

**NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY
(POTCHEFSTROOM CAMPUS)**

in association with

Greenwich School of Theology UK

**CONFIDENT AND IMAGINATIVE:
SCRIPTURE & HERMENEUTIC IN THE
JOHANNINE PASSION NARRATIVE AND TODAY**

by

Revd JOHN PERUMBALATH, BD, MA, MTh

**For the thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the Philosophiae Doctor degree in New Testament studies of the
North-West University (Potchefstroom Campus)**

Promoter: Prof Stephen W Need

Co-Promoter: Prof GJC Jordaan

**Potchefstroom
2007**

CONFIDENT AND IMAGINATIVE: SCRIPTURE & HERMENEUTIC IN THE JOHANNINE PASSION NARRATIVE AND TODAY

TABLE of CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
2.0	SCRIPTURE IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL	
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	Prominent Issues in the Study of the Johannine use of Scripture	5
2.3	John's Understanding of the term 'Scripture'	19
2.4	John's use of the Fulfilment Formula	28
2.5	A Structural Overview of the Johannine Passion Narrative	31
2.6	Summary	37
3.0	EXPLICIT SCRIPTURE QUOTATIONS IN THE JOHANNINE PASSION NARRATIVE	
3.1	Introduction	39
3.2	"They Divided my Garments" (19:24)	40
3.3	"I Thirst" (19:28, 29)	49
3.4	"No Bone Shall be Broken" (19:36)	53
3.5	"They Shall Look on the One They have Pierced" (19:37)	58
3.6	Summary	62

4.0	IMPLICIT ALLUSIONS TO SCRIPTURE IN THE JOHANNINE PASSION NARRATIVE	
4.1	Introduction	64
4.2	Criteria for Allusions	64
4.3	Paschal Imagery	67
4.4	The 'I AM' Sayings	76
4.5	The Servant of Yahweh	82
4.6	The Isaac Story	86
4.7	Summary	88
5.0	JOHN'S HERMENEUTIC OF SCRIPTURE IN HIS PASSION NARRATIVE	
5.1	Introduction	90
5.2	John's Hermeneutical Context	90
5.3	Appropriation Techniques	100
5.4	Hermeneutical Issues	104
5.5	Summary	109
6.0	JOHN'S USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THE LIGHT OF OUR CONTEMPORARY HERMENEUTICAL QUEST	
6.1	Introduction	110
6.2	In Search of a Paradigm	110
6.3	Hermeneutical Axioms	119
6.4	Hermeneutical Method	129
6.5	The Nature of Hermeneutics	134
6.6	'Meaning' in Interpretation	139
6.7	Validity of Interpretation	141
6.8	Summary	143

7.0	CONCLUSION	144
8.0	BIBLIOGRAPHY	150

CONFIDENT AND IMAGINATIVE: SCRIPTURE & HERMENEUTIC IN THE JOHANNINE PASSION NARRATIVE AND TODAY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

There have been a number of significant contributions to the study of the use of the Hebrew Scriptures in the New Testament (eg Dodd, 1950; Lindars, 1961; Longenecker, 1977; Ellis, 1992; Moyise, 2001), including those focused more specifically on the use of the Old Testament by the writer of the Fourth Gospel (Hanson, 1991; Schuchard, 1992; Menken, 1996; Obermann, 1996). All of these studies have emphasised one or more of the following concerns: text, source, appropriation techniques and faithfulness to the original context; the purpose of each contributor has been to attempt to identify a common objective in the New Testament writers' use of the Old Testament in their own writings.

There has been a tendency in recent discussions within the field of hermeneutics to return to the classics or pre-modern interpreters for inspiration (cf Frei, 1974; Lindbeck, 1977; Young, 1997; Clark, 1999). Many of these works affirm that not only did interpreters of Scripture from a previous age have coherent systems of interpretation in place that were appropriate in their own context, but also that our own investigations can benefit from a similar approach.

If a return to the classics and ancient interpreters is justifiable in current hermeneutical discussions, then surely a study of the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament is especially relevant in the light of hermeneutical reflection, given that it represents the earliest Christian interpretation of Scripture. Moreover, although a number of scholars have pointed out the hermeneutical relevance of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament (eg Dunn, 1987; Thiselton, 1992), and Richard Hays has demonstrated the hermeneutical relevance of Paul's use of the Hebrew Scriptures (1989), there has yet to be a systematic study that addresses this question in relation to John's use of the Old Testament.

No satisfactory attempt has been made to produce a comprehensive hermeneutical appreciation of the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament. Although scholars have studied isolated issues and asked questions that might be described as loosely related to the subject, it seems that there is a need for a concerted and deliberate study that collates and interprets relevant research on the New Testament use of the Old Testament with a primary hermeneutical interest, whilst at the same time assessing the New Testament writers' hermeneutic of Scripture as a coherent system. This research is a modest attempt in that direction.

Any evaluation of this kind must begin with an exegetical task: a closer look at the New Testament texts where the Old Testament is either quoted or alluded to. The confines of time and space, however, dictate that it is beyond the scope of this work to consider the whole of the New Testament exegetically, and so a choice must be made. With this in mind, I have selected the Johannine passion narrative (**Jn 18, 19**), which employs four direct quotations from the Old Testament in addition to a number of inferences to Old Testament texts and narratives.

A hermeneutical reflection on John's use of Scripture in his passion narrative demands the involvement of any perceived hermeneutical concerns in dialogue with the Johannine use of Scripture *per se*. One of the basic presuppositions in doing this is that the interpreters of Scripture in all ages share some common concerns regarding similar issues. This being understood, I propose to employ both modern and post-modern categories in my discussion in an attempt to demonstrate that there are clear parallels between pre-modern interpretation of Scripture (here represented by John) and the late modern/post-modern interpretative trends. The central question of this work, therefore, is: 'What is the nature and purpose of the Johannine hermeneutic of Scripture as found in his passion narrative?'

The questions that naturally arise from this problem are:

- What are the main concerns raised by existing contributions in the fields of Old and New Testament studies in general and John's use of the Old Testament in particular and what significant questions emerge from these studies?

- What are the explicit and implicit references to Scripture in the Johannine passion narrative, and why and how does John use them?
- What insights can be attained by applying contemporary hermeneutical concerns to the study of John's use of Scripture?

The main aim of this thesis is to provide a positive assessment of the nature and purpose of the Johannine hermeneutic of Scripture through a study of John's use of Scripture in his passion narrative.

The objectives of this study must be seen in their relationship to the aim. In so doing, I intend to approach the subject from three angles:

- i) To critically assess the existing contributions in the fields of Old and New Testament studies in general and John's use of the Old Testament in particular, identifying the main concerns raised and collating the significant questions that emerge from these studies.
- ii) To identify the passages in the Johannine passion narrative where Scripture is either quoted directly or alluded to and explore such passages exegetically in order to determine the hermeneutic that guided John in his use of Scripture.
- iii) To explicate hermeneutical insights from John's use of Scripture by applying it to contemporary hermeneutical concerns and observing any points of similarity or otherwise between the Johannine hermeneutic and some contemporary hermeneutical trends.

The central theoretical argument of this thesis is that the writer of the Fourth Gospel has a coherent hermeneutic, which addresses concerns that are similar to those in contemporary hermeneutics, and his way of dealing with these concerns has parallels in some of the recent hermeneutical trends.

This study will employ linguistic and textual research, using tools from modern literary studies and historiography, particularly for the critical assessment of the existing contributions with the purpose of identifying and discussing the major concerns in the area of research. I shall use the markers (eg quotation formulae) available within the

narrative itself to identify scripture quotations, whilst at the same time developing a set of criteria and applying them to the suggested passages in order to establish biblical allusions. A detailed study of the results will then be undertaken in which the passages concerned will be subject to historico-theological exegesis and narrative analysis. I shall attempt to evaluate and describe John's hermeneutic that guided him in his use of scripture by reviewing the results of the exegetical study in the light of the issues and concerns identified in the assessment of the existing contributions

In order to achieve the objective of explicating hermeneutical insights from John's use of scripture, I shall make use of contemporary hermeneutical categories and establish a dialogue between John's hermeneutic and contemporary hermeneutics. By comparing John's use of scripture with some of the contemporary trends in hermeneutics, I shall attempt to establish that John had faced issues similar to the ones we face today in biblical interpretation and that his subsequent approach has parallels today. Being fully aware that no such study can be entirely detached from the bias of the one carrying out the research, however unintentional, I must acknowledge that my broad agreement with the post-liberal schools of theology and hermeneutics will not be hidden from this study.

2.0 SCRIPTURE IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It is the central argument of this thesis that the Fourth Evangelist has a coherent hermeneutic, which addresses concerns that are similar to those in contemporary hermeneutics, and that his way of dealing with these concerns has parallels in some of the recent hermeneutical trends. I intend to establish this by examining the use of scripture in the Johannine passion narrative. Before taking up a detailed analysis of John's use of scripture in his passion narrative, however, some other more general concerns must first be addressed: John's use of the term 'scripture,' his use of 'fulfilment formula' and the structure of the Johannine passion narrative. In order to set this study in context and assess the state of research in this area today, it will also be helpful to look at current scholarship regarding John's use of scripture.

2.2 PROMINENT ISSUES IN THE STUDY OF THE JOHANNINE USE OF SCRIPTURE

John's Old Testament quotations are obviously few in number, though he does use scripture in a variety of other ways. The whole Gospel is set against the background of the Old Testament. There are innumerable allusions to the texts, events and persons of the Old Testament. In certain cases, the structure of a narrative itself is an allusion to the Old Testament. This class of allusions in this exact form is particular to John (Hanson, 1980: 170). Old Testament places, symbols and institutions are woven into the very fabric of John's narrative. John uses the 'fulfilment' formula only in the second half of his Gospel where the emphasis is the suffering and death of Jesus. Here it is the evangelist not Jesus who quotes the scripture (in Culpepper & Black, eds, 1996: 158).

John makes use of the Old Testament passages that had already been recognised as Christological in the tradition of primitive Christianity (Smith, 1972: 54; Lindars, 1961: 265-272). As John's Gospel belongs to the later period of the New Testament, it would be interesting to see how it makes use of earlier traditions of using scripture. It seems that in the context of the controversy between Christian Jews and non-Christian Jews, the individual 'proof-texts' no longer count; rather it is the whole of the scripture that is at stake (see Culpepper & Black, eds, 1996: 158). John's use of the Old Testament has

an unmistakable Christological focus. For John, the entire Old Testament testifies to Jesus (**Jn 5:39, 45, 46**).

