297... In addition, Jesus's “ἀμὴν ἀμὴν” saying in John's narrative is never used as separate from the previous text.

⁶¹⁵ Concerning the use of the phrase “ἐγώ εἰμι” in John, cf. n. 16.

for the sheep through which one comes to be saved and to have life (10:9–10). He *is* the good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep; the sheep know him and he knows his sheep (10:11, 14–16). Again, as talking about his identity as a life-giver, Jesus reiterates his relationship with the Father and the commandment that he has received from the Father (10:15, 17–18). Following Jesus’s Good-Shepherd discourse, the narrator reports the division among the Jews (cf. 9:16). The debate of the division is again about Jesus’s identity, just as the previous chapter. Therefore, both the arguments between the healed blind and the Pharisees in John 9 and the subsequent discourse of Jesus in 10:1–21 center on Jesus’s identity. The narrator here again lets his protagonist elucidate the meaning of *Christ* (10:24).

The quotation in 10:34 happens in the narrative context when Jesus is walking in the portico of Solomon during the Festival of Dedication (10:22–23), and the Jews are hurrying him to make himself clear if he is Christ (10:24). Jesus’s immediate reply is a summary of the previous Shepherd discourse (10:27–29) and a statement about their unbelief of what Jesus has said and done (10:25–26). The Jews then are infuriated enough to want to stone Jesus by his conclusion: “I and the Father are one” (10:30). As the Jews accuse Jesus of blasphemy that he as a human makes himself God (10:33),⁶¹⁶ Jesus immediately quotes the text from Ps 82 to respond to their accusation. By using the pattern of “taking control of the conversation” in 10:32–34,⁶¹⁷ the narrator expresses the conflicting point of view on Jesus’s identity from the Jews.

From Ps 82:6, Jesus quotes his text in the argument. The scene described in Ps 82 is God judging gods in the divine assembly. There are some debates on the nature of the gods (אֱלֹהִים)

⁶¹⁶ During the Dedication, the Jews’ accusation of Jesus’s blasphemy may echo the epithet “Epiphanes” (manifest god) of Antiochus IV.

⁶¹⁷ In 10:32–34, the narrator reports the back-and-forth argument with the pattern, “ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς” (vv. 32, 34) and “ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι” (v. 33). Concerning the rhetoric of the verb ἀποκρίνομαι, see n. 563.

mentioned in vv. 1 and 6, whom Jesus interprets as those “to whom the word of God came” in John 10:35. According to some OT exegetes, they are the heavenly powers/deities⁶¹⁸ or earthly judges/governors.⁶¹⁹ However, the context of Ps 82 in the third Book of the Psalter (Pss 73–89) suggests that the address to *gods* can also refer to the *people* or the *leaders* of Israel. Both Ps 81 and Ps 82 read as God’s response to the people’s complaints in the previous psalms about their enemies’ suppression.⁶²⁰ In these two psalms, the focus is on Israel’s disobedience (81:11–12; 82:2–5), which is the reason God responds to their suffering status. The reference to the divine assembly (or the congregation of God; עֲדַת־אֱלֹהִים/συναγωγη θεῶν)⁶²¹ in 82:1 is likely a response to the plea for God’s remembrance of “your assemble” (עֲדַתְךָ/συναγωγη σου) in 74:2, which means the people/congregation of Israel.⁶²² Now, it is the place where God judges the *gods*. In the narrative of Ps 82, the *gods* are described as leaders obligated to give justice to the needy and show punishment to the wicked (Ps 82:2–4); however, God rebukes their partiality (cf. Ps 72:1–2, 4, 12–13). They are also accused of lacking knowledge and understanding and of walking in darkness (82:5; cf. 73:11; 81:13).⁶²³ Although they are called as *gods* (אֱלֹהִים/θεοί), namely, the sons of the Most High (בְּנֵי עֶלְיוֹן/υἱοὶ ὑψίστου),⁶²⁴ they will die like men and fall like any one of the princes (82:6–7). Just like its context in Ps 80:15 (80:16 MT) of calling *Israel* the son of God,

⁶¹⁸ Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 335; Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 155–56; John Goldingay, *Psalms: Volume 2, Psalms 42–89*, BCOTWP (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 560. Their evidences from religion-historical research are mostly Syrian-Canaanite mythology and Ugaritic texts.

⁶¹⁹ Konrad Schaefer, *Psalms*, Berit Olam (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001), 201; Hakham, *Psalms*, 2:247.

⁶²⁰ Robert L. Cole, *The Shape and Message of Book III (Psalm 73–89)*, JSOTSup 307 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 98, 101–2.

⁶²¹ Concerning the plural *gods* in LXX, see Tate, *Psalms 51–100*, 329.

⁶²² Cf. *ibid.*, 329.

⁶²³ Cf. Goldingay, *Psalms 42–89*, 565–66. He considers that *they* in Ps 82:4 are the wicked ones.

⁶²⁴ In 80:15, Israel is also described as the son (בֶּן/υἱὸν) God made strong for himself. The conjunction ו in 82:6 is exegetical.

the address “the sons of the Most High” in 82:6 is supposed to be *Israel*, particularly those who are in the position of judging/leading in the congregation/people of Israel. Therefore, the *gods* in this psalm does not refer to other heavenly agents, some divine beings, or ancient divinities but to the Israelite leaders who have God’s law and are obligated to show just judgment among the people⁶²⁵ in order to become the true assembly of God, the sons of God.

Jesus’s quoting from Ps 82:6 in John 10:34 is followed by his conditional interrogation (10:35–36). To make his argument valid, the Jews have to agree with Jesus’s protasis statements⁶²⁶ that “the ‘gods’ in the OT text are those to whom the word of God came”⁶²⁷ and that “the Scripture cannot be annulled.”⁶²⁸ At this point, Jesus and the Jews seem to have concurring points of view on these presuppositions of the quoted text. Possibly, they all understand that the *gods* in the quotation signifies *Israel* to whom the word of God—the Scripture—came, just as the OPoV of the context of Ps 82 has implied. The people of Israel or, more particularly, the leaders of Israel as the representatives, received the word from God and were called *gods*, “the sons of the Most High.”⁶²⁹ In John’s narrative, the Jews insist that they are not only the offspring of Abraham (8:33–39) but also the children of God (8:41). However, they do not acknowledge Jesus’s relationship with the Father (e.g., 5:18; 8:19). Therefore, Jesus’s protasis in his conditional statement implies not only that the people/leaders who had God’s word (although failed to obey) were “sons-of-God-like gods” in the psalmist’s time, with which the Jews agree, but also that the Jews in Jesus’s time consider their “sons-of-God” status, with which the Jews

⁶²⁵ Cf. Cole, *Psalms* 73–89, 103.

⁶²⁶ Jesus’s use of “in your law” (10:34) also suggests this point.

⁶²⁷ Anthony Tyrrell Hanson, “John’s Citation of Psalm LXXXII Reconsidered,” *NTS* 13 (1967): 364–65, suggests that ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in this verse refers to the preexistent Word. However, it is not accepted by scholars.

⁶²⁸ Carson, *John*, 399.

⁶²⁹ Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 374, also suggests that “‘gods’ and ‘sons of God’ are equivalents.”

also agree, (cf. 7:48–49; 8:41; 9:28–29; 10:34) because of their possession of God’s word although they failed to listen (cf. 5:38–39).⁶³⁰

However, Jesus’s word in the apodosis about his legitimacy to address his identity shows his point of view against the Jews. Jesus argues that his self-address, “I am the Son of God,” is not a blasphemy because he is the one whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world (10:36). In the context, Jesus’s several declarations provoke the Jews’ immediate action to remove him. They are about to stone Jesus when he states, “Before Abraham was born, I am,” in 8:58 and, “I and the Father are one,” in 10:30 and to arrest him when he says, “The Father is in me and I am in the Father” in 10:39 (cf. 5:18; 7:29). The Jews’ violence suggests that they consider Jesus’s words to be *blasphemy*. Ironically, the Jews *correctly* understand Jesus’s words as denoting his ontological divinity,⁶³¹ which is actually what the narrator declares from the beginning.⁶³² However, they do not believe Jesus’s divine identity or origin. For Jesus, he is not blaspheming but telling the truth (cf. 8:43–45; 10:27–28). Jesus’s apodosis does not claim that he is *like* the people/leaders of Israel who received the word/law from God, called “gods, sons of God,” into which he can be allied. Rather, he is much greater and more unique to them. He is the *only* one sent by/from the Father *into* the world (10:36), spoke God’s words, and did the Father’s works precisely, as Jesus keeps affirming in the narrative (e.g., 5:37; 7:16–17; 10:25). Moreover,

⁶³⁰ Cf. Keener, *John*, 828; Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 604–5. Moreover, the location is in Jerusalem (10:22), where the group of the Jews is likely the ones who hold authority of the Scripture (cf. 10:34).

⁶³¹ Historically, interpreters would consider that the address John’s “the Son of God” has political/imperial meaning in the first century, e.g., Lance Byron Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John*, CBQMS 43 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007), 91–103; Carter, *John and Empire*, 176–97. In John’s narrative where Jesus addresses himself as “the Son of God” or “the Son” is always about his *divine* source, that he existed in the beginning, was with the Father, and was sent by the Father from above. Cf. Andreas J. Köstenberger and Scott R. Swain, *Father, Son, and Spirit: The Trinity and John’s Gospel*, New Studies in Biblical Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008), 75–84; Carson, *John*, 394–95; Keener, *John*, 825–26.

⁶³² E.g., 1:14–18 (μονογενὴς θεὸς ὃν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς), 34; 3:16–17 (τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν; ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον).

Jesus asserts that the Father sanctified him (10:36). This statement has to be construed with Jesus as the very carrier of God's word. In John's narrative, the verb ἀγιάζω appears only here and in 17:17–19 of which the context suggests that the sanctification has to do with the truth, which is the word of the Father (cf. 17:14; 15:3).⁶³³ Therefore, Jesus in his apodosis in 10:36 indicates that he is the only one who truly possesses and speaks God's word (cf. 3:34; 6:45–46; 7:15–17). Jesus here argues that he is completely legitimate to address himself as the Son of God because he himself *is* the Son whom the Father sent and the Word who speaks God's word.⁶³⁴

The quotation may not be used by Jesus to prove his divinity or divine sonship directly, as Carson points out.⁶³⁵ Nonetheless, Jesus's point of view through the quotation obviously corresponds to what the psalmist has shown in the context of Ps 82. While Pss 81–82 mention the disobedience of Israel, the psalmist in 80:15 (80:16 MT) refers Israel to the son of God of hosts and in 80:1 calls God “the Shepherd of Israel” (שֹׁרֵץ יִשְׂרָאֵל / ὁ ποιμαίνων τὸν Ἰσραηλ). The Shepherd is considered able to restore and give life (יְחַיֶּה / ζώσσεις ἡμᾶς; 80:18) to the people of Israel, the son of God. These words are perfectly in tune with Jesus's second Shepherd discourse (John 10:26–29) right before the Jews' accusation. Jesus's claim that he gives eternal life to his sheep (10:28) echoes the claim of the psalmist's Shepherd (Ps 80:1). His following statement, “I and the Father are one,” makes perfect sense with such an echo (John 10:30).

⁶³³ In the context of Jesus's prayer for the disciples in 17:17–19, Jesus is sending the disciples into the world, just as the Father has sent Jesus into the world. Jesus asks the Father to sanctify the disciples in the word of God. The disciples do not belong to the world since they have the word of God. Cf. Jerome H. Neyrey, “I Said ‘You Are Gods’: Psalm 82:6 and John 10,” *JBL* 108 (1989): 660. He considers the Father's consecrating Jesus is about Jesus's holiness. Also cf. Köstenberger, *John*, 316, “the term ‘set apart’ was used for those appointed to fulfill an important task or office.” Beasley-Murray, *John*, 177, notes the term would be related to the festival of the dedication of the temple.

⁶³⁴ Cf. Bultmann, *John*, 389. He considers this verse (v. 36) “*a minori ad maius* that Jesus all the more entitled to call himself God's Son.” Also Hays, *Echoes*, §17, “Salvation Is from the Jews.”

⁶³⁵ Carson, *John*, 399. Also cf. Maurice Casey, “Christology and the Legitimizing Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*, ed. Steve Moyise, JSNTSup 189 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 60–61.

Therefore, Jesus's OT quotation hints that the Jews who do not believe in Jesus's word are those disobedient ones despite being called gods/sons of God (10:34; cf. 8:24; 10:26). Jesus, as the life-giving Shepherd, has judged the Jewish leaders who abuse their responsibility of feeding the sheep with the word of God entrusted to them (cf. 5:30; 10:12–13). When Jesus quotes from the Psalm in this context, JPoV is concurrent with OPoV of the context of the Psalm. Moreover, the OT Scripture, not able to be annulled, still affirms that God calls those who receive and obey his word as gods, the sons of the Most High. In the narrative, the disciples and those who believe the word of God will be called the children of God (17:6–8, 20; 1:12).

The narrator's phraseological influence through the quotation formula again is heard on Jesus's lips. In the narrative context, the narrator, through Jesus's dialogue with the Jews in the portico of Solomon and Jesus's explication of the OT quotation, not only shows Jesus as the speaker of truth sent by the Father and as legitimately addressing himself by saying "I am the Son of God," but also indicates Jesus's divine identity. The narrator does not perform Jesus as one of the sons of God who has the word of God; rather, he demonstrates that Jesus is the Son of God who is the Word of God sent by the Father and faithfully speaking the word of God.⁶³⁶ Furthermore, NPoV likely adopts OPoV on the righteous Son of God as the anticipated king who practices just judgment (Ps 72) like God (Ps 82:8). Such a theme is not unfamiliar in John's narrative (John 1:49; 5:22, 30; 12:13; 18:37).

5.2.6 John 12:13–15 It Is Written, Your King Is Coming

The OT quotations appear in John 12:13–15: "ἐκράυγαζον· ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, [καὶ] ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ... καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον·

⁶³⁶ Cf. Hanson, *Citation of Psalm LXXXII*, 364–65.

μὴ φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεται, καθήμενος ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου.” (They cried out, “Hosanna! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the king of Israel!” ... just as it is written, “Do not be afraid, daughter of Zion; look, your king is coming, seated on a donkey’s colt!”). In John’s narrative, after Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead, the narrator reports the impact of the event (11:45–12:11). Many Jewish people believed in him on account of Jesus’s miraculous deeds (11:45–46). Caiaphas the high priest suggested to the council of the chief priests and the Pharisees to have Jesus killed so that they may preserve their place and their nation (11:47–50). The narrator’s immediate comment tells the NPoV that it is a prophecy of the high priest regarding Jesus’s dying for the sake of the nation and for the purpose of gathering and uniting the children of God into one (11:51–52). This NPoV concurs with Jesus’s former saying about the one flock of sheep in 10:15–16. By indicating that Caiaphas did not say this *from himself* (11:51), the narrator implies that the purposive plan about Jesus’s death, although similar to what Caiaphas *prophesied*, is a divine plan (cf. 10:17–18).⁶³⁷ Therefore, at this juncture, two opposite parties (the Jewish leaders vs. Jesus/God) have shown clearly their different ideological points of view on the necessity of Jesus’s death for the people. For the Jewish leaders, Jesus’s death would save them and the people from Roman military intervention (11:48); for Jesus, he is to be killed for the children of God so that they may have eternal life. Moreover, in Jesus’s departure from the Jews, the narrator also shows the nonconcurrence between Jesus and the Jews (11:54; cf. 7:1). As the narrative setting immediately turns to the last Passover (11:55), the plot is still on Jesus’s death. The narrator again displays the psychological point of view of the Jewish leaders in that they *plan* (ἐβουλεύσαντο) to kill not only Jesus

⁶³⁷ Also 1:29; 2:19–21; 3:14–17; 10:11; 12:23–33; 13:31–32.

(11:53, 57) but also Lazarus (12:10–11) in order to prevent more people from believing in Jesus. For Jesus, his comment on Mary’s anointing signals his impending death (“for the day of my burial” 12:7).

However, the narrator also portrays the third party, the Jewish crowd (11:45, 55–56; 12:9 [ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων]). They have known about the order from the chief priests and the Pharisees to report Jesus’s presence (11:57; cf. 7:25); however, they appear to be more interested in Jesus and the risen Lazarus (12:9). Their actions of leaving the party of the chief priests and believing in Jesus on account of Lazarus are told by the narrator as the reason why the chief priests also plan to kill Lazarus (12:10–11). Probably, the Jerusalem crowd and some other pilgrims made up “the large crowd” (ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς 12:12; cf. 11:55; 12:17–18) who went to meet Jesus in his coming to Jerusalem and kept shouting (12:13), “Hosanna! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord, even the King of Israel!” Some of them then begin to witness about the Lazarus event to others (12:17). On the surface, the narrator’s spatial description displays that the crowd leaves the party of the Jewish leaders for Jesus’s party (cf. 12:19), which implies their ideological point of view concurring with Jesus, particularly when Jesus does not withdraw from the adherents as he did before (cf. 2:24; 6:15).⁶³⁸ However, the narrator shows later their incomprehensibility of both the heavenly voice and Jesus’s word about his death (12:29–30, 32–34). In fact, the narrator has already exposed the disciples’ lack of understanding of the events happening in Jesus’s entry into Jerusalem (12:16). This narrator’s comment makes *his* OT quotation (12:15) connect to the crowd’s shouting (12:13) as something the disciples recall as being fulfilled after Jesus’s glorification.

⁶³⁸ Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 678.

Two OT quotations appear in this paragraph of Jesus's entry into Jerusalem. One is heard from the crowd's shouting, cited from Ps 118:25–26 (John 12:13) although without John's QF attached; the other is quoted by the narrator from Zech 9:9 (John 12:15).⁶³⁹ Nonetheless, the *additional phrases* read in both John 12:13 (ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ [the King of Israel]) and 12:15 (μὴ φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών [Fear not, daughter of Zion]) suggest phraseological influence from Zeph 3:14–16 in these quotations.⁶⁴⁰ In other words, John's narrator, while quoting Zech 9:9 in John 12:15, allows the phraseological impact of the kingly phrase from Zephaniah to drift into the crowd's acclamation of Ps 118:25–26 in John 12:13. Again, with this phraseological perspective, the two sets of quotations in 12:13 and 15 are linked together by the narrator although only the quotation in 12:15 has John's preceding quotation formula.

Psalms 118, known as one of the Hallel Psalms (Pss 113–118),⁶⁴¹ appears to be originally a royal processional song of thanksgiving,⁶⁴² which celebrates God's deliverance of the righteous (Ps 118:14, 21). Although Ps 118 anticipates God's attack against the nations, Ps 117 is, in fact, exhorting all nations and all peoples to praise YHWH together.⁶⁴³ This context cannot easily be ignored in singing Ps 118. As Benjamin Segal observes, "Psalm 118 provides a panorama of life,

⁶³⁹ Both quotations are clearly shortened from the original OT passages.

⁶⁴⁰ Among commentators, Brown, *John I–XII*, 458 (also 462), provides the most convincing observation that Zeph 3:15–16, instead of Isa 40:9 or Isa 44:2, can well be the source for John 12:13 and 15. Also Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 424; Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:375; Brodie, *John*, 410. Cf. Wm. Randolph Bynum, *The Fourth Gospel and Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37*, NovTSup 144 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 129–30. However, Maarten J. J. Menken, "Allusions to the Minor Prophets in the Fourth Gospel," *Neot* 44 (2010): 73–74, does not consider Zeph 3:15–16 as adopted in John 12:13 and 15. But, it is clear that the appearance of the two phrases together in vv. 13 and 15 with the narrator's quotation formula and comment suggests Zephaniah's phraseological influence.

⁶⁴¹ Or, the Egypt Hallel. Hakham, *Psalms*, 3:155.

⁶⁴² Leslie C. Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, rev. ed., WBC 21 (Nashville: Nelson, 2002), 165; Köstenberger, "John," 470.

⁶⁴³ John Goldingay, *Psalms: Volume 3, Psalms 90–150*, BCOTWP (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 349–50.

from near death to postsalvation celebration.”⁶⁴⁴ In Ps 118, through the change of pronouns, at least two voices are heard: the congregation *we* and the royal king *I*.⁶⁴⁵ Psalm 118:25–26 is the voice from the congregation, appealing to the Lord for their future deliverance (v. 25) and blessing of the king (i.e., the one who comes in the name of the Lord, v. 26) to execute God’s deliverance. The psalm tells of the king experiencing the Lord’s salvation from his potential death (118:13–14, 21–22). From the congregation’s point of view, the psalmist acclaims their anticipation of God’s future deliverance through the king when they welcome the king’s entry into the temple of the Lord (18:26).

This anticipation of God’s deliverance from a royal king can also be read in the other two oracles just mentioned as adopted in John 12:13–15. In both Zeph 3 and Zech 9, God’s voice tells about his deliverance for the daughter of Zion (i.e., the people of Israel) through the coming/presence of her king. In Zeph 3:14–20, the Lord assures the people of Israel that he—the King of Israel (מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל; βασιλεὺς Ἰσραηλ)—is in their midst (vv. 15, 17). He is also the one able to save (גִּבּוֹר יוֹשִׁיעַ; δυνατὸς σώσει [v. 17; cf. v. 19]).⁶⁴⁶ Thus, the presence of the Lord is the reason why Zion ought to rejoice and not to fear (vv. 14, 16).⁶⁴⁷ Such a deliverance is not only about the restoration of *Israel* (3:19–20) but also about the return of *the peoples* (3:9–10 [עַמִּים]). Similarly, in Zech 9:9–10, the Lord also commends Zion to rejoice because her king is coming.⁶⁴⁸

⁶⁴⁴ Benjamin J. Segal, *A New Psalm: The Psalms as Literature* (Jerusalem: Gefen, 2013), 562.

⁶⁴⁵ Verses 1–4 and 22–27 are likely from the congregation and vv. 5–21 and 28–29 from the royal king and his accompany. Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 60–150*, 396–400; Allen, *Psalms 101–150*, 165–67.

⁶⁴⁶ The Hebrew word גִּבּוֹר (lit., able/mighty) in military terms can mean a hero/warrior. Cf. J. J. M. Roberts, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 223; Marvin A. Sweeney, *Zephaniah: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 201–2.

⁶⁴⁷ The promise in Zeph 3:12–13 provides the ground for the commendations in vv. 14–17. Roberts, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, 222.

⁶⁴⁸ In LXX, the first sentences in Zeph 3:14 and Zech 9:9 are identical (Χαίρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σιών· κήρυσσε, θύγατερ Ιερουσαλημ) although their Hebrew texts differ.

This royal figure appears to be someone assigned by the Lord, through whom the Lord will exercise his dominance on earth (cf. Zech 14:9).⁶⁴⁹ The coming of the righteous king here also fulfills the Lord's promise that he, as God of the people in faithfulness and righteousness, will return to Zion and save them (8:3, 7–8, 13). As in Ps 118, the king is described as saved (נוֹשָׁע, *nošac*),⁶⁵⁰ who represents God's deliverance to the people (Zech 9:9). However, rather than in military might, the arrival of the royal king in Zech 9:9–10 shows his reign in peace and humility.⁶⁵¹ Again, in the context of Zech 9, God's restoration of Israel (9:11–17) involves the return of the peoples (8:20–23). Therefore, these three passages clearly show their OPoVs that denote the God's deliverance coming through the arrival of a king, either God himself as the king or the victorious royal king representing the Lord. In their immediate contexts, all relate the return/acknowledgement of the peoples to Israel's deliverance.

In the scene of John 12:12–19, John's narrator reports that the crowd was shouting to Jesus from Ps 118:25–26 to acclaim him as the one coming in the name of the Lord. The additional phrase “the king of Israel” denotes the identity of the one coming in the name of the Lord on the lips of the crowd. It is their understanding of the cited psalm, as well as their ideological point of view on Jesus, that he is the coming king of Israel. For the Jewish crowd, the identity of “the king of Israel” can be equal to Messiah, the descendent of David (cf. 1:49; 6:14–15; 7:26–27, 40–42).⁶⁵² They consider that Jesus is the Messianic king (12:34) but only in their

⁶⁴⁹ Mark J. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, NIV Application Commentary (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 409, 415. In the context, this royal ruler refers to the Branch (3:8; 6:12), the royal line of David. Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Zechariah 9–14*, AB 25C (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 169.

⁶⁵⁰ Ibid., 127, suggests that the Niphal verb “נוֹשָׁע” means “saved,” instead of “having salvation.” The king's being saved is God's action.

⁶⁵¹ Ibid., 169–71.

⁶⁵² From the point of view of the Jewish leaders in the immediate context, the crowd's recognizing Jesus as the king of Israel is a reality. However, they see that such a recognition would result in the destruction of the nation (11:48; 12:19).

own terms. As the narrator describes, they do not comprehend the voice from heaven nor what Jesus says. Still, they have a nonconcurring point of view with JPoV despite the narrator's phraseological influence on their quotation. Therefore, the additional phrase already mentioned as a phraseological influence from the narrator substantiates the point of view of the crowd in crying out Ps 118:25–26 to Jesus. It also conveys the NPoV when it connects to the following quotation cited by the narrator.

Following the crowd's shouting, the narrator continues to describe Jesus's riding on a donkey with his formulaic quotation, which contains texts from Zeph 3:16 and Zech 9:9. The comparative conjunction *καθώς* in front of the quotation formula suggests that the narrator considers what is happening to Jesus corresponds with the written texts. The narrator's quoting is a *flashback*, just like his parenthesis in the next verse about disciples' later recall of the referent of these verses and of what the people did to Jesus. In the narrative timeframe, the disciples do not know yet the meaning of what is happening before their eyes.⁶⁵³ In the narrator's flashback, Jesus *is* the coming king—the king of Israel (“your king”) riding on a donkey, which Zech 9 and Ps 118 states. Such a parenthetical comment in 12:16 also suggests the narrator's NPoV and the disciples' later awareness on the *fulfillment* of the scriptural texts in Jesus's entry into Jerusalem as not only about Jesus's riding on a donkey but also for the acclamation of the crowd.⁶⁵⁴

J. Ramsey Michaels points out, “The threefold repetition of ‘these things’ is striking, referring first to the whole scene (vv. 12–15), then to the Scripture citation in particular (v. 15), and finally to the action of the crowd meeting Jesus (vv. 12–14).”⁶⁵⁵ Moreover, the verb *written*

⁶⁵³ Cf. Lieu, “Narrative Analysis,” 152–52.

⁶⁵⁴ Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 351, also considers a future fulfillment of the prophecy.

⁶⁵⁵ Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 678–79.

in 12:16 confirms the QF in 12:14 that these things written in the Scripture were written about Jesus. The narrator's quoting and the crowd's shouting together point out Jesus's identity as the coming king expected by the nation. However, in terms of ideological point of view, the narrator does not concur with the crowd. The crowd understand "the king"—Jesus's messiahship—differently.⁶⁵⁶ Meanwhile, with Zephaniah's phraseological influence, the narrator's quotation in 12:15, echoes God's responsive voice to his people that the presence of God—the King of Israel—is in the midst of the people to bring Israel's restoration. He is the one who is mighty to save.

In addition, at least two points are related to the NPoV on Jesus in the immediate context according to the quotations here. First, the glorification through death is the purpose of this royal Messiah's destiny, and through glorification, the Scripture about Jesus is illuminated. In the immediate context of Jesus's entry to Jerusalem, as mentioned, the Jewish leaders have decided to kill Jesus (11:45–12:11) and the narrator shows that Jesus's hour of glorification involves the crucifixion (12:23–33; cf. 12:7). Although the immediate contexts of the three OT passages are not explicit on this point, NPoV tells that this hour of glorification/crucifixion is how Jesus is the scripture-mentioned/promised messianic coming King (cf. 18:37; 1:49) that reveals the presence of the Lord and manifests the deliverance of Israel (cf. 1:18, 49–51). Second, in both the immediate context of Jesus's entry into Jerusalem and the immediate contexts of the three quoted OT texts, not only the restoration/deliverance of the people but also the return of the nations are in sight. While showing Jesus's words (10:11–18; 12:20–23, 32) and telling narratorial comments (11:51–52; 12:19) on this motif, the narrator concurs with his OT antecedents on such an

⁶⁵⁶ Cf. Barrett, *John*, 419. Barrett mentions that the crowds greeted Jesus *without* giving the text a messianic interpretation; so did the disciples. However, in John's narrative, they really considered Jesus was the Messiah but in terms of their own messianic understanding, which is what the narrator shows here.

ideological point of view. Jesus as the Messiah is not only the delivering king of Israel but also the king of the world to whom all the peoples will return (cf. 12:31; 1:10–11).

5.2.7 John 12:38 That the Word May Be Fulfilled, the Arm of the Lord

The narrator quotes Isaiah's work in John 12:38: “ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν· κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίον κυρίου τίς ἀπεκαλύφθη;” (That the word of Isaiah the prophet may be fulfilled, which he spoke, “Lord, who has believed our report? and to whom the arm of the Lord has been revealed?”). As John's narrative reaches its climatic at the end of the first part, the narrator shows that in Jesus's entry to Jerusalem, Jesus's hour of glorification has come (John 12:23, 28; cf. 2:4), which refers to Jesus being lifted up to death (12:24, 32).⁶⁵⁷ Here, the voice from heaven, as the Father's response to Jesus, confirms that Jesus's hour glorifies the Father (v. 28). The narrator again clearly shows that Jesus and the Father have a very harmonious point of view. On the contrary, the Pharisees' comment on Jesus's entry into Jerusalem, as the narrator reports in 12:19, denotes the Pharisees' ideological nonconcurrence with Jesus. However, the narrative suggests that even the crowd, whom the Pharisees have deemed as following Jesus, are still in their conflicting incomprehension about Jesus. They neither catch the heavenly voice (12:28–29) nor understand Jesus's word about his death (12:31–34; cf. 12:44–50). Jesus then urges the people to walk in the light (i.e., to believe in him; 12:35–36).⁶⁵⁸ Therefore, the narrator shows that at the end of Jesus's public ministry, the Jewish leaders and the people do not concur with Jesus's ideological perspective, particularly Jesus's identity. In addition, the narrator's report of Jesus's departure

⁶⁵⁷ Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John: Text and Context*, BibInt 72 (Boston: Brill, 2005), 75–76.