In this section, I propose to trace the development of major emphases and concerns in the study of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel that have emerged in the past. This short review raises some questions that will have to be considered in this evaluation of John's use of scripture in his passion narrative.

2.2.1 Sources: Generic and Creative

How did John find the Old Testament references he used? Did he discover the passages for himself or did he find the passages in some common source(s) that he could readily use? These are the concerns that need to be addressed in this section.

In discussing the use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel, Menken concludes that John received the major part of his scripture quotations from portions of "what CH Dodd called 'the Bible of the early church': Zech 9-14; Isa 6:1-9:7; 40:1-11; 52:13-53:12; Psm 69: 22, 34, 41" (Menken, 1996: 209). It will be noticed that all Johannine Old Testament quotations except one (ie **19:36**) are drawn from the Old Testament passages identified as part of the early Christian testimonia. He has four from Isaiah (**1:23; 6:45; 12:38, 40**), seven from the Psalms (**2:17; 6:31; 10:34; 12:13; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24**) and two from Zechariah (**12:15; 19:37**). Many scholars have concluded that John made use of primitive Christian testimonies (Smith, 1984: 54). But at the same time, it should be acknowledged that most of the textual and conceptual allusions found in the Fourth Gospel are from Pentateuchal passages, which are not considered as part of suggested testimonia.

The classic formulation of testimonia theory goes back to Rendel Harris' attempt (1920) to explain some problems in the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament, such as the same composite quotations found in different traditions of New Testament literature where the quotations are placed together without reference to their authors (cf **Rom 9:25-29; 10:15-21; 11:8-10; 11:26, 34, 35; 15:9-12; 2 Cor 6:16-18; 1 Pet 2:6-8**). Harris also observed that these composite quotations are often organised around a catchword, such as 'heathen' or 'stone'. Other issues involved the attribution of citations to wrong authors (eg **Mk 1:2, 3** ascribes **Malachi 3:1** to Isaiah) and

citations that diverge from the commonly used text of the Septuagint. He traced them back to the use of testimonia that he conceived as a written collection of messianic proof-texts used by the early church, for a polemic directed against the Jews. Dodd (1953: 28-30) rejected the hypothesis of a single document of proof-texts and included the wider field of oral tradition in his discussion. He further argued that the isolated quotations are not proof-texts in the New Testament, but that they point to the overall context of the passage quoted, knowledge of which is assumed. He concluded that there was a consensus among the early Christians about specific textual 'fields' in the Old Testament and this is reflected in the repeated use of the same and neighbouring texts in various New Testament books. Lindars (1961: 75-131), agreeing with Dodd, made inquiries into the specific apologetic circumstance that led the early Christians to choose these texts. He concluded that the early Christians found it necessary to defend the passion of Christ scripturally and hence a 'passion apologetic' was behind the choice of early Christian testimonies. Dodd (1963: 272-283) identified certain blocks from the Prophets and the Psalms, Abraham references in Genesis and messianic texts from 2 Samuel 7 as the core of the testimonia.

Testimonia hypotheses have had a far-reaching influence in the study of the Old Testament in the New Testament, though the suggestion about a written book of messianic proof-texts in the early Christian community has not found much scholarly support. These hypotheses rightly pointed out a common tradition underlying the Old Testament references found throughout the New Testament. Dodd's proposal of 'textual fields', which was followed up by Lindars, was found to be more appealing by New Testament scholars, though this theory also faced objections from Sundberg (1959: 268-81). He argued that the New Testament authors seemed to have drawn their citations from such a wide area of the Old Testament and hence it is unlikely that they were following a tradition that directed attention to specific limited texts. Dodd's focus was on a common tradition, which was shared by the New Testament writers in general in their use of the Old Testament (rather than a statistical survey of individual instances), while Sundberg's argument was based on the Old Testament materials found in the New Testament, which are not part of that suggested tradition. The presence of such extra material does not rule out the possibility of a common tradition. It could rather mean that Dodd's assessment of the concerned tradition was not adequate: the range of the texts was not as narrow or limited as he envisaged. It can also mean that, in addition to what New Testament writers shared in common, each of them or their

communities had used other sources too. It is also possible that reflection or study of the Old Testament by different communities paved the way for highlighting many other Old Testament passages also.

Fitzmyer (1957: 513-537) suggests that the possibility of a testimonia tradition was further strengthened after the Qumran discoveries. A small collection of pre-Christian testimonies was found among the Qumran literature. Although *4Q Testimonia* (4Q175) has more Pentateuchal texts and they do not coincide with the passages identified as early Christian testimonia, this discovery proves that there were collections of messianic texts in pre-Christian Judaism and it strengthens the possibility of a Christian testimonia collection. Whilst it would be inappropriate to speculate into the nature and the extent of Christian testimonies, it is possible to conclude that there were certain blocks or portions of scripture that were recognised by the early followers of Jesus as important for their reflection on the Christ event. Whether they were fully written down or were partly available as documents or remained entirely as part of early Christian oral tradition we are not able to decide (for arguments in favour of written testimonia, see Albl: 1999: 286, 287). New Testament writers drew their Old Testament quotations and allusions from these portions freely even though they also used certain texts that are not recognised among the testimonies, which came to them through other sources. How much John relied on this testimonia tradition can be decided only after a thorough investigation of his literature.

Another source suggested for the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel is Jewish lectionaries. Postulating a triennial lectionary cycle that was supposedly at use in the Jewish synagogues, Aileen Guilding (1960) argued that the Fourth Gospel should be understood as a book of sermons based on Jewish lectionary readings. In her analysis of the pattern of the Fourth Gospel, she finds the whole set of Jewish festivals in the backdrop of the Gospel: Passover, New Year, Tabernacles, Dedication and Purim.

The facts about the lectionary suggested are not easy to ascertain. All that we can conclude from various reliable sources available is that in the synagogues the reading of the Law of Moses was a well established custom in the first century AD. Josephus (*Against Apion*, 2: 175) bears testimony to this. At the same time, this cannot tell us anything about the modalities of readings on Sabbath mornings, especially about the specific texts for each occasion and their order in a series of readings. Many scholars do

not accept that there is evidence for an organised or established lectionary for synagogues until after the fall of the Second Temple (for a detailed discussion, see Mulder, 1988: 137-159). The innumerable allusions to various Pentateuchal passages, events and figures in the Gospel of John may possibly be explained in the light of widespread use of the Pentateuch in the first-century Judaism, but this does not enable us to reconstruct a synagogue lectionary.

Synoptic tradition is considered by many scholars to be one of the sources for John's use of the Old Testament. Freed (1965: 130) suggests that John used synoptic sources and Old Testament texts simultaneously: "John's school felt the need, among many other things, to strengthen and defend the synoptic presentation of Jesus through the use of additional Old Testament texts." Although Reim's (1974) conclusion that John used insertions from a fourth synoptic Gospel is highly hypothetical and has not found much support, it points to some sort of synoptic connection. Moody Smith points out that "in several instances John has an explicit testimony that is only suggested in Mark" (1984: 54).

Although it is not possible to make a judgment at this introductory stage as to whether there is any emphasis in John's narrative that would make us think he was strengthening or defending the synoptic presentation of Jesus, it can be observed that there are enough indications to conclude that John was aware of the synoptic tradition. Some influence of this tradition can be detected in his Gospel. First of all, there are similarities in the overall structure and outline. The Johannine story, like the synoptic one, begins with John the Baptist (avoiding the prologue) and progresses through the calling of the disciples (in John's Gospel they are rather 'quest stories') and miracles towards the passion, death, resurrection and appearances of Jesus. Secondly, John has many sections that show strong similarities with the synoptic tradition: the Baptist traditions, the cleansing of the Temple, the healing miracles, the feeding of the multitude, the anointing of Jesus' feet, the entry into Jerusalem, the last supper, to name a few. Thirdly, there is some overall agreement of order between John and Mark with some verbal parallels (Painter, 1991: 73-80). Whether this can then explain as to how, in the passion narratives, John's Old Testament quotations and their use are very close to the same in synoptic tradition is a matter of investigation in this research.

Reim (1974) discusses the possibility of Old Testament quotations coming to John in his *semeia* source. He holds that John expanded this source with wisdom themes and insertions from a fourth synoptic Gospel. Reim further concludes that the influence of the Elijah/Elisha tradition in John's narrative came from this *semeia* source. Although the *semeia* source has found support amongst some scholars (Brown, 1970: vii; Fortna & Thatcher, 2001: 191-235), the possibility of explaining the Johannine signs without postulating such a specific signs source cannot be overruled. It can be shown that Johannine signs are generally similar (except for the first sign at Cana) to the miracles found in the synoptics. Moreover, Bultmann's and Fortna's theory concerning the signs source presupposes that the narrative source was free from discourse. However, it seems "highly likely that narrative and discourse were woven together from the beginning of the Johannine development" (Painter: 1991: 86). A *semeia* source theory has not evoked much impact on the study of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel, but only a detailed study of the influence of the Old Testament in the portions identified as coming from *semeia* can help us to make any conclusion in this matter. The whole discussion warns us that we must take into account the question of specifically Johannine sources in our study of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel.

Where do these discussions lead us? Are we to conclude that the New Testament writers shared the sources of their scripture references and, hence, there is nothing much creative in their individual choice and use of the scripture portions? Or should we play down the question of sources and assume that each writer was responsible for the choice of the scripture passages for his theological reflection? Neither position will do justice to the practice of the early Christian interpreters of scripture. The possibility of some sources has emerged in our discussion. A tradition of testimonies containing selected portions is well attested and John's dependence on this tradition, like that of other New Testament writers, is a plausible option. We should also investigate whether his choice and use of Old Testament materials were influenced also by the synoptic tradition and *semeia* source.

This does not necessarily imply that John was less creative in his use of the scripture, for he was not so bound by the *testimonia* that he could not look for scriptural references elsewhere. In the Fourth Gospel most of the textual allusions are to Pentateuchal sections, which are not considered a part of the *testimonia*. The author uses scripture from the whole range of the Old Testament writings and this makes mere

dependence on a few sources unlikely. He was a creative user of scripture. We will need a thorough exegetical study in order to appreciate his creative use of scripture. The question of sources also leads us to the relationship between scripture and tradition, which will also have to be explored exegetically.

2.2.2 Purpose and Nature: Polemic but Generative

Was scripture only a tool for the articulation of John's message or did scripture play a role in formulating the message? Was scripture a servant or the master? Lindars (1961: 265-272) argued that Johannine formula quotations have a clear apologetic tendency. Moody Smith (1976: 236-241) has also emphasised the apologetic function of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel. Situating the Gospel against the background of Jewish Christian and Jewish non-Christian debate and polemic within the context of the synagogue, he finds the need for a scriptural apologetic in order to justify the passion of Jesus, which John undertook in the Gospel by the addition of some Old Testament *testimonia*. Smith's study has brought to light the theological and the structural function of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel.

This issue has played a vital role in the discussions on the use of the Old Testament by the New Testament writers since CH Dodd (1950: 12ff), who placed the emphasis on the kerygma of the church. Consequently, he maintained that the exegesis of the Old Testament came within the church later in aid of kerygma and this exegesis became the substructure of New Testament theology. Lindars (1961: 13ff) accepted the basic arguments of Dodd and carried the discussion further by establishing that the choice of texts and the handling of them by early Christians were shaped by their apologetic concerns.

The debate between Borgen and Lindars was an important turning point in this discussion. Over against the conclusion of Lindars that the place of the Old Testament in the formation of New Testament Theology was that of a servant, Borgen (1976: 59-71) argued that, as the scriptures had authority for New Testament writers, the scriptures "created many of the theological issues which were taken up in the New Testament." Wilcox (in Carson & Williamson, eds, 1986: 1-17) and Black (in Best & Wilson, eds, 1979: 231-250) also responded to Lindars' proposals by arguing that the Old Testament and its interpretation was the matrix out of which the kerygma sprang. Smith posits that

“one must take seriously Paul’s appropriation of the Old Testament and his understanding of it as providing the framework, if not the root, of his theology” (in Evans & Stegner, eds, 1994: 287), whilst Hanson (in Evans & Stegner, eds, 1994: 377), concludes his study of John’s use of the scripture by suggesting that it acts as a control upon John: “At times, it seems to be his mentor.”

Borgen and others who responded to Lindars were able to put the generative function of scripture in the New Testament thought to the forefront of the discussion. A tension between the generative and polemic functions of scripture is present in Lindars thought itself. Although he uses the term ‘servant’ to emphasise the polemical nature of the use of the Old Testament in New Testament, he accepts that the Old Testament is “the greatest single influence in the formation of New Testament Theology” and that the scriptures have “an authority which is unquestioned” (1976: 60). The problem lies with the inadequacy of the metaphor of ‘servant’ in explaining the New Testament writers’ use of the Old Testament. Borgen (1976: 70, 71) rightly points out that scripture is rather an “authoritative witness.”

On the one hand, it is the impact of the work, death and resurrection of Jesus that provided the disciples with revised hermeneutical axioms for understanding scripture in a new way, whilst the apologetic concerns of this kerygma demanded further reflection on the scriptures. On the other hand, however, as Jews, the first disciples needed scriptural support to make sense of the Christ event, especially in terms of the cross. Jesus himself interpreted his mission through the scriptures. This means that scriptural reflection was generated within the Church before it was further stimulated by apologetic concerns (see Carson & Williamson, eds, 1986: 259). We are facing here a dialogical situation: the Christ event interpreting scripture and scripture interpreting the Christ event. The Old Testament provided images to understand Christ and the New Testament redefined the same images in the light of Christ (Moyise, 2001: 135). In the first instance, the context and the contemporary concerns of the early Christians compelled them to look at the Old Testament with new perspectives whilst, at the same time, scripture provided them with categories and perspectives with which they could approach their own situation and constitute their strategy and message. We should be able to keep scripture and the interpretative context in a balance. Each has to be taken into account on its own merits as interpretation is a dialogical process involving both.

In this context it is necessary for us to inquire into the possible context of John's Gospel and his use of the Old Testament. Brown (1979) has worked out a complete history of the Johannine community based on Martyn's (1979: 18ff) proposal of a "two-level drama," where the story of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel reflects also the experience of the Johannine Community. Although this reconstruction is highly speculative, the core of the argument points to an essential dimension in the Johannine context: the determinative factor in the milieu of Johannine community was its exclusion from the synagogue and the subsequent conflict between the two. There is a dialogue between the synagogue and the Johannine community underlying the scheme of the Gospel. We must expect this situation to be reflected in John's use of the Old Testament. Craig Evans (1993: 172) suggests what we see in the Fourth Gospel is a "Christological apologetic that is not only rooted in Jewish Scriptures but which also presupposes Jewish assumptions and thinking."

Most of the studies in John's use of the Old Testament have not given proper attention to the interplay between the Johannine community's particular interpretative context and the scripture that is interpreted. We can easily notice that some of the scripture quotations in the Fourth Gospel are found in the context of the apologetic-polemical exchange with "the Jews". Do the Old Testament references in the Gospel perform an apologetic-polemic function? Are these references used as part of claiming an alternate identity for the community? If not, what purpose do they serve in relation to the overall structure of the Gospel? These questions are yet to be addressed.

If John's use of scripture, like that of other New Testament writers, was both polemic and generative, there are many aspects of this dynamic interpretative process that must be considered in detail. We will have to take up these aspects and shape our questions accordingly when we engage with Johannine texts in detail later in this exegetical exercise. These concerns include the function of scripture in his specific circumstances. Another area would be the nature of the dialogue between the authoritative text and the interpreter's context; it is necessary to explore how these partners in dialogue are engaged with each other. It also concerns us as to how in John's interpretation the gap between the ancient text and the immediate context was bridged. That would also force us to explore John's approach to his own context; whether he had a critical engagement with scripture, on one hand, and the context, on the other.

2.2.3 Text Forms: Dependence with Freedom

The problem of varying text forms that were available to the New Testament writers has been a confusing area of inquiry for many scholars. The problem lies in the fact that many of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament do not agree with any Old Testament text known to us.

There have been a number of focused studies on the text form of the Old Testament references in the Fourth Gospel. Many scholars agree that, like other New Testament writers, John's basic text was the Greek Septuagint. However, a dissenting voice came as early as 1922 from Charles Burney (1922: 114-123). He concluded that all the Old Testament citations in John are either accurate quotations from or free reminiscences of the Hebrew text. One of the quotations (found in **Jn 7:38**) he considered to be a misreading of the Aramaic text. We should recognise that there were limitations for such a study in Burney's time. First of all, the concept of redactional concern was not taken into account in biblical studies of his age and, hence, all the variations had to be explained as conformity with another text or as the result of the human error on the side of the author. Secondly, only a limited number of text forms – chiefly Septuagint and Masoretic Text – was known to have been available to New Testament writers, whilst later research and discoveries have come to acknowledge other text forms in the first century AD. Still, Burney's studies challenge a 'Septuagint only' attitude.

Most of the scholars who agree that the Septuagint was the basic scripture text for the author of the Fourth Gospel also acknowledge that he knew the Hebrew text and, at times, made use of it (Freed, 1965: 6). Brown (1970: ix) endorses the suggestion that many of the Old Testament quotations in John are independently translated from the Hebrew text. Hengel talks about John's "ability to examine and correct Septuagintal formulations based on his knowledge of the Hebrew text" and he attributes it to "certain scribal knowledge" (in Evans & Stegner, eds, 1994: 395).

The attempts of Menken and Schuchard to study the text form of the Old Testament quotations in John must be noted, especially as the method employed by them combined the questions of sources and redaction. Menken, who introduced this method in various articles that later appeared in his book, defines his purpose as seeing "whether an adequate explanation of the form of quotation can be reached by taking into account

Johannine redaction of the Old Testament passages, in a textual form which is known or can be reasonably argued” (1996: 14). He establishes that all the variations in the quotations are deliberate changes made by the evangelist due to his exegetical and theological considerations. He concludes that, with the exception of three quotations (in 12:40; 13:18; 19:37) that may have come from a Hebrew version, other cases strongly support a Septuagintal origin. Bruce Schuchard followed the same method, but concluded that “there is in John’s citations tangible evidence for the use of one and only one textual tradition, the Old Greek” (1992: xvii).

The methodology of Menken and Schuchard is not without problems. In their study, a source or a basic text is decided first and then the deviations from that text are inquired into. Here Menken is more open to other textual traditions, but Schuchard seems to have stuck to one permanent hypothesis in the case of every quotation: the text is from the Septuagint. Is it necessary to presuppose a basic text in such a study for comparing the present text form? How certain can we be about this initial hypothesis? One can presuppose another basic text and work through the same method to arrive at more or less the same conclusions. In the cases where Menken feels that John chose the Hebrew text to suit his purposes over against the Septuagint, we may ask why John could not achieve his purpose by simply altering/changing his otherwise basic text. On Schuchard’s study, one might ask about the quotations where both the Septuagintal text and John’s quotations are identical in the form and are accurate translations of the Masoretic Text (10:34; 12:38; 19:34), as to what they can enlighten us about the relationship between form and function. Menken rightly avoids a discussion on these passages and he acknowledges that there is nothing to be learnt about authorial redaction from them.

We must also consider the possibility of multiple Hebrew and Greek versions in John’s time. The discovery of some readings previously considered as peculiar to the Septuagint in Qumran Hebrew Manuscripts suggests that a Hebrew Old Testament text similar to the Septuagint can be posited. This text tradition may possibly be the basis of the Septuagint. The Samaritan Pentateuch represents another possible Palestinian tradition (Moo, 1983: 45). Also, the texts attested to by targums and that of peshitta have to be considered as potential sources for pre-Christian readings (Black, 1967: 20-22). In the case of the Septuagint, we are to accept the textual variations within this family. So the scholars speak of LXX-A, LXX-B and LXX-F (Ellis, 1956: 16-20). The

possibility of other Greek translations of the Old Testament also has been raised. A scroll of the Minor Prophets in Greek, suggested to be of the time of the Bar Cochba revolt, points to the possibility of a translation of the Greek Bible (may be some parts only), emended on the basis of the proto-Masoretic Text (Cross, 1964: 282, 283).

Block (1987: 12) argues that a distinction must be made between the text form and the conceptual form of the Old Testament usage in the New Testament. On the whole, the New Testament writers are more dependent on the Septuagint than other texts. Does this mean that the conceptual framework of the argument is grounded in the Septuagint text? Block answers in the absolute negative, but we must notice that there are cases of Old Testament quotations where the writer prefers the Septuagint reading over the others because it provides him with a better conceptual framework. Block's attempt to distinguish between the two stems from his concern to avoid Greek/Hellenistic influence in the interpretative framework of the New Testament writers. Such a distinction becomes difficult as we recognise that a double interaction between Greek and Hebrew thought had already taken place in the Septuagint (Barrett, 1956: 208-229).