⁶⁵⁸ The conjunction οὖν in 12:35 alludes to a relationship of causation. Concerning “walking in the light,” see Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 705; Johannes Beutler, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. Michael Tait (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 336–38.

from all hints a spatial distance/nonconcurrence between Jesus and them (12:36b; cf. 6:15). At this point where the protagonist is temporarily away, the narrator gives his comment with two OT texts in 12:37–43.

The narratorial comment in 12:37–43 is a summary for the first part of the narrative, telling the negative faith responses of the Jewish leaders and the people regarding Jesus's ministry on earth, as well as the reason for their unbelief. The narrator, giving the evaluative point of view, states that the Jewish leaders and the people (i.e., they) did not believe in Jesus though he had done many signs in front of them (12:37, 39). The tense form of both indicative verbs describing their unbelief is *imperfect* (οὐκ ἐπίστευον [12:37];⁶⁵⁹ οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεῦειν [12:39]), which denotes their ongoing state of unbelief and inability to believe at that time. Such a statement apparently signifies the narrator's omniscience about the Jews' evaluative point of view on Jesus in the psychological plane. Moreover, in 12:38 the narrator directly uses a fulfillment-purpose clause preceding the OT quotation from the Book of Isaiah (Isa 53:1) to indicate the correspondence of the unbelieving circumstance with the prophetic passage. This place has the first employment of quotation formula of fulfillment-purpose statement in the Johannine narrative. The quotation and the formula together express NPoV on Isaiah's text in this context.

The OT quotation in John 12:38 is from the passage Isa 52:13–53:12, so called the Suffering Servant, which is in the broader context that demonstrates the ministry of the Lord's Servant who will deliver God's servant Israel from exile (chs. 40–55).⁶⁶⁰ The use of the first person pronouns in the passage 52:13–53:12 suggests that it begins with the Lord's introduction

⁶⁵⁹ For the verb ἐπίστευον, only few textual witnesses read ἐπίστευσαν (aorist tense; \mathfrak{P}^{66} f¹³ Eus).

⁶⁶⁰ See Oswalt, *Isaiah: 40–66*, 7–16.

to *his* Servant (עֶבְדִּי [“my servant”] 52:13–15) and ends with the Lord’s summary of the effect of the work of *his* Servant (עֶבְדִּי [“my servant”] 53:11–12). Between them is the prophet’s message describing the Servant of the Lord (53:1–10).⁶⁶¹ The quoted text in Isa 53:1 consists of two rhetorical questions: “Who (מִי) has believed our report?”⁶⁶² and, “To whom (עַל־מִי) has the arm of the Lord been revealed?” The prophet asks these questions when the message about the suffering servant of the Lord has been heard by the people. In 53:1 and its context, the messengers’ report (שְׁמִיעָתֵנוּ) is obviously about the arm of the Lord. By the arm, the salvation of God to the nations will be seen (52:10; cf. 40:10; 51:5). The content of the report, which is understood as showing the arm of the Lord, includes the character and the deeds of the Suffering Servant, who is the one like a lamb bearing the sins of the people (53:4–12).

The identification of *we*, (the first plural pronoun suffix in לְשִׁמְעָתֵנוּ [our report]) who have the report for others to believe, is probably referring to the speaking prophet *with* those former prophets or some believers who have proclaimed the message of God’s deliverance,⁶⁶³ particularly through such a servant. The prophet as the narrator of the book, by using the rhetorical questions, implies the people’s unbelief in the prophet’s message. From the beginning of Isaiah (1:2–9), the people have been accused by the narrator as rebelling against, being estranged from, and forsaking the Lord. Isaiah 53:1 stands to mark the negative attitude of the

⁶⁶¹ Cf. Goldingay, *Isaiah 40–55*, 469–70.

⁶⁶² Concerning the phrase “τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν,” cf. Harris, *John*, 237

⁶⁶³ Certain commentators suggest that the *we* in 53:1 is either the prophet and the servants/Israelites who have believed, or the prophet identifying himself with Israel and speaking for them. E.g., Oswalt, *Isaiah: 40–66*, 381; Gary V. Smith, *Isaiah 40–66*, NAC 15B (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2009), 444. However, this suggestion works well for the *we* in the following verses (53:2–6) but not for 53:1. The *we* refers to the reporters from whom the people heard the message of the Lord as the prophet proclaimed the message of Suffering Servant. If the message is for the people of the future, then it is likely that the *we* includes the prophet and the future messengers of the same message of God’s salvation. Cf. R. Reed Lessing, *Isaiah 40–55*, Concordia Commentary (St. Louis: Concordia, 2011), 612–13.

people towards the Lord and his salvation through his Servant.⁶⁶⁴ Therefore, as the rhetorical interrogations show, the prophet Isaiah as the narrator expresses the OPoV on the people's attitude to God's salvation message, as well as on the Lord's Servant who will eventually be exalted and glorified (52:13) although being killed according to the will of the Lord (53:10–12).

By quoting Isa 53:1, the Johannine narrator expresses NPoV of Jewish unbelief in Jesus (John 12:37). This statement is parallel to the unbelief of Isaiah's audience. Not only the unbelieving attitudes of both Jewish people in John and the people in Isaiah but also the objects of such unbelief, Jesus and the Suffering Servant are parallel. In the broader contexts of John, the narrator tells that Jesus is the one who was sent by God and will die for all in order that they may be saved from sin and have life (e.g., John 1:29; 3:14–18; 10:14–18; cf. 11:49–52; 18:14). In the immediate context of the quoting, John shows that Jesus is the one who will be lifted high (ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ) and be glorified (δοξασθῇ) in John 12:23–33. Isaiah also has shown in the context of the Suffering Servant that the Lord is coming as the King to save his people (Isa 52:7–10; cf. Isa 55:3–4; John 12:13–15), and the Servant would bear the sins of the people by giving his life (Isa 53:4, 6, 8, 10–11) so that his life will be futile (Isa 53:10) and many will have righteous life because of him (53:5, 11).⁶⁶⁵ In the passage, the exaltation and glorification of the servant are mentioned, too (52:13; יְרוּם וְנִשָּׂא וְנִבְרָךְ; καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται [LXX]).⁶⁶⁶ These parallels demonstrate the Johannine narrator's point of view on the phraseological plane where he adopts Isaiah's phraseology describing the Suffering Servant and God's salvation. Apparently,

⁶⁶⁴ Although many nations will startle, they will see and hear (52:14–15).

⁶⁶⁵ Oswalt, *Isaiah*: 40–66,

⁶⁶⁶ Many scholars have pointed out the motif of “being lifted and glorified” between John 12 and Isaiah 52–53. E.g., Brown, *John I–XII*, 477–79; Hays, *Echoes*, §16, “Come and See”; Williams, “Isaiah in John's Gospel,” 114–15; Bauckham, *Glory*, 43–62.

in this passage, the NPoV concurs with OPoV in terms of showing the delivering savior sent by the Lord and the unbelief of the people.

For John's narrator, the fulfillment-purpose QF in 12:38 signifies that the failure of Isaiah's audience to believe the report about God's deliverance through the Servant (the arm of the Lord) corresponds to the failure of the Jewish people to believe in Jesus. In Isaiah, the Suffering Servant song is a message of God's deliverance that the prophet conveyed to his audience. For John, Jesus, the protagonist in the narrative, has revealed who he is through his words and works.⁶⁶⁷ From John's phraseological use of Isaiah in the context, the Suffering Servant now is not merely a message promising to reveal God's redeeming arm but more about the promise fulfilled in the Jesus event that shows how Jesus's words and works are manifesting God himself. Such a fulfillment-purpose quotation, with the context portraying Jesus as the Servant, does not describe a predestination for this unbelieving people.⁶⁶⁸ Rather, it implies that in Isaiah's oracle, the unbelieving people of God's promised Servant has been foreseen (not only the unbelief of the message but also the future unbelief of the Servant), and as the Suffering Servant comes, the unbelief of the people is also foreseen (not only the unbelief of the Servant but also the unbelief of his message). The narrator then provides two following reasons to explain why on account of the scriptural fulfillment they were still unable to believe. One is the immediate OT quotation in 12:40; the other is in 12:43 that, just like Jesus says in 5:44, they do not love/seek God's glory.

⁶⁶⁷ Brown, *John I–XII*, 485, considers the narrator echoing Deut 29:2–4, where the Lord had performed signs in Egypt before the people but they still disbelieved.

⁶⁶⁸ Concerning predestination, see Barrett, *John*, 431. Also cf. John Painter, "The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b–43," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 432–34; Köstenberger, *Theology*, 391.

5.2.8 John 12:39–40 Again, Blinded Eyes and Hardened Hearts

Following 12:38, by using the phrase “πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας,” John in 12:40 quotes immediately another of Isaiah’s text (Isa 6:10) to describe the first reason of their failure to believe in Jesus: “ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας· τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς” (For again Isaiah said, “He has blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts that they might not see with their eyes, and understand with their hearts, and turn, and I would heal them”). The previous quotation depicts the unbelieving state of the people (12: 27–38) while this quotation provides the reason for their ongoing inability to believe (12:39; οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεύειν). Looking closer at the narrator’s verbs, one can observe that not only is the helping verb “ἠδύναντο” but also the infinitive “πιστεύειν” is in the *imperfect*, which means continuing action/state here according to its verbal aspect. The narrator’s comment in 12:42 implies that the Jews have freedom to believe but they hold some reason for which they withdraw their belief.⁶⁶⁹ Some believers do not continue keeping their faith (cf. 8:30–59). These descriptions show the evaluative point of view in the whole narrative on *believing*. John 12:43 provides the very reason for their unbelief. Both the *internal* point of view from Jesus (5:44) and the *external* point of view from the narrator (12:43) on the Jews’ unbelief in the Scripture and Jesus together show the narrative evaluative point of view on the Jews who do not love God and his word and then do not believe the Son whom the Father has sent to them. In fact, the quotation from Isa 6:10 in John 12:40 provides the first reason for the Jews’ inability to keep their faith.

⁶⁶⁹ Cf. Brown, *John I–XII*, 484–85. In addition, the narrator’s language in 12:42 suggests that believing involves confessing and keeping the belief.

Moreover, John's narratorial comment in 12:41 adds a motif of glory beside the people's unbelief. Hence, the quotation in 12:40 explicates the glory Isaiah saw.

Isaiah 6 provides both the conclusion of the solution for the previous five chapters that set and summarize Israel's existing problem to be God's faithful servant and the introduction to the following chapters (Isa 7–39) that account for the real issues of Israel's trust in God.⁶⁷⁰ In the chapter, after Isaiah's experience of God's sovereignty and holiness (6:1–8), God's commission for Isaiah comes immediately, which is, in fact, to tell about the people's stubbornness that will cause them to be hardened even more (6:9–10). However, the result is not hopeless. The last verse has a glimpse of a holy seed as its stump remaining although the nation will be like a massive tree burned and felled (6:11–13).⁶⁷¹ Therefore, Isa 6 does not stand independently from the narrative of the book as a whole but covers the evaluative point of view that is summarized by the previous chapters and is elucidated by the following passages. Isaiah 6 starts with the tremendous glory and sovereignty of the Lord viewed by Isaiah. The splendor of God as the creator and the Holy One of Israel is the only thing unto which the people of Israel should really look (e.g., 4:2–6; 17:7; 35:2–4; 42:8–9; 43:15). However, in the beginning of the book, Israel is identified as rebellious, not knowing their God (1:2–3), not listening to him (1:10, 19), and not seeing the works of his hands (5:11–12). In the chapters that follow Isa 6, the rebellion of the kings, the leaders, and the people are more detailedly illustrated (e.g., 7:12–13; 28:7–10; 31:1; 43:22–24; 48:4, 8). For those rebellious people, God's destruction is also clearly mentioned as already prepared throughout Isaiah, particularly in Isa 1–39. Such destruction then is God's

⁶⁷⁰ John N. Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: Chapter 1–39*, NICOT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), 172–76. In addition, Isa 7–39 specifically deals with Israel as a nation not trusting God but other nations. The accounts about two kings, Ahaz (chs. 7–8) and Hezekiah (chs. 36–39), make an *inclusio* for this section, addressing that neither earthly royal figures nor other nations are trustworthy.

⁶⁷¹ However, the last phrase of 6:13 in MT does not appear in LXX.

answer to Isaiah in Isa 6:11–13.⁶⁷² Nonetheless, a seed still remains, which is also repeatedly disclosed in Isaiah as the only resolution for Israel to become the servant God desires.

Since Israel's negative attitude toward God and God's destruction for it are explicitly told in the previous chapters, God's mission for Isaiah seems to be to harden the people.⁶⁷³ In the text of LXX, the causal conjunction γὰρ in Isa 6:10 tells of a relation of substantiation to Isa 6:9, meaning that the people's hearts are being made thick (ἐπαχύνθη), which is the reason why they hear/see but will not hear/see (οὐ μὴ συνῆτε/ἴδητε). On the contrary, in MT, Isa 6:10 is more like the sequent actions (God tells the prophet to harden their hearts) after the prophet's message in 6:9. In either text, what Isaiah is called to convey is the actual rebellious situation of Israel that is mentioned in Isaiah's context. In Isa 6:9, the message that God has Isaiah speak is likely the true hardened state of the people (cf. 29:10–16).⁶⁷⁴ Their attention is actually not on God's words but their own wills (e.g., 30:10–11; 47:10; 65:2). For those rebels, destruction is for them (65:12). In addition, the last purpose clause in 6:10—"lest they see with their eyes, hear with their ears, understand with their hearts, turn, and find healing for themselves"—seems to suggest that God is telling the prophet his prevention of the people's repentance, or the divine predestination for the people (cf. 10:23).⁶⁷⁵ However, although the inevitable punishment for the people is surely reported, Isaiah's (or God's) messages do not exclude a call of repentance. The negative purpose clause (i.e., "lest" clause) in 6:10 hints that one may find healing by turning to

⁶⁷² Isaiah 6 reads a contrast between God's tremendous splendor and the forsaken land/felled oak tree.

⁶⁷³ In Isa 6:10, MT reads the three verbs (make fat [פָּחַד], make heavy [כָּבֵד], make blind [עָוַר]) *imperatives*, while LXX reads *indicatives* (ἐπαχύνθη, βαρέως ἤκουσαν, ἐκάμυσαν) in a causal clause.

⁶⁷⁴ Cf. John D. W. Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, WBC 24 (Waco, TX: Word, 1985), 75; Oswalt, *Isaiah: 1–39*, 189.

⁶⁷⁵ The chiasmic structure in Isa 6:10 seems to suggest that their rebellion is from their hearts and then makes their hearts more hardened. Cf. Geoffrey D. Robinson, "The Motif of Deafness and Blindness in Isaiah 6:9–10: A Contextual, Literary, and Theological Analysis," *BBR* 8 (1998): 176.

God. In the immediate context that follows, God has Isaiah call upon king Ahaz to trust in God (7:4–11). In the broader context, God’s calling of the people to return is heard in many places (e.g., 1:27–28; 30:15; 31:6; 46:8–13; 55:1–3). Moreover, the ultimate hope for the people, which will bring Israel’s restoration, is also indicated as the Sprout of the Lord (4:2), Shoot/Root of Jesse (11:1, 10), and the Davidic King (9:7; 16:5; 32:1–2) who is supposed to be the holy seed in 6:10. The people, in fact, have the ability to hear, see, and return just as in Isaiah’s repentant response when he glimpsed at the Lord’s glory (6:5). Therefore, God’s message for Isaiah in Isa 6:10, as OPoV, is depicting the inevitable consequence of the severe obstinacy of the people, which is dullness to God’s words as a result of their rebellion against the Lord.⁶⁷⁶

When quoting Isa 6:10 in his summary of Jesus’s public ministry, John’s narrator seems to take the view, more boldly than LXX, that the people’s unbelief is in God’s work.⁶⁷⁷ As previously mentioned, John has another reason regarding their unbelief as mentioned right after this quotation, which is the result of the people not loving God’s glory (12:43). In addition, the contrast language between Isaiah-seeing and Israel-not-seeing in Isa 6 is likely adopted by John when the narrator contrasts Isaiah with the Jews. This contrast can also be John’s point of view on the phraseological plane because of the phraseological influence from Isaiah’s text. For John, Isaiah *saw* the glory of the Lord and *became* God’s messenger (John 12:41; Isa 6). On the contrary, the Jewish leaders *do not love* the glory of God and *fear* to acknowledge their belief (John 12:42). Therefore, John’s NPoV on their unbelief in these verses is parallel with Isaiah’s.

⁶⁷⁶ Watts, *Isaiah 1–33*, 75.

⁶⁷⁷ In LXX, the text reads that “the heart of the people *was made dull*, and they did not hear, ... and they closed their eyes.” But John makes the subject of the verbs, blinded and hardened, third person singular, which implies God. John also has some differences from LXX. In John’s quotation, the portion of “ears” is ignored. John’s order for the parts of perception is dissimilar. Humann, “Function and Form,” 43, suggests that the order changed by John marks “the signs done by Jesus and seen by the Jews.” Also cf. Craig A. Evans, “The Function of Isaiah 6:9–10 in Mark and John,” *NovT* 24 (1982): 133–35.

In John, the Jew's hardened heart is also a result from their unbelief in God and a cause for their disbelieving in the One sent by God (cf. 5:38; 9:39; 10:26). Such an evaluative point of view (from both Isaiah and John) explains the unbelievable unbelief of the Jews described in 12:37.

However, although his quoting serves to support the fact of unbelief of the Jews, John turns his focus on *him* right after the quotation by indicating the reason why Isaiah said the text. In 12:41, the narrator adds a comment telling that the quoted text is also what Isaiah spoke about *him*. Then, the question is who the *he* is. According to Isaiah's illustration in Isa 6, the glory that Isaiah saw is supposed to be the glory of YHWH (כְּבוֹדוֹ; τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ), which the Seraphs declared (Isa 6:1–3).⁶⁷⁸ However, the third person pronoun *he* throughout John 12:37–42 is understood as being Jesus. John's narrator uses two Isaianic texts to refer to the Jews' failure to believe in Jesus. Accordingly, in narrator's comment in 12:41, the *him* that Isaiah spoke about ("καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ") is Jesus and *his glory* that Isaiah saw ("εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ") is Jesus's glory. The narrator implicitly shows his evaluative point of view by displaying the image about the splendor portrayed in Isaiah's text. The omniscient and omnipresent narrator seems to concur with Isaiah's point of view on both the temporal-spatial and psychological planes. Not only in his own narrative but also in Isaiah's story, by *seeing* through Isaiah's eyes in the timeframe of Isaiah's narrative world, the narrator boldly comments that Isaiah glimpsed the glory of Jesus there.

The point of view is clearly that Jesus and God share the same divine glory. On the one hand, the narrator has addressed NPoV that Jesus is the unique one (μονογενὴς θεὸς) who makes the Father known/revealed (1:18). That Jesus is the Word, with God as creator in the

⁶⁷⁸ In Isa 6:1 LXX, what filled the temple was the glory of God (τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ).

beginning (1:1–2). Such high Christological point of view in the end of the first part of the narrative forms an *inclusio* echoing back not only to the Prologue but also to the very first OT quotation (1:24), which is also from Isaiah’s message, regarding John the Baptist’s voice calling to have the path of the Lord—Jesus—straightened. On the other hand, this point of view is entirely confirmed by Jesus himself in the narrative (JPoV). In the immediate context right after these two Isaianic quotations in 12:38–40, Jesus cries out that whoever believes in and sees him believes in and sees the one who sent him (12:44–45). In another instance (10:30), Jesus states, “I and the Father, we are one.” Later in Jesus’s prayer to the Father, Jesus indicates that he and the Father share the glory even before the creation (17:5). Therefore, both NPoV and JPoV supports the understanding in 12:41 where the narrator insists that Isaiah saw the divine glory, which is identified with Jesus’s glory.⁶⁷⁹

In addition, the narrator’s phraseological use of Isaiah’s language also uncovers the NPoV. As mentioned in the previous discussion, that the exaltation-glorification language in Isaiah’s Suffering Servant passage used by John’s narrator in John 12 reveals Isaiah’s phraseological influence in John’s passage, not only in the quotation in 12:38 but also in the immediate context. As scholars have observed,⁶⁸⁰ such an exaltation-glorification language appears in Isa 6 where John’s narrator quotes the second quotation in John 12:40. Again, the Greek terms ὑψηλοῦ (high-lifted) and δόξης (glory) shows in the illustration of God’s splendid image in Isa 6:1–3 just as the terms used by John’s Jesus in 12:23–33 expose his *hour* to come. He will be lifted high (ὑψωθῶ) and be glorified (δοξασθῇ). Moreover, Catrin H.

⁶⁷⁹ The narrator also implicitly shows this evaluative point of view through the irony in the Jews’ misunderstanding. See 5:18; 8:58–59; 10:33.

⁶⁸⁰ Cf. n. 666. Also see Moloney, *Text and Context*, 74–80. Moloney includes the verbs “ἀναβαίνω” and “καταβαίνω” in the discussion.

Williams indicates that the term *seeing* in three contexts, Isa 52:13–15, Isa 6, and John 12:37–41, also plays a role to link together what has been seen in the texts.⁶⁸¹

Therefore, the narrator's QF and quotations in these verses, and comments in the context explicitly describe the Jews' failure to believe in Jesus and implicitly express the evaluative point of view on Jesus by Isaiah's phraseology. Particularly, in John 12, the narrator relates his telling and showing to the original contexts of the prophetic messages quoted by him, illustrating Jesus as the coming King/God to his people. When the Jewish leaders plan to kill him and his people do not really understand him as a result of their unbelief, he will be high-lifted and glorified on a cross, through which he as the Suffering Servant will reveal the delivering arm of God and God himself to the people and the nations. Despite the failure of Isaiah's Israel/John's Jews to believe in God/Jesus, God does not fail to fulfill his word. Rather, as the narrator says, the word of Isaiah (the word of God) is fulfilled in the people's failure, as well as fulfilled in the life of the incarnated God.

5.2.9 John 13:18 That the Scripture May Be Fulfilled, His Heel against Me

One of Jesus's OT quotations is in John 13:18, which reads, “ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ· ὁ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ” (But [it happens] that the Scripture may be fulfilled, “The one who ate my bread has lifted his heel against me”). This quotation is the first one of two instances in John's Farewell Discourse. Both instances are on Jesus's lips, respectively speaking of his being betrayed by one of his disciples (13:18) and of the hatred from the world (15:25). In addition, both of Jesus's quotations are preceded by a fulfillment-purpose formula “ἵνα πληρωθῇ.” The narrator, being outside of the narrative, keeps

⁶⁸¹ Catrin H. Williams, “John, Judaism, and ‘Searching the Scriptures’,” in *John and Judaism: A Contested Relationship in Context*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and Paul N. Anderson (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 88–90.

exposing the psychological knowledge of his protagonist, Jesus. In the beginning of the Farewell Discourse, the narrator exposes that Jesus *knew* the coming of the hour of departure to the Father (13:1, 3). The narrative plot, following the hint of Jesus's hour of death in the previous chapters, rapidly *descends* from Jesus's miraculous deeds to Jesus's last words to his disciples, although Jesus's hour is also the hour of glorification (12:23). The suspense of the narrator's foreshadowing, in the prior narrative about Judas's betrayal (6:64, 71),⁶⁸² is reaching its realization (13:2). The narrator in section 13:1–30 reveals his view when swinging back and forth between Jesus's knowing and the disciples' unknowing, interweaving his comments by giving some points of view of his characters about the betrayal on the psychological and tempo-spatial planes. As Judas receives the piece of bread, the narrator signals the coming of the hour by the phraseological means of *night* (νύξ).⁶⁸³ However, as seen in ch. 12, paradoxically, this moment turns out to introduce the *hour* of Jesus's glorification (13:31–32).⁶⁸⁴

In John 13:1–30, the narrator starts with showing Jesus's psychological awareness and what is happening in Judas's heart (13:1–3) and ends with the disciples' ignorance of Jesus's word and what ideas they have (13:28–29).⁶⁸⁵ During the unfolding events, the narrator pauses to add his comments. He describes Jesus's awareness of his traitor right after Jesus speaks of the disciples' cleanness (13:10–11). Again, he shows that the disciples are uncertain about the betrayer when Jesus insists that one of them will betray him (13:21–22). All these narratorial comments on the psychological plane are about Judas's betrayal, which stands at the juncture of

⁶⁸² Concerning Jesus's awareness of the one who is about to betray him, the narrator in both 6:64b and 6:71 adds his explicit expositions for Jesus's obscure words in 6:64a and 6:70.

⁶⁸³ Commentators indicate that the νύξ is also a symbol for some status of spiritual darkness. E.g., Burge, *John*, 113–114, 373; Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 177–78; Carson, *John*, 186, 476. Cf. Culpepper, *John*, 208.

⁶⁸⁴ Note the terms οὐν and νουν in 13:31.

⁶⁸⁵ The disciples are still portrayed as *ignorant* according to the narratorial comment in 12:6.

the coming hour of Jesus. Although giving his point of view by the terms “it was night,” the narrator has his protagonist indicate the glorification (13:31; cf. 12:23, 33). Such a paradoxical tension is also displayed in the context. When the intimate relationship between Jesus and the disciples is illustrated in Jesus’s washing of the disciples’ feet and dinning with them, the issue here is betrayal of Jesus from one of the disciples. However, such an intimate relationship does not align the disciples’ ideology with Jesus’s at the moment. The intimate relationship will be effective, as Jesus says, when the event happens and they believe that “ἐγώ εἰμι” (13:19; cf. 18:5).⁶⁸⁶ Then the intimate relationship will mark them as those sent by Jesus, as well as those sent by the Father (13:20; cf. 13:16–17). At this moment, however, the disciples do not concur in point of view with Jesus, which is exposed by the narrator on the psychological plane. In the exposition of such a relationship, Jesus cites the scriptural text from Ps 41:9 (John 13:18).⁶⁸⁷

Jesus’s quotation is commonly recognized from Ps 41, which is the last psalm of the First Book of the Psalter (Pss 1–41).⁶⁸⁸ The poetic narrator, noted as David in the title (Ps 41:1 MT/LXX), speaks of attacks not only from his enemies (41:5–8) but also from his close friend (שׂוֹנֵאֵי שְׁלוֹמִי) in whom he trusts (41:9 [41:10 MT/LXX]).⁶⁸⁹ He asks the Lord’s favor in such a circumstance, in sickness and hostile strikes. In the broader context, the whole First Book of the Psalter is comprised of pleas for deliverance from the scheme and striking of evil ones and

⁶⁸⁶ Jesus’s language in John 13:19 is similar to Isa 43:9–12. If so, Isaiah’s phraseological influence still penetrates in the narrative and the phrase “ἐγώ εἰμι” and then is construed as the divine name in Isaiah. The narrator’s description in 18:1–8 suggests that no one is able to stand firmly before the “ἐγώ εἰμι,” who is Jesus of Nazareth. Also cf. Billy E. Simmons, “A Christology of the ‘I Am’ Sayings in the Gospel of John,” *TTE* 38 (1988): 98; Carson, *John*, 471.

⁶⁸⁷ Cf. Maarten J. J. Menken, “The Translation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18,” *JSNT* (1990): 69. He argues that the wording and translation of the quoted text in John 13:18 has influence from 2 Sam 18:28. Also, Schuchard, *Scripture*, 114–17.

⁶⁸⁸ Wilson, *Psalms Volume 1*, 650–51. Wilson also observes that the term *blessed* in this psalm would cause the reader to reflect back on the blessings in Pss 1–2, which are the introduction of the Psalms as a whole.

⁶⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 654, mentions that the enemies and the betraying friend attack the psalmist by using verbal power.

enemies.⁶⁹⁰ Near the end of the First Book, in Ps 38:11, the psalmist notes that his friends (רֵעִי) and close companions (קָרִיבִי) stand away from his affliction. Moreover, as shown in Ps 41:9, the psalmist's close friend even becomes his traitor⁶⁹¹ who is described as eating the psalmist's bread but lifting the heel against him.⁶⁹² The poetic narrator finally still trusts in the mercy of the Lord (41:10–12).

In the Psalm, the psalmist is to plea for the Lord's mercy because of his sin against the Lord (41:4, 10). This attitude makes the psalmist the one whose integrity pleases the Lord (41:11–12) that he may be healed and requite with the attackers (4:10).⁶⁹³ The language in Ps 41 is analogous with it in Ps 3, and they form an *inclusio* in the light of that the psalmist experienced attacks and mockeries from enemies (3:1–2; 41:5–8) and found YHWH as the One who made him stand (3:7; 41:10). At least three points are worth noting. First, at the end of the First Book of the Psalter, the attack against the psalmist reaches the peak that even his trustworthy close friend now turns to a treacherous one, as his enemies. Second, the narrator likely has a higher social state than his friend since the friend ate *from* him (אוֹכַל לְחֶמֶי; lit., “eating my bread”), who is king David in this context.⁶⁹⁴ Third, the one with whom the Lord is

⁶⁹⁰ Wilson, *Psalms Volume 1*, 89–90. The psalmist frequently mentions the deeds of his enemies before the Lord, e.g., 3:1–2; 12:7–8; 22:12–18; 31:11–13; 40:14–15.