All these issues remind us that identification of a text form is not an easy task. What we consider to be a misreading or modification of the text may be an accurate reading of a text form that we are not able to verify and are, therefore, unable to conclude precisely which text forms were available to John. Moreover, the Hebraic character of the Septuagint Greek may also mislead us in our inquiry (see Porter & Evans, eds, 1997: 163-173). In the past, the inquiry for the exact text of John rested on one or both of the two assumptions: he had access to only a single tradition of text and he precisely copied his texts. Both are unacceptable today. We have also come to know that agreement with a particular text form cannot be considered as the sole ground for justifying dependence on that textual tradition. It is possible for us to conclude that John was aware of some alternate (possibly Hebrew) version to the Septuagint, though he chose to use the Septuagint as his basic text. Moreover, it is clear that he exercised remarkable freedom in the use of the text; his theological and redactional concerns did affect the form of the text used.

John's handling of scripture raises certain questions that we must explore in detail. How does he conceive the authority of scripture (cf 10:35: "scripture cannot be broken"), whilst in practice he is allowing his theological presuppositions to modify the text

itself? How far do his attempts at ‘contemporisation’ of the text remain faithful to the sense of the text? Did he consider the text to have a fixed meaning conditioned by its original context or to take on new meaning in a changed situation? We will keep these concerns in mind in our exegetical attempts in subsequent chapters.

2.2.4 Appropriation Techniques: Contextual but Innovative

Recently, particularly after the Qumran discoveries began to influence the study of the New Testament, there have been a number of studies focusing on the exegetical categories or appropriation techniques that the New Testament writers used in their process of interpreting the Old Testament. Ellis (1993), Borgen (1987) and Longenecker (1977) have produced comprehensive studies in this area and have concluded that the New Testament writers were making use of the techniques that were engaged in the Jewish interpretation of scripture in the first Christian century. Some scholars have suggested the presence of many of these exegetical categories or appropriation techniques in the use of the Old Testament by the fourth Evangelist. Their conclusions point to the exegetical categories that were available to John and the possible use of those techniques in John’s appropriation of scripture.

Brown (1970: lxi) points out that at some instances John translates the text from the Hebrew in a targumic way to bring out his interpretation of the same. Evans (1993: 130-134, 157-167) suggests that the appropriation of scripture in the Prologue of the Gospel is partly targumic. *Targums* are interpretative translations in Aramaic in which text and interpretation are combined through paraphrase (McNamara, 1972: 35). In order to render the scripture text more meaningful, straightforward renderings were mixed with harmonistic paraphrases and glosses, which often reflect lines of traditional interpretation extant elsewhere (Vermes, 1973: 228, 229). Early examples of targums are found in Qumran (4Q156, Targum of Leviticus; 4Q157 and 11Q10, Targum of Job). Targumic activity or practice was prevalent among Jews of the first Christian century, though the written Palestinian targums took their shape at a later stage. Targumic tendencies seem to be present in John’s Gospel.

Borgen (1965) has explored in detail the best example of *midrash* in John’s Gospel (cf **Jn 6:31-52**). He also finds midrashic influence in the Prologue, arguing that it is modelled after the conception of light-giving Torah received through Moses (1972: 115-

130). A *midrash* is normally an exposition of a passage or text. *Darash* means ‘to interpret’ (literally ‘to search’). A *midrash* starts from a text, but the text is not merely explained: “its meaning is extended and its implications drawn out with the help of every possible association of ideas” (Gerhardsson, 1966: 1; see also Wright, 1967; Neusner, 1987). Midrash often takes the form of a running commentary and it generally took two forms: *halakic*, concerned with legal matters; and (h)*aggadic*, which is homiletical (Dunn, 1977: 62-63). Borgen’s suggestions point to the presence of (h)*aggadic* form of *midrash* in the Fourth Gospel.

Longenecker (1977: 155, 156) suggests that a *peshet* motif is seen in most of the Old Testament quotations in John as the fulfilment motif is normally invoked under a *peshet* treatment, reflecting a type of interpretative approach employed by the community of Qumran. *Peshet* is characteristically eschatological in orientation and its emphasis is on the precise meaning in terms of the present: ‘this’ is ‘that’(cf 4Q166-67, Hosea Peshet; 1Q14 and 4Q168, Micah Peshet). *Peshet* is basically an approach rather than a technique, which explains why *peshet* is sometimes found as a qualifying term alongside other exegetical categories (Patte, 1975: 301-308; Hanson, 1983: 14-43; Longenecker, 1977: 38-45). In this broader sense John’s attempts to contemporise scripture, which is intensified in the second half of the Gospel through the use of fulfilment formula, are *peshet* in their perspective.

Typology is another category that is suggested to have been employed in the Fourth Gospel. Many of the Old Testament figures and institutions are invoked in the description of Jesus. Leon Morris (1964: 25) comments: “The use of the type is not a complete explanation of John’s method. But it is certainly part of the explanation.” Figural interpretation, which was employed in Judaism, became a basic key by which the scriptures were understood by early Christians (Goppelt, 1982; Davidson, 1981). It involves intentional modelling of one story upon another (Goulder, 1964: 7-10). Basic to the typological method is the conviction that “... the history of God’s people and of his dealings with them is a single continuous process in which a uniform pattern may be discerned” (Lampe, 1953: 201). John seems to share these presuppositions. John’s typological use of the Old Testament in his passion narrative has been explored by many scholars (Moo, 1983: 361-363).

If the scholarly opinions that John employs these exegetical techniques can be substantiated, we will have to conclude that he received his exegetical tools from his religious and cultural situation. In other words, John's interpretative methods were contextual. Does this mean that he merely used the methods available to him and he did not have anything different or new to offer? Or does he use the contextual techniques with caution and care? Does he adapt them for his purposes? We need to do a thorough study of John's use of the Old Testament from a hermeneutical perspective before we can give a firm answer.

2.3 JOHN'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE TERM 'SCRIPTURE'

In this section we aim to look at the way John uses the terms that denote the Jewish scriptures: the 'writing' ($\eta(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta)$) and the 'writings' ($\alpha\iota(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota)$), the word which the New Testament reserves exclusively for 'scripture'.

2.3.1 $\alpha\iota(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota)$

There is only one instance where John uses $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta$ in the plural: "You search the scriptures because you think to have eternal life in them..." (**Jn 5:39**). No individual passage of scripture is cited or alluded to here. Jesus is referring to an already existing practice of searching the scripture and is not inviting them to search the scriptures. The reference here is to the whole body of literature that was known to the hearers as scripture and was, thus, the object of their 'search.'

The use of $\alpha\iota(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota)$ for the whole scripture or for the collection of writings recognised as authoritative religious literature is in agreement with the Jewish and early Christian practice of denoting scripture. Philo also uses $\alpha\iota(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota)$ for the scriptures as a whole (*De Abrahamo* 61, 236; *De vita Mosis* 2, 40; *De decalogo*, 8; *De fuga et inventione*, 4; *De specialibus legibus* 1, 214; *De opificio mundi*, 77). In the New Testament, all other occurrences of $\alpha\iota(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota)$ are references to the Jewish scriptures in general (**Mt 21:42; 22:29; 26:54, 56; Mk 12:24; 14:49; Lk 24:27, 32, 45; Acts 17:2, 11; 18:24, 28; Rom 1:2; 15:4; 16:26; 1 Cor 15:3, 4; 2 Tim 3:15; 2 Pet 3:16**). Therefore, we can conclude that John's use of $\alpha\iota(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\alpha\iota)$ was in agreement with the normal way of using that term in his context, namely for the scriptures as a whole.

2.3.2 η(γραφή/

In the whole Gospel the word γραφή/ occurs eleven times in the singular (**2:22; 7:38, 42; 10:35; 13:18; 17:12; 19:24, 28, 36, 37; 20:9**). We shall briefly look at all of them to see whether there is any preliminary observation that we can make out of these instances.

The main issue we need to face here concerns the meaning of this singular use. Does η(γραφή/ refer to a particular scripture passage or the scripture as a whole? Beutler (in Culpepper & Black, eds, 1996: 147-162) argues that η(γραφή/ in the Fourth Gospel is 'scripture' as such and not individual passages. He suggests that what is fulfilled for John is the scripture in general and hence John is not particularly concerned about the specific verse he quotes. On the other hand, Barrett (1956: 201) and Morris (1995: 179) suggest that John uses γραφή/ in the singular to refer to specific passages of scripture. This debate presents us with a problem that we need to address in our survey of all the cases where John uses η(γραφή/.

Philo uses η(γραφή/ to refer to either a particular passage of scripture (*Quis rerum Divinarum heres*, 266; *De Abrahamo*, 131) or a particular book or section of scripture (*De vita Mosis* 2, 51; *De specialibus legibus* 1, 1; *De decalogo* 51). In the New Testament, the application of the term is not very consistent. Matthew and Luke use the term η(γραφή/ for individual passages (cf **Mk 12:10; Lk 4:21**). Some references in Acts are also possibly to individual passages (**1:16; 8:32, 35**). But in Pauline and post-Pauline writings, we come across η(γραφή/ as a reference to the whole of the scripture on many occasions (eg **Gal 3:8, 22; 2 Tim 3:16; 1 Pet 2:6; 2 Pet 1:20**). In fact, none of the uses of η(γραφή/ outside of the Gospels and Acts (**Rom 4:3; 9:17; 10:11; 11:2; Gal 4:30; 1 Tim 5:18; Jas 2:8, 23**) necessarily demand a reference to some individual passage of the scripture. They could all probably be referring to scripture as such.

John's use of η(γραφή/ appears complicated at first sight. We divide the eleven instances where John uses η(γραφή/ into three categories for our survey:

i) η(γραφή/ **without any Specific Reference**

There are three places where η(γραφή/ is used without any reference to a specific passage: **2:22; 10:35; 20:9**.

➤ **John 2:22**

“και.: ε)πι/στευσαν τϵ/γραφε/ και.: τ%/λο/γ%/ οϐν ειπεν ο(Ιησου/φ.” John makes this editorial comment in the context of the cleansing of the temple. So some scholars suggest that ‘scripture’ here refers to the scripture passage or prediction believed by the disciples in this context, which is **Psm 69: 9** (quoted in **2:17**), and the word of Jesus in question is his statement in **2:19** (Beasley-Murray, 1987: 41; Moloney, 1998: 83). The word of Jesus does not have to be a reference to a particular word uttered by Jesus but it could be the word of Jesus in general (cf **Jn 15:20**), even though reference to a specific prediction remains a possibility. As far as a particular passage of scripture is concerned, Psalm 69:9 is an unlikely candidate, as it does not have anything that could be connected to the concept of resurrection (unless we make *καταφα/γεται/* to refer to the destruction of Jesus’ body in death, which is an unnatural interpretation). ‘Scripture’ here is, therefore, probably scripture in general (Barrett, 1956: 201). The use of η(γραφή/ in **John 20:9** is a close parallel to this case where resurrection is also the essential context in which the scripture is understood to have been fulfilled.

➤ **John 10:35**

“και.: ου) δυ/ναται λυθη/ναι η(γραφή/.” ‘Annul’ (λυ/ω) can be contrasted with ‘fulfil’ (πληρο/ω) and hence “cannot be annulled” may mean “to keep from being fulfilled” (Jungkuntz, 1964). It is in agreement with John’s general perspective that the whole scripture is fulfilled in the life and work of Jesus. Some scholars argue, however, that John is referring to the fulfilment of the scripture quoted in the previous verse (**Psm 82:6** in **Jn 10:34**). For example, Hanson (1991: 146) feels that John had the whole Psalm in his mind, even though he quoted only one verse, and when Jesus says: “and the scripture cannot be annulled” it is the final line of the Psalm (“Rise up, O God, judge the earth; for all the nations belong to you!”) that is intended. Although this is a possibility, it cannot be established from the text as there is no clear parallel or echo of the final line of the Psalm here. On the other hand, even if there is an allusion to the whole Psalm (which is possible according to John’s practice), ‘scripture’ here can still

be a reference to the scripture in general, as what was true of the passage quoted is so only because it was part of the whole scripture and showed the characteristics of being part of it. At best, it is a statement made about the whole in the context of the particular.

➤ **John 20:9:**

“οὐδε/πῶ γὰρ· ἔδεισαν τῆ·ν γραφῆ·ν ὅτι δει/αυτο·ν ἐκ νεκρῶ/α)ναστῆ/ται.
” Some scholars (Bernard, 1942: 241; Sanders, 1968: 422) think ‘scripture’ here refers to some individual passage and consider **Psalm 16:10** as the most likely candidate, whilst **Hosea 6:2** and **Isaiah 53:10-12** are also suggested (Bruce, 1983: 386; Morris, 1995: 737). But none of these texts can satisfactorily claim to fit in the particular context here. There is no passage of scripture indicated anywhere in the narrative here and, in fact, it is not easy to locate a particular passage in the Old Testament that says someone must rise from the dead. There were several passages from the Old Testament that contributed to the early church’s understanding of resurrection and John might be referring to them in general. Schnackenburg argues that even though John uses scripture in the singular, it is used with the same sense of ‘the scriptures’ (plural) as found in **Luke 24: 27, 46** and, hence, what is meant is the testimony of the entire scripture (cf Schnackenburg 1, 1982: 313; Beasley-Murray, 1987: 373). John here seems to make a general reference similar to Paul’s claim: “He was raised on the third day according to the scriptures” (**1 Cor 15:4**).

We may conclude, therefore, that in these three instances where John uses η(γραφή without being specific about any particular passage, the reference is to the scriptures in general.

ii) η(γραφή/ with Unclear or Multiple References

In this section we look at the instances where η(γραφή/ looks as if it is introducing some scripture, but either the scripture is unclear or what is introduced is a combination of passages. There are five such instances to consider in this category:

➤ **John 7:38**

“καθωφ ειπεν η(γραφη/, ποταμοι.: εκ τηφ κοιλι/αφ αυ)του/ρ(ευ/σουσιν υλδατοφ ζωντοφ.” The source of the quotation is disputed as no text either in the Septuagint or the Masoretic Text is in agreement with this (Carson, 1991: 325-327; Beasley-Murray, 1987: 114-117). Amongst the suggested scripture passages are **Proverbs 5:15; 18:4; Isaiah 43:11** and **Zechariah 14:18** (Brown, 1970: 321-323). In this case, as there is no specific text quoted, η(γραφη/ cannot be considered as referring to an individual scripture passage. Moreover, the introductory formula does not suggest that η(γραφη/ refers to the quoted verse, even if there is one; rather it just tells us: ‘η(γραφη/’ says: “From within him shall flow rivers of living water.” John is collecting ideas from various passages of scripture and presenting them to his readers as ‘what scripture says’. ‘Scripture’ here, therefore, can mean scripture as such, not an individual passage.

➤ **John 7:42**

“ουξ η(γραφη.: ειπεν ολτι εκ του/σπε/ρματοφ Δαυι.:δ και.: α)πο.: Βηθλε/εμ τηφ κω/μησ ολπου ηπν Δαυι.:δ εφρξεται ο(Ξριστο/φ.” Here, also, we have an example of multiple allusions. On the one hand it alludes to the passages like **2 Samuel 7:12; Psalm 88:4, 5** and **Jeremiah 23:5**, which speak about the future offspring of David. On the other hand, it also points to **Micah 5:2**, which talks about a ruler of Israel coming from Bethlehem. As in **7:38**, John is collecting ideas from various parts of the scripture and, hence, no specific passage is referred here as η(γραφη/. The introductory formula is also similar. It does not identify what is quoted or stated as η(γραφη/ but η(γραφη/ ‘says’ what is stated. Here, also, η(γραφη/ may mean ‘scripture’ as such.

➤ **John 17:12**

“/και.: ουδει.: φ ε)χ αυ)των α)πω/λετο ει)μη.: ο(υι(ο.: φ τηφ α)πωλει/αφ, ιλνα η(γρ αφη.: πληρωθϵ.” As there is no Old Testament passage that talks about the destruction of a ‘son of perdition’, there has not been any consensus on the scripture passage referred to here. Many scholars (Brown, 1970: 760; Carson, 1991: 564; Barrett, 1956: 509) feel that the scripture mentioned here is the one quoted in **John 13:18** (ie **Psm 41:10**). Some (Freed, 1965: 97; Thompson, ed, 1987) suggest that the reference is to Jesus’ own earlier words as given in **6:37. Proverbs 24:22, Isaiah 57:4** and **2 Samuel**

12:5 are considered by some scholars (Brown, 1970: 760; Schnackenburg 3, 1982: 182) as passages contributing to the Johannine statement. The statement is introduced by a fulfilment formula, “that the scripture might be fulfilled.” As there is no specific scriptural passage quoted here, it is difficult to consider *η(γραφη/* as a reference to any individual scripture. In this case, what is fulfilled is *η(γραφη/*, scripture as such.

➤ **John 19:28**

“ι<να τρλειωθ<η(γραφη/, λε/γει, Διψω/.” It is not clear which passage of the Old Testament is here referred to. Scholars suggest Psalm 68:22, 62:2 and 41:3 (all Septuagint) as possible options (see 3.4). The quotation remains ambiguous, as in none of these references is the first person singular used. The possibility that *η(γραφη/* in the introductory formula is the ‘scriptures’ as such has to be kept open.

➤ **John 19:36**

“ε)γε/νετο γα. ρ ταυ/τα ι<να η(γραφη. ρ. πληρωθ<η/, Ο(στου<ν ου) συντριβη/σεται αυ)το υ/.” This is the last occurrence of Johannine fulfilment formula and the formula here possibly governs the next quotation too (v 37). The text directs our mind to a multiple allusion, involving the concepts of the paschal lamb and the ‘righteous sufferer’. Texts suggested are **Exodus 12:10, 46**; **Numbers 9:12** and **Psalm 33:21** (see 3.5). Here, also, ‘*η(γραφη*’ is part of the fulfilment formula and, as there are multiple allusions, it cannot be considered as referring to one individual passage of the scripture. We will have to accept that what is fulfilled is ‘scripture’ as such. In this case, it can be argued that John probably thought that he was quoting a single passage, though in the other cases we considered in this section such an argument would become problematic. For example, in certain cases there is no scripture quoted at all, whilst in others the multiple allusions are so complex that they are not cases of minor changes or amalgamations but clear examples bringing together different biblical passages, which were all familiar passages for the early followers of Jesus. That John did not know the background of those well-known passages would be an unfair conclusion. Even in the case of the quotation in **John 19:36**, both the particular Pentateuchal text and the Psalm were familiar to early Christian interpreters of scripture.

iii) γραφή/ with Specific References

We are left with three instances where η(γραφή/ forms part of an introductory formula to a specifically quoted individual scripture:

➤ **John 19:37**

“και.: πα/λιν ε(τερα γραφή.: λε/γει, ΟⓄψονται ει)φ οϽν ε)χεκε/ντησαν.” It is beyond doubt that ε(τερα γραφή.: here refers to the scripture quoted (**Zech 12:10**). So we have here a clear case for John’s use of γραφή/ (singular) relating to a particular passage of the scripture.

In the light of John’s use of γραφή for an individual passage above, one will be tempted to conclude that in the other two cases where quoted scripture is identified as some individual scriptural passage, a similar conclusion is possible. We need to carefully analyse both the cases.

➤ **John 19:24**

Here, the scripture passage from Psalm 22:19 (Septuagint) is introduced with a formula: ι<να η(γραφή.: πληρωθη/, which has a textual variation. The longer form adds η(λε/γουσα, which would then mean “in order to fulfil the scripture that says.” Here, η(γραφή/ can mean ‘scripture’ as such, therefore taken to mean ‘scripture (not the particular passage) says’. In case of the shorter form “that the scripture might be fulfilled’, it can either mean the particular passage quoted or the scripture as a whole that is fulfilled through this particular event. In the light of our earlier observations on introductory formulae in other cases, scripture as such is preferable to scripture as an individual passage.

➤ **John 13:18**

The same applies here as above, where η(γραφή/ is used in the fulfilment formula, “ι<να η(γραφή.: πληρωθη/,” to introduce a quotation from **Psalm 41:10**. Although reference to the text quoted as ‘scripture’ is not implausible, ‘scripture’ as such is the more probable option in the light of John’s use of the term elsewhere.