⁶⁹¹ The Hebrew phrase for “my close friend” in this verse, אִישׁ שְׁלוֹמִי (lit. “man of my peace”), can be found in Jer 38:22 and Obad 7 with the similar meaning (“your close friend”).

⁶⁹² Concerning the place of the noun עָקֵב (“heel”), Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary*, trans. Hilton C. Oswald, CC (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 430, suggests that it is excluded from the verse. Also cf. the discussion in Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, WBC 19 (Waco, TX: Word, 1983), 319. In addition, Köstenberger, “John,” 487, states that the expression of “eating someone’s bread” in a Jewish context conveys the notion of *close fellowship*. Also, Wilson, *Psalms Volume 1*, 654.

⁶⁹³ The words “will not stand again” (לֹאֶקִים)/“my close one” (שְׁלוֹמִי) and “make me stand” (הִקְיֵמֶנִי)/“requite” (אֲשַׁלְמֶה) seem to be a twofold wordplay. The psalmist’s repayment is according to their deeds and is presumably based on his state before the Lord (Ps 41:11–12; cf. 28:3–4).

⁶⁹⁴ Also, Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 432, “[The friends] have left the common level of life, have elevated themselves and demeaned the sufferer.” Cf. Köstenberger, “John,” 486.

pleased will not be triumphed by the enemies. The language here conveys the ideological point of view of the poetic narrator that an intimate friend betrayed him as an enemy would, as being the worst hostile attack, yet he still believes he is able to stand before the Lord who delights in him. Nonetheless, the text of the friend's betrayal does not seem to take any specific prophetic sense or depict any eschatological scenery.

John's narrator seems to portray Jesus as the psalmist in the First Book of the Psalter. Although the narrator foreshadows Judas's betrayal right after Peter and the disciples' confession of Jesus as the Holy One of God (John 6:67–71), the narrator exposes the desires of Jesus's adversaries to destroy Jesus since the beginning of the narrative (2:19; 5:16; 7:1, 19, 25; 8:40; 11:50; 12:32; cf. 1:10–11). In the First Book of the Psalter, the psalmist is also experiencing the deadly threats from his enemies and evil doers (e.g., Pss 3:1–8; 17:7–14; 22:12–13; 31:11–13 ; cf. Ps 1). In the last moment, even the close friend turned to become a betrayer (Ps 41:9). In John 13:1–30, while the event of foot-washing focuses on the intimate relationship between Jesus and the disciples, at the same moment, the narrator in his comments pays attention to Judas's betrayal that is previously foreshadowed. Judas, as one of the disciples being washed by Jesus and seated at Jesus's table, eating (as chosen and known by Jesus), turns out to be a betrayer. As the first fulfillment-purpose formula that Jesus uses in the narrative, John's narrator shows that his protagonist, concurring with him ideologically, is quoting Ps 41:9 to imply the impending betrayal from one of those disciples eating with him (John 13:18). Jesus's words in John 13:19 reinforce the fulfillment-purpose of 13:18 by indicating the certainty of this occurrence (cf. 14:29; 16:4).⁶⁹⁵ Since the original text does not seem to have a prophetic implication, Jesus's use

⁶⁹⁵ Jesus appears to fulfill the scriptural text by intentionally giving a piece of bread (τὸ ψωμίον) to Judas.

of *fulfillment* unlikely connotes the fulfillment as the promised word coming to pass.⁶⁹⁶ However, while the temporal point of view of the quoted text in the psalmist's context is past, Jesus in John's narration forecasts it as imminent despite the verbal tense (ἐπῆρεν) Jesus employs.⁶⁹⁷

The fulfillment-purpose formula “ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ” in John 13:18, as previously mentioned, is the narrator's phraseological influence. If the QF changed to the “as it is written in the Scripture” pattern, it would seem to be no semantical problem. However, as the narrator's QF distribution exists in his narrative, with other fulfillment-purpose formulae, John's Jesus in 13:18 keeps the formula. The Scripture finds its fulfillment not only in terms of promise-coming-to-pass in Jesus—the scriptural promised One, but also in terms of truthfulness in Jesus—the One who lives according to the word of God and lives out the word of God. The Scripture proves true in Jesus. Just as Jesus's words are reported as *fulfilled* by the narrator (17:12; 18:9, 32), the Scripture is *fulfilled* in Jesus.⁶⁹⁸

However, the quotation does not seem to imply merely Jesus as the coming Davidic king.⁶⁹⁹ Although Psalm 41 is titled as David's psalm,⁷⁰⁰ it does not naturally crown Jesus with a title of David.⁷⁰¹ At most, according to the context of Psalm 41 and the language of John's narrator, Ps 41:9 in John 13 implies that Jesus is a righteous sufferer who endures mockeries and

⁶⁹⁶ Cf. Nicholas J. Zola, “The One Who Eats My Bread Has Lifted His Heel Against Me: Psalm 41:10 in 1QHa 13.25–26 and John 13:18,” *PRSt* 37 (2010): 417. Zola considers that the evangelist views the ultimate fulfillment of the predictive text in Jesus's life.

⁶⁹⁷ The text that Jesus quotes here does not resemble the text in LXX (Ps 41:10), which reads “ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ’ ἐμὲ πτερισμόν.” However, the Hebrew text found in 1QHa XIII, 23–24 is almost similar to the text in HB. Also cf. Steve Moyise, *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), 71–72.

⁶⁹⁸ Cf. Obermann, *Erfüllung*, 270

⁶⁹⁹ Cf. Menken, “Psalm 41:10,” 71; Köstenberger, “John,” 487.

⁷⁰⁰ The First Book of the Psalter is most “Davidic.”

⁷⁰¹ Marianne Meye Thompson, “‘They Bear Witness to Me’: The Psalms in the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of John,” in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*, ed. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 269.

attacks from evildoers and still fully trusts in the righteousness of the Lord, as seen in the First Book of the Psalter (e.g., Pss 4:1; 7:9; 15:1–2; 18:20–24; 24:3–6; 34:19–22). In the First Book of the Psalter, “the righteous” not only refers to King David but also to the people of God who obey God (Pss 14:4–5; 31:23; 34:6–10; 37:27–29). The Psalms portray the experiences of David⁷⁰² on the one hand and of the righteous people of God, on the other hand. In John’s narrative, Jesus, who fulfills the Scripture, is the example of the suffering righteous people (cf. John 7:18; 8:46; 9:31; 10:32). In the immediate context, the paradoxical ideology still displays that the hour of being lifted is the hour of glorification, the teacher-lord is also the foot-washing servant, becoming an example for the believing disciple-servants (13:15–16). Similarly, the righteous host-lord (or the “ἐγὼ ἐῖμι” Lord) is the one betrayed by his eater-friend, not for his own sake but for the sake of all. Jesus is the example for the righteous sufferers who observe the word of God but face attacks, as Jesus later warns his disciple-servants in 15:18–20.⁷⁰³ Therefore, the quotation in John 13:18 is used to indicate Judas’s betrayal as one of Jesus’s chosen disciples. Moreover, the narrator shows that Jesus is the one who prompts it to happen so that the text from Ps 41 may be fulfilled and, at the same time, the coming of his paradoxical hour may be fulfilled. John’s narrator conveys the point of view that Jesus is the ultimate example for his believing disciples to be the righteous sufferer. He is their lord, yet he washes their feet. He is the righteous one, yet he suffers. The hour of suffering is the hour of the Lord’s glorification.

⁷⁰² It may refer to the event in 2 Sam 15:31 (cf. Ps 55:12–13). Cf. Margaret Daly-Denton, “The Psalms in John’s Gospel,” in *The Psalms in the New Testament*, ed. Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken, NTSI (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 129–30.

⁷⁰³ In both 13:15–16 and 15:18–20, Jesus uses the proverbial saying, “A servant is not greater than his master.”

5.2.10 John 15:25 That the Word May Be Fulfilled, They Hated Me

In his farewell discourse, Jesus quotes the second scriptural text in the context regarding the world's enmity, which also will be against the disciples (John 15:18–25; 16:1–4): “ἀλλ’ ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος ὅτι ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν” (But [it happens] that the word which is written in their law may be fulfilled: “They hated me without a cause”). Jesus then provides the reason for the world's hostility. The disciples belong to Jesus and the world has first hated Jesus. The enmity towards Jesus implies that the world does not know the Father and hates the Father (15:21–24; 16:3) because Jesus fully and completely represents the Father (cf. 14:9–31; 5:19–30; 10:30). Syntactically, the three occurrences of fronting direct objective “ἐμὲ” for the adverse actions of the world (“hate” in vv. 18, 23; “persecute” in v. 20) in this context suggest Jesus's emphasis on himself as the primary object of the world's hostility. Therefore, as servants of their master Jesus (15:20), the disciples will not escape from the world's enmity.⁷⁰⁴ In his explanation of the coming hatred against the disciples, Jesus quotes the text: “They hated me without a cause” (15:25) with the fulfillment-purpose formula.

While showing Jesus's discourse to his disciples in this passage, the narrator keeps silent.⁷⁰⁵ The silence of the narrator does not hint a distance between the NPoV and JPoV.⁷⁰⁶ Rather, as mentioned, it conveys the concurrence of the narrator with the protagonist.⁷⁰⁷ As in the whole narrative, Jesus is shown as being an omniscient protagonist. He comprehends the

⁷⁰⁴ Burge, *John*, 371, points out that the proverb “a servant is not greater than his master” in John 15:20 (also in 13:16) indicates that “what is applicable to the master ... is likewise applicable to the servant.”

⁷⁰⁵ In fact, the narrator begins to be silent since 13:31 until 16:33 (except short phrases in 14:22 and 16:19).

⁷⁰⁶ This silence of John's narrator is opposite to the “silent scene” mentioned in Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 65, where the silent scene is due to the distance between the observing narrator and an observed action.

⁷⁰⁷ The narrator has told in the very beginning about the world attitude towards the Word in John 1:10.

psychological point of view even of the people of the world (cf. 2:24–25). Jesus exposes their failure to know the Father (15:21; 16:3), their inward hatred thinking (5:18–19, 23–24) and reasoning (15:19, 21; 16:2), and then their future intention of persecution (15:20–21; 16:2). By Jesus’s discourse, the narrator shows the enmity and persecution of the world against Jesus and his disciples that is taking place without any appropriate reason. In this hostile world, the disciples will witness to Jesus, and the Holy Spirit as a Jesus-like broker and sustainer is sent from the Father to them (15:26–27; 16:7–15).⁷⁰⁸ The quotation in 15:25 succinctly concludes Jesus’s discourse about the world’s animosity against himself as the reason why the world will be also hostile to the disciple. The narrator displays the opposite evaluative point of view on serving God between Jesus-party and the world-party.

Two scriptural candidates are fitting to be the source of the quotation in John 15:25. They are Ps 35:19 (34:19 LXX) and 69:4 (69:5 MT; 68:5 LXX).⁷⁰⁹ Both have the same wording in the MT (שֹׂנְאֵי הַנָּפֶשׁ) and in the LXX (οἱ μισοῦντές με δωρεάν) for the quoted phrase “those who hate me without cause.” In both places, the Hebrew phrases in the poetic parallelism are identical, which read “those who oppose me with lies” (אִיְבֵי שֶׁקֶר).⁷¹⁰ Therefore, the meaning of “without a cause” can be construed with “not based on rational argument or legitimate grounds.”⁷¹¹ According to Menken, the frequent use of Ps 69 in John’s Gospel (e.g., 2:17; 19:28) and the parallelism of the verbs *hating* and *persecuting* employed in both contexts of John 15:25

⁷⁰⁸ Tricia Gates Brown, *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective*, JSNTSup 253 (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 217–18.

⁷⁰⁹ Menken, *Quotations*, 142–43; Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 281–82. In Psalm, “the haters” (those who hate) of the psalmist or his group is mentioned ten times (Pss 18:17, 40; 35:19; 38:19; 44:7, 10; 55:12; 69:4, 14; 86:17). The phrase “those who hate me without cause (δωρεάν)” only appears in Pss 15:19 and 69:4.

⁷¹⁰ However, the LXX parallels are read a bit differently: “οἱ ἐχθραίνοντές μοι ἀδίκως” (34:19 LXX) vs. “οἱ ἐκδιώκοντές με ἀδίκως” (68:5 LXX).

⁷¹¹ Köstenberger, “John,” 494.

and Ps 69:5 suggest that the source of Jesus's quotation is more likely from Ps 69.⁷¹² As discussed,⁷¹³ the Psalm is a part of the second Book of the Psalter, Pss 42–72, which contains pleas for God's deliverance from enemies. Psalm 69 describes the psalmist's experience of enemies' hostilities and attacks for the sake of God and his zeal for the revival of God's household (Ps 69:7, 9, 19, 33–36). The psalmist's pious behaviors become a reproach from others toward him (69:10). Therefore, the OPoV shows that the psalmist, as a righteous sufferer, is treated wrongly because of his innocence and piety. The very reason is the psalmist's piety and zeal for the Lord. The Lord is the only one from whom the salvation and vindication will come (69:1, 13, 18, 29, 35).

Jesus, in John's narrative, resembles the psalmist of Ps 69 in terms that both are found innocent in the way they practice piously yet encounter hostile treatments from others (cf. John 8:46).⁷¹⁴ In John 15:18–25, the frequent occurrence of the third person pronouns, beginning with singular and then plural, signals the persecutors of the world. The phrase “their Law” that Jesus employs in the QF seems to signify his point of view on the phraseological plane. However, Jesus's use of *their* scriptural text does not mean that Jesus and they concur in the same understanding of the Scripture. In John's narrative, disbelieving Jesus signals unbelief of the Scripture (5:37–47). Even though the Scripture, as mentioned previously, is the ultimate word of God for the Jewish people to follow and believe, both Jesus and narrator indicate that what the Jews seek in the Scripture is their own benefit (5:38–40; 7:15–23; 19:7 cf. 5:44; 12:43). Therefore, the use of “their Law” apparently is irony. *They*, those who hate Jesus and his

⁷¹² Menken, *Quotations*, 144–45.

⁷¹³ See p. 157.

⁷¹⁴ In fact, Psalm 35 also expresses such experience and appeal to God's salvation.

disciples without a cause, are now portrayed as the *they* written in *their* scripture of Ps 69 who hated the righteous psalmist without a cause. This use may also echo Jesus's word in John 10:34–35, where he uses “your Law.” No matter how the Jews treat or misapprehend their Law, “the Scripture cannot be annulled” (10:35). The Scripture is *their* Scripture that they do not perceive now being fulfilled.

In John 15:25, the use of the OT quotation in Jesus's discourse shows again that JPoV opposes the Jews who do not believe him and persecute him even though both have the same Scripture. The narrator, with *his* QF, signals the NPoV that Jesus is the ultimate righteous sufferer who seeks God's will alone, witnessing faithfully about the Father (cf. 1:14–18). In the immediate context, Jesus, in fact, urges the disciples to become faithful servants as he is and to testify for Jesus's word with the help of the Spirit of the Truth (15:26–16:15). While Jesus is heading to his hour of being lifted to death, the two quotations in Jesus's Farewell Discourse imply Jesus's innocence, which later in the narrative is also pronounced by the Roman prefect Pilate for three times (18:38; 19:4, 6). Jesus is the ultimate righteous sufferer. He seeks no his glory but the Father's glory and God's will done, yet he is persecuted and betrayed by his people. The Scripture texts are fulfilled in the way that the suffering experiences of the faithful psalmist find true in Jesus as the example of YHWH's faithful witness.

5.2.11 John 19:24 That the Scripture May Be Fulfilled, They Divided My Clothes

John 19:24 has an OT quotation: “ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ [ἡ λέγουσα]⁷¹⁵· διμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον” (That the scripture may be fulfilled [which says], “They divided my clothes for themselves, and upon my clothing they

⁷¹⁵ UBS⁵ notes that ἡ λέγουσα appears in \mathfrak{P}^{66} vid A D and many others while it is omitted in \mathfrak{B} B. Cf. Metzger, *Textual*, 217. Since ἡ λέγουσα is not found in John's narrative, especially in all quotation formulae, it is possibly added into the original text (although the manuscript \mathfrak{P}^{66} , dated about 200, has it).

cast lots”). John’s last four OT quotations appear in the second half of John 19, in the context of Jesus being crucified on the cross. The first two are quoted right before Jesus’s death (19:24, 28) while the other two are cited in the scene after Jesus just died (19:36, 37). Three of them belong to the narrator’s telling (19:24, 36, 37), and one is in the narrator’s showing of Jesus’s word (19:28). After the account of Jesus’s arrest, in which the narrator has twice commented on the fulfillment of Jesus’s word (18:9, 32),⁷¹⁶ the scene of Pilate’s judgment clearly centers on Jesus as the King of the Jews. While Jesus admits his kingship, although not of this world (18:36–37), the narrator reports the declaration of the Jewish highest leaders: “We have no king but Caesar” (19:15; cf. 1:11). After the declaration, the narrative displays the narrator’s spatial-temporal point of view on Jesus as the King. In 19:17–18, the narrator shifts the pace rapidly from the scene of Jesus bearing the cross by himself to the place where Jesus is crucified between two others. This description is the first out of two times (19:18, 23) that the narrator reports them crucifying Jesus (“αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν”). Although his spatial frame changes swiftly to crucifixion, the narrator’s focus still remains on Jesus’s kingship. The cross on the Place of the Skull is the place where Jesus is *recognized* as a king. The attention is drawn to the inscription that Pilate wrote for the lifted Jesus: “the King of the Jews” (19:19–22). While reporting again that they crucified Jesus (“ἐσταύρωσαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν”), the narrator turns the scene to the soldiers (19:23).

In the scene of four soldiers dealing with Jesus’s clothes in 19:23–24, the narrator describes the historical event by using aorist indicative verbs that express a general pace of main actions and an external view on them.⁷¹⁷ Such an account, by the verbal tense, does not seem to show any specific dynamics of point of view. However, after the soldiers’ separation of Jesus’s

⁷¹⁶ Jesus’s word about Peter’s denial (13:38) is also *fulfilled* (18:27).

⁷¹⁷ Cf. Yamasaki, *Perspective Criticism*, 69–73, 77.

tunic in silence (19:23a), the narrator's comment on the tunic by detailing the weave of the tunic in 19:23b provides not only his own understanding but also the soldiers' point of view on the psychological plane (perceived inside).⁷¹⁸ This narratorial comment in v. 23b is the cue for the four soldiers to decide verbally to cast lots for the tunic.⁷¹⁹ The narrator's audible soldierly characters in 19:24a and his short summary in 19:24c that "the soldiers therefore indeed did these things" together underscore the quotation in 19:24b.

Meanwhile, the narrator's scriptural quotation and his summary together illustrate the completion of the soldiers' casting actions.⁷²⁰ The quotation with a fulfillment formula echoes the act happening. The short summary also affirms that the soldiers has completed their lot-cast. Particularly, the affirmative particle $\mu\epsilon\nu$ (indeed) enhances the NPoV that what the soldiers did corresponds with what is written in the Scripture. Moreover, the verbatim scriptural text quoted (Ps 21:19 LXX) by the narrator again shows the narrator's phraseological point of view. Although the text is cited by the narrator, at this point, the first person pronoun *I* in the quote sounds from the view of the one whose clothes are taken by the soldiers.

The text cited in John 19:24 is identical to the text of Ps 21:19 in LXX (22:19 MT; Ps 22:18). The Psalm is titled as from David. Like many other works in the First Book of the Psalter, David the psalmist appeals to the Lord for just deliverance from deadly sufferings.⁷²¹ In

⁷¹⁸ Cf. David E. Garland, "The Fulfillment Quotations in John's Account of the Crucifixion," in *Perspectives on John: Method and Interpretation in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Robert B. Sloan and Mikeal C. Parsons, NABPR Special Studies Series 11 (Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1993), 235–36.

⁷¹⁹ Concerning the symbolism of the seamless tunic, see discussions in Beasley-Murray, *John*, 347; Carson, *John*, 614–15. However, Brant, *John*, 252, considers that it is "to turn attention away from Jesus's naked body to the soldiers' preoccupation with Jesus's clothing."

⁷²⁰ Maarten J. J. Menken, "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John: Jn 10,34; 12,38; 19,24," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. C. M. Tuckett, BETL 81 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 387–88, points out the difference of description between the quotation and the narrative on the two soldiers' actions. Menken also discusses how John treats his wording of the quotation. He concludes that the quote suited the narrative (389–92).

⁷²¹ They are chs. 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 25, 26, 31, and 35. Cf. also Wilson, *Psalms Volume 1*, 89–90.

this psalm, before he urges the people to give praises to the Lord in the last ten verses (Ps 22:22–31), the psalmist mainly describes his present situation as a forsaken person (22:1–2) due to enemies’ severe mockery and attacks against him (22:6–8, 12–18).⁷²² In the description, the psalmist interchanges his complaints and confessions of trust in 22:1–10⁷²³ and then brackets the third complaint (vv. 12–18) by two petitions (vv. 11, 19–21).⁷²⁴ The third complaint section, as the most severe one, displays how the psalmist views the death-dealing treatments from the enemies, *they* (vv. 12–13, 16–18); how he looks the sufferings of his own, *I* (vv. 14–15, 17); and how he sees the deed of the Lord, *you* (v. 15; cf. 1–2). The psalmist’s portrait seems to tell his dying state under the enemies’ attacks: his falling into severely mental and physical collapse, and the enemies’ treating him as intentionally putting him to death immediately. As a result, they divide his last possession—the garment, treating him as nothing alive.⁷²⁵ Whether or not the language is poetic, the psalmist’s point of view from Ps 22:18 (21:19 LXX) is the very final stage of his life while being put to death by the enemies without God’s responding deliverance action yet. However, in the psalm, the psalmist still shows his trust unto the Lord and urges the people to praise God.

When John’s narrator adopts the speech from Ps 22 (Ps 21 LXX), one can observe at least two shifts of point of view on the phraseological plane. First, John’s narrator clearly implies two

⁷²² Cf. Artur Weiser, *The Psalms: A Commentary*, trans. Herbert Hartwell, OTL (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), 219.

⁷²³ Complaint (about God; vv. 1–2); confession of trust (God as Israel’s savior; vv. 3–5); complaint (about enemies; vv. 6–8); confession of trust (God as my maker; vv. 9–10). Cf. David L. Thompson, *Psalms 1–72: A Commentary in the Wesleyan Tradition*, New Beacon Bible Commentary (Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 2015), 132–33

⁷²⁴ Both petitions in vv. 11 and 19 start with “do not be far off” (אַל-תִּרְחֹק).

⁷²⁵ Allen P. Ross, *A Commentary on the Psalms: Volume 2 (42–89)*, Kregel Exegetical Library (Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013), 541, comments that the enemies divided his last possession, the garment, because they reckoned that he was as good as dead. The Hebrew poetic parallelism likely regards the ἱματῖα (כְּנָדִים; garments) and the ἱματισμόν (לְבִישׁ; garment) as synonymous.

kinds of clothing in John 19:23–24 (ἱμάτια and χιτῶν) despite the poetic synonymous terms for *clothing* in Ps 22:18, whether in the MT or the LXX.⁷²⁶ The narrator, by quoting the text, underscores the soldiers' two acts, one for Jesus's outer garments, the other for the seamless tunic. Thus, on the one hand, the narrator's phraseological point of view displays Jesus's present deadly suffering that corresponds with what David the psalmist has portrayed.⁷²⁷ On the other hand, the narrator adapts the text to report the event of soldiers' dividing Jesus's garments and drawing lots for his tunic, which may not resemble *literally* what be expressed poetically in Ps 22:18 though not opposite to the text.⁷²⁸ Therefore, for the narrator, this point of view on the phraseological plane seems to be more semantic (two acts referred) than pragmatic (poetic parallelism). Even what is written in Ps 22:16 that "they have pierced my hands and feet" is literally in view in Jesus's crucifixion account.

Second, the narrator's adoption of OT text combines his own point of view with JPoV on the psychological plane. The first person genitive pronoun *my* in the quotation originally refers to David the psalmist. Although the protagonist Jesus is silent, the language of the quote sounds from the viewpoint of Jesus whose garments were divided and for whose tunic lots were cast. Such dynamics of the point of view show not only the NPoV, but also the JPoV on the psychological plane at that moment. Therefore, when he uses the fulfillment formula with the quotation, the narrator does display the picture that Jesus, like the psalmist, was experiencing severe suffering unto death when the attackers expected his death so that they could take and

⁷²⁶ John Goldingay, *Psalms: Volume 1, Psalms 1–41*, BCOTWP (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 333, "This is worked out concretely in the two parallel closing cola, in which the second explains how the action in the first was put into effect." Also Hakham, *Psalms*, 1:162–63. Cf. Carson, *John*, 613–14.

⁷²⁷ Keener, *John*, 1138, "Romans crucified their victims naked.... Public nakedness could cause shame in other settings ... but it was especially shaming for Palestinian Jews."

⁷²⁸ See also relative discussion in Menken, "Three Quotations," 386–92.

deal with his clothes. In the narrative, what the soldiers indeed did literally fits the quote and alludes to the crucified one as the dying sufferer.

As the previous two quotations in Jesus's farewell discourse, the quotation in John 19:24 is also quoted from Psalms. The fulfillment is not only conveying the sense that Jesus's event happened just as what is written in those Psalms and that the Scripture finds itself fulfilled in Jesus but is also referring to the Righteous Suffering Servant that the narrator flags by his first fulfillment quotation right at Jesus's hour coming in John 12,⁷²⁹ to which one more fulfillment quotation is quoted in the immediate text.

5.2.12 John 19:28 That the Scripture May Be Completed, I Am Thirsty

In John 19:28, the narrator reports Jesus's word in this way: “ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, λέγει· διψῶ”⁷³⁰ (That the scripture may be completed, he says, “I am thirsty”). This quotation is attributed to Jesus on the cross. In Jesus's crucifixion events, the narrator's point of view draws closer to the crucified one. The narrator's spatial point of view goes from *they* crucifying (19:17–18) and Pilate's dispute for the inscription (19:19–22), closer to soldiers' division of his clothing (19:23–24), and much closer to Jesus's entrusting his mother to the beloved disciple (19:25–27).⁷³¹ The phrase “μετὰ τοῦτο” in 19:28 signals a transition to the very final moment of Jesus's death,⁷³² from the happenings that surround Jesus to Jesus himself on the cross. The narrator's *position* then is right beside Jesus, hearing his last words (19:28–30).

⁷²⁹ Moloney, *Text and Context*, 337.

⁷³⁰ As mentioned earlier in this paper, it is not uncommon that a quoted text would be lightly modified from the original by the quoter. Therefore, since the word (one word quoted) is preceded by a quotation formula and the following context also backs up the source literarily, John 19:28 is considered to be a quotation in this paper.

⁷³¹ Compared with the aorist verbs in 19:16–24, the narrator uses present verbs for Jesus's speaking in 19:26–27. According to Campbell, *Basics of Verbal Aspect*, the present tense expresses a value of spatial proximity.

⁷³² Concerning the use of μετὰ τοῦτο/ταῦτα, cf. Barrett, *John*, 194. He notices that μετὰ τοῦτο and μετὰ ταῦτα “are frequent, and synonymous, indications of the transition from one narrative to another.” But, to know the length of the interval intended is impossible.

The narrator concurs with JPoV is seen on both his spatial proximity to Jesus and his revealing Jesus's psychological thoughts. The present tense form of the verb λέγει in 19:28 conveys a sense of proximity in the spatial point of view on Jesus's uttering a word "διψῶ" (I am thirsty) on the cross. Although in 19:30 the narrator records the other word "τετέλεσται" (it is finished) *said* by Jesus (εἶπεν), the *present* act of Jesus's quoting (λέγει) in 19:28 is shown closer to the narrator.⁷³³ On the psychological plane, the narrator uncovers Jesus's reasoning behind quoting the scriptural word. First, the omniscient narrator reports in 19:28 that Jesus said, "I am thirsty," since he *knew* (εἰδὼς) that all have been finished (τετέλεσται).⁷³⁴ The narrator, standing outside of the narrative, reveals his knowing of his omniscient protagonist who is inside of the story. The complement in Jesus's inner awareness can also be heard later from the same word "τετέλεσται" that Jesus spoke after drinking the sour wine in 19:30.⁷³⁵ Second, Jesus's intent of saying his thirst is also disclosed by the narrator through the purpose ἵνα-clause, which is connected with the verb λέγει.⁷³⁶ The purpose clause, as many scholars note,⁷³⁷ is more on Jesus's part than the comment of the narrator himself.⁷³⁸ Jesus's intent to have the Scripture be completed/fulfilled (τελειωθῇ) corresponds with his consciousness of complement of all, all the

⁷³³ It does not mean that Jesus's final word "Finished" is not important. The verbal aspect of the present tense form semantically expresses proximity, while the aspect of the aorist provides a general view of whole picture.

⁷³⁴ Cf. L. Th. Witkamp, "Jesus' Thirst in John 19:28–30: Literal or Figurative?" *JBL* 115 (1996): 492–93.

⁷³⁵ These are the only two occurrences of the verb τελέω in John.

⁷³⁶ Regarding the syntactical debate among scholars about the ἵνα clause, see discussion in Brian Tabb, "Jesus's Thirst at the Cross: Irony and Intertextuality in John 19:28," *EvQ* 85 (2013): 339–40; Witkamp, "Thirst," 494.