We should also note that in **John 19:37** where we suggested that γραφή/ could be a reference to the individual scripture quoted, the expression is ‘another scripture’. It is similar to the cases in the synoptic Gospels and Acts where the individual passages are referred to as ‘this scripture’ (cf **Mk 12:10; Lk 4:21; Acts 1:16**). It is not η(γραφή/ in those instances. In every other instance in the Fourth Gospel, ‘scripture’ is preceded by the definite article and it is possible that, as in the case of Paul and post-Pauline use, he refers to ‘scripture’ as such, not to the individual passages quoted. John’s concern is the fulfilment of the scripture and, even when this fulfilment is seen in a particular event corresponding to some particular event in scripture, it is the scripture as such that is fulfilled. Fulfilment of the part is fulfilment of the whole. This, of course, is not to say that he was not concerned about the quoted and alluded scripture passages and their relevance in the particular narrative context. Actually, it was the other way around. Without these specific correspondence and ‘fulfilments’, scripture as such could never be regarded as having been fulfilled.

It might also prove beneficial to look at the instances where John uses the verbal form γρα/φειν. On some of these occasions γε/γραπται or γεγραμμε/νον form part of the introductory formulae (**2:17; 6:31, 45; 8:17; 10:34; 12:14; 15:25**), which is used for introducing the scripture quotations. In the first half of the Gospel, John generally uses a simple introductory formula “it is written”. In **12:16**, too, “these things were written of him” means that they were written in the scripture. Other instances include “Moses wrote” (**5:46**) and “Moses and the prophets wrote” (**1:45**). However, the verbal form is not reserved for references to the scripture alone in the Fourth Gospel. In the crucifixion scene, for example, in referring to the *titulus* John says: “it was written” (**19:20**). He also speaks about the gospel tradition: “these are written” (**20:31; cf 21:24, 25**). It is clear that the verbal form did not have any exclusive use for scripture in John, though he used the introductory formulae with “written”, which were probably already known to the readers as formulae to introduce the scripture.

It may also be noted that at least on three occasions ‘the law’ (ο(νομοφ) is used by John in the sense of scripture in general (**10:34; 12:34; 15:25**). These are exceptions, as the normal use of the term is to refer to the Law of Moses (cf **1:17, 45; 7:19, 41, 49; 8:17; 18:31; 19:7**).

2.3.3 The Word of Jesus as Scripture?

An interesting and important development in the Fourth Gospel that has a bearing on our discussion on John's use of 'scripture' is the authority of Jesus' words and their status vis-à-vis the 'scripture'. John does not refer to the words of Jesus as 'scripture' anywhere. However, the words of Jesus seem to assume an authority comparable to that of the scripture. There are some observations that strengthen this point.

First of all, the word of Jesus can be 'fulfilled'. On two occasions John speaks about the fulfilment of Jesus' words (cf **Jn 18:9** – “This was to fulfil the word that he had spoken”; **18:32** – “This was to fulfil what Jesus had said”). The expression used in these two instances is closer to John's unique fulfilment formula, which is reserved to introduce the Holy Scriptures in the second half of the Gospel. In **18:9**, John talks about the fulfilment of a statement Jesus made in his 'bread of life' discourse (**6:39** – “I should lose nothing of all that he has given us”). In **18:32**, John refers to the fulfilment of what Jesus said about the kind of death he would die. There is no indication about the particular statement of Jesus, though the possibility remains that it might refer to his saying about the Son of Man being lifted up (cf **3:14**; **8:18**; **12:32**). By being fulfilled in the death and resurrection of Jesus, the words of Jesus now share an authority that was otherwise the property of the Scripture.

Secondly, the disciples are said to have 'remembered' the word of Jesus after his resurrection (**2:22**). The result of such remembering was belief in the scripture and in the word of Jesus. We must notice here that such 'remembering' is often linked with the word of scripture (cf **2:17**; **12:16**). John has also linked 'remembering' with the word of Jesus elsewhere (**15:20**; **16:4**). The word of Jesus can now be remembered alongside the word of the scripture. Thirdly, a parallel is drawn between what Moses wrote and what Jesus said in **John 5:47**. This statement comes in the context of Jesus' rebuke of the Jewish unbelief and the claim that the scriptures testify to Jesus. If they had believed in the scriptures, they would certainly have believed in Jesus' words too.

As we observed earlier, there is no indication that the word of Jesus had become part of the authoritative 'scripture' for the Johannine community. Clearly, however, it had become an authoritative word alongside the scripture. Jesus' words share an authority similar to that of 'scripture' and, hence, it can be 'fulfilled' and it is 'remembered'. It

seems evident, therefore, that John considered scripture as having a shared authority; not an independent authority.

2.4 JOHN'S USE OF THE FULFILMENT FORMULA

John does not use fulfilment formulae in the first half of his Gospel where quotations are generally introduced with a simple formula: "it is written" or similar (**Jn 2:17; 6:45; 8:17; 10:34**). All the scripture quotations in the second half of the Gospel, however, (see **12:38-40; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24, 28, 36, 37**) are introduced by a fulfilment formula. Why is this fulfilment motive distinctively prominent in the second half of the Gospel?

Evans (in Evans & Stinespring, eds, 1987) points out that the use of fulfilment formulae ("that the scripture might be fulfilled") has to do with the passion of Jesus in the Gospel. John seems to be making an extra effort to establish a scriptural background and validation for the suffering of Jesus. John is taking special effort to prove that Jesus' rejection and death are not signs of divine rejection (which would have been the argument of 'the Jews'), but that they are in fulfilment of God's plan, which had already been revealed in the scriptures (cf Evans, 1993: 176-180). John presents Jesus' death as a true salvation event and it is there that the glorification of the Word is completed. This completion is not an unexpected turn in the story, but something foreshadowed in scripture (Hengel, 1989: 392, 393). The differences reveal themselves when we ask questions about the nature of this 'fulfilment'. What does John mean by 'fulfilment'? What does this fulfilment formula guide the readers to infer?

First of all, to understand the nature of the fulfilment formula, we need to look at the possible background of the Johannine fulfilment formula. Scripture is commonly quoted in Qumran literature and we notice that a variety of formulae were used. The main category has 'written' as its essential element. The usual variations of this formula were: $\beta\omega\tau\kappa \} \kappa \} \psi\kappa$, "for so it is written" (1QS 5.15); $\beta\omega\tau\kappa \rho\exists\kappa$, "as it was written" (1QS 8.14; CD 7.19); $\beta\omega\tau\kappa \psi\kappa$ (CD 11.20); $\mu \} \psi\kappa \beta\omega\tau\kappa \} \psi\omega$, "and is it not written that...?" (CD 9.5). Equivalent forms are found in Greek among various introductory formulae in the New Testament (cf **Mt 2:5; Lk 2:23; Acts 1:20; Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:19; 10:17; 2 Cor.9:9**). John himself uses similar formulae in the first part of his Gospel (cf **2:17;**

6:31, 45; 8:17; 12:14). Therefore, the simple formulae that John uses in the first part of his Gospel are paralleled in Qumran literature and other New Testament writings.

There is no parallel, either in Qumran or other Jewish literature of the Johannine period, for the fulfilment formulae that John uses in his second half of his Gospel. Moreover, we do not find any use of the word $\lambda\mu/\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega$ to describe the fulfilment or coming true of the scripture in Qumran, Josephus or Philo (Fitzmyer, 1957: 533). The only parallel we can find in the Christian context is from the New Testament itself, in the Gospel of Matthew. The Johannine formula is generally shorter without any further description of the scripture quoted (eg “in order that the scripture might be fulfilled”), while Matthew’s formulae are explanatory in general (eg **Mt 1:22** – “in order that it might be fulfilled which had been spoken by the Lord through the prophet; **4:14** – “in order that what had been spoken through the prophet Isaiah might be fulfilled”). It should also be noticed that Matthew does not use the term ‘scripture’ in his fulfilment formulae. For him, what is fulfilled is generally ‘what has been spoken’ by some prophet. On two occasions John’s formulae are more descriptive like Matthew’s: (**Jn 15:25** – “in order that the word that is written in their law... might be fulfilled”; **12:38** – “in order that the word of prophet Isaiah which says... might be fulfilled”).

So we find some parallel for Johannine fulfilment introductory formulae in the New Testament only. This does not mean that there was no fulfilment motif present in pre-Johannine use of the scripture. Absence of a fulfilment formula does not imply absence of a fulfilment motif. All that we can conclude, however, is that the particular group of words $\pi\lambda\eta/\rho\omega\upsilon\lambda\mu$ was not used in any formula to introduce scripture (Moule, 1967: 293-320). In the absence of any parallels for the fulfilment formula in the contemporary use of scripture, it is necessary for us to see how these words are used within the Old Testament and other literature.

In the Septuagint, the word $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega$ is found over seventy times for forms of $\lambda\mu$ and other terms and has both literal and figurative senses. This term is used in the sense of fulfilling the word, promise or demand: (**1 Kgs 2:27** – “that the word of the Lord to be fulfilled”; **1 Kgs 8:15** – “fulfilled that which he promised”; **Psm 20:5b** – “May the Lord fulfil all your petitions”; **Jer 44:25** – “You... have accomplished in deeds what you declared in words”; **2 Chr 36:21** – “That the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah to be fulfilled”). In all these cases the Hebrew word is $\lambda\mu$ and there is a sense of

fulfilling a general promise or an obligation, but not necessarily the coming true of a particular prediction.

In the absence of the use of πληροῦν/λμ for the fulfilment of the word of scripture or word of God outside the Old Testament, we can only assume that the practice of using these words for fulfilment purposes developed from the practice within the Old Testament itself, of which we have observed a few examples. As these words were used to denote the fulfilment of the word of the Lord in the Old Testament, the New Testament writers did not find any problem in using them to speak about the fulfilment of the scripture. As the introductory formulae were developed to relate the scripture to the events in Jesus' life, this group of words easily found a way in. From the examples taken from the Old Testament, it can be observed that the word 'πληροῦν' does not in itself demand a 'prediction-fulfilment' setting. It may well refer to meeting the demand of a promise or being in conformity with a plan. In John's use of fulfilment formulae, as we have seen above, it is scripture as such which is fulfilled, not the individual passages quoted. He implies the fulfilment of "... not any single, limited promise, but all the promise and hope attaching to all that is epitomized in the Bible by God's covenant with his people" (Moule: 1967: 294; Childs, 1978: 259-71). This would also mean that John does not find fulfilment in an atomistic manner, limited to the words quoted only. When he quotes a text it is not merely the quoted verse that he has in mind, but the whole event or wider textual context (Moo, 1983: 384, 385). It is the correspondence between the two events that is considered as the link between the precursor and successor texts. It is not merely the words quoted that are fulfilled; rather the event represented by the precursor text finds fulfilment in the event described by the successor text. The meaning produced by the interplay between the precursor and successor texts goes beyond the independent meaning of either text (Hollander: 1981, 62ff).

We should now move on from the background to the actual formula John uses. Grammatically, a sense of purpose is clearly seen in the Johannine fulfilment formulae because of the presence of ἵνα in all cases. It shows that the events in Jesus' life are grounded in God's plan, which scripture declares. God's saving plan achieves its full measure in the life and death of Jesus. For John, the whole scripture is a witness to *Christ (Jn 5:39)*. Its function is to point to Christ. Therefore, what happens in Jesus' passion is in accordance with scripture.

At the same time, we also note that John uses $\iota\lambda\nu\alpha$ in an ecbatic or resultative force (cf 1:27; 17:3) elsewhere in his Gospel (Barrett, 1956: 430). If this is the case with the fulfilment formula, it can mean “with the result that the scripture is fulfilled”. The present event *resulted* in the fulfilment of the scripture, not necessarily that the event took place *in order to* fulfil the scripture. This is a possibility that we shall be able to test in our detailed study of the explicit scripture quotations in the Johannine passion narrative.

It is clear from our study of John’s fulfilment formula that John, along with other New Testament writers, found the life, death and resurrection of Jesus as purposed by God who spoke his will through the scriptures. So, in general, scripture looked forward to its fulfilment in Christ and John finds the fulfilment of scripture as a whole in the life of Jesus. Whether he considered each scripture passage that he used as a prediction concerning Jesus is a question that needs further evaluation. We will need a detailed study of each quotation/allusion in order to arrive at any conclusion on this.

2.5 A STRUCTURAL OVERVIEW OF THE JOHANNINE PASSION NARRATIVE

There have been suggestions that there is a scheme or pattern of scripture lying behind the Fourth Gospel as a whole. Guilding (1960) argues that a Jewish synagogue lectionary lies behind the Gospel and that the Old Testament scripture quoted or alluded to comes basically from the lectionary readings. Brodie (1993: 121) tries to establish that John systematically used the Pentateuch throughout the Gospel and, hence, the Pentateuchal texts and narrative lie behind Johannine Jesus story.

These and similar arguments for a scheme or pattern in the use of the Old Testament by John compel us to inquire into various possibilities. Even if we reject any such scheme for the whole of the Gospel, we must ask whether there is a pattern in the use of the scripture in the passion narrative that we are now to study. Apart from studying each scripture quotation or allusion in the immediate context of the event it refers to, we will have to bring the threads together for the whole of the passion narrative. This would demand that we see whether there is any connection between the various scripture portions quoted, any movement from one to another. Therefore, it is necessary to have a closer look at the structure of the Johannine passion narrative. The narrative that

consists of chapters eighteen and nineteen has three natural principal divisions: **18:1-27; 18:28-19:16a; 19:16b-42** (Brodie, 1993: 519; Stibbe: 1994: 96; Beasley-Murray, 1987: 321).

2.5.1 The Arrest and the Jewish Trial (18:1-27)

Janssens de Varebeke (1962: 504-522) finds seven episodes in this section. This seems to be as a result of his attempt to find seven episodes in the section to match with the number of episodes in the other two major sections. Others have divided this section into two units or acts, the first describing the arrest of Jesus and the second dealing with Peter's denial of Jesus and the interrogation of Jesus by Annas (Ellis, 1984: 247). Brown (1970: 814) agrees that there is a simple division of two scenes (**vv 1-12; vv 13-27**), but considers the attempts for further divisions into various episodes as far-fetched and complicated. He also suggests that there is continuity between the two units.

References to the slave of the high priest (**18:10, 26**), references related to the background of night, and the role that Peter plays in both the parts of the unit indicates the overall unity of **John 18:1-27**. There is an implied contrast between Jesus and Peter in this unit. Jesus' self revelation ($\epsilon\gamma\omega/\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$) (**vv 5, 8**) and Peter's denial ($\sigma\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$), (**vv 17, 25**) seem to have been placed in opposition with each other. This contrast also binds the two parts of the scene together as one unit. On the other hand, the setting of the scene shifts from the garden at the eleventh verse. Moreover, after this, Jesus is seen as a victim in the narrative. He is arrested, bound, and slapped. Based on these observations, we may conclude that **18:1-27** be regarded as a single structural unit consisting of two parts: **vv 1-11** (events in the garden before the arrest) and **vv 12-27** (arrest and the Jewish trial). Referring to the whole passage (**vv 1-27**) as "the arrest" of Jesus, as most commentators do, "hardly reflects Jesus' dominion of the events in the garden" (Moloney, 1998: 483).

The first eleven verses of this chapter present Jesus as being in control of the scene. He comes forward to face Judas and the accompanying group. On hearing of $\epsilon\gamma\omega/\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$, they step back and fall on the ground. From verse twelve onwards, Jesus is portrayed as a victim. The narrator specifies that Jesus was bound (**vv 12, 24**), he was taken (**v 13**) and struck (**v 22**). While Jesus was on trial at Annas' place, Peter was

facing an informal trial outside (**vv 15-18, 25-27**). He hides his identity saying, “I am not”, in stark contrast to Jesus’ “I am”.

There is no explicit scripture quotation in this section, though there are possible allusions to the Old Testament. Jesus’ self-declaration: “I am he” (ἐγώ/ εἰμι) is pointed out as an allusion to Old Testament theophanic texts (Schnackenburg 3, 1982: 225; Barrett, 1956: 520; Williams, 2000: 287ff).

2.5.2 The Trial before Pilate (18:28-19:16a)

The dramatic presentation of the trial before Pilate in a series of scenes that are set in an ‘outside’ versus ‘inside’ format has received attention from various scholars, first pointed out by Strachan (1941: 315). Pilate moves between the inside and the outside, inside to question Jesus and outside to consult the Jews. In the first episode, the Jews hand Jesus over to Pilate and in the last episode Pilate hands Jesus back to the Jews. This narrative structure depicts the dilemma of Pilate, his struggle in making a judgment.

Rudolf Bultmann (1971: 501) divides the scene into six episodes (**18:28-32; 33-38a; 38b-40; 19:1-7; 8-11 and 12-16a**). He further groups them into two, the first group consisting of four episodes and the second consisting of two episodes. Holding on to the basic divisions suggested by Bultmann, we would deviate from his outline on two points. First of all, we split Bultmann’s fourth episode into two, thus: **vv 1-3** and **4-7**. Obviously, the scourging of Jesus by soldiers (**vv 1-3**) takes place inside. In verse four, Pilate goes out again and this change of the stage suggests the beginning of another scene. We would also attach verse eight to the preceding episode (ie **vv 4-7**) rather than with the following one (**vv 9-11**) because this verse shows Pilate’s reaction to what the Jews’ said in verse eight and, therefore, forms a natural conclusion to that episode. In total, then, we have seven episodes in this scene in the place of six offered by Bultmann. Secondly, we find Bultmann’s way of grouping the episodes not very convincing. He suggests the key to the first group is “behold the man” (**19:5**) and for the second “Here is your King” (**v 14**). However, the kingship motif is present in the episodes belonging to the first group also (cf **18:33, 36, 37, 39, 19:3**). The narrative structure here would suggest that we leave seven episodes without being grouped into further scenes, each one leading to the next and certain common motifs – the struggle of Pilate, unbelief of

the Jews (or rejection of the king) and Jesus' continuing self-revelation (even though he stands in the place of a victim in this scene) – running through the whole scene.

Brown (1970: 859) accepts a chiasmic structure of seven episodes, having the fourth episode (**Jn 19:1-3**) at the centre. The crowning of Jesus with thorns with the words: "Hail, king of the Jews" is considered to be the centre of the story. We must be able to hold this structure without losing a forward movement that is clear in the narrative. In the opening episode, the Jews ask for Jesus' death and in the final episode Pilate grants their demand. In between, we have a dramatic trial with one episode leading to the next. The movement looks straightforward. The purpose of this structure is to depict Pilate's struggle and "to indicate the dubious nature of the trial through the separation of accusers and defendant" (Stibbe, 1993: 106).

As in the previous section, there is no explicit scripture quotation in this section, though there are several allusions suggested that need our careful evaluation. There are possible allusions to 'the suffering servant' of Isaiah in the mockery scenes and the trial (Hanson, 1991: 205, 208). References to Passover day and the 'sixth hour' have been taken by many scholars to support a Passover imagery (Barrett, 1956: 454; Brown, 1970: 895, 896; Keener, 2003: 2100).

An interesting development in this scene is the use of the fulfilment formula, which John uses to introduce the quotations from the Scriptures in the second half of his gospel, to talk about the fulfilment of Jesus' words (**18:9, 32**). We will have to explore this use in detail and see how this affects John's understanding of the scripture in general.

2.5.3 Crucifixion and Burial (19:16b-42)

Raymond Brown (1970: 911; 1994, 2: 908) recognises an inverted parallelism (chiasm) in **John 19:16b-42**, having verses **25-27** at the centre. Brown's arrangement of the whole narrative as five episodes with an introduction and a conclusion is helpful and is followed or acknowledged by many commentators (Moloney, 1998: 502; Stibbe, 1993: 193, 194):

- | | | |
|----|------------------|--|
| a) | 19:16b-18 | Introduction: The Crucifixion; |
| b) | 19:19-22 | Episode 1: Pilate refuses Jews' request; |
| c) | 19:23, 24 | Episode 2: Executioners divide Jesus' clothes; |
| d) | 19:25-27 | Episode 3: Jesus' mother and his beloved disciple; |
| e) | 19:28-30 | Episode 4: Executioners offer Jesus wine; |
| f) | 19:31-37 | Episode 5: Pilate grants the Jews' request; |
| g) | 19:38-42 | Conclusion: The burial. |

We use these episodes for our analysis, too, yet we need to ask whether the inverted parallelism is the best arrangement of connecting the episodes together. Are there any other clues about the connection between these episodes? Secondly, we will treat crucifixion and burial as episodes in their own right rather than considering them as introduction and conclusion.

In the second episode (**vv 19-22**), the title given to Jesus may be the focal point rather than Pilate's refusal to change it. In this sense, it stands as a dramatic contrast to the crucifixion scene of the first episode (**vv 16b-18**). Jesus is condemned to death, but at the same time – though unwittingly – he is given a title of honour. Given John's interest in Jesus' kingship and exaltation, it is natural to think that the emphasis is on the *titulus* itself rather than the circumstances involved. Therefore, the first two episodes can be placed together.