⁷³⁷ E.g., Carson, *John*, 619; Burge, *John*, 528–29; Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 580; Mavis M. Leung, *Reading the Old Testament with John: Revisiting John's Theology of the Cross* (Hong Kong: Tien Dao, 2015), 273–74.

⁷³⁸ Few English translations, e.g., NRSV, ESV, and NET, put the phrase in a bracket. Also cf. Borchert, *John 12–21*, 270–71; Evans, "Quotation Formulas," 80.

works that the Father sent him to finish.⁷³⁹ Moreover, the subsequent event shown by the narrator in 19:29–30 also completes what Jesus has known and quoted.

Most scholars agree that Jesus’s “διψῶ” in John 19:28 is derived from Ps 69:21 (68:22 LXX).⁷⁴⁰ Although both the MT and the LXX have the noun *thirst* with a genitive pronoun *my*, that a quoter adopted and adapted some text into his is not unusual in the ancient world, as mentioned earlier. Brian Tabb indicates that “though the verbal form διψῶ finds no precise match in the LXX, the noun ‘thirst’ (δίψαν) in Psalm 68:22 LXX is verbally similar, and only here in the Old Testament is thirst mentioned in connection with ‘sour wine’ (ὄξος) as in John 19:29.”⁷⁴¹ Thus, lack of verbatim sameness with the antecedence may not be a proper reason to refuse Jesus’s formulaic “I am thirsty” in John 19:28 to be an explicit OT quotation from Ps 69.⁷⁴²

This is the third time that the text of Ps 69 is explicitly quoted in John’s narrative. In John 2:17, the narrator has a flashback of disciples’ scriptural relation to Jesus’s zeal for the Father’s house. In John 15:25, the narrator records Jesus’s quoting about the world’s hatred. As mentioned, Ps 69 introduces a psalm grouping, Pss 69–71, recalling the book’s theme of lament and plea for God’s deliverance from attacking enemies.⁷⁴³ In Pss 69–71, while depicting how severe enemies’ attacks are, the psalmist pleads for the Lord’s deliverance (69:1; 70:1; 71:2) and finally in Ps 72 anticipates the coming of the long-awaited righteous redeeming King from God. In Ps 69, the quoted text 69:21 is located at the end of the depiction about attacks (vv. 5–12, 19–

⁷³⁹ The verbs τελειῶ and τελέω share the same root. Witkamp, “Thirst,” 493, indicates that they are “virtually equivalent.”

⁷⁴⁰ See succinct discussions in Tabb, “Jesus’s Thirst,” 341–42; R. L. Brawley, “An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28–29,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 434–38. Also cf. Myers, *Characterizing Jesus*, 168 (n. 92).

⁷⁴¹ Tabb, “Jesus’s Thirst,” 342.

⁷⁴² E.g., Schuchard, *Scripture*, xiv.

⁷⁴³ See p. 157.

21) between the section of the psalmist's prayer for deliverance (vv. 13–18) and the section of his desire for enemies' judgment (vv. 22–28) with final praising to the Lord (vv. 29–36).⁷⁴⁴ The psalmist reminds the Lord of the reproach, shame, and dishonor from *all* the enemies (69:19), which are apparently for the sake of the Lord and God's people (69:7, 9–10). He also reminds the Lord of his grievous situation in that *no* pity or comfort is found (69:20). The psalmist expresses his point of view on the psychological plane of God's awareness by saying, "You know" (יָדָעְתָּ יְיָ, יְיָ יָדָעְתָּ). The Psalm describes that the Lord is the only one from whom the psalmist can find his vindication while no one but hostile attackers are on his side (cf. 69:7–9). Verse 21 thus "appears to be a summation of the treatment he has received."⁷⁴⁵ Such a treatment of giving sour wine in 69:21 was not to comfort the psalmist's pain but to increase his pain and agony.⁷⁴⁶

In John's narrative, the passage describes the last moment for Jesus on the cross. Although only the verb $\delta\iota\psi\omega$ is plainly uttered by Jesus as the completed/fulfilled scriptural text, Jesus's subsequent act of drinking the sour wine actually completes the text. The psalmist's original description is likely poetic. The narrator, on the one hand, shows Jesus's phraseological point of view that concurs with the psalmist's point of view at the last phase of the enemies' deadly attack. The text now is manifestly and literally fulfilled in Jesus's dying. On the other hand, following Jesus's verbalized quotation, the narrator describes the soldiers' giving the sour wine.⁷⁴⁷ The narrator tells his point of view, which concurs with Jesus's in the way that the telling *completes* Jesus's quotation from Ps 69:21.

⁷⁴⁴ Cf. Hakham, *Psalms*, 2:91; James M. Boice, *Psalms 42–106*, vol. 2 of *Psalms*, An Expository Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994), 577.

⁷⁴⁵ Ross, *Psalms*, 497.

⁷⁴⁶ See Wilson, *Psalms Volume 1*, 955, n. 24; Ross, *Psalms*, 498.

⁷⁴⁷ Brawley, "Absent," 435.

Jesus's thirst also echoes the description of the dried up dying righteous psalmist in Ps 22:15–16, which is similar to the immediate context of the previously quoted text in John 19:24. Following the quotation, the narrator's showing and telling together demonstrate his point of view on Jesus's dying as the righteous sufferer, attacked by enemies for the Lord's sake. At the last moment of his life, no comfort comes for him but more pain and anguish. Both the narrator (from outside) and the protagonist, Jesus (from inside), tell the fulfillment/complement of the Scripture, implicitly and explicitly, at this point. Moreover, by showing Jesus uttering his last word, "τετέλεσται," the narrator implies the fulfillment/complement purpose of the quotation and Jesus's knowing all as completed/fulfilled. Jesus's dying has completed all the Father sent him to do and fulfilled the Scripture. Jesus's death also fulfills/completes the glory to which the narrator refers from the beginning of the narrative.⁷⁴⁸

All these recent four scriptural quotations (John 13:18; 15:15; 19:24, 28) are quoted from Psalms. More specifically, they are from David's psalms that have the similar motif about a righteous sufferer seeking God's deliverance. Three of them are reported as quoted by Jesus and one by the narrator (19:24), which sounds as if it is Jesus's point of view by the first person pronoun *my*. These four quotations, with the contexts, are likely to reinforce and elucidate the combined quotations at the end of ch. 12 where Isaiah's Suffering Servant is clearly in sight. The Servant song in Isa 52:13–53:12 describes that the Servant is disbelieved and forsaken by the people and that God's will is for the Servant to bear the sins of all as a sacrificial lamb (Isa 53:4–10; cf. John 1:29, 36). It is the very reason for Jesus's being betrayed and crucified. The four quotations also elucidate what the Suffering Servant of God would go through. As the narrative

⁷⁴⁸ Concerning Jesus's "giving his spirit" in 19:30, see Keener, *John*, 1150; Burge, *John*, 529–30.

shows that what is written in the Scripture is fulfilled in Jesus's event, Jesus's personal suffering to death manifests the Scripture. David's psalms reflect his experience as a righteous sufferer, whether poetic or actual; however, Jesus as the ultimate Righteous Sufferer, without sins, indeed has experienced correspondingly and literally what was written in these Psalms, being betrayed by the close friend, bearing hatred from his people and the world, and being killed unto death as forsaken by God but completing the will of God.⁷⁴⁹ By using fulfillment purpose quotations, the narrator portrays Jesus as the Scripture defined Messiah, who fulfills and completes the Scripture.

5.2.13 John 19:36 That the Scripture May Be Fulfilled, Not a Bone Being Broken

One of the last two OT quotations in John is in 19:36: “ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ· ὅστων οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ” (For these things happened that the scripture may be fulfilled, “A bone of his will not be broken”). The last two OT quotations in John (19:36–37) share one QF of fulfillment-purpose and are linked by the adverb πάλιν, which is seen in 12:39 as a normal way to combine two quotations. These combined quotations are located in the passage 19:31–37, right after the paragraph of Jesus dying on the cross. In this passage, the narrator's omnipresence and omniscience are undoubtedly obvious. Thus, the narrator's spatial point of view shifts rapidly from distant Pilate's place to underneath the cross. The focus is on the issue of confirming the death of the crucified ones. Presumably, in Pilate's place, the Jewish leaders reminded Pilate that the legs of the crucified ones should be broken in order that the criminals may die in a very short period (19:31).⁷⁵⁰ Then unto Golgotha, the

⁷⁴⁹ Cf. Moloney, *Text and Context*, 338. “The death of Jesus not only fulfills the promises of Scripture, but it brings them to their τέλος, as the world of Jesus has promised earlier in the narrative.”

⁷⁵⁰ Cf. Keener, *John*, 1150.

soldiers broke the legs of two others crucified with Jesus (19:32). Finally, beneath Jesus's cross, the soldiers did not break Jesus's legs because they saw Jesus was already dead (19:33). This narrator's report confirms Jesus's final declaration of complement in 19:30. As his spatial perspective gets closer to Jesus, the narrator focuses on Jesus's death by spending a *longer* time on the soldier's inspecting action from the temporal point of view. The soldier's piercing Jesus's side and immediate pouring of blood with water concentrate on Jesus's complete death on the cross (19:34).⁷⁵¹ Therefore, through the dynamics of the narrator's point of view on the spatial and temporal planes, Jesus's death, with blood and water from his side and unbroken legs remain as the last scene of this passage. At this scene, the parenthetical comment of the narrator in 19:35 as eyewitness language accentuates the reality of Jesus's death as believable and the point of view of the whole narrative about Jesus's glorious death.⁷⁵² The narrator then quotes the last OT texts for the scene he has just shown.

The narrator quotes two scriptural texts. The one in 19:36 is regarding the unbroken bone, “ὅστοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ” (a bone of his will not be broken); the other in 19:37 is the action of piercing, “ὅψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν” (they will look onto the one whom they pierced). Both quotations are tightly related to the last scene that the narrator has shown in 19:33–34. The narrator's fulfillment purpose QF is preceded by a main clause, “ἐγένετο ταῦτα” (these things happened). Such a main clause is understood as being omitted in the previous fulfillment purpose formulae.⁷⁵³ The plural demonstrative pronoun ταῦτα obviously refers to the

⁷⁵¹ Köstenberger, *John*, 552.

⁷⁵² The purpose of the eyewitness focuses on the fact that Jesus's death is true and believable. Carson, *John*, 627. Also, the subjunctive verb *believe* has the same textual variant as the *believe* in 20:30–31.

⁷⁵³ In John 13:18 and 15:25, the omitted would be in the *future* tense when Jesus predicts what would happen that the Scripture may be fulfilled.

unbroken bone and soldier's piercing in 19:33–34.⁷⁵⁴ The causal conjunction *γὰρ* then indicates the reason for the happening events, which is for the fulfillment of Scripture. Therefore, the QF and the following quotations together express the NPoV as his theological reason. The original OT texts will help discern the reason for the narrator to quote them. In this section, the focus is on the first quotation in John 19:36.

Three scriptural candidates are fitting to be the source of the quotation in John 19:36. They are Ps 34:20 (34:21 MT; 33:21 LXX), Exod 12:46,⁷⁵⁵ and Num 9:12. In the Pentateuchal passages, the use of the verbs is *general prohibition*⁷⁵⁶ while in the Psalm, it is indicative although *perfect* aspect in Hebrew (לֹא נִשְׁכָּרֵה) and *future* tense in Greek (οὐ συντριβήσεται). The word order of John's text is similar to the word order in Exod 12:46 and Num 9:12, both in the Hebrew and Greek texts. Nevertheless, the future passive verb (οὐ συντριβήσεται) in John 19:36 is the same with the verb found in Ps 33:21 LXX. Both the subjects in John 19:36 and Ps 33:21 LXX are bone(s). Menken has done an examination on the source of the quotation in John 19:36.⁷⁵⁷ He is likely right when he concludes that the quotation is influenced by Ps 33:21 LXX and Exod 12:46/Num 9:12 LXX: “[B]oth the psalm verse and the Pentateuchal texts are important as sources of the quotation.”⁷⁵⁸ In other words, Ps 34:20 (33:21 LXX) and Exod 12:46/Num 9:12 (as well as their points of view) are taken in sight by the narrator in his quotation.

⁷⁵⁴ Keener, *John*, 1155.

⁷⁵⁵ The LXX text in Exod 12:10 has an extra clause “καὶ ὅστων οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ,” which does not exist in the MT. See the textual comparison chart in Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 298–99.

⁷⁵⁶ Bill T. Arnold and John H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 137.

⁷⁵⁷ Menken, *Quotations*, 147–66. Cf. Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 298–310; Schuchard, *Scripture*, 133–40. They have almost the same result about the source of the quotation.

⁷⁵⁸ Menken, *Quotations*, 165. Also, Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 300, 309. Obermann considers the Pentateuchal texts to be the main source of the quotation.

Psalm 34 (Ps 33 LXX), starting with a thanksgiving, urges the people to trust in God, fearing and seeking YHWH.⁷⁵⁹ The psalmist iterates that the Lord is trustworthy (34:5, 8, 22) and will deliver those who take refuge in him from the evil ones and troubles (34:6, 17, 19, 22). As the righteous, although they suffer, the Lord is watching them and listening to their cries (34:15). Thus, the psalmist in 34:16–20 describes how the Lord protects a righteous sufferer. The wicked will be condemned; on the contrary, the righteous, the servants of the Lord, will not (34:21–22). Hence, the Lord’s deliverance for the righteous sufferers is clearly the psalmist’s ideological point of view. The psalmist insists that not one bone from a righteous sufferer would be broken.

The quoted texts in Exod 12:46 and Num 9:12 are both in the context concerning the Passover regulations. Exodus 12:1–28 records God’s command to Moses and Aaron for observing the feast of the Passover and then Moses’s to the elders. Again, the institution of the Passover shows in 12:43–50. The Lord’s command reads in 12:46, “And you (pl.) shall not break a bone of it.” Numbers 9:9–14 notes God’s command to Moses when and how those who are not able to observe the Passover on the fourteenth day of the first month should keep the feast. The Lord says in 9:12, “And they shall not break a bone of it.” In both texts, the Pentateuchal narrator reports that the Lord prohibits people from breaking any bone of the paschal lamb while eating the feast of Passover.

Therefore, John’s quotation in John 19:36 likely combines two themes from the original texts with the concept of unbroken bone. One is God’s perfect protection for the righteous sufferer, not one of whose bones will be broken. The other is the Paschal Lamb, whose bones

⁷⁵⁹ The first line of the Psalm implies that it was written after David was driven away by Abimelech. Cf. Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 387; Thompson, *Psalms 1–72*, 174–75.

will not be broken.⁷⁶⁰ The narrator's phraseological point of view signals two *identities* for Jesus as the owner of the unbroken bones. First, Jesus is the ultimate righteous sufferer, just as the NPoV the previous fulfillment-purpose quotations have clearly implied (13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28). In the narrative, Jesus declares his innocence from sin several times (cf. 7:18; 8:46; 9:31; 10:32). In the passion section, as the narrator has shown, Pilate said three times, "I find no guilt in him" (18:28; 19:4, 6). The fulfillment purpose QF, with the narrator's declaration that "these things happened," correspondingly connects Jesus's unbroken legs (19:33) to the righteous sufferers' unbroken bones. The point of view on the phraseological plane of the narrator's quotation alludes to Jesus as the perfect and ultimate righteous sufferer. As Craig R. Koester states, "Jesus died in obedience to the will of God, not in violation of it."⁷⁶¹ Even in his death, Jesus's leg bones were not broken by soldiers.

Second, Jesus is the Paschal Lamb.⁷⁶² In the sacrifice of the lamb without breaking any bone of it, people will be delivered from death (Exod 12:27).⁷⁶³ The narrator in the beginning of the Gospel has already specified twice through John the Baptist's mouth that Jesus is the Lamb of God (John 1:29, 36). Although no verbal parallel is found for the term *lamb*, the ideological point of view for the paschal sacrificial lamb is truly apparent, just as scholars suggest.⁷⁶⁴ Thus, the fulfillment purpose QF also connects Jesus's unbroken bones to the Paschal Lamb, which

⁷⁶⁰ Cf. Carson, *John*, 627. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, 509, "the evangelist's understanding of Jesus as *both* the righteous sufferer *and* the Paschal Lamb."

⁷⁶¹ Koester, *Symbolism*, 217.

⁷⁶² Köstenberger, *John*, 553, indicates three events, the hyssop in 19:29, the unbroken bones in 19:33, and the mingled blood in 19:34, that portray Jesus as the Passover Lamb.

⁷⁶³ In Exod 12:27, the text reads, "זֶבַח־פֶּסַח הוּא לַיהוָה" (it is the sacrifice of the Passover to the Lord)." Also cf. Porter, *John*, 204.

⁷⁶⁴ Köstenberger, *John*, 67; Borchert, *John 1–11*, 135–36; Barrett, *John*, 176; Porter, *John*, 207–13. Cf. a view of the triumphant eschatological Lamb in Beasley-Murray, *John*, 24–25.

dies in order that the people may have life (cf. 3:14; 12:23–24). Such a figure has been invoked by the narrator in the first fulfillment purpose quotation (Isa 53:1) in John 12:38. Stanley Porter points out that “the author appears to be invoking the Suffering Servant motif of Isa 53.”⁷⁶⁵ In Isa 53, the Servant of the Lord exactly combines the identities together, the Righteous Suffering Servant and the sacrificial Lamb bearing sins for others. Therefore, the narrator again, through phraseological point of view of the OT unbroken-bone Righteous Sufferer and Paschal Lamb, identifies Jesus as the Lord’s Suffering Servant, the perfect One who is crucified on the cross to death in obedience to the Lord for all.

5.2.14 John 19:37 Again, Look onto Whom They Have Pierced

This quotation is the second one of the combined quotations in 19:36–37: “καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφή λέγει· ὁψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν” (And again another scripture says, “They will look onto the one whom they have pierced”). The adverb “πάλιν” and the terms “ἑτέρα γραφή” signal that the second quotation is also led by the fulfillment purpose formula.⁷⁶⁶ As already mentioned, the combined quotations are related to the last scene that the narrator has shown in 19:33–34. While the quotation in John 19:36 pairs with the event described in 19:33, the quoted text in 19:37 then is construed with the happening reported in 19:34, which is the soldier’s piercing Jesus’s side.

⁷⁶⁵ Porter, *John*, 209.

⁷⁶⁶ Maarten J. J. Menken, “The Textual Form and the Meaning of the Quotation from Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37,” *CBQ* 55 (1993): 506, suggests that the quotation in 19:37 “is not connected to the preceding one.” The reason is that the verb “to fulfill” is absent from the formula right before the quotation. However, in a combined quotation set, the quotations in the set share the introductory formula that precedes the set. Particularly, in the case of 19:36–37, two quotations are to explain the happenings in 19:33–34 accordingly. See also Leung, *Reading*, 277. Leung states that the repeated “γραφή” in 19:36–37 implies emphasis. However, in John’s twice uses of “πάλιν” for combined quotations, the source is always attached (cf. 12:38–39; 19:36–37).

However, some exegetical issues have been raised, as Menken points out.⁷⁶⁷ The most important one is whether the two verbs in the quotation, “ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν” (*they will look onto the one whom they have pierced*), share the same subject when the text pairs with 19:34. Obviously, the singular accusative relative pronoun ὃν refers to Jesus, the one *whom* they pierced and unto *whom* they will look. In John 19, the *they* who did the piercing in the immediate context is understood to be the soldier(s) who pierced Jesus’s side. However, according to the broader context, those who planned and aimed to *pierce* Jesus are the Jews (18:31–32; 19:6, 15, 17–18, 31; cf. 11:53; 12:32–33). As for the *they* who did the looking, from the narrator’s description in 19:33–35, the candidates can be the soldiers, the eyewitness, or both since both parties *viewed* the scene of the blood and water coming out from Jesus’s side. Some scholars suggest, as Menken also lists, that the imagery of Moses’s lifted serpent in John 3:14–15 is connected with here.⁷⁶⁸ In the backdrop of the serpent’s story (Num 21:9), those who looked at the lifted serpent were those who had faith, and then John 3:14 says that those who believe in the Son of Man will have eternal life.⁷⁶⁹ However, *seeing* in John’s narrative does not always mark *believing* (e.g., 2:23–24; 6:36; 9:39; 15:24) although *seeing* is significant with respect to *believing* (cf. 1:50–51; 9:37–39).⁷⁷⁰ In addition, Jesus’s saying in 12:32 that he will draw *all* to himself when he is lifted up does not promise universalism. Jesus’s crucifixion will reveal the glory of the Father (8:28; 12:28), but it does not imply that all who see the lifted one will then embrace a true faith. On the contrary, those who have relationship with Jesus as disciples (cf.

⁷⁶⁷ Menken, “Textual Form,” 504–10.

⁷⁶⁸ Ibid., 506, n. 48.

⁷⁶⁹ James H. Charlesworth, “The Symbolism of the Serpent in the Gospel of John,” in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher, ECL 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 71.

⁷⁷⁰ Also cf. Bynum, *Fourth Gospel and Scriptures*, 176–77.

8:31; 15:8–10) are the ones who will *see* the Father and Jesus (14:7, 19–21; 16:16). Thus, from John’s passion narrative onward, the narrator shows that Jesus’s disciples/followers *saw* the risen Lord (20:18, 20, 29, 25, 29; cf. 1:51).⁷⁷¹ Therefore, in the context, those who did the piercing are the soldiers who represent the unbelieving Jews.⁷⁷² The one whom was pierced is Jesus, who died on the cross and from whose wounded side blood and water came out. Those who looked unto Jesus refer both to the piercing soldier(s) and the believing party.⁷⁷³ The narrator emphasizes not only that the eyewitness himself *saw* Jesus pierced but also that the eyewitness bore the witness with a purpose that the hearers may believe (cf. 20:29).

Since the textual form quoted in John 19:37 differs from that in Zech 12:10 (both MT and LXX), some debates are regarding the source of the quotation in John.⁷⁷⁴ Nevertheless, alteration of a quoted text is not uncommon in the ancient literature. In addition, most commentators agree that Zech 12:10 is employed in John 19:37.⁷⁷⁵ Mark J. Boda points out, “Zechariah 12:1–13:6 represents an oracle from God that outlines his comprehensive plan for the renewal of his people.”⁷⁷⁶ According to the distribution of the structural formula that “it will happen on that day” (וְהָיָה בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא) in Zechariah’s message, Zech 12:2–13:6 predicts the victory of Jerusalem

⁷⁷¹ In John 1:51, Jesus has foretold that the disciples would see (ὄψεσθαι) the angels of God coming up and down on him, which refers to Jesus’s crucifixion that God’s glory is revealed.

⁷⁷² The soldiers who executed the crucifixion are Romans. Keener, *John*, 1138–39.

⁷⁷³ In Rev 1:7, the same quotation is used in the *Parousia* context, in which all people (including those who pierced him) will see Jesus coming.

⁷⁷⁴ See the discussions in Menken, “Textual Form,” 495–504, 511; Bynum, *Fourth Gospel and Scriptures*, 59–109, 139–47. In his examination, Menken suggests that the quotation in 19:37 is from “an early Christian Greek translation of the Hebrew text” rather than from the LXX.

⁷⁷⁵ E.g., Carson, *John*, 628; Burge, *John*, 534; Keener, *John*, 1156–57; Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 747–48.

⁷⁷⁶ Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 480.

against the nations.⁷⁷⁷ While the paragraph 12:3–8 accounts aspects of this victory,⁷⁷⁸ the passage 12:9–13:1 reveals God’s victory and restoration for his people in pouring out his Spirit (12:9–10; 13:1) and then the people mourning for the pierced one (12:10–14).⁷⁷⁹ Consequently, the removal of idolatry and false prophecy will take place in the land (13:2–8).⁷⁸⁰ As a result, the true people of the Lord are those who are purified (13:9). Zechariah the prophet shows the Lord’s promise for the house of David (בֵּית דָּוִיד; τὸν οἶκον Δαυιδ) and the inhabitants of Jerusalem (יְרוּשָׁלַם; τοὺς κατοικοῦντας Ἱερουσαλημ), God’s people. In Zech 12:10, the Lord foretold that his renewal work among his people would come with the pouring out of the Spirit of compassion and supplication *upon* this people. The pouring of God’s Spirit restores the spirit of humankind (12:1). Such an action of pouring out the Spirit shows a proximity of point of view on the spatial plane that God is approaching his people. Likewise, the people’s action of looking unto the Lord expresses a closer distance between them and the Lord, which is in contrast to the remoteness in their action of piercing him.⁷⁸¹ This future point of view also shows on the psychological plane. The Lord, knowing the people’s inner thoughts, foretold that they would *look* unto him and *mourn* for their wrong treatments. Therefore, in Zech 12:10, the Lord is the one—*him*—against whom the people pierced by their sins (rebellion, idolatry, and false prophecy; 13:1–6). The Lord

⁷⁷⁷ Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 481. The formula בְּיָמֵי יְהוֹשָׁפָט appears in 12:3, 9; 13:2, 4, while the phrase בְּיָמֵי יְהוֹשָׁפָט in 12:4, 6, 8, 11; 13:1. Also cf. David L. Petersen, *Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 112. Petersen considers that these two formulae are stylistic expressions.

⁷⁷⁸ Also cf. Zech 14:8–9.

⁷⁷⁹ Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 481–82. The sentence in 12:10, quoted in John 19:37, has received attentions among commentators. See George L. Klein, *Zechariah*, NAC 21B (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2008), 365; Menken, “Textual Form,” 494–511. For example, is the prepositional form אֵלַי (to me) or אֵלָיו (to him)? Who is the *me* or *him*? Who did the piercing? Who is the one pierced?

⁷⁸⁰ Cf. Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 482.

⁷⁸¹ Ibid., 488. Boda rightly indicates that Yahweh is the *me* (the pronoun suffix of אֵלַי; μὲν) in 12:10. Also, he points out the *him* in the same verse (the pronoun suffix of אֵלָיו; αὐτὸν), the object of the piercing, is Yahweh, too, by noticing such pronoun switches found in the OT. Actually, in 12:6–9, the subject switches from first person *I* to third person *Yahweh*, and then back to *I*.

is also the one—*me*—unto whom the people will look with their penitential mourning (12:10–14).⁷⁸² Such a deep mourning will be accompanied by the restoring work of the Lord, this is, the pouring out of the Lord’s Spirit as an opened fountain (13:1; cf. 14:8). Thus, Zechariah’s OPoV is clear that Israel did the piercing against their God because of their sins. The repentant ones, however, will look unto their Lord in the Spirit’s restoration, and the Lord will eventually be their God (13:9) and the King of all (14:9). For Israel, this is the Lord’s eschatological (*on that day*) restoration promise for his people.

John’s narrator tells that the Lord’s promise in Zech 12:10 has been fulfilled in the event of soldiers’ piercing of Jesus’s side. In John’s narrative, although the executioners of the crucifixion (including piercing) are Roman soldiers (John 19:23–24; cf. Ps 22:16), those who eagerly intend to crucify Jesus and hustle to break his legs are actually the Jews (18:31–32; 19:6, 15, 17–18, 31),⁷⁸³ the people who identify themselves as sons of God (8:41) but neither know their Father nor the Son whom God sent (cf. 5:37–38; 8:19; 15:20–24; 16:3).⁷⁸⁴ Just as the narrator previously dealt with the Psalms’ texts, in the same way, the narrator relates Zechariah’s piercing against God to the act of piercing against Jesus physically as the scriptural text being fulfilled in a *literal* way. Thus, concurring with the OPoV in Zech 12, John’s narrator shows that those who did the piercing are the people. In Zech 12:10, the one whom the people pierced and later would look unto is the Lord himself. In John 19:37, the one whom the people pierced is Jesus, and those who will *see* Jesus later are his believers/followers (14:19). The fulfillment not

⁷⁸² Boda, *Haggai, Zechariah*, 487, “it is not speaking directly of the death of someone; rather, it is using mourning to describe penitential response to God.”

⁷⁸³ Cf. Harris, *John*, 320. Harris only indicates the subjects of “ὁψονται.”

⁷⁸⁴ In John’s narrative, Jesus explicitly points out the “not knowing” of the people. E.g., 3:10 (Nicodemus); 4:22 (Samaritans); 8:14–55 (the Jews). On the contrary, the Jewish leaders claim that they know, e.g., 3:2; 7:49–52; 9:24–29; cf. 11:49.

only refers to the acts of piercing and looking but to the one pierced, Jesus, who is also identified as the Lord—YHWH—pierced by the people (cf. 1:23; 12:39–40). According to John’s NPoV, Jesus is the μονογενὴς θεός, the only one who makes the Father revealed (1:14, 18). Jesus also claims, “I and the Father, we are one.” In his crucifixion, Jesus fully reveals the glory of the Father (12:28; 17:4–5),⁷⁸⁵ and Jesus’s divine identify as the Lord of Israel is revealed. The people who believe will then *see* him, just as the narrative will show in the following passage of Jesus’s resurrection.

In the immediate context of Zech 12:10, the Lord’s eschatological restoration for his people is accompanied by the pouring out of the Spirit and the cleansing of the fountain (Zech 13:1–2). In John’s narrative, Jesus is the one who will grant/send the *Spirit* (cf. John 1:33; 7:38–39; 14:16–17; 20:22), and blood and *water* come from him.⁷⁸⁶ *Water* has a symbolic connection to the Spirit in John.⁷⁸⁷ Both Jesus’s blood and Jesus-given water are tightly related to the new life, which the Spirit will bring (John 3:3, 5; 6:53–56). In this imagery, the narrator presents Jesus activating the work of the Spirit that the Lord has promised to restore his people (Zech 12:1; 13:1, 9; 14:8). Jesus is the one from whom the life-giving blood and water—the life-giving Spirit—come. For the NPoV, Jesus’s crucifixion, as the sacrificed lamb, accomplishes the restoration work that the Lord promised to his people, giving them new life.

In the last combined quotations related to the scene after Jesus’s death, the narrator tells that the Scripture is fulfilled. With the previous fulfillment-purpose quotations (except 12:39–

⁷⁸⁵ Also see 5:17; 6:57; 8:58; 12:45; 14:9.

⁷⁸⁶ See a brief discussion on scholars’ interpretations in Beutler, *John*, 491–92.

⁷⁸⁷ *Water* in John is a symbol connected to the Spirit (e.g., 3:5; 4:14). Cf. Bauckham, *Glory*, 82–90; Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 192–95; Larry Paul Jones, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*, JSNTSup 145 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 225. Also Burge, *John*, 533, sees the connection between Jesus’s “giving his Spirit” in 19:30 and the water here. Keener, *John*, 1153, suggests that here is the climax of John’s water motif.

40), the narrator in John 19:36 refers to Jesus as the Righteous Sufferer and the Suffering Servant, who is the Sacrificial Lamb of God. The narrator in John 19:37 demonstrates the pierced Jesus as the Lord who promised to restore his people, being their God and their King, whose tremendous glory—the Holy God and the Highest King—was once seen by Isaiah, just as illustrated in John 12:41. The NPoV is clear that Jesus, though rejected and pierced to death by the Jews, is no other than the restoring Lord of Israel (cf. 2:17–22). Paradoxically but truly, by being killed as the Suffering Servant Lamb, Jesus manifests God’s glory—God himself.

5.3 John’s Formulaic Explicit OT Quotations and Christology in the Narrative

In John’s narrative world,⁷⁸⁸ the Scripture—the word of God—is the norm for the life of Jewish people (cf. 1:17; 9:29), which includes their ancestral stories as the reference of their lives (e.g., 4:12; 6:31; 8:39), the regulations of their life practices (e.g., 2:6; 5:18; 7:52), and the promises concerning their eschatological lives (e.g., 1:45; 5:39).⁷⁸⁹ However, Jesus explicitly indicates that they neither believe nor understand what is written in the Scripture (3:12; 5:46–47; 7:16–19),⁷⁹⁰ so they do not believe what Jesus says (8:45; 10:25). Disbelieving Jesus implies their unbelief in the word of God (5:38; 8:47), which is the narrative evaluative point of view on the Jews’ attitude toward Jesus and the Scripture. The Jews do believe the coming of a messianic figure (cf. 1:19–25; 7:40–52; 10:24); nevertheless, since they do not have God’s word in them, what they believe concerning the Messiah is from their own evaluative point of view rather than from the point of view of Scripture. Therefore, their messianism makes Jesus unqualified (e.g., 5:18; 6:30; 10:33).⁷⁹¹ Jesus does not entrust himself to their belief (2:24; 16:30–31). Jesus

⁷⁸⁸ John’s narrative world may present the historical world in Jesus’s days.

⁷⁸⁹ These can be illustrated by the semi-quotations in 7:42 (for eschatological) and 8:17 (for daily).

⁷⁹⁰ Concerning 3:12, see p. 61.

⁷⁹¹ See discussion in 2.3.3.

contends that the Scriptures bear witness about him (5:39). The narrator also has the scriptural texts help witness to Jesus as the Messiah/the Son of God (20:30). For this very purpose of the narrative, it is significant not only that Jesus is the Messiah/the Son of God/the King of Israel (1:41–49) but also that Jesus is the Scripture-defined Messiah/Son of God/King of Israel (1:50–51), which is also the God-promised One.

In the uses of QFs in the whole narrative, the narrator shows his point of view on the ideological plane. In Uspensky's terms, the regular QF forms in John are the narrator's *fixed epithets* where the narrator's ideological point of view on the use of OT texts can be found.⁷⁹² In quoting the OT quotations, the narrator flags the phraseological influences from the OT. By using QFs that are in form similar to the formulae found in the OT, Second Temple Jewish writings, and the NT, the narrator adopts their ideological point of view on the word of God. The word of God is to be observed and fulfilled. John's QFs, whether the "it is written" pattern or the fulfillment-purpose mode, act to bridge the recent (con)text and the OT (con)text, not only in the light of linkage on the terminological surface but also by virtue of corresponding in the deeper ideological point of view.⁷⁹³ However, unlike other Jewish writings, John's OT quotations are all concentrated on Jesus alone. Phraseologically, as Obermann suggests, the quotations led by the "it is written" mode witness to Jesus's ministry as *implicit* fulfillment of the Scripture, and those led by the fulfillment purpose pattern for the Christ event as *explicit* fulfillment.⁷⁹⁴ Ideologically, for the narrator, the Scripture witnesses to Jesus's perfect fulfillment of the word of God and finds itself complete in Jesus. Furthermore, the parallelism between the Scripture—the word of

⁷⁹² Uspensky, *A Poetics of Composition*, 13–16; 123–24.

⁷⁹³ John's last combined quotations in 19:36–37 are an example.

⁷⁹⁴ Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung*, 80, 348–50.

God—and the word of Jesus can also be seen in John’s QFs for the semi-quotations that report fulfillment of Jesus’s word (17:12; 18:9, 32; cf. 21:19).

When an OT text is quoted in John’s narrative, one can observe not only that the text itself is quoted but also that the whole contextual picture of the quoted text is in view of John’s context (e.g., Isa 6 in John 12). The quoted text is not independently derived from its original OT context, which displays the OPoVs. Similarly, a scriptural text in John is not isolated from the narrative context, which demonstrates the NPoV. Accordingly, the OT quotations are not only functioning as proof-texts that simply substantiate some argument, but they also interact with John’s context by their OPoVs to elucidate Jesus as the Scripture-qualified Messiah. In John’s narrative, the Scripture explains Jesus’s event; Jesus also fulfills the Scripture. The word of God and the Word interpret each other. Thus, among John’s account of Jesus’s signs and speeches, which lead those blind to the truth (cf. 7:15–18; 10:25, 37–38), the Scripture in John’s narrative functions to establish the evaluative point of view that is concurrent with God’s. The formulaic OT scriptural texts then function as indexes to the precise ideological stance of the Scripture—of God—on Jesus, exposing in the narrative the true definition of the Messiah/the Son of God, the incarnated Word and ultimately God himself (1:14–18).⁷⁹⁵

Moreover, the formulaic OT quotations function to help to see the issues of the people’s *belief* in the narrative clearly. Throughout the narrative, the narrator keeps showing an irony on belief. When the people and the disciples show their belief unto Jesus, the narrator displays Jesus’s damper on their belief (e.g., 1:50–51; 2:23–25; 8:31; 16:30–31). Just as the narrator signals in 2:22, the post-Easter belief, which is true and precise belief, has to be completed with

⁷⁹⁵ John 1:17 also tells that Jesus Christ enacts God’s character—God himself—as full of the $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$ -דְּכֻפָּה and the ἀληθεῖα-אֱמֶת, which is what the word of God (represented by Moses’s Law) is all about. Bauckham, *Glory*, 52.

believing *both* the Scripture *and* Jesus (cf. 12:16; 20:9; 20:28). Put in other words, without believing the Scripture, one cannot believe in Jesus as the Messiah; without believing in Jesus and his word, one is not believing in the word of God. Thus, twice in the context of unbelieving God's word, Jesus in 5:42–47 and the narrator in 12:37–43 confirm that the Jews' failure to love God and seek God's glory is the very reason they do not and cannot believe. Therefore, John's quotations in the narrative not merely hint at the theme of rejecting of Jesus⁷⁹⁶ but more provide the precise descriptions about the Messiah—scriptural fulfillment in Jesus—which the Jewish people ignore due to their unbelief.

In John's narrative, Jesus is fully God's Messiah, which means the Messiah according to God's point of view, speaking God's word and performing God's work. For those who do not know God, their evaluative points of view differ from God's, and they would not identify Jesus as the Messiah. Throughout the narrative, Jesus insists that his work is God's work and that his word is God's word, whether his healing on the Sabbath or his ultimate judgment on the eschaton (cf. 5:17–30; 12:44–50). This ideological point of view is the core of John's Prologue. Therefore, in this way, the sense of correspondence between the texts that John's QFs convey also means that Jesus by all means reveals the will of God, the word of God, or even God himself. No single piece in Jesus's life does not accord with the word written in the Scripture, nor fulfill the word of God. Put in other words, Jesus the Son of God fully obeys the Father in every aspect. Thus, in John's Prologue, this Jesus is the divine Word preexisting in the beginning and the Word incarnating and tabernacling among his people. He is completely full of God's characters (1:14)

⁷⁹⁶ Humann, "Function and Form," 34.

though rejected by them. The narrator has mapped out his Christology in the very beginning of the Gospel. This point of view governs his narrative.

John's Christology, then, is explicated more by John the Baptist, the witness sent from God in the narrative in order to reveal to Israel the One who comes after. In the first quotation, John the Baptist hints that the One who comes after him is the Lord who will bring his salvation for his people (John 1:23; Isa 40:3). This implication of John the Baptist's quotation is also the narrative evaluative point of view on Jesus, identifying Jesus as the Lord of Israel. John the Baptist then declares something striking. In John 1:29 and 1:36, when *seeing Jesus*, John declares, "Behold, the Lamb of God, taking the sin of the world." For the Jewish people in the narrative world, a lamb that takes the sin means being killed as a sacrifice. However, between the two declarations, John the Baptist says that he *has seen and witnessed* that this man, *Jesus*, is the Son of God (1:34). The title certainly refers to the King of Israel—Messiah (cf. 6:14–15; 19:7, 12), who is not reckoned as dying or being killed but remaining forever (12:31–34). Such a paradox has appeared in the prologue, that the Creator is not received by the created world (1:5, 11), and then will be shown through the narrative. Moreover, John the Baptist also witnesses about what God said to him regarding the coming One. Jesus is the one baptizing with the Holy Spirit, which is tightly related both to the eternal life God gives and the right relationship with the Father (cf. 3:3, 5–6; 4:14, 23; 7:38–39). Also, the Holy Spirit is firmly connected to the truth, the word of God (cf. 3:16:13–15; 4:23). The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of the Truth (14:17; 15:26; 16:13). Therefore, in John the Baptist's short testimony, John's Christology is sketched, which is the precise definition for the Messiah. He is the one about whom Moses and the Prophets wrote, and the Son of God—King of Israel, that the first group of disciples recognize and title (1:41, 45, 49), though they do not perceive him in the same way yet. John the Baptist's

testimony at the same time illuminates Jesus's *Son of Man* upon whom the angels of God ascend and descend (1:51). Before the spotlight moves away from him, John the Baptist leaves his succinct but perfect introduction to the Christ (3:28; 10:41; cf. 1:23). This Messiah is not the messiah that the Jewish leaders and people suppose. Such a Christology then will be elucidated and elaborated by those OT quotations and their contexts in the narrative.

In the first half of the narrative, according to the OPoVs of the OT texts, the quotations in John 2:17 and 12:13–17 refer to Jesus as the coming royal figure⁷⁹⁷ who is bringing God's deliverance and restoration for God's people. His zeal is for the revival of the household of God, both the Jewish people and the nations, through himself. Such a Messiah, is not a worldly political governor (cf. 6:15; 18:36) but a King of God's people (cf. 12:32; 18:37). In addition, he is identified as the Lord in the midst of his people (Zeph 3:16–17). Both contexts of the quotations hint that the restoration has to be done by Jesus's physical death and resurrection, which is Jesus's hour of glorification (2:19–21; 12:7, 16, 23). The narrator articulates the disciples' later retrospect/belief of the Scripture in both immediate contexts. As the Messiah/Son of God/the King of Israel, Jesus is the one, the promised returning Lord, who comes as the delivering King to restore the repentant people by giving his own life (cf. 10:1–18; Ezek 34).⁷⁹⁸

John's narrator makes this Christology more elaborate in the second half of the narrative while Jesus's hour comes. In the combined quotations in John 12:38–40 and 19:36–37,⁷⁹⁹ the Suffering Servant and the Paschal Lamb are in sight (12:38; 19:36). In their OT contexts (Isa

⁷⁹⁷ They are Jesus's first time and last time entry to Jerusalem in John, respectively.

⁷⁹⁸ This life-giving King then is portrayed in John 10 as the Good Shepard, who is the God-like/David-titled Shepard promised in Ezek 34.

⁷⁹⁹ John 12:38 has Isa 53 as the backdrop to transit the narrative from Jesus's earthly ministry to Jesus's passion narrative. The quotation alludes to the unbelief of the Jews and hints that their unbelief leads Jesus towards the death.

52:13–53:12; Ps 34:20), the righteous sufferer is innocent, which is also displayed in Jesus's quotations in his Farewell Discourse and his crucifixion (John 13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28). Along with John's contexts, the narrator displays Jesus as the rejected/disbelieved Servant of the Lord who gives his life as the sin-bearing lamb to be killed without a bone broken (Exod 12:46; Num 9:12) and as the Lamb of God who takes the sin of the world. In this way, the life-sacrificed Messiah gives eternal life to all by his blood and water. Furthermore, both the second quotations from these two combined sets (John 12:39–40; 19:37) convey the point of view of the OT texts (Isa 6; Zech 12) on the high-lifted and glorious Lord who was offended/pierced by the rebellion of his people but still prepares the restoration for the repentant/remnant ones. The narrator's phraseology incontrovertibly identifies Jesus as the glorified and highly lifted One whose glory has been glimpsed by Isaiah as the Holy One of Israel and will be looked unto by the repentant believers on That Day. Moreover, the contextual phraseology of Isa 6 and Zech 12 clearly marks that the Lord is the only God and King of his people.

Those Christological significances, in fact, penetrate John's whole narrative. In the Prologue, the Word is the True Light, the life-giving Creator, who comes to lighten the world but is rejected by the world and his own people (1:9–11; cf. 12:46). The Jews' reactions about Jesus's word also suggest Jesus's blasphemy, which reflects Jesus making himself equal to the Lord of Israel (5:17–18; 8:51–59; 10:30–31, 38–39). Indeed, Jesus repeatedly says, "I Am" (4:26; 6:20; 8:24, 28, 58; 13:19; 18:5–8). He also asserts his pre-creation existence (8:58; 17:5, 24) and his eschatological authority to perform judgment and to raise of the dead (5:20–29; 12:48). At the same time, Jesus adverts that he comes as a man to give his life in order that all who believe may have eternal life (e.g., 3:14–17; 6:53–58; 10:11–18). Even the adversary figure Caiaphas ironically has a high priest's prophecy about Jesus's death for the whole nation and the children

of God (11:49–52). Jesus also exposes Mary’s intention of anointing Jesus for his burial (12:3–7). Undoubtedly, in Jesus’s Farewell Discourse, Jesus’s leaving the world for the Father is the primary topic. Therefore, the explicit OT quotations just mentioned perfectly provide the scriptural points of view on John’s Christology, helping portray Jesus as Messiah in John’s narrative.

As just mentioned, the four texts (13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 28) quoted from Psalms in Jesus’s Farewell Discourse and his crucifixion unquestionably display Jesus as the innocent righteous sufferer. However, unlike the psalmist (titled as David), Jesus is truly innocent of sins while the psalmist in his Psalms claims the need of God’s pardon (e.g., Pss 41:4; 69:5). As those quotations with the fulfillment-purpose QFs, the narrator shows that those poetic languages for the righteous sufferer now literally and physically happen in Jesus’s last suffering, being betrayed by one of the close disciples and hated without a cause. In addition, on the cross, the soldiers’ dividing of Jesus’s clothes and the way they treat Jesus’s thirst occur as the Scripture being fulfilled. These four quotations all sound from Jesus’s point of view with first person pronouns.⁸⁰⁰ Through the quotations, the narrator shows that Jesus is truly willing to fulfill God’s will (cf. 14:31; 17:4) “with Jesus’s full knowledge and participation.”⁸⁰¹ This complete concurrence with God’s will particularly clear in the three occurrences of $\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ in 19:28–30 as Jesus’s knowing, purposing, and claiming the complement of the will/word of God the Father. Jesus, by willingly being the Lamb of God, is truly the Son of God (cf. 17:1–5; 12:28).

While the second half of the narrative is about Jesus’s sacrificing his own life, the first half of the narrative is mostly about Jesus’s speeches of giving eternal life, which is the Father’s

⁸⁰⁰ John 19:24 is a narratorial comment sounding as in Jesus’s psychological point of view.

⁸⁰¹ Hays, *Echoes*, §16, “Come and See.” Also cf. 17:12; 18:9, 32.

commandment for Jesus (12:50; cf. 20:31). The explicit OT quotations in 6:31, 6:45, and 10:34 in that context imply Jesus as the Messiah/the Son of God who gives life to those who believe his word (3:15–16; 5:24; 6:40, 47). In John 6, Jesus asserts that he is the bread of life, that is, the bread of God from heaven that gives life (6:33, 35, 48, 51, 58). Jesus’s point of view is in opposition to the crowd’s misunderstanding of the Scripture (quoted from Ps 78; cf. 6:14–15). This bread of life has to do with the word of God. Having Jesus as the bread of life means believing and obeying his word (John 6:56–58; 8:31, 51). Jesus explicates it in John 6:63: “It is the Spirit that gives life; the flesh is useless. The words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life.” Just as Jesus’s quotations in 6:45 and 10:34 imply, Jesus is the only one able to *interpret* the Father and *teach* the word of God, the perfect Son of God (1:18; 6:46; 10:36). Jesus the Messiah/the Son of God is the life giver (cf. 1:3–5), truly conveying the word of God so that whoever believes may have life.

In John’s narrative, Jesus refers to the life as the mutual relationship with him, as well as with the Father. Those who have eternal life (never seeing death) are the ones who listen to and obey Jesus’s word and God’s word (6:56–58; 8:31, 51; 14:23; 15:3–8). The Good Shepherd saying in 10:1–29 clearly portrays this imagery. Moreover, as Jesus mentions in John, the word of God is the truth, which is tightly associated with the Spirit (14:17; 15:26; 16:13). Jesus the Messiah/the Son of God is the Word of God, able to teach the word of God—the truth—faithfully (8:32, 40–46; 18:37), and he sends the Spirit of Truth (14:16–17, 26; 16:13–15) so that those who believe and obey his word have right worshiping relationship with God (4:21–23) and become the children of God (1:13; 3:3, 5; cf. 10:34–36).⁸⁰² Jesus the Messiah activates the

⁸⁰² See discussion in p. 177 (n. 633).

restoration work of the Spirit promised in the Scripture (7:38–39)⁸⁰³ to which the OT contexts of John’s first and the last quotations (1:23; 19:37) clearly refer (cf. Isa 40:7 ;42:1; Zech 13:1; 14:7). Therefore, the three quotations in John 6:31, 6:45, and 10:34 in the context provide the scriptural point of view on the Messiah’s ministry of the word of God, which is also his ministry of giving life. Just as the word of God is supposed to be obeyed and fulfilled in the OT, for John’s narrative, the word of Jesus is also to be obeyed and fulfilled. Jesus the Messiah/the Son of God is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit, by which one can possess eternal life and restore right relationship with the Father.

The narrator has John the Baptist as God’s witness testify for Jesus after the Prologue. John the Baptist, following what the narrator has mapped in the Prologue, explicates that Jesus is the Lamb of God and the Son of God who is originally before John the Baptist. In addition, Jesus is the one who possesses the Holy Spirit and baptizes in the Holy Spirit. In John the Baptist’s OT text from Isaiah, Jesus is identified as the Lord of Israel. John the Baptist’s testimony is considered accurate and true (5:32–33; 10:41); however, Jesus appeals to a greater witness, the Scripture (5:36–39). John’s explicit OT quotations then play a prominent role in conveying the scriptural point of view on Jesus the Messiah, which is also God’s point of view.⁸⁰⁴ In the narrative, those OT quotations elucidate and elaborate the Christology mapped in the Prologue and in John the Baptist’s declaration. For the narrator, Jesus is the Messiah, the Scripture-defined Messiah. He is the servant-king agent of the Lord bringing the Lord’s deliverance and shares the very identity of the returning Lord of Israel to restore the people and the world. He is the

⁸⁰³ Regarding the potential scriptural sources, see the references in nn. 280 and 281. Also, Carson, *John*, 321–28.

⁸⁰⁴ Zumstein, “Intratextuality and Intertextuality,” 134, suggests that the use of the Scripture “should not be viewed in isolation but rather should be seen as composing a coherent whole that creates a hermeneutical background for the entire discourse.”

Messiah, giving life to the believers by giving his own life as the sin-bearing Lamb. In this way, he gives the Spirit of Truth in order that believers may have right relationships with God in his word, knowing God and doing the will of God. He is the Son of God who is willing to fulfill the word of God so that he go toward the hour to be the crucified King of Israel (12:27). There, he shares the highly lifted glory of the Father. This Messiah/Son of God/King of Israel is what Jesus refers to as the Son of Man upon whom the angels of God ascending and descending (1:51).

6 CONCLUSION

This paper looks at the literary features on the genre and primary structure of John's Gospel in the second chapter and the concept of the scriptural writings in John's narrative world in the third. The following two chapters survey the uses of QFs in Jewish literature, the NT, and the Gospel of John and every explicit OT quotations in John's Gospel. The conclusion of this paper is threefold.

6.1 The Scripture Witnesses Jesus as the God-Promised/Defined Messiah

The literary genre of the Gospel as a βίος suggests that John's narrative is about the person of Jesus with emphasis on his death. The theological concern and Jewish salvation-historical interest come through as Jesus's βίος unfolds. John's selectivity of OT elements in the Gospel, as one of the ancient historiographical features, reinforces the historicity of Jesus's events, not only that Jesus's events are historically vivid but also that Jesus's events occurred according to and corresponding to the Scripture written in the history of Israel. The Scripture of Jewish salvation-history witnesses Jesus as the God-promised Christ.

The survey of the Gospel's literary structure shows that the witness languages for Jesus are used throughout the whole narrative. In the purpose statement of the narrative, the narrator states that the Gospel testifies for Jesus's identity in hopes that the readers may have right belief (come to believe or deepen their belief) in him and possess eternal life through him (20:30–31). In the prologue and the beginning of the narrative, the narrator appeals to John the Baptist who is the witness from God to reveal Jesus as the coming One, as well as the sacrificing Lamb of God and the Son of God, who activates the promised pouring out of the Holy Spirit. He has the same purpose that all may believe in the Light (1:7–8; cf. 3:26–30; 10:41–42). In the whole narrative, the narrator testifies for Jesus by presenting Jesus's deeds and speeches. Jesus himself intends to

complete the Father's work and will that whoever believes may have eternal life. Thus, the content of the entire book is about Jesus, more specifically, about Jesus's true identity as the life-giving Messiah, the Son of God (1:14; 12:50; 20:31), who is ontologically beyond historical time (1:1–2) and space (21:25), above all creatures and human beings (1:3; 12:47–48), but fleshly within time and space for a period among the Jewish people with the purpose that all may have life (1:4–5). Jesus the protagonist in the narrative declares that the scriptural writings are his witnesses (5:39; cf. 3:12; 5:46–47). Therefore, such a Christology is not defined by the concepts among the Jewish authorities or understandings of the Jewish people but by the word of the Father who sent his Son and bears witness to him through his own word written in Israel's Scripture. The Scripture in Jesus's view is the place where one can find the most reliable testimony about him.

In John's narrative, the Scripture serves as the authoritative word from God and the standard value in the narrative world, despite the various denotations, whether narrowly a regulation/text within it or a concept about eschaton or Messiah from it, or broadly the sacred Writing as a whole or the collective writings that consist of Moses's Law and the Prophets. As the narrative plays out, the Scripture provides timely words about Jesus the protagonist so that the identity of the Messiah may be understood correspondingly and correctly. Inside the narrative world, the Scripture is clearly acknowledged as the word of God, supposed to be comprehended and observed by all characters. However, the Scripture seems obscure to all characters. Jesus is the only one who in every aspect accords with the Scripture. Thus, the Scripture provides correct description and vindication for Jesus's identity and ministry, and Jesus's words and works manifest the significance of the Scriptures. As far as the narrative goes, the Scripture proves its

fulfillment in Jesus's events that display the Scripture-defined messiahship. The fulfillment of the Scripture then denotes that Jesus is the climax of salvation-history.

While he presents that the Scripture witnesses Jesus as the Messiah in the narrative, the narrator signals Jesus's glorification as the hermeneutical key to the Scripture (2:22; 7:39; 12:16; 20:9). Thus, what is written or said in the Scripture finds its accordance in Jesus's events in the narrative. The narrator's insistence of both the Scripture and Jesus's word being fulfilled also suggests the perfect concurrence between them. Moreover, the Scripture in the narrative, in fact, also implies a collection of the writings that were written by Moses and the prophets in days past. For the characters inside the narrative and the narrator outside the narrative, the Scripture is the written record of God's words about salvation-history for them. For the narrator and Jesus, the Scripture is not only something literary but also the word of God, said and written in the past and being spoken and fulfilled in their days and the days to come while God's saving work is being fulfilled.

6.2 The Function of John's QFs as the Narrator's Fixed Epithets for the NPoV

Concerning the QFs, John basically employs two patterns: the "it is written" preceding every OT quotation in the first half of the narrative (except 1:23) and the "that the word/scripture may be fulfilled" for every quotation in the second half. The regular use and distribution of them in the narrative show that the forms of QFs are the narrator's *fixed epithets*, which express the narrator's ideological point of view on the Scripture as Jesus's witness. John's QF forms follow the techniques of his Jewish ancestors and the other NT writers and differ from Josephus and Philo's. In that Scripture-based literary milieu, John's QFs are recognized by his audiences as signifiers evoking their attention to the correspondence between the events narrated and the (con)texts adopted. Given that the literary genre and the book structure suggest that John's

Gospel is Jesus-centered and that the formulaic OT texts are related to Jesus's events, the QFs then flag the scriptural texts as indexes to John's Christology. John has his QFs *uniformed* in his narrative, despite who the formula user is the crowd, Jesus, or himself. Thus, while Matthew has the fulfillment QFs in his authorial comments to show the motif of fulfillment in his Gospel, John's phraseological works on the QFs attributed to various quoters suggest his point of view on the formulaic quoted texts, as well as the Scripture as a whole. Such a use emphasizes that the *written* Scripture is the source from which John quotes the written word of God that relates to Jesus's ministry, and the word of the Scripture finds *fulfillment* in Jesus's life. John's QFs signal the explicit quotations. They help the OT quotations led by them become the index of John's portrayal of Jesus the Messiah. The QFs and the OT quotations together evoke the attention to the written word of God as the divine point of view on Jesus the Messiah. The written word of God is fulfilled in Jesus's days (as the other NT writers claim), just like God's word was fulfilled in the history of Israel (as the OT writers accounted). Furthermore, the word of God is ultimately completed in the Word of God.

6.3 The Explicit OT Quotations as an Index to John's Christology—Jesus the Messiah, Giving Life by Delivering up His Own Life

In John's first chapter, the narrator, by *telling* about the Word in the Prologue and *showing* the declarations of John the Baptist about Jesus, maps his Christology. Jesus the Messiah is the glorious Lord of life (1:1–9, 14, 23; Isa 40). By giving his own life (John 1:10–11, 14, 29, 36), he gives eternal life to the world (1:4–5, 13–17, 33) so that those who believe may become the children of God (1:12–13). The narration of the chapters in the first part (the hour has not yet come) is about Jesus as the one who can grant eternal life (e.g., 3:15–16; 6:33, 35; 11:25) by sacrificing of his own life (e.g., 2:19; 7:33–34; 10:11–18). The account of the passages

in the second part (the hour has come) then focuses on the realization of Jesus's delivering up his own life, which is the hour of glorification. Jesus's ministry anticipates his hour of glorification; the hour of glorification accomplishes the purpose of Jesus's works and words. Moreover, throughout the narrative, the narrator and the protagonist Jesus repeatedly convey Jesus's divine identity (e.g., 3:31–35; 8:51–58; 10:30) as the Lord of Israel in the Scripture.

The implications of John's OT quotations are also clearly distributed in accordance with the plot of narrative. Regarding the QFs, in the first half of the narrative, the first QF by John the Baptist indicates the unfolding of God's promise just *as Isaiah the prophet said*. The QFs of the *written* mode signify that Jesus acting as the restorer of his people and the life giver accords with *what has been already written* in the Scripture. In the rest of the narrative, the QFs with the *fulfillment-purpose* type affirm that the events happening in Jesus's hour is *the words in the Scripture being fulfilled*, just as Jesus's word about his death is fulfilled. The QFs indicate, for the narrator, that all the Scripture texts are *explicitly* fulfilled in Jesus's events.⁸⁰⁵ The explicit (formulaic) OT scriptural texts then function as the index to the precise ideological stance of the Scripture—of God—on Jesus, exposing in the narrative the true definition of the Messiah who is the incarnated Word and ultimately God himself (1:14–18). The explicit OT quotations also function to help see clear the issues of the people's belief in the narrative.

Regarding the OT quotations, following the plot of the narrative, they concur with the testimonies of the narrator and John the Baptist and provide an index to Jesus as the Messiah, the Scripture-defined Messiah. Jesus is the One that Isaiah predicted in Isa 40, as John the Baptist's quotation hints, the returning Lord, bringing God's comfort and restoration and the revelation of

⁸⁰⁵ Jesus's words about his *successors*, his disciples/believers and the Holy Spirit, will also be fulfilled (cf. John 13–17; 21).

the creating Lord's glory, which is the everlasting word of God (Isa 40:8). In addition, he is the coming King of Israel to deliver his people (John 12:13–16; Ps 118; Zech 9:9; Zeph 3:15).

Clearly, Jesus is identified as the Lord of Israel, YHWH, and the mission of Jesus is to restore the creation (cf. 1:1–13). Jesus is the One who is to restore the relationship between the people and their God, the human beings and their Creator (John 12:13–15). He himself is the House of God, only through which those who believe are able to be the true household of God, the children of God, having right relationship to the Father (John 2:17; Ps 69; cf. Gen 28:12). This is the eternal life—the God-granted life, the Spirit-born life—that Jesus is to give. It has to be done by sacrificing his own life. In the first half of the narrative, the Holy Spirit, the living water, the light, and the gate of the sheep are all associated to the life that Jesus—the one who is about to be lifted—is to give. In his last sign in John 11, as the climactic one, Jesus claims, “I am the resurrection and the life” (John 11:25). Jesus is the bread of life that God gives from heaven in order to grant the life to the world (John 6:31–6:35; Ps 78), indicating Israel's obligation to obey God's word. Jesus is the Son of God, the only one who has seen God and truly practices the word of God, able to convey perfectly and teach faithfully the word of God (John 6:44–46; 10:34–36; Isa 54:13; Ps 82:6). By believing in Jesus and obeying Jesus's word (i.e., eating Jesus's flesh and drinking his blood), one at the same time believes in God and obeys the word of God and possesses the eternal life. Jesus is the lifted Son of Man (John 3:14; 12:23, 34) as the rebuilt Beth-El (2:19), where the household of God meets their God (1:51). He is also the returning Lord to his place and his city (Jerusalem/Zion) to restore all (2:13–21; 12:12–16). For the narrator, all these Christological significances are in accordance with *what is written* in the Scripture. The OT quotations in the context of the first half part of the narrative help explain Jesus the Messiah as the One who grants eternal life to all. The first half of the narrative prepares the second half.

The second half of the narrative is the account showing how Jesus fulfills this life-giving ministry. Jesus is the one who gives life by giving his own life. The unbelief of the rebellious people of God, once in Isaiah's time, is still against the servant of God in Jesus time. Jesus, as the Suffering Servant, is forsaken by the Jews and becomes the sin-bearing Paschal Lamb (John 12:38; 19:36; Isa 52–53; Exod 12:46). This will of the Lord is foretold and now fully fulfilled in Jesus the Messiah as the Lamb of God taking the sin of the world. Meanwhile, for the narrator, Jesus's divine identity as the Lord of Israel again is unveiled in the people's obstinacy and rebellion. The narrator tells boldly that the glory of the Lord glimpsed by Isaiah is the glory of Jesus the Messiah (John 12:39–41; Isa 6). In addition, Jesus is the One being pierced by his people and then being looked unto, the Lord of Israel (John 19:37; Zech 12). On those events, the narrator asserts that the Scripture is fulfilled. Jesus's wrong treatment is accordant with the will of God in order that he may become the sacrificial lamb, bearing the sin of all. However, Jesus is the righteous sufferer, willing to obey the word of God and fulfill the will of God with his full knowledge and participation (cf. John 2:4). In the betrayal of his disciple Judas (John 13:18; Ps 41:9) and the hatred of the world (John 15:25; Ps 69), he is crucified naked without being treated as a living one (John 19:24; Ps 22). As knowing all the work of God is completed in his crucifixion, he gives his spirit as the truly righteous sufferer (John 19:38; Ps 69). By his crucifixion with blood and water coming out, the narrator implies that Jesus the Messiah is the one who gives life to all by giving his own life as the innocent Lamb of God (John 19:33–37). The accounts of Jesus's burial and resurrection also echoes God's rebuilding the Temple (John 2:20–21), the vindication of his Suffering Servant (Isa 52–53; John 2:19–22; 20:9), who as the arm of the Lord fulfills the salvation of God (Isa 52:9–10). For the narrator, the Scripture, the word/will of God is fulfilled not only in Jesus's crucifixion but also in Jesus's glorification as the

Lord's glorification. The OT quotations in the context of the second half part of the narrative help clarify the realization of Jesus's giving life by delivering up his own life. John's use of explicit OT quotations as an index of his Christology in the narrative indicates Jesus as the Scripture-defined Messiah, the Father-sent Son. This Messiah is the Son of Man that the blind should see and believe (John 1:51; 9:35–37). Jesus the Messiah completes and fulfills the word; the Word of God completely reveals the Father.

APPENDIX

Chart 1: *Quotations* in the Gospel of John

Bold: Introductory Formula Key Word <i>Italic:</i> Obscure Formula/Ref.		[]): Formula Shadowed: Semi-Quotation	“”: Quotation	
Ref.	Quotation Formula	Quotation	Attribution	Misc.
1:23	ἔφη ἐγὼ ... καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης	Isa 40:3	John the Baptist	
1:51	<i>ὄψεσθε</i>	Gen 28:12	Jesus	Semi- ([]=?)
2:17	γεγραμμένον ἐστίν	Ps 69:9	Disciples	
6:31	καθὼς ἐστίν γεγραμμένον	Ps 78:24	The Jews	
6:45	ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις	Isa 54:13	Jesus	
7:38	καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή	?	Jesus	Semi- (“”=?)
7:42	οὐχ ἡ γραφή εἶπεν ὅτι	? (<i>Ps 89:3–4</i>)	The Crowd	Semi- (“”=?)
8:17	ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ γέγραπται ὅτι	? (<i>Deut 17:6</i>)	Jesus	Semi- (“”=?)
10:34	ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι	Ps 82:6	Jesus	
12:13	<i>ἐκράυγαζον</i>	Ps 118:25–26; Isa 44:6/Zeph 3:15	The crowd	Semi- ([]=?)
12:14–15	καθὼς ἐστίν γεγραμμένον ·	Zech 9:9	Narrator	
12:27	---	Ps 6:3–4	Jesus	Semi- ([]=?)
12:38	ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν	Isa 53:1	Narrator	Combined
12:39–40	πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ·	Isa 6:10	Narrator	
13:18	ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ·	Ps 41:9	Jesus	
15:25	ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος ὅτι	Ps 35:19/69:4	Jesus	
17:12	ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ	?	Jesus	Semi- (“”=?)
18:9	ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν ὅτι	? (6:39?)	Narrator	Semi- (“”=?)
18:32	ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν	? (Jesus’s word; 12:32–33?)	Narrator	Semi- (“”=?)
19:24	ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ [ἡ λέγουσα]·	Ps 22:18	Narrator	
19:28	ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή ·	Ps 69:21	Narrator/ Jesus	
19:36	ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ·	Exod 12:46/Num 9:12/Ps 34:20	Narrator	Combined
19:37	πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφή λέγει ·	Zech 12:10	Narrator	

Chart 2: The Occurrences of γραφή and γράφω in John

Bold: the verb formUnderlined: the noun form

**· γράμμα (written work)

Shadowed: quotation related*Italic:* specified source

Ref.	Text	OT Ref. if available	Attribution	Actor (writing)
1:45	ὃν ἔγραψεν Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφῆται εὐρήκαμεν,		Philip	Moses and the prophets
2:17	ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι γεγραμμένον ἐστίν·	Ps 69:9	Narrator/Disciples	
2:22	ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῇ <u>γραφῇ</u> καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.	(the first γραφή)	Narrator	
5:39	ἐραυνάτε <u>τὰς γραφάς</u> , ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζῶν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ·	(plurality)	Jesus	
5:46	περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν .		Jesus	Moses
5:47	εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου *γράμμασιν* οὐ πιστεύετε		Jesus	
6:31	οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον ·	Ps 78:24	The crowd	
6:45	ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς <i>προφήταις</i> ·	Isa 54:13	Jesus	(a prophet)
7:15	πὼς οὗτος *γράμματα* οἶδεν μὴ μεμαθηκώς;		The Jews	
7:38	καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ <u>γραφὴ</u> , ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥέουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος.	? Semi-quotation	Jesus	
7:42	οὐχ ἡ <u>γραφὴ</u> εἶπεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ καὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλέεμ τῆς κώμης	? (Ps 89:3–4) Semi-quotation	The crowd	
8:17	καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ τῷ ὑμετέρῳ γέγραπται ὅτι	? (Deut 17:6) Semi-quotation	Jesus	(Moses, the writer of Torah)
10:34	οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι	Ps 82:6	Jesus	(Moses, the writer of Torah)
10:35	καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ <u>γραφὴ</u>			
12:14	καθὼς ἐστὶν γεγραμμένον ·	Zech 9:9	Narrator	
12:16	τότε ἐμνήσθησαν ὅτι ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα καὶ ταῦτα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ.	(Ps 118:25–26; Isa 44:6/Zeph 3:15; Zech 9:9)	Narrator/Disciple	

13:18	ἵνα ἡ <u>γραφὴ</u> πληρωθῇ·	Ps 41:9	Jesus	
15:25	ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν γεγραμμένος ὅτι	Ps 35:19/69:4	Jesus	(Moses, the writer of Torah)
17:12	ἵνα ἡ <u>γραφὴ</u> πληρωθῇ	? Semi-quotation	Jesus	
19:19	ἔγραψεν δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος ... ἦν δὲ γεγραμμένον		Narrator	Pilate
19:20	καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί.		Narrator	Pilate
19:21	μὴ γράφε · ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων		The chief priests	Pilate
19:22	ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Πιλάτος· ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα .		Pilate	Pilate
19:24	ἵνα ἡ <u>γραφὴ</u> πληρωθῇ [ἡ λέγουσα]·	Ps 22:18	Narrator	
19:28	ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ <u>γραφὴ</u> ·	Ps 69:21	Narrator/Jesus	
19:36	ἵνα ἡ <u>γραφὴ</u> πληρωθῇ·	Exod 12:46/Num 9:12/Ps 34:20	Narrator	
19:37	πάλιν ἑτέρα <u>γραφὴ</u> λέγει·	Zech 12:10	Narrator	
20:9	οὐδέπω γὰρ ᾔδεισαν τὴν <u>γραφὴν</u> ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι.	(the last <u>γραφὴ</u>)	Narrator	
20:30	Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεία ... ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ·		Narrator	The implied author
20:31	ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα		Narrator	The implied author
21:24	Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ ὁ γράψας ταῦτα,		Narrator	The BD/ the implied author
21:25	ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφεται καθ' ἓν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία.		Narrator	The implied author

Chart 3: The Occurrences of “Moses” and “νόμος” in John

Bold: “Moses”Underline: “νόμος”**Shadowed:** quotation related

Ref.	Text	OT inf.	Attribution	Misc.
1:17	ὅτι ὁ <u>νόμος</u> διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη,		Narrator	Moses–Law
1:45	ὃν ἔγραψεν Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ <u>νόμῳ</u> καὶ οἱ προφητὰι εὐρήκαμεν,		Philip	Moses–Law
3:14	Καὶ καθὼς Μωϋσῆς ὑψωσεν τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,		Jesus	
5:45	ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν Μωϋσῆς , εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε.		Jesus	
5:46	εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ , ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν.		Jesus	
6:32	ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,		Jesus	
7:19	Οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν <u>τὸν</u> <u>νόμον</u> ; καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ποιεῖ <u>τὸν νόμον</u> .		Jesus	Moses–Law
7:22	διὰ τοῦτο Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὴν περιτομήν – οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐστὶν ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν πατέρων		Jesus and Narrator	Moses–Law
7:23	εἰ περιτομήν λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῳ ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ <u>νόμος</u> Μωϋσέως ,		Jesus	Moses–Law
7:49	ἀλλ’ ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων <u>τὸν νόμον</u> ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν.		Pharisees	
7:51	μὴ ὁ <u>νόμος</u> ἡμῶν κρίνει τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ πρῶτον παρ’ αὐτοῦ καὶ γνῶ τί ποιεῖ;		Nicodemus	
8:17	καὶ ἐν τῷ <u>νόμῳ</u> δὲ τῷ <u>ὑμετέρῳ</u> γέγραπται ὅτι	Semi-quotation	Jesus	
9:28	ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐσμέν μαθηταί·		The Jews	
9:29	ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσεῖ λελάληκεν ὁ θεός,		The Jews	

10:34	οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον <u>ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν</u> ὅτι	Ps 82:6	Jesus	
12:34	Ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ ὄχλος· ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν <u>ἐκ τοῦ νόμου</u> ὅτι ὁ χριστὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,		The crowd	
15:25	ἀλλ' ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὁ <u>ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν</u> γεγραμμένος ὅτι	Ps 35:19/69:4	Jesus	
18:31	εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλάτος· λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς καὶ <u>κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν</u> κρίνατε αὐτόν.		Pilate	
19:7	ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ἡμεῖς <u>νόμον</u> ἔχομεν καὶ <u>κατὰ τὸν νόμον</u> ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν,		The Jews	

Chart 4: The Occurrences of “prophet” and “Isaiah” in John

Bold: “Isaiah”		Underline: “prophet”		Shadowed: Scripture related/referred	
Ref.	Text		Attribution	OT Ref.	
1:21	ὁ <u>προφήτης</u> εἰ σύ;	Messianic	The Jews		
1:23	ἔφη· ἐγὼ <i>φωνή βοῶντος</i> καθὼς ... εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας <u>ὁ προφήτης</u> .	Isaiah	John the Baptist	Isa 40:3	
1:25	τί οὖν βαπτίζεις εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς οὐδὲ Ἡλίας οὐδὲ ὁ <u>προφήτης</u> ;	Messianic	The Pharisees		
1:45	ὃν ἔγραψεν Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ <u>προφῆται</u> εὐρήκαμεν,	The Prophets	Philip		
4:19	θεωρῶ ὅτι <u>προφήτης</u> εἰ σύ.	General (Jesus)	The Samaritan woman		
4:44	<u>προφήτης</u> ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι τιμὴν οὐκ ἔχει	General (Jesus)	Jesus		
6:14	οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ <u>προφήτης</u> ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.	Messianic	The crowd		
6:45	ἔστιν γεγραμμένον <u>ἐν τοῖς προφήταις</u> · καὶ ἔσονται <i>πάντες διδασκοὶ θεοῦ</i> .	The Prophets	Jesus	Isa 54:13	
7:40	οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ <u>προφήτης</u> .	Messianic	The crowd		
7:52	ἐραύνησον καὶ ἴδε ὅτι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας <u>προφήτης</u> οὐκ ἐγείρεται.	General/ Messianic	The Pharisees		
8:52	Ἀβραὰμ ἀπέθανεν καὶ οἱ <u>προφῆται</u> ,	General	The Jews		
8:53	καὶ οἱ <u>προφῆται</u> ἀπέθανον.	General	The Jews		
9:17	ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ὅτι <u>προφήτης</u> ἐστίν	General (Jesus)	The born blind		
12:38	ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαΐου <u>τοῦ προφήτου</u> πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν· <i>κύριε</i>	Isaiah	Narrator	Isa 53:1	
12:39–41	διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἠδύναντο πιστεῦειν, ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας · <i>τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς</i> ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ.	Isaiah	Narrator	Isa 6:10	

Chart 5: OT Quotations in the Qumran Writings*

1. Proof-text supporting the rule/principle stated;
2. Proof-text illustrating a contemporary circumstance/phenomenon;
3. Proof of a statement or an eschatological event;
4. Proof of a historical event;
5. Prayer;
6. Interpreting another scripture.

Ref.	Formula (Eng.)	Formula (Heb.)	Quotation	Topic
1QS V 15	for thus it is written	כִּי אֵין כֶּתוּב	Exod 23:7	1 (the wicked)
1QS V 17	as what is written	כִּאֲשֶׁר כֶּתוּב	Isa 2:22	1 (the wicked)
1QS VIII 14	as what is written	כִּאֲשֶׁר כֶּתוּב	Isa 40:3	1/2 (wilderness)
CD I 13–14	it is the time about which it is written	הִיא הַעֵת אֲשֶׁר הָיָה כְּתוּב עָלֶיהָ	Hosea 4:16	2 (rebellious ones)
CD III 20–IV 2	as what God established for them by the hand of Ezekiel the prophet, saying	כִּאֲשֶׁר הָקִים אֱלֹהִים לָהֶם בְּיַד יְחִזְקִאל הַנָּבִיא לֵאמֹר	Ezek 44:15	2 (faithful house)
CD IV 13–14	as what God said by the hand of Isaiah the prophet, son of Amoz, saying	כִּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֱלֹהִים בְּיַד יִשְׁעִיָּה הַנָּבִיא בֶן אֲמוּץ לֵאמֹר	Isa 24:17 (followed by its <i>peshet</i>)	2 (Belial)
CD IV 20	what it/he said	אֲשֶׁר אָמַר	Mic 2:6	2 (wall builders)
CD IV 21	--		Gen 1:27	1 (one wife)
CD V 1–2	about the prince it is written	וְעַל הַנָּשִׂא כֶּתוּב	Deut 17:17	1 (leader's marriage)
CD V 8–9	Moses said	וּמֹשֶׁה אָמַר	Lev 18:13	1 (marriage)
CD V 13	--		Isa 50:11	2 (law breakers)
CD V 13–14	--		Isa 59:5	2 (law breakers)
CD V 16	for	כִּי	Isa 27:11	2/4 (law breakers)
CD V 17	--		Deut 32:28	2/4 (law breakers)
CD VI 3	--		Num 21:18	4 (well)
CD VI 7–8	what Isaiah said	אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יִשְׁעִיָּה	Isa 54:16	6 (for Num 21:8)
CD VI 13–14	what God said	אֲשֶׁר אָמַר אֱלֹהִים	Mal 1:10	1 (lock the door)
CD VII 8–9	as what it/he said	כִּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר	Num 30:17	1 (family life)

* In this chart, if a text appears identically in more than one location, only one is listed (e.g., CD XI 18 = 4Q270 6 V 21 = 4Q271 5 I 12; CD XVI 6 = 4Q271 4 II 7). But, if the text appears more complete in a fragment, then the fragment is listed (e.g., CD XIII 23 and 4Q267 9 V 2).

CD VII 10–12	<i>when the thing happens</i> , which is written in the words of Isaiah, son of Amoz, the prophet, said,	בבוא הדבר אשר כתוב בדברי ישעיה בן אמוץ הנביא אשר אמר	Isa 7:17	3 (the day for God's judgment)
CD VII 14–15	as what it/he said	כאשר אמר	Amos 5:26–27	3/6 (for Isa 7:17)
CD VII 16	as what it/he said	כאשר אמר	Amos 9:11	6 (for Amos 5:26)
CD VII 19–20	as what is written	כאשר כתוב	Num 24:13	2 (the Interpreter)
CD VIII 3 (cf. CD-B XIX 15)	--		Hos 5:10	3 (the day for God's judgment)
CD VIII 9–10	God said about them	אשר אמר אל עליהם	Deut 32:33	3 (the wicked)
CD VIII 14–15 (cf. CD-B XIX 26–27)	what Moses said	ואשר אמר משה	Deut 9:5	2 (God's love for the righteous)
CD IX 2	what it/he said	ואשר אמר	Lev 19:18	1 (revenge)
CD IX 5	is it not written that	ואין כתוב כי	Nah 1:2	3 (God's revenge)
CD IX 7–8	what it/he said to him	אשר אמר לו	Lev 19:17	1 (revenge)
CD IX 8–9	about the oath which it/he said	על השבועה אשר אמר	1 Sam 25:26	1 (oaths)
CD X 16–17	for it is what it/he said	כי הוא אשר אמר	Deut 5:12	1 (Sabbath)
CD XI 18	for thus it is written	כי כן כתוב	Lev 23:38	1 (Sabbath)
CD XI 20–21	for it is written	כי כתוב	Prov 15:8	1 (Sabbath)
CD XIII 23 (see 4Q267 9 V 2)	?		Isa 7:17	3 (the Day)
CD XVI 6	what it/he said	ואשר אמר	Deut 23:24	1/4 (oath)
CD XVI 10	what it/he said	אשר אמר	Num 30:9	1 (oath)
CD XVI 15	for it is what it/he said	כי הוא אשר אמר	Mic 7:2	1 (food)
CD-B XIX 1 (CD VII 6)	as what is written	ככ(כאשר כתוב)	Deut 7:9	3 (long life)
CD-B XIX 7–9 (contra CD VII 10–11)	<i>when the thing happens</i> , which is written by the hand of Zechariah the prophet	בבוא הדבר אשר כתוב ביד זכריה הנביא	Zech 13:7	3 (God's visit)
CD-B XIX 11–12	what it said by the hand of Ezekiel	אשר אמר ביד יחזקאל	Ezek 9:4	3/4 (rebel)
CD-B XIX 15–16 (CD VIII 3)	as what it/he said	כאשר דבר	Hos 5:10	3 (the day for God's judgment)
CD-B XIX 26–28 (CD VIII 14–15)	what Moses said to Israel	ואשר אמר משה לישראל	Deut 9:5	2 (God's love for the righteous)
CD-B XX 16–17	as what it/he said	כאשר אמר	Hos 3:4	3 (rebel)

CD-B XX 19–20	--		Mal 3:16	3 (the repentant)
CD-B XX 20–21	--		Mal 3:18	3 (the repentant)
CD-B XX 21–22	--		Exod 20:6/ Deut 7:9	3 (the repentant)
4Q266 6 I 8–9	what it/he said	ואשר אמר	Lev 13:33	1 (scale)
4Q266 11 3–4	concerning Israel, it is written	ועל ישראל כתוב	Lev 26:31	1 (sin offering)
4Q266 11 4–5	in another place it is written	ובמקום אחר כתוב	Joel 2:12–13	1 (sin offering)
4Q267 9 V 2–4 (CD XIII 23)	when the thing happens, which it/he said	בבן[א ה]דבר אשר דבר	Isa 7:17	3 (the Days)
4Q265 1 3–4	it is written in the book of Isaiah the prophet	כתוב בס[פר] ישעיה הנביא	(Isa 54:1–2)	
1QM X 2–5	He taught us from then, our generations, saying	וילמדנו מאז לדורותינו לאמור	Deut 20:3–4	5 (battle)
1QM X 6–8	what you said by the hand of Moses, saying	ואשר ד[ברת]ה ביד מושה לאמור	Num 10:9	5 (battle)
1QM XI 5–7	as what you told us from then, saying	כאשר הגדתה לנו מאז לאמור	Num 24:17– 19	5 (anointed one)
1QM XI 11–12	from then you told us ... saying,	ומאז השמע[תנו] ... לאמור	Isa 31:8	5 (enemies)
4Q394 3–7 II 14– 15	concerning which it is written	וע[ל] שא כתוב	(Lev 7:13)	1/2 (ritual)
4Q397 14–21 6	again it is written	ואף[] כתוב	(Deut 7:26)	(1)
4Q397 14–21 12– 14	again it is written	ואף כתוב	(Deut 31:29)	(1)
4Q274 1 I 3–4	for it is what it/he said	כי הוא אשר אמר	Lev 13:45–46	1 (uncleanness)
4Q174 1–2 I 2–3	as what is written in the book of Moses	כאשר כתוב בספר [מושה]	Exod 15:17– 18	3 (the House)
4Q174 1–2 I 7	what he said to David	ואשר אמר לדוד	2 Sam 7:11	3 (enemies)
4Q174 1–2 I 10–11	--		2 Sam 7:12– 14	3/4 (Interpreter)
4Q174 1–2 I 12	as what is written	כאשר כתוב	Amos 9:11	3 (Interpreter)
4Q174 1–2 I 15–16	that is written in the book of Isaiah the prophet	אשר כתוב בספר ישויה הנביא	Isa 8:11	6 (Ps 1:1)
4Q174 1–2 I 16–17	that is written ... in the book of Ezekiel the prophet	אשר כתוב ... בספר יחזקאל הנביא	Ezek 44:10	2/6 (Ps 1:1)

4Q174 1–3 II 3	what is written in the book of Daniel the prophet	אשר כתוב בספר דניאל הנביא	Dan 12:10	3/6 (Ps 1:2)
11Q13 II 2	what it/he said	ואשר אמר	Lev 25:13	3 (Jubilee)
11Q13 II 2–3	and concerning it it/he said	[ועליו אמר]	Deut 15:2	3 (Jubilee)
11Q13 II 9–10	as what is written about him in the Songs of David, which/who said	כאשר כתוב עליו בשירי דוד אשר אמר	Ps 82:1	3 (Melchizedek's authority to judge)
11Q13 II 10–11	and concerning him it/he said	ועליו אמר	Ps 7:8–9	3 (Melchizedek)
11Q13 II 11	what it/he said	ואשר אמר	Ps 82:2 (followed by its <i>peshar</i>)	3 (Melchizedek)
11Q13 II 15–16	what he said by the hand of Isaiah the prophet, he said	אשר אמר -- ביד ישעיה הנביא אשר אמר	Isa 52:7 (followed by its <i>peshar</i>)	3 (the day of salvation)
11Q13 II 18	as what Daniel said about him	כאשר אמר דניאל עליו	Dan 9:25	3/5 (the Messenger)
11Q13 II 19–20	the one about whom it is written, it said	הוא הכתוב עליו אשר	Isa 61:2	3/5 (the Messenger)
11Q 13 II 23	as what is written about him	כאשר כתוב עליו	Isa 52:7	3 (the divine being)
11Q 13 II 25	what it/he said	ואשר אמר	Lev 25:9	3/5 (Melchizedek's power)
4Q177 7 3–4	what is written in the book of Ezekiel the prophet	אשר כתוב בספר יחזקאל הנביא	(Ezek 25:8)	3 (the last day)
4Q177 10–11 1–2	as what is written	כאשר כתוב	(Zech 3:9)	?
4Q177 10–11 3	concerning them it is written	אשר עליהם כתוב	?	?

Chart 6: OT Quotations in the OT Apocrypha

Ref.	Formula (English)	Formula (Greek)	Quotation	Misc.
Tob 2:6	And I remembered the prophecy of Amos, as he said,	καὶ ἐμνήσθην τῆς προφητείας Ἀμως, καθὼς εἶπεν,	Amos 8:10	
Bar 2:20–21	as you had spoken by the hand of your servants the prophets, saying, Thus said the Lord,	καθάπερ ἐλάλησας ἐν χειρὶ τῶν παίδων σου τῶν προφητῶν λέγων, Οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος	Jer 27:11–12	
Sus 53	although the Lord says	τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος	Exod 23:7	
Bel 41	The king cried out and said	καὶ ἀναβοήσας εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς	Isa 45:21	
1 Macc 4:24	while they returned they began to sing and praise to heaven that	καὶ ἐπιστραφέντες ὕμνουν καὶ εὐλόγουν εἰς οὐρανὸν ὅτι	Ps 118: 1, 29	
1 Macc 7:16–17	according to the word which wrote	κατὰ τὸν λόγον, ὃν ἔγραψεν αὐτόν	Ps 79:2–3	
2 Macc 7:6	as Moses declared by his song that bore witness against faces, saying,	καθάπερ διὰ τῆς κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀντιμαρτυρούσης ᾧδῆς διεσάφησεν Μωυσῆς λέγων	Deut 32:36	
4 Macc 2:5	for the Law says	λέγει γοῦν ὁ νόμος	Exod 20:7	
4 Macc 17:19	for Moses says	καὶ γάρ φησιν ὁ Μωυσῆς	Deut 33:3	
4 Macc 18:14	he reminded you of the scripture of Isaiah which says	ὑπεμίμνησκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν Ἡσαιου γραφὴν τὴν λέγουσαν	Isa 43:2	
4 Macc 18:15	he sang to you the psalmist of David which says	τὸν ὕμνογράφον ἐμελώδει ὑμῖν Δαυιδ λέγοντα	Ps 34:19	
4 Macc 18:16	he recited the proverb of Solomon which says	τὸν Σαλωμῶντα ἐπαροιμιάζειν ὑμῖν λέγοντα	Prov 3:18	
4 Macc 18:17	he affirmed the word of Ezekiel	τὸν Ἰεζεκιηλ ἐπιστοποῖει τὸν λέγοντα	Ezek 37:3	
4 Macc 18:18–19	for indeed he did not forget the song that Moses taught which says	ᾧδὴν μὲν γάρ, ἣν ἐδίδαξεν Μωυσῆς, οὐκ ἐπελάθετο διδάσκων τὴν λέγουσαν	Deut 32:39	

Chart 7: OT Quotations in the NT (according to UBS⁵ and NA²⁸)

X: No QF --: No QF in a group of combined quotations

Ref.	Quotation Formula	Quotation	Attribution	NA ²⁸
Matthew				
1:22–23	ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος,	Isa 7:14	Narrator	
2:5–6	οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου	Mic 5:2	Chief priests and scribes	
2:15	οὕτως γὰρ γέγραπται διὰ τοῦ προφήτου	Hos 11:1	Narrator	
2:17–18	τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος	Jer 31:15	Narrator	
3:3	οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος,	Isa 40:3	Narrator	
4:4	ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν·	Deut 8:3	Jesus	
4:6	γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι	Ps 90:11–12 LXX	Satan	
4:7	ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·	Deut 6:16	Jesus	
4:10	γέγραπται γάρ·	Deut 6:13	Jesus	
4:14–16	ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·	Isa 9:1–2	Narrator	
5:21	ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις·	Exod 20:13/Deut 5:17	Jesus	
5:27	ἐρρέθη·	Exod 20:14/Deut 5:18	Jesus	
5:31	Ἐρρέθη δέ·	Deut 24:1	Jesus	allusion
5:33	ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις·	Lev 19:12/Num 30:2	Jesus	allusion
5:38	ἐρρέθη·	Exod 21:24/Lev 24:20/Deut 19:21	Jesus	
5:43	ἐρρέθη·	Lev 19:18	Jesus	
7:23	X	Ps 6:9 LXX	Jesus	citation
8:17	ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·	Isa 53:4	Narrator	
9:13	πορευθέντες δὲ μάθετε τί ἐστιν·	Hos 6:6	Jesus	
9:36	X	Num 27:17	Narrator	citation

10:35–36	X	Mic 7:6	Jesus	
11:10	οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται	Mal 3:1/Exod 23:20	Jesus	
11:29	X	Jer 6:16	Jesus	citation
12:7	εἰ δὲ ἐγνώκειτε τί ἐστιν·	Hos 6:6	Jesus	
12:17–21	ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἑσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·	Isa 42:1–4	Narrator	
12:40	ὥσπερ γὰρ	Jonah 1:17	Jesus	
13:14–15	καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἑσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα·	Isa 6:9–10	Jesus	
13:35	ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·	Ps 77:2 LXX	Narrator	
13:42, 50	X	Dan 3:6	Jesus	citation
15:4a	ὁ γὰρ θεὸς εἶπεν	Exod 20:12/Deut 5:16	Jesus	
15:4b	καὶ	Exod 21:17	Jesus	
15:7–9	καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἑσαΐας λέγων·	Isa 29:13	Jesus	
16:27	X	Ps 62:13/Prov 24:12	Jesus	citation
18:16	X	Deut 19:15	Jesus	
19:4	οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι	Gen 1:27/5:2	Jesus	
19:5	καὶ εἶπεν·	Gen 2:24	Jesus	
19:7	Τί οὖν Μωϋσῆς ἐνετείλατο	Deut 24:1	Pharisees	allusion
19:18–19a	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·	Exod 20:12–16/Deut 5:16–20	Jesus	
19:19b	καὶ	Lev 19:18	Jesus	
21:4–5	τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·	Isa 62:11; Zech 9:9	Narrator	
21:9	ἔκραζον λέγοντες·	Ps 117:25–26 LXX	the crowd	
21:13	γέγραπται·	Isa 56:7	Jesus	
21:16	οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι	Ps 8:3 LXX	Jesus	allusion
21:42	οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς·	Ps 117:22–23 LXX	Jesus	
22:24	Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν·	Deut 25:5	Sadducee	allusion
22:31–32	οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος·	Exod 3:6/15	Jesus	
22:37	ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ·	Deut 6:5	Jesus	

22:39	δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ·	Lev 19:18	Jesus	
22:43–44	πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον λέγων·	Ps 109:1 LXX	Jesus	
23:39	ἕως ἂν εἴπητε·	Ps 117:26 LXX	Jesus	
24:15	Ὅταν οὖν ἴδητε	Dan 9:27	Jesus	citation
24:29	X	Isa 13:10; 34:4	Jesus	citation
24:30	ὄψονται	Dan 7:13	Jesus	
26:31	γέγραπται γάρ·	Zech 13:7	Jesus	
26:38	τότε λέγει αὐτοῖς·	Ps 42:5/11/43:5	Jesus	citation
26:64a	ὄψεσθε	Ps 109:1 LXX	Jesus	allusion
26:64b	καὶ	Dan 7:13	Jesus	
27:9–10	τότε ἐπληρώθη τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος·	Zech 11:12–13	Narrator	
27:35	X	Ps 21:19 LXX	Narrator	citation
27:43	X	Ps 21:9 LXX	Chief priests , scribes, and elders	citation
27:46	ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων·	Ps 21:2 LXX	Jesus	
Mark				
1:2	Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ·	Mal 3:1/Exod 23:20	Narrator	
1:3	--	Isa 40:3	Narrator	
4:12	ἵνα	Isa 6:9–10	Jesus	
6:34	X	Num 27:17	Narrator	citation
7:6–7	καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὡς γέγραπται [ὅτι]	Isa 29:13	Jesus	
7:10a	Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν·	Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16	Jesus	
7:10b	καί·	Exod 21:17	Jesus	
9:48	X	Isa 66:44	Jesus	citation
10:4	Ἐπέτρεψεν Μωϋσῆς	Deut 24:1/3	Pharisees	allusion
10:6	X	Gen 1:27/5:2	Jesus	
10:7–8	X	Gen 2:24	Jesus	
10:19	τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας·	Exod 20:12–16/Deut 5:16–20	Jesus	

11:9–10	ἔκραζον·	Ps 118:25–26 (117:25–26 LXX)	the crowd	
11:17	οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι	Isa 56:7	Jesus	
12:10–11	οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε·	Ps 118:22–23 (117:22–23 LXX)	Jesus	
12:19	Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι	Deut 25:5	Sadducees	allusion
12:26	οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάρτου πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων·	Exod 3:6/15	Jesus	allusion
12:29–30	ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν·	Deut 6:4–5	Jesus	
12:31	δευτέρα αὕτη·	Lev 19:18	Jesus	
12:32a	εἶπες ὅτι	Deut 6:4	a scribe	
12:32b	--	Deut 4:35/Isa 45:21	a scribe	
12:33a	καί·	Deut 6:5	a scribe	
12:33b	καί·	Lev 19:18	a scribe	
12:36	αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ	Ps 110:1 (109:1 LXX)	Jesus	
13:14	X	Dan 11:31	Jesus	citation
13:24	X	Isa 13:10	Jesus	citation
13:25	X	Isa 34:4	Jesus	citation
13:26	ὄψονται	Dan 7:13	Jesus	
14:27	ὅτι γέγραπται·	Zech 13:7	Jesus	
14:34	καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς	Ps 42:5/11/43:5	Jesus	citation
14:62a	ὄψεσθε	Ps 110:1 (109:1 LXX)	Jesus	allusion
14:62b	--	Dan 7:13	Jesus	
15:24	X	Ps 22:18 (22:19 MT; 21:19 LXX)	Narrator	citation
15:34	ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ·	Ps 22:1 (22:2 MT; 21:2 LXX)	Jesus	
Luke				
1:15	X	Num 6:3	an angel	
2:23	καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι	Exod 13:2, 12, 15	Narrator (Evangelist)	
2:24	κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου	Lev 12:8	Narrator (Evangelist)	
3:4–6	ὥς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἰησοῦ τοῦ προφήτου·	Isa 40:3–5	Narrator (Evangelist)	

4:4	γέγραπται ὅτι	Deut 8:3	Jesus	
4:8	γέγραπται	Deut 6:13	Jesus	
4:10–11	γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι ... καὶ ὅτι ...	Ps 91:11–12 (90:11–12 LXX)	Satan	
4:12	εἶρηται	Deut 6:16	Jesus	
4:18–19	οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον (17); σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφή αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὠσὶν ὑμῶν (21)	Isa 61:1–2	Narrator (Evangelist) / Jesus	
7:27	οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται	Mal 3:1/Exod 23:20	Jesus	
8:10	ἵνα	Isa 6:9	Jesus	allusion
9:54	X	2 Kgs 1:10, 12	Disciples	citation
10:27a	(ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; [26]) ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν·	Deut 6:5	a lawyer	
10:27b	--	Lev 19:18	a lawyer	
13:27	X	Ps 6:8 (6:9 LXX)	Jesus	citation
13:35	ἕως [ἤξει ὅτε] εἶπητε	Ps 118:26 (117:26 LXX)	Jesus	
18:20	τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας	Exod 20:12–16/Deut 5:16–20	a ruler	
19:38	λέγοντες·	Ps 118:26 (117:26 LXX)	Disciples	
19:46	γέγραπται	Isa 56:7	Jesus	
20:17	τί οὖν ἐστιν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο	Ps 118:22 (117:22 LXX)	Jesus	
20:28	Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν	Deut 25:5	Sadducees	allusion
20:37	Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὡς λέγει	Exod 3:6	Jesus	
20:42–43	αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν	Ps 110:1 (109:1 LXX)	Jesus	
21:27	ὄψονται	Dan 7:13	Jesus	
22:37	τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί (... καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει)	Isa 53:12	Jesus	
22:69	X	Ps 110:1 (109:1 LXX)	Jesus	allusion
23:30	X	Hos 10:8	Jesus	
23:34	X	Ps 22:18 (22:19 MT; 21:19 LXX)	Narrator (Evangelist)	citation
23:46	καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν	Ps 31:5 (31:6 MT; 30:6 LXX)	Jesus	

Acts				
1:20a	γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν·	Ps 69:25 (69:26 MT; 68:26 LXX)	Peter	
1:20b	καί	Ps 109:8 (108:8 LXX)	Peter	
2:17–21	τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ	Joel 2:28–31 (3:1–5 MT/ LXX)	Peter	
2:25–28	Δαυὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν	Ps 16:8–11 (15:8–11 LXX)	Peter	
2:30	προφήτης οὗν ὑπάρχων καὶ εἰδὼς ὅτι	Ps 132:11 (131:11 LXX)	Peter	allusion
2:31	ἐλάλησεν	Ps 16:10 (15:10 LXX)	Peter	
2:34–35	λέγει δὲ αὐτός	Ps 110:1 (109:1 LXX)	Peter	
3:13	X	Exod 3:6, 15	Peter	
3:22	Μωϋσῆς μὲν εἶπεν ὅτι	Deut 18:15–16	Peter	
3:23a	--	Deut 18:19	Peter	
3:23b	--	Lev 23:29	Peter	
3:25	(God) λέγων πρὸς Ἀβραάμ	Gen 22:18; 26:4	Peter	
4:11	οὗτός ἐστιν	Ps 118:22 (117:22 LXX)	Peter	allusion
4:24	εἶπαν	Exod 12:11; Ps 146:6; Neh 9:6; Isa 37:16	Believers	citation
4:25–26	ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδὸς σου εἰπών·	Ps 2:1–2	Believers	
7:3	εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν	Gen 12:1	Steven	
7:5	ἐπηγγείλατο	Gen 17:8	Steven	
7:6–7a	ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ὅτι	Gen 15:13–14	Steven	
7:7b	ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν	Exod 3:12	Steven	allusion
7:18	X	Exod 1:8	Steven	
7:27–28	εἰπών	Exod 2:14	Steven	
7:30	X	Exod 3:2	Steven	allusion
7:32	ἐγένετο φωνὴ κυρίου (31)	Exod 3:6	Steven	
7:33	(εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος)	Exod 3:5	Steven	
7:34	--	Exod 3:7, 8, 10	Steven	
7:35	(εἰπόντες)	Exod 2:14	Steven	
7:37	οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἶπας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ	Deut 18:15	Steven	

7:40	(εἰπόντες)	Exod 32:1, 23	Steven	
7:42–43	καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν	Amos 5:25–27	Steven	
7:49–50	καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει (48)	Isa 66:1–2	Steven	
8:32–33	ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν ἡν αὕτη	Isa 53:7–8	Narrator	
13:22a	ὃ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας	Ps 89:20 (89:21 MT; 88:21 LXX)	Paul	allusion
13:22b	(εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας)	1 Sam 13:14	Paul	allusion
13:33	ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ	Ps 2:7	Paul	
13:34	οὕτως εἴρηκεν	Isa 55:3	Paul	
13:35	καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει·	Ps 16:10 (15:10 LXX)	Paul	
13:41	τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις (40)	Hab 1:5	Paul	
13:47	οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος·	Isa 49:6	Paul	
14:15	X	Exod 12:11; Ps 146:6; Neh 9:6; Isa 37:16	Barnabas and Paul	citation
15:16–17	τούτῳ συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν καθὼς γέγραπται (15)	Amos 9:11–12	James	
23:5	γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι	Exod 22:28	Paul	
28:26–27	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν (25)	Isa 6:9–10	Paul	
Romans				
1:17	καθὼς γέγραπται	Hab 2:4		
2:6	X (ὁς)	Prov 24:12; Ps 62:13		citation
2:24	γὰρ . . . καθὼς γέγραπται	Isa 52:5		
3:4	καθὼς γέγραπται	Ps 51:4 (LXX)		
3:10–12	καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι	Ps 14:1–3		
3:13a	--	Ps 5:9		
3:13b	--	Ps 140:3		
3:14	--	Ps 10:7		
3:15–17	--	Isa 59:7–8		
3:18	--	Ps 36:1		

4:3	τί γὰρ ἡ γραφή λέγει;	Gen 15:6		
4:7–8	καθάπερ καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει . . . (6)	Ps 32:1–2		
4:17	καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι	Gen 17:5		
4:18b	κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον	Gen 15:5		
4:22	διὸ	Gen 15:6		
7:7	εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν	Exod 20:17; Deut 5:21		
8:36	καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι	Ps 44:22		
9:7	ἀλλ’	Gen 21:12		
9:9	ἐπαγγελίας γὰρ ὁ λόγος οὗτος	Gen 18:10, 14		
9:12	ἐρρέθη αὐτῇ ὅτι	Gen 25:23		
9:13	καθὼς γέγραπται	Mal 1:2–3		
9:15	τῷ Μωϋσεὶ γὰρ λέγει	Exod 33:19		
9:17	λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή τῷ Φαραὼ	Exod 9:16		
9:20	(ἀνταποκρινόμενος)	Isa 29:16		citation
9:25	ὥς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ λέγει	Hos 2:23		
9:26	--	Hos 1:10		
9:27–28	Ἡσαΐας δὲ κράζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ	Isa 10:22–23		
9:29	καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας·	Isa 1:9		
9:33	καθὼς γέγραπται	Isa 8:14; 28:16		
10:5	Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει . . . ὅτι	Lev 18:5		
10:6a	--	Deut 9:4		
10:6b–8	--	Deut 30:12–14		
10:11	λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή	Isa 28:16		
10:13	γὰρ	Joel 2:32		
10:15	καθὼς γέγραπται	Isa 52:7		
10:16	Ἡσαΐας γὰρ λέγει	Isa 53:1		
10:18	μενοῦνγε·	Ps 19:4		
10:19	πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει	Deut 32:21		
10:20	Ἡσαΐας δὲ ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει	Isa 65:1		
10:21	πρὸς δὲ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ λέγει	Isa 65:2		
11:2	X	1 Sam 12:22		citation
11:3	ἐν Ἠλὶα τί λέγει ἡ γραφή (2)	1 Kgs 19:10, 14		
11:4	ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός	1 Kgs 19:18		

11:8	καθὼς γέγραπται	Deut 29:4; Isa 29:10		
11:9–10	καὶ Δαυὶδ λέγει	Ps 69:22–23		
11:26–27a	καθὼς γέγραπται	Isa 59:20–21		
11:27b	--	Isa 27:9		
11:34	γὰρ	Isa 40:13		
11:35	--	Job 41:11		
12:19	γέγραπται γάρ . . . λέγει κύριος	Deut 32:25		
12:20	ἀλλὰ	Prov 25:21–22		
13:9a	γὰρ	Exod 20:13–15, 17; Deut 5:17–19, 21		
13:9b	ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται	Lev 19:18		
14:11a	γέγραπται γάρ	Isa 49:18		
14:11b	--	Isa 45:23		
15:3	ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται	Ps 69:9		
15:9	καθὼς γέγραπται	Ps 18:49		
15:10	καὶ πάλιν λέγει	Deut 32:43		
15:11	καὶ πάλιν	Ps 117:2		
15:12	καὶ πάλιν Ἡσαΐας λέγει	Isa 11:10		
15:21	ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται	Isa 52:15		
1 Corinthians				
1:19	γέγραπται γάρ	Isa 29:14		
1:31	ἵνα καθὼς γέγραπται	Jer 9:24		
2:9	ἀλλὰ καθὼς γέγραπται	Isa 64:4		allusion
2:16	X	Isa 40:13		
3:19	γέγραπται γάρ	Job 5:13		
3:20	καὶ πάλιν	Ps 94:11		
5:13	X	Deut 17:7		
6:16	γάρ, φησὶν (the scripture/ God)	Gen 2:24		
9:9	ἐν γὰρ τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται	Deut 25:4		
10:7	ὥσπερ γέγραπται	Exod 32:6		
10:26	γὰρ	Ps 24:1		
14:21	ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται ὅτι . . . λέγει κύριος	Isa 28:11–12		

14:25	ἀπαγγέλλων	Isa 45:14		citation
15:25	X	Ps 110:1		citation
15:27	γὰρ	Ps 8:6		
15:32	X	Isa 22:13		
15:45	οὕτως καὶ γέγραπται	Gen 2:7		
15:54	τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος	Isa 25:8		
15:55	--	Hos 13:14		
2 Corinthians				
4:13	κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον	Ps 116:10 LXX		
6:2	λέγει γάρ (the scripture/ God)	Isa 49:8		
6:16	καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς ὅτι	Lev 26:12; Ezek 37:27		
6:17a	διὸ . . . (λέγει κύριος)	Isa 52:11		
6:17b	καὶ	Ezek 20:34		
6:18	καὶ	2 Sam 7:8, 14		
8:15	καθὼς γέγραπται	Exod 16:18		
9:7	γὰρ	Prov 22:8		
9:9	καθὼς γέγραπται	Ps 112:9		citation
9:10	--	Isa 55:10		citation
10:17	X	Jer 9:24		
13:1	X	Deut 19:15		
Galatians				
3:6	Καθὼς Ἀβραὰμ	Gen 15:6		
3:8	προϊδοῦσα δὲ ἡ γραφὴ ... προεηγγελίστατο τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὅτι	Gen 12:3; 18:18		
3:10	γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι	Deut 27:26		
3:11	ὅτι	Hab 2:4		
3:12	ἀλλ'	Lev 18:5		
3:13	ὅτι γέγραπται	Deut 21:23		
3:16	X	Gen 12:7		
4:27	γέγραπται γάρ	Isa 54:1		
4:30	ἀλλὰ τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;	Gen 21:10		
5:14	ὁ γὰρ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἐνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ·	Lev 19:18		

Ephesians				
1:22	X	Ps 8:7		citation
4:8	διὸ λέγει (the scripture)	Ps 68:18		
4:25	Διὸ	Zech 8:16		
4:26	--	Ps 4:4		
5:31	X	Gen 2:24		
6:2–3	... ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ ...	Exod 20:12; Deut 5:16		
1 Timothy				
5:18a	λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή	Deut 25:4		
5:18b	καὶ	(Luke 10:7)??		citation
2 Timothy				
2:19a	ἔχων τὴν σφραγίδα ταύτην	Num 16:5		
2:19b	καὶ	Isa 26:13		
Hebrews				
1:5a	Τίτι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων·	Ps 2:7		
1:5b	καὶ πάλιν	2 Sam 7:14		
1:6	λέγει	Deut 32:43/Ps 97:7 (96:7 LXX)		
1:7	καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει	Ps 104:4 (103:4 LXX)		
1:8–9	πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν	Ps 45:6–7 (44:7–8 LXX)		
1:10–12	καί	Ps 102:25–27 (101:26–28 LXX)		
1:13	πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἶρηκέν ποτε	Ps 110:1 (109:1 LXX)		
2:6–8	διεμαρτύρατο δὲ πού τις λέγων	Ps 8:4–6 (8:5–7 LXX)		
2:12	λέγων	Ps 22:22 (21:23 LXX)		
2:13a	καὶ πάλιν	Isa 8:17/ Isa 12:2		
2:13b	καὶ πάλιν	Isa 8:18		
3:7–11	καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον	Ps 95:7–11 (94:7–11 LXX)		
3:15	ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι	Ps 95:7–8 (94:7–8 LXX)		
4:3	καθὼς εἶρηκεν	Ps 95:11 (94:11 LXX)		

4:4	εἶρηκεν γάρ που περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης οὕτως	Gen 2:2		
4:5	καὶ ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν	Ps 95:11 (94:11 LXX)		
4:7	πάλιν	Ps 95:7–8 (94:7–8 LXX)		
5:5	X	Ps 2:7		
5:6	καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει	Ps 110:4 (109:4 LXX)		
6:13–14	ᾧμοσεν καθ' ἑαυτοῦ (13) λέγων·	Gen 22:16–17		
7:1–2	Οὗτος γὰρ	Gen 14:17–20		
7:4	X	Gen 14:20		
7:17	μαρτυρεῖται γὰρ ὅτι	Ps 110:4 (109:4 LXX)		
7:21	διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν	Ps 110:4 (109:4 LXX)		
8:5	γὰρ φησιν	Exod 25:40		
8:8–12	λέγει	Jer 31:31–34		
9:20	λέγων	Exod 24:8		
10:5–7	λέγει	Ps 40:6–8 (39:7–9 LXX)		
10:16–17	Μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον· μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι (15)	Jer 31:33–34		
10:28	X	Deut 17:6		citation
10:30	οἶδαμεν γὰρ τὸν εἰπόντα . . . πάλιν . . .	Deut 32:35–36		
10:37–38	ἔτι γὰρ	Hab 2:3–4		
11:5	X	Gen 5:24		allusion
11:18	πρὸς ὃν ἐλαλήθη ὅτι	Gen 21:12		
11:21	X	Gen 47:31		
12:5–6	καὶ ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως, ἥτις ὑμῖν ὡς υἱοῖς διαλέγεται	Prov 3:11–12		
12:15	X	Deut 29:3		citation
12:20	οὐκ ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ διαστελλόμενον	Exod 19:12–13		allusion
12:21	Μωϋσῆς εἶπεν	Deut 9:19		
12:26	νῦν δὲ ἐπήγγελται λέγων	Hag 2:6		
12:29	καὶ γὰρ	Deut 4:24/9:3		citation
13:5	γὰρ εἶρηκεν	Deut 31:6/8		
13:6	ὥστε θαρροῦντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν	Ps 118:6 (117:6 LXX)		

James				
2:8	κατὰ τὴν γραφήν	Lev 19:18		
2:11 (x2)	ὁ γὰρ εἰπών· . . . εἶπεν καί . . .	Exod 20:13–14; Deut 5:17–18		
2:23	καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφή ἣ λέγουσα·	Gen 15:6		
4:6	διὸ λέγει (the scripture)	Prov 3:34		
1 Peter				
1:16	διότι γέγραπται [ὅτι]	Lev 19:2		
1:24–25	διότι	Isa 40:6–8		
2:3	X	Ps 34:8 (34:9 MT; 33:9 LXX)		citation
2:6	διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ	Isa 28:16		
2:7	X (the rejected stone)	Ps 118:22 (117:22 LXX)		
2:8	καὶ (the rejected stone)	Isa 8:14		
2:22	X	Isa 53:9		
3:10–12	γὰρ	Ps 34:12–16 (33:13–17 LXX)		
3:14	X	Isa 8:12		citation
3:15	X	Isa 8:13		citation
4:14	X	Isa 11:2		citation
4:18	καὶ	Prov 11:31		
5:5	ὅτι [ὁ] θεὸς	Prov 3:34		
2 Peter				
2:22	τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας	Prov 26:11		

Chart 8: Quotation Formulae in Synoptic Parallels

Mark	Luke	Matthew
1:2–3 (Mal 3:1; Isa 40:3)	3:4–6 (Isa 40:3–5)	
Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ·	ὥς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου·	
4:12 (Isa 6:9–10)	8:10 (Isa 6:9 allusion?)	13:14–15 (Isa 6:9–10)
ἵνα	ἵνα	καὶ ἀναπληροῦται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαΐου ἡ λέγουσα·
7:6–7 (Isa 29:13)		15:8–9 (Isa 29:13)
καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν Ἡσαΐας περὶ ὑμῶν τῶν ὑποκριτῶν, ὥς γέγραπται [ὅτι]		(ὑποκριταί,) καλῶς ἐπροφήτευσεν περὶ ὑμῶν Ἡσαΐας λέγων· (7)
7:10a / b (Exod 20:12 / 21:17)		15:4a / b (Exod 20:12 / 21:17)
Μωϋσῆς γὰρ εἶπεν· / καί		ὁ γὰρ θεὸς εἶπεν / x
10:6 / 7–8 (Gen 1:27 / 2:24)		19:4 / 5 (Gen 1:27 / 2:24)
X / X		οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ὅτι / καὶ εἶπεν·
10:19 (Exod 20:12–16)	18:20 (Exod 20:12–16)	19:18–19a (Exod 20:12–16)*
τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας·	τὰς ἐντολὰς οἶδας	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·
11:9–10 (Ps 118:25–26)	19:38 (Ps 118:25–26)	21:9 (Ps 118:25–26)
ἔκραζον·	λέγοντες·	ἔκραζον λέγοντες
11:17 (Isa 56:7)	19:46 (Isa 56:7)	21:13 (Isa 56:7)
οὐ γέγραπται ὅτι	γέγραπται	γέγραπται
12:10–11 (Ps 118:22–23)	20:17 (Ps 118:22)	21:42 (Ps 118:22–23)
οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε·	τί οὖν ἐστὶν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο	οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς·
12:26 (Exod 3:6)	20:37 (Exod 3:6)	22:32 (Exod 3:6)
οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῇ βίβλῳ Μωϋσέως ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων·	Μωϋσῆς ἐμήνυσεν ἐπὶ τῆς βάτου, ὥς λέγει	οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑμῖν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ λέγοντος· (31)

12:29–30 (Deut 6:4–5)	10:27a (Deut 6:5)	22:37 (Deut 6:5)
(ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων; [28] <i>A SCRIBE</i>) ὅτι πρώτη ἐστίν·	(ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; [26] <i>JESUS</i>) ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.	(ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; [36] <i>A LAWYER</i>) ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῷ·
12:31 (Lev 19:18)	10:27b (Lev 19:18)	22:39 (Lev 19:18)
δευτέρα αὕτη·	X	δευτέρα δὲ ὁμοία αὐτῇ·
12:36 (Ps 110:1)	20:42–43 (Ps 110:1)	22:44 (Ps 110:1)
αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ	αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν	πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον λέγων· (43)
13:14 (Dan 11:31; 12:11)		24:15 (Dan 11:31; 12:11)
Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε		Ὅταν δὲ ἴδῃτε . . . τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Δανιήλ τοῦ προφήτου
13:24 / 25 (Isa 13:10 / 34:4)		24:29 (Isa 13:10 / 34:4)
X / X		X
13:26 (Dan 7:13)	21:27 (Dan 7:13)	24:30 (Dan 7:13)
ὄψονται	ὄψονται	ὄψονται
14:27 (Zech 13:7)		26:31 (Zech 13:7)
ὅτι γέγραπται·		γέγραπται γάρ·
14:62a / b (Ps 110:1 / Dan7:13)		26:64a / b (Ps 110:1 / Dan7:13)
ὄψεσθε / X		ὄψεσθε / X
15:24 (Ps 22:18)	23:34 (Ps 22:18)	27:35 (Ps 22:18)
X	X	X
15:34 (Ps 22:1)		27:46 (Ps 22:1)
ἐβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ·		ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων·
	4:4 (Deut 8:3)	4:4 (Deut 8:3)
	γέγραπται ὅτι	γέγραπται

	4:10–11 (Ps 91:11–12)	4:6 (Ps 91:11–12)
	γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι... καὶ ὅτι...	γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι
	4:12 (Deut 6:16)	4:7 (Deut 6:16)
	εἴρηται	πάλιν γέγραπται
	4:8 (Deut 6:13)	4:10 (Deut 6:13)
	γέγραπται	γέγραπται γάρ·
	13:27 ? (Ps 6:8)	7:23 ? (Ps 6:8)
	X	X
	7:27 (Mal 3:1; Exod 23:20)	11:10 (Mal 3:1; Exod 23:20)
	οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται	οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται
	13:35 (Ps 118:26)	23:39 (Ps 118:26)
	ἕως [ἤξει ὅτε] εἴπητε	ἕως ἂν εἴπητε·

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Achtemeier, Paul J., Joel B. Green, and Marianne Meye Thompson. *Introducing the New Testament: Its Literature and Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Retelling the Old Testament." Pages 99–121 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Alkier, Stefan. "Intertextuality and the Semiotics of Biblical Texts." Pages 3–21 in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Edited by Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Allen, Leslie C. *Psalms 101–150*. WBC 21. Rev. ed. Nashville: Nelson, 2002.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of James*. ICC. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Amir, Yehoshua. "Authority and Interpretation of Scripture in the Writings of Philo." Pages 421–53 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Anderson, Paul N. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*. WUNT 2/78. Tübingen: Mohr, 1996.
- . "Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel: Consensus and Convergences." Pages 379–86 in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher. ECL 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Archer, Gleason L., and Gregory Chirichigno. *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1983.
- Arnold, Bill T., and John H. Choi. *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Attridge, Harold W. "Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 121 (2002): 3–21.
- Aune, David E. "Greco-Roman Biography." Pages 107–26 in *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament: Selected Forms and Genres*. Edited by David E. Aune. SBLSPS 21. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

- . *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. LEC 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- Bailey, James L., and Lyle D. Vander Broek. *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A Handbook*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Balfour, Glenn. "The Jewishness of John's Use of the Scriptures in John 6:31 and 7:37–38." *TynBul* 46 (1995): 357–80.
- Ball, David Mark. *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*. JSNTSup 124. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. BLS 17. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989.
- Barrett, C. K. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *JTS* 48 (1947): 155–69.
- . "The Prologue of St. John's Gospel." Pages 27–48 in *New Testament Essays*. London: SPCK, 1972.
- . *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.
- . "Luke/Acts." Pages 231–44 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Barus, Armand. "The Structure of the Fourth Gospel." *AJT* 21 (2007): 96–111.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Audience of the Fourth Gospel." Pages 101–11 in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- . *Jesus and the Eyewitness: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- . "Historiographical Characteristics of the Gospel of John." *NTS* 53 (2007): 17–36.
- . *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.
- . *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Bauer, David R. *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. JSNTSup 31. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988.

- Bauer, David R., and Robert A. Traina. *Inductive Bible Study: A Comprehensive Guide to the Practice of Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Beale, G. K. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012. Kindle edition.
- Beale, G. K., and D. A. Carson, eds. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Beasley-Murray, George R. *John*. WBC 36. 2nd ed. Nashville: Nelson, 1999.
- Beetham, Christopher A. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Colossians*. BibInt 96. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Bennema, Cornelis. "The Historical Reliability of the Gospel of John." *Foundations* 67 (2014): 4–25.
- Berding, Kenneth, and Jonathan Lunde, eds. *Three Views on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Bernard, J. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1953.
- Beutler, Johannes. "The Use of 'Scripture' in the Gospel of John." Pages 147–62 in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- . "Faith and Confession: The Purpose of John." Pages 19–31 in *Word, Theology, and Community in John*. Edited by John Painter, R. Alan Culpepper, and Fernando F. Segovia. St. Louis: Chalice, 2002.
- . *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Translated by Michael Tait. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel: Issues and Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002.
- Bock, Darrell L. "Scripture Citing Scripture: Use of the Old Testament in the New." Pages 255–76 in *Interpreting the New Testament Text: Introduction to the Art and Science of Exegesis*. Edited by Darrell L. Bock and Buist M. Fanning. Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006.
- Boda, Mark J. *Haggai, Zechariah*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004.
- Boer, Martinus C. de. "The Original Prologue to the Gospel of John." *NTS* 61 (2015): 448–67.

- Boice, James M. *Psalms 42–106*. Vol. 2 of *Psalms*. An Expository Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994.
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1983.
- Borchert, Gerald L. *John 1–11*. NAC 25A. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996.
- . *John 12–21*. NAC 25B. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2002.
- Borgen, Peder. *Bread from Heaven*. NovTSup 10. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Brant, Jo-Ann A. *John*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Brawley, R. L. “An Absent Complement and Intertextuality in John 19:28–29.” *JBL* 112 (1993): 427–43.
- Breck, John. “John 21: Appendix, Epilogue or Conclusion?” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 36 (1992): 27–49.
- Brodie, Thomas L. *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–1985.
- Brown, Jeannine K. *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective: The Portrayal and Function of the Matthean Disciples*. AcBib 9. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- . *Scripture as Communication: Introducing Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John, I–XII*. AB 29. New York: Doubleday, 1966.
- . *The Gospel According to John, XIII–XXI*. AB 30. New York: Doubleday, 1970.
- . *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York: Paulist, 1979.
- . *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. ABRL. Edited by Francis J. Moloney. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- Brown, Tricia Gates. *Spirit in the Writings of John: Johannine Pneumatology in Social-Scientific Perspective*. JSNTSup 253. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Brownson, James V. “John 20:31 and the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel.” *RefR* 48 (1995): 212–16.

- Bruce, F. F. *The Time Is Fulfilled: Five Aspects of the Fulfilment of the Old Testament in the New*. The Moore College Lectures. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.
- . *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bruner, Frederick Dale. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Brunson, Andrew C. *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John*. WUNT 2/158. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Bryan, Steven M. “Consumed by Zeal: John’s Use of Psalm 69:9 and the Action in the Temple.” *BBR* 21 (2011): 479–94.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Eng. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- . *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Rev. ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1972.
- Burge, Gary M. *John*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.
- Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Busse, Ulrich. “Die Tempelmetaphorik als ein Beispiel von implizitem Rekurs auf die biblische Tradition im Johannesevangelium.” Pages 395–428 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. BETL 81. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Bynum, Wm. Randolph. *The Fourth Gospel and Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37*. NovTSup 144. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Campbell, Constantine R. *Verbal Aspect, the Indicative Mood and Narrative: Soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Greek 13. New York: Lang, 2007.
- . *Basics of Verbal Aspect in Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2008.
- Carr, David. “Torah on the Heart: Literary Jewish Textuality within Its Ancient Near Eastern Context.” *Oral Tradition* 25 (2010): 17–40.
- Carson, D. A. “The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered.” *JBL* 106 (1987): 639–51.
- . “John and John Epistles.” Pages 245–64 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- . *The Gospel According to John*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- . “Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20:30–31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel.” *JBL* 124 (2005): 693–714.
- . “1 Peter.” Pages 1015–45 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Carson, D. A., and Douglas J. Moo. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.
- Carter, Warren. *John and Empire: Initial Explorations*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Casey, Maurice. “Christology and the Legitimizing Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament.” Pages 42–64 in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*. Edited by Steve Moyise. JSNTSup 189. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Charlesworth, James H. “The Symbolology of the Serpent in the Gospel of John.” Pages 62–72 in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 2: Aspects of Historicity in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher. ECL 2. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- . *Coming to Terms: The Rhetoric of Narrative in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Chester, Andrew. “Citing the Old Testament.” Pages 141–69 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Clark-Soles, Jaime. *Scripture Cannot Be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Cohen, Naomi G. *Philo’s Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings*. JSJSup 123. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Cole, Robert L. *The Shape and Message of Book III (Psalm 73–89)*. JSOTSup 307. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.

- Collins, John J. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.
- Collins, John J., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Colson, F. H. "Philo's Quotations from the Old Testament." *JTS* 41 (1940): 237–51.
- Cothenet, Édouard. "L'arrière-plan vétérotestamentaire du IV^e évangile." Pages 43–69 in *Origine et postérité de l'évangile de Jean: XIII^e Congrès de l'ACFEB Toulouse (1989)*. Edited by Alain Marchadour. LD 143. Paris: Cerf, 1990.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1–50*. WBC 19. Waco, TX: Word, 1983.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. "The Pivot of John's Prologue." *NTS* 27 (1980): 1–31.
- . *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- . "The Theology of the Gospel of John." *RevExp* 85 (1988): 417–32.
- . *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Interpreting Biblical Texts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.
- . "Cognition in John: The Johannine Signs as Recognition Scenes." *PRSt* 35 (2008): 251–60.
- Daly-Denton, Margaret. *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms*. AGJU 47. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . "The Psalms in John's Gospel." Pages 119–37 in *The Psalms in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. NTSI. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
- Dauids, Peter H. *The Epistle of James*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . *The First Epistle of Peter*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Davies, Margaret. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTSup 69. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." Pages 379–419 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.

- Dodd, C. H. *Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Dongell, Joseph R. *John: A Bible Commentary in the Wesleyan Tradition*. Indianapolis: Wesleyan Publishing House, 1997.
- . “Reconsidering the Puzzle of ‘Earthly Things’ in John 3:12.” Pages 89–112 in *Kingdom Rhetoric: New Testament Explorations in Honor of Ben Witherington III*. Edited by T. Michael W. Halcomb. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2013.
- Dunn, James D. G. “John the Baptist’s Use of Scripture.” Pages 42–54 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. JSNTSup 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- . *Jesus Remembered*. Vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*. 3rd ed. London: SCM, 2004.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *Paul’s Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1981.
- . “The Old Testament Canon in the Early Church.” Pages 653–90 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity*. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Enns, Peter. *Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005. Kindle edition.
- Evans, Craig A. “On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel.” *BZ* 26 (1982): 79–83.
- . “The Function of Isaiah 6:9–10 in Mark and John.” *NovT* 24 (1982): 124–38.
- . “The Structural and Theological Significance of the Quotation Formulas of John.” *Evangelical Theological Society Papers: ETS-1107* (1987): 1–28.
- . *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.
- . *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John’s Prologue*. JSNTSup 89. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Farely, Nicolas. *The Disciples in the Fourth Gospel*. WUNT 2/290. Tübingen: Siebeck, 2010.

- Faure, Alexander. "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im 4. Evangelium und die Quellenscheidungshypothese." *ZNW* 21 (1922): 99–121.
- Fee, Gordon D. "On the Text and Meaning of John 20,30–31." Pages 2193–205 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible*. HCS 27. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Fischer, Georg. "Wie geht das Johannesevangelium mit dem Alten Testamentum?" Pages 3–13 in *Im Geist und in der Wahrheit: Studien zum Johannesevangelium und zur Offenbarung des Johannes sowie andere Beiträge: Festschrift für Martin Hasitschka SJ zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Konard Huber and Boris Repschinski. NTabh 2/52. Münster: Aschendorff, 2008.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *NTS* 7 (1961): 297–333.
- . "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts." *SBLSP* 31 (1992): 524–38.
- Fortna, Robert T. *The Fourth Gospel and Its Predecessor*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Franzmann, M., and M. Klinger. "The Call Stories of John 1 and John 21." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 36 (1992): 7–15.
- Freed, Edwin D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. NovTSup 11. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Garland, David E. "The Fulfillment Quotations in John's Account of the Crucifixion." Pages 229–50 in *Perspectives on John: Method and Interpretation in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Robert B. Sloan and Mikeal C. Parsons. NABPR Special Studies Series 11. Lewiston, NY: Mellen, 1993.
- Goetchius, E. V. N. Review of *Toward a Descriptive Analysis of ἔλπει as a Linking Verb in New Testament Greek*, by Lane C. McGaughey, *JBL* 95 (1976): 147–49.
- Goldingay, John. *The Message of Isaiah 40–55: A Literary-Theological Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- . *Psalms: Volume 1, Psalms 1–41*. BCOTWP. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.
- . *Psalms: Volume 2, Psalms 42–89*. BCOTWP. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

- . *Psalms: Volume 3, Psalms 90–150*. BCOTWP. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Gonda, J. “A Remark on ‘Periphrastic’ Constructions in Greek.” *Mnemosyne* 12 (1959): 97–112.
- Goodwin, Charles. “How Did John Treat His Sources.” *JBL* 73 (1954): 61–75.
- Gundry, Robert Horton. *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew’s Gospel: With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope*. NovTSup 18. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Guthrie, George H. “Hebrews’ Use of the Old Testament: Recent Trends in Research.” *CurBR* 1 (2003): 271–94.
- Hakham, Amos. *Psalms with the Jerusalem Commentary*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Massad Marav Kook, 2002.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. “John’s Citation of Psalm LXXXII Reconsidered.” *NTS* 13 (1967): 363–67.
- . *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.
- . “John’s Use of Scripture.” Pages 358–79 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. JSNTSup 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Harris, Elizabeth. *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist*. JSNTSup 107. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Harris, Murray J. *John*. Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2015.
- Harstine, Stanley. *Moses As a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques*. JSNTSup 229. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016. Kindle edition.
- Hays, Richard B., and Joel B. Green. “The Use of the Old Testament by New Testament Writers.” Pages 122–39 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Hengel, Martin. “Die Schriftauslegung des 4. Evangeliums auf dem Hintergrund der urchristlichen Exegese.” Pages 249–88 in *»Gesetz« als Thema Biblischer Theologie*. Edited by Ingo Baldermann, Ernst Dassmann, Ottmar Fuchs, Berndt Hamm, and Otfried Hofius. Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie 4. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989.

- . “The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel.” Pages 380–95 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. JSNTSup 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- . “Eye-Witness Memory and the Writing of the Gospels: Form Criticism, Community Tradition and the Authority of the Authors.” Pages 70–96 in *The Written Gospel*. Edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . “The Prologue of the Gospel of John as the Gateway to Christological Truth.” Pages 265–94 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Hoskins, Paul M. *Jesus as the Fulfillment of the Temple in the Gospel of John*. Paternoster Biblical Monographs. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2006.
- Houwelingen, P. H. R. van. “John and the Others: To Whom Does the ‘We’ in the Fourth Gospel’s Prologue and Epilogue Refer?” *Fides Reformata* 19 (2014): 95–115.
- Humann, Roger J. “The Function and Form of the Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John.” *Lutheran Theological Review* 1 (1988): 31–54.
- Hwang, Won-Ha, and Jan van der Watt. “The Identity of the Recipients of the Fourth Gospel in the Light of the Purpose of the Gospel.” *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 63 (2007): 683–98.
- Hysten, Susan E. *Imperfect Believers: Ambiguous Characters in the Gospel of John*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009.
- Jones, Larry Paul. *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*. JSNTSup 145. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- . “‘What Is Truth?’: Pilate’s Perspective on Jesus in John 18:33–38.” Pages 77–94 in *John, Jesus, and History, Volume 3: Glimpses of Jesus Through the Johannine Lens*. Edited by Paul N. Anderson, Felix Just, and Tom Thatcher. ECL 18. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.
- Kelber, Werner H. “The Birth of a Beginning: John 1:1–18.” Pages 121–44 in *How Gospels Began*. Edited by Dennis E. Smith. Semeia 52. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

- Klauck, Hans-Josef. "Geschrieben, erfüllt, vollendet: Die Schriftzitate in der Johannespassion." Pages 140–57 in *Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannesevangelium*. Edited by Michael Labahn, Klaus Scholtissek, and Angelika Strotmann. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004.
- Klein, George L. *Zechariah*. NAC 21B. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2008.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHT 69. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.
- Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann J. Stamm. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Translated and edited under the supervision of Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999.
- Koester, Craig R. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *John*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- . "John." Pages 415–512 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- . *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters: The Word, the Christ, the Son of God*. Biblical Theology of the New Testament Series. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.
- . "The Genre of the Fourth Gospel and Greco-Roman Literary Conventions." Pages 435–62 in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts. TENTS 9. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Scott R. Swain. *Father, Son, and Spirit: The Trinity and John's Gospel*. New Studies in Biblical Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2008.
- Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 60–150: A Commentary*. CC. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.
- . *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary*. CC. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Labahn, Michael. "Scripture Talks because Jesus Talks: The Narrative Rhetoric of Persuading and Creativity in John's Use of Scripture." Pages 133–54 in *The Fourth Gospel in First-Century Media Culture*. Edited by Anthony Le Donne and Tom Thatcher. LNTS 426. London: T&T Clark, 2011.

- Lange, Armin, and Matthias Weigold. *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*. Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011.
- Lessing, R. Reed. *Isaiah 40–55*. Concordia Commentary. St. Louis: Concordia, 2011.
- Leung, Mavis M. *Reading the Old Testament with John: Revisiting John's Theology of the Cross*. Hong Kong: Tien Dao, 2015.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.
- Lieu, Judith M. "Narrative Analysis and Scripture in John." Pages 144–63 in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*. Edited by Steve Moyise. JSNTSup 189. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.
- . "The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology: Prolegomena." *NTS* 23 (1976): 59–66.
- . *The Gospel of John*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- . *John*. NTG. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.
- Loader, William. "Jesus and the Law in John." Pages 135–54 in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel: Essays by the Members of the SNTS Johannine Writings Seminar*. Edited by G. Van Belle, Jan van der Watt, and P. Maritz. BETL 184. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Malbon, Elizabeth Struthers. *Mark's Jesus: Characterization as Narrative Christology*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Manning, Gary T. *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*. JSNTSup 270. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Marcus, Joel. "Rivers of Living Water from Jesus' Belly (John 7:38)." *JBL* 117 (1998): 328–30.
- Mărgulescu, Cotiso. "Die Stellung von Joh 21 innerhalb des Johannesevangeliums." *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai, Theologia Catholica Latina* 58 (2013): 97–106.

McDonald, Lee Martin. *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.

McGaughy, Lane C. *Toward a Descriptive Analysis of $\epsilon\iota\eta\alpha\iota$ as a Linking Verb in New Testament Greek*. SBLDS 6. Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

McNeil, Brian. "The Quotation at John xii 34." *NovT* 19 (1977): 22–33.

Menken, Maarten J. J. "The Quotation from Isa 40,3 in John 1,23." *Bib* 66 (1985): 190–205.

———. "The Provenance and Meaning of the Old Testament Quotation in John 6:31." *NovT* 30 (1988): 39–56.

———. "The Translation of Psalm 41:10 in John 13:18." *JSNT* (1990): 61–79.

———. "The Textual Form and the Meaning of the Quotation from Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37." *CBQ* 55 (1993): 494–511.

———. "The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: A Survey of Recent Research." Pages 292–320 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*. Edited by Martinus C. De Boer. JSNTSup 84. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

———. *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): 160–75.

———. "The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John: Jn 10,34; 12,38; 19,24." Pages 367–93 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. BETL 81. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.

———. "Observations on the Significance of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *Neot* 33 (1999): 125–43.

———. "Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John." Pages 29–45 in *New Testament Writers and the Old Testament: An Introduction*. Edited by John M. Court. Grand Rapids: SPCK, 2002.

———. "Fulfilment of Scripture as a Propaganda Tool in Early Christianity." Pages 179–98 in *Persuasion and Dissuasion in Early Christianity, Ancient Judaism, and Hellenism*. Edited by Pieter W. van der Horst, Maarten J. J. Menken, Joop F. M. Smit, and Geert Van Oyen. CBET 33. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

———. "Allusions to the Minor Prophets in the Fourth Gospel." *Neot* 44 (2010): 67–84.

- Metzger, Bruce M. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah." *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307.
- . *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Meyers, Carol L., and Eric M. Meyers. *Zechariah 9–14*. AB 25C. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *The Gospel of John*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Miller, Paul. "'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him': The Gospel of John and the Old Testament." Pages 127–51 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Minear, Paul S. "The Original Functions of John 21." *JBL* 102 (1983): 85–98.
- Mrakuzhyil, George. *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*. AnBib 117. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1987.
- Moloney, Francis J. *The Johannine Son of Man*. Biblioteca di scienze religiose 14. Roma: LAS, 1976.
- . *The Gospel of John*. SP 4. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- . "Can Everyone be Wrong? A Reading of John 11.1–12.8." *NTS* 49 (2003): 505–27.
- . "The Gospel of John as Scripture." *CBQ* 67 (2005): 454–68.
- . *The Gospel of John: Text and Context*. BibInt 72. Boston: Brill, 2005.
- . "The Gospel of John: The 'End' of Scripture." *Int* 63 (2009): 356–66.
- Montanaro, Andrew. "The Use of Memory in the Old Testament Quotations in John's Gospel." *NovT* 59 (2017): 147–70.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983.
- . *The Letter of James*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Morgan, Richard L. "Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations." *Int* 11 (1957): 155–65.
- Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

- . *Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.
- . *The Gospel According to Matthew*. Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Moule, C. F. D. “Fulfilment-Words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse.” *NTS* 14 (1968): 293–320.
- Moyise, Steve. *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*. Continuum Biblical Studies Series. London: Continuum, 2001.
- . “Quotations.” Pages 15–28 in *As It Is Written: Studying Paul’s Use of Scripture*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Christopher D. Stanley. SBLSymS 50. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.
- . “Intertextuality and Historical Approaches to the Use of Scripture in the New Testament.” Pages 23–32 in *Reading the Bible Intertextually*. Edited by Richard B. Hays, Stefan Alkier, and Leroy A. Huizenga. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- . *Jesus and Scripture: Studying the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Myers, Alicia D. *Characterizing Jesus: A Rhetorical Analysis on the Fourth Gospel’s Use of Scripture in Its Presentation of Jesus*. LNTS 458. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- New, David S. *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis*. SBLSCS 37. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. “I Said ‘You Are Gods’: Psalm 82:6 and John 10.” *JBL* 108 (1989): 647–63.
- . *The Gospel of John in Cultural and Rhetorical Perspective*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A History and Literary Introduction*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- O’Rourke, John J. “The Fulfillment Texts in Matthew.” *CBQ* 24 (1962): 394–403.
- . “John’s Fulfillment Texts.” *ScEccl* 19 (1967): 433–43.
- Obermann, Andreas. *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium: eine Untersuchung zur johanneischen Hermeneutik anhand der Schriftzitate*. WUNT 2/83. Tübingen: Mohr, 1996.
- Olsson, Birger. *Structure and Meaning in the Fourth Gospel: A Text-Linguistic Analysis of John 2:1–11 and 4:1–42*. ConBNT 6. Lund: Gleerup, 1974.

- Østenstad, Gunnar. "The Structure of the Fourth Gospel: Can it be Defined Objectively?" *ST* 45 (1991): 33–55.
- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapter 1–39*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- . *The Book of Isaiah: Chapter 40–66*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Painter, John. "The Quotation of Scripture and Unbelief in John 12.36b–43." Pages 429–58 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner. JSNTSup 104. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *The Writings of John: A Survey of the Gospel, Epistles, and Apocalypse*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.
- Penner, Ken M. "Citation Formulae as Indices to Canonicity in Early Jewish and Early Christian Literature." Pages 62–84 in *Jewish and Christian Scriptures: The Function of "Canonical" and "Non-Canonical" Religious Texts*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth and Lee M. McDonald. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 7. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Petersen, David L. *Zechariah 9–14 and Malachi*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Petersen, Norman R. "Point of View in Mark's Narrative." *Semeia* 12 (1978): 97–121.
- Peterson, Brian Neil. *John's Use of Ezekiel: Understanding the Unique Perspective of the Fourth Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.
- Phillips, Peter M. *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Sequential Reading*. LNTS 294. London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Pink, Arthur W. *Exposition of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970.
- Pitts, Andrew W. "Source Citation in Greek Historiography and in Luke(-Acts)." Pages 349–88 in *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts. TENTs 9. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Pokorný, Petr. *From the Gospel to the Gospels: History, Theology and Impact of the Biblical Term 'euangelion'*. BZNW 195. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.
- Porter, Stanley E. Review of *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, by Christopher D. Stanley, *JETS* 41 (1998): 492–93.

- . *John, His Gospel, and Jesus: In Pursuit of the Johannine Voice*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- . *Sacred Tradition in the New Testament: Tracing Old Testament Themes in the Gospels and Epistles*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *What is Narrative Criticism?* GBS. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Poythress, Vern S. “Testing for Johannine Authorship by Examining the Use of Conjunctions.” *WTJ* 46 (1984): 350–69.
- Reim, Günter. *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*. SNTSMS 22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- . “Jesus as God in the Fourth Gospel: the Old Testament Background.” *NTS* 30 (1984): 158–60.
- Renahan, Robert. “Classical Greek Quotations in the New Testament.” Pages 17–46 in *The Heritage of the Early Church: Essays in Honor of the Very Reverend Georges Vasilievich Florovsky*. Edited by David Neiman and Margaret A. Schatkin. OrChrAn 195. Rome: Pont Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1973.
- Resseguie, James L. *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John*. BibInt 56. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Richey, Lance Byron. *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John*. CBQMS 43. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007.
- Rimmon-Kenan, Shlomith. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Roberts, Colin. “John 20:30–31 and 21:24–25.” *JTS* 38 (1987): 409–10.
- Roberts, J. J. M. *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- Robinson, Geoffrey D. “The Motif of Deafness and Blindness in Isaiah 6:9–10: A Contextual, Literary, and Theological Analysis.” *BBR* 8 (1998): 167–86.
- Ronning, John L. “The Targum of Isaiah and the Johannine Literature.” *WTJ* 69 (2007): 247–78.
- Ross, Allen P. *A Commentary on the Psalms: Volume 2 (42–89)*. Kregel Exegetical Library. Grand Rapids: Kregel Academic, 2013.

- Rothfuchs, Wilhelm. *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums: eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung*. BWANT 88. Kohlhammer: Stuttgart, 1969.
- Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Schaefer, Konrad. *Psalms*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Schlund, Christine. »Kein Knochen soll gebrochen werden«: *Studien zu Bedeutung und Funktion des Pesachfests in Texten des frühen Judentums und im Johannesevangelium*. WMANT 107. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2005.
- Schmid, Wolf. *Narratology: An Introduction*. Translated by Alexander Starritt. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel according to St. John*. 3 vols. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- . *Jesus in the Gospels: A Biblical Christology*. Translated by O. G. Dean. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Schuchard, Bruce 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.
- Segal, Benjamin J. *A New Psalm: The Psalms as Literature*. Jerusalem: Gefen, 2013.
- Segovia, Fernando F. "The Final Farewell of Jesus: A Reading of John 20:30–21:25." Pages 167–90 in *The Fourth Gospel from a Literary Perspective*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Fernando F. Segovia. Semeia 53. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1991.
- . "John 1:1–18 as Entrée into Johannine Reality." Pages 33–64 in *Word, Theology, and Community in John*. Edited by John Painter, R. Alan Culpepper, and Fernando F. Segovia. St. Louise: Chalice, 2002.
- Senior, Donald. "The Lure of the Formula Quotations: Re-assessing Matthew's Use of the Old Testament with the Passion Narrative as Test Case." Pages 89–115 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. BETL 81. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Sheridan, Ruth. *Retelling Scripture: 'The Jews' and the Scriptural Citations in John 1:19–12:15*. BibInt 110. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Shidemantle, C. Scott. "The Use of the Old Testament in John 7:37–39: An Examination of the Freed-Carson Proposal." Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2001.

- Simmons, Billy E. "A Christology of the 'I Am' Sayings in the Gospel of John." *TTE* 38 (1988): 94–103.
- Simpson, T. W. "Testimony in John's Gospel: The Puzzle of 5:31 and 8:14." *TynBul* 65 (2014): 101–18.
- Smith, D. Moody. "The Presentation of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." *Int* 31 (1977): 367–78.
- . "The Pauline Literature." Pages 265–91 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Smith, Gary V. *Isaiah 40–66*. NAC 15B. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2009.
- Stanley, Christopher D. "Paul and Homer: Greco-Roman Citation Practice in the First Century CE." *NovT* 32 (1990): 48–78.
- . *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . "The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method." Pages 44–58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigation and Proposals*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. JSNTSup 148. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.
- Stanley, Jeff. "The Structure of John's Prologue: Its Implications for the Gospel's Narrative Structure." *CBQ* 48 (1986): 241–64.
- Stanton, Graham. "Matthew." Pages 205–19 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Stendahl, Krister. *The School of St. Matthew, and Its Use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Indiana Literary Biblical Series. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- . "Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse." *Poetics Today* 66 (1990): 107–56.
- Stibbe, Mark W. G. *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*. SNTSMS 73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- . *John's Gospel*. New Testament Readings. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. *Zephaniah: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

- Tabb, Brian. "Jesus's Thirst at the Cross: Irony and Intertextuality in John 19:28." *EvQ* 85 (2013): 338–51.
- Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 51–100*. WBC 20. Dallas: Word, 1990.
- Tenney, Merrill C. "Literary Keys to the Fourth Gospel: Old Testament and the Fourth Gospel." *BSac* 120 (1963): 300–308.
- Thompson, David L. *Psalms 1–72: A Commentary in the Wesleyan Tradition*. New Beacon Bible Commentary. Kansas City: Beacon Hill, 2015.
- Thompson, Marianne Meye. "'They Bear Witness to Me': The Psalms in the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of John." Pages 267–83 in *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*. Edited by J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Thyen, Hartwig. *Das Johannesevangelium*. HNT 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Tidball, Derek. "Completing the Circle: The Resurrection according to John." *Evangelical Review of Theology* 30 (2006): 169–83.
- Traina, Robert A. *Methodical Bible Study*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985.
- Uspensky, Boris. *A Poetics of Composition: The Structure of the Artistic Text and Typology of a Compositional Form*. Translated by Valentina Zavarin and Susan Wittig. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973.
- Vahrenhorst, Von Martin. "Johannes und die Tora: Überlegungen zur Bedeutung der Tora im Johannesevangelium." *KD* 54 (2008): 14–36.
- Vermes, Geza. "Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature." *JSS* 34 (1989): 493–508.
- . *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Penguin Classics. 5th. ed. London: Penguin Books, 2011.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.
- Watts, John D. W. *Isaiah 1–33*. WBC 24. Waco, TX: Word, 1985.
- . *Isaiah 34–66*. WBC 25. Waco, TX: Word, 1987.
- Weiser, Artur. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. OTL. Translated by Herbert Hartwell. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.

- Williams, Catrin H. Review of *Die Christologische Erfüllung Der Schrift Im Johannesevangelium*, by Andreas Obermann, *JTS* 49 (1998): 237–39.
- . “Isaiah in John’s Gospel.” Pages 101–16 in *Isaiah in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Steve Moyise and Maarten J. J. Menken. NTSI. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- . “John, Judaism, and ‘Searching the Scriptures’.” Pages 77–100 in *John and Judaism: A Contested Relationship in Context*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Paul N. Anderson. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Wilson, Gerald H. *Psalms Volume I*. NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Lutterworth, 1995.
- Witkamp, L. Th. “Jesus’ Thirst in John 19:28–30: Literal or Figurative?” *JBL* 115 (1996): 489–510.
- Woods, Mark William. “The Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel: The Hermeneutical Method Employed in the ‘Semeia’ and Its Significance for Contemporary Biblical Interpretation.” Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980.
- Yamasaki, Gary. *Watching a Biblical Narrative: Point of View in Biblical Exegesis*. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- . *Perspective Criticism: Point of View and Evaluative Guidance in Biblical Narrative*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2012.
- Zink, James Keith. “The Use of the Old Testament in the Apocrypha.” Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1963.
- Zola, Nicholas J. “The One Who Eats My Bread Has Lifted His Heel Against Me: Psalm 41:10 in 1QH^a 13.25–26 and John 13:18.” *PRSt* 37 (2010): 407–19.
- Zumstein, Jean. “Intratextuality and Intertextuality in the Gospel of John.” Pages 121–35 in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore. Translated by Gray, Mike. SBLRBS 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.