The third episode (**19:23, 24**) is about the soldiers dividing the garments. The fourth episode (**vv 25-27**) portrays those who stood near the cross as his friends. A contrast is implied in the use of $\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ in the last sentence of verse 24 and $\delta\epsilon$ in verse 25a. Moreover, at the end of the episode involving the soldiers, John says: "this is what the soldiers did," which is a repetition (cf **v 23a**), probably to bring out a contrast with the faithful ones presented in the next episode. So, it is possible to conclude that John intended a contrast here and we shall take these two episodes together also.

The fifth episode (**vv 28-30**) can stand on its own as a section. The core of the section is the last two utterances from Jesus on the cross: "I thirst" and "It is finished". Some scholars find a contrast implied here too: the first statement expresses need, whilst the other is a confident statement on the completion of the work (Stibbe, 1993: 114). We

can decide whether this contrast can be justified only after our exegetical analysis of the words uttered by Jesus.

The sixth episode (vv 31-37) begins with the piercing of Jesus' side and then moves on to an editorial theological (rather scriptural, for two scripture passages are quoted here) evaluation or appreciation of what has happened. Two scripture quotations bring about a turn in the emphasis. These quotations talk about the vindication of the suffering Jesus or the wider implications of the death of Jesus. They suggest that the death of Jesus is not merely a death of a messianic pretender. The episode aims to give the reader a positive interpretation of the cross. According to the last episode (vv 38-42), the glorious death was followed by an honourable burial in a new tomb, wrapping the body with spices in linen. The narrative flows from sixth episode to seventh episode smoothly and we, therefore, take them together in our study.

These observations suggest that we should see beyond a chiasmic arrangement of structure in this scene. Although we can recognise chiasm as a literary device here, we must see that the episodes are connected with each other in a horizontal progression. In the chiasmic structure followed by Brown, the accent of the entire scene is on the episode involving Jesus, his mother and his beloved disciple. However, there is no indication in this narrative to believe that the focus of the story of Jesus' death is the incident of handing over his mother to the disciple. Rather, the story develops with a forward-looking perspective until the last episode. This forward-looking perspective must be upheld, even though we are not thereby obliged to fully rule out the possibility of a chiasmic arrangement of the episodes.

Thus, for our purposes I propose to divide the scene into the following four parts:

1. A dishonourable death and an honourable title (vv 17-22);
2. The persecutors and the friends around the cross (vv 23-27);
3. Two last words: 'thirsty' and 'completed' (vv 28-30);
4. Events after (and reflection on) the death and the burial (vv 31-42).

In our study of the scripture in this scene, the most important observation is that there are four explicit quotations here. Although the first part, verses 17-22, does not have any quotation from the Scripture in it, all the other sections do. Each of these explicit quotations (vv 24, 28, 36 and 37) is introduced with a fulfilment formula. It must also

be observed that out of the total of seven scripture quotations that John uses in his Gospel with fulfilment formula, four appear in this narrative. Out of the four explicit citations, two (**19:24, 28**) or possibly three (if we include v **36**) are from the Psalms.

There are also many allusions to scripture suggested by some scholars in this scene. Glasson (1963: 40-44) finds an allusion to Moses traditions at verse 18 (“One on either side”). Allusions to Isaac traditions are suggested because of the expression “carrying the cross by himself” (Macgregor, 1928: 344). Thirdly, there are possible allusions to the ‘Servant Songs’ of Isaiah in the Johannine crucifixion narrative, particularly at verse **18** (associated with criminals in death), verses **39** and **40** (criminal saved, innocent one delivered to death) and verse **16** (**Isaiah 53:6, 12**) (cf Stibbe, 1993: 136; Orchard, 1998: 230-240).

2.6 SUMMARY

Our review of the state of scholarship has shown us that much has been done in the area of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, particularly so in the Fourth Gospel. Yet, there are areas still to be explored. Most of the studies in the use of the scripture in the Fourth Gospel have focused on the explicit Old Testament quotations. It is not justifiable to make judgments on John’s use of the Old Testament solely on the basis of fourteen quotations or verses when his unique use of the Old Testament is found in innumerable allusions.

There are definitely major areas of consensus. That most of John’s scriptural quotations came to him from his tradition is accepted by almost all scholars, though the identity and details of the sources are not agreed upon except for a greater consensus on some form of testimonia. On the question of the nature and purpose of John’s interpretation of the Old Testament, the earlier assertion of its polemical nature is well balanced in recent discussions, with an agreement on the generative use of scripture. As far as the text is concerned, there is consensus on the Septuagint as the major text of John, whilst most scholars – with the notable exception of Schuchard – hold that John knew some other text form(s), too. On exegetical categories and interpretative methods, the agreement is clear that they come from the Jewish traditions.

Most of the studies on John's use of the Old Testament have concentrated on basic technical targets of scholarship: sources, context, text form and purpose. The purpose of these studies differs from one work to another: establishing John's provenance, inquiring into his redactional concerns, or seeking the sub-structure or origin of his theology.

These pieces are of immense importance for our research, which aims to look at and evaluate John as an interpreter of scripture. The questions that have already been addressed in previous studies are very much part of our larger question: what is John's hermeneutic? John's use of the Old Testament involves a hermeneutic and a comprehensive study of this hermeneutic is needed in which the insights and the results of the previous studies are drawn together and systematised. Our research goes beyond the domains of previous studies, not only in its aim to understand John's hermeneutic of scripture as a coherent system, but also in undertaking such a study in the light of our contemporary hermeneutical discussions and attempting to probe the significations created by a representative sampling of Johannine use of scripture.

We have also noticed the possibility that John uses the term 'scripture' not so much to refer to the individual passages from scripture but to scripture as such. This line of thought was also supported by the observation that whenever John refers to the fulfilment of scripture using his fulfilment formulae, he possibly means fulfilment of the whole scripture: scripture as a whole is forward-looking and can be fulfilled.

Our overview of the Johannine passion narrative with a closer look at its structure has helped us to understand that the Old Testament was an important aspect in Johannine understanding and interpretation of Jesus' death and resurrection. We need to proceed to careful exegetical exercise to establish what exactly is the role that scripture plays therein.

3.0 EXPLICIT SCRIPTURE QUOTATIONS IN THE JOHANNINE PASSION NARRATIVE

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Our study of the Old Testament in the Johannine passion narrative will address some of the general hermeneutical questions. First of all, we shall identify the quotation or allusion using the signs from the narrative itself. If there is no clear sign or marker, such as an introductory formula, an allusion will have to be established through the application of the criteria that we shall identify in the beginning of chapter four. Secondly, we shall ascertain the textual form of the quotation/allusion as far as possible. Although we may be able to make some general comments on the way John approaches the text, we would hesitate to make significant conclusions on the basis of minor textual deviations because we are not in a position to ascertain all the text forms that were available to John. Thirdly, we shall inquire whether John was sharing this scripture with some other source; whether the quoted scripture possibly came to him through some source. The concern here is whether his use of the scripture is generic or creative. If it can be established that he shares the quotation/allusion with other sources, we need to inquire further whether he uses it in exactly the same way as it is used by other sources or whether he deviates from those traditions, bringing in something of his own. Fourthly, we shall establish the possible connection between the text quoted or alluded to and the present narrative. We will take into account the insights from recent studies on intertextuality in our effort to understand the connection between the precursor text and the successor text. Finally, we shall examine the particular hermeneutical model or methods or axioms involved in the use of the scripture. In this process, we shall be able to see how John's hermeneutic was shaped or influenced by his social, cultural and religious context.

We now turn our attention to the explicit Old Testament quotations in the Johannine passion narrative. As we noted in the previous chapter, there are four such quotations, all of which appear in the crucifixion narrative proper (**Jn 19:24, 28, 36, 37**). Each of these quotations is introduced by a fulfilment formula. We shall now look at each of them separately.

John has a detailed scene of the incident of the dividing of Jesus’ clothes by soldiers. Whereas the synoptics simply make reference to the division of clothes by casting lots (Mt 27:35; Mk 15:24; Lk 23:34), John makes an episode out of it by identifying the number of parts into which the garments were divided. He also describes a seamless tunic for which lots were cast among the soldiers. Moreover, he states that the incident was in fulfilment of scripture. Whereas the synoptics make an allusion to scripture through the wording of the description of the event, John turns it into an explicit quotation. Having first described the incident, he quotes the scripture with a fulfilment formula and concludes by once again commenting on the actions of the soldiers. In effect, the Psalm verse appears in the fourth gospel initially by way of enactment and then in a formal quotation of the full verse.

The form of the fulfilment formula used here is distinctively Johannine, $\iota\upsilon\alpha\ \eta(\ \gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta\ .\ \pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\epsilon\iota$ (cf 13:18; 17:12; 19:18, 36), though there is a textual variation, an addition of $\eta(\ \lambda\epsilon/\gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$. As we discussed in the previous chapter (2.3), it is possible that what John intends through this formula is the fulfilment of scripture as a whole rather than a mere correspondence with a particular passage quoted from scripture. Some scholars find the use of $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ in this passage unusual (Moo, 1983: 254). However, the placing of $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ and the fulfilment formula here is in agreement with the practice of the fourth Evangelist elsewhere: the incident first and then the scripture quote introduced by a $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ clause (cf 12:37; 19:36). The passage under consideration is not an example for the fulfilment of scripture preceding the event. Grammatically, $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ here can go with the words of the soldiers, but the fulfilment of scripture cannot be part of the soldiers’ words. Another option is to regard it as dependent on $\epsilon\iota\lbracket\pi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$. In this case, John is making an editorial comment to the effect that what the soldiers said was in fulfilment of scripture. But it looks more natural in the narrative that John’s point of reference is what the soldiers did rather than what they said. What they said only qualifies what they did. We will have to take this as simply a $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ clause for which we have to supply the governing verb ‘this was’ (Moulton, 1962: 304). In this case, the reference is to the whole event consisting of the dividing of the clothes and casting lot for the tunic. It is the most plausible approach as the text quoted is made out to refer to two distinctive actions that together accommodate the whole of the narrated event. The event is narrated in verses 23 and 24a, and then comes the scripture quotation, after

which another qualifying sentence is added to reiterate the connection between the event and the scripture quotation.

Most scholars agree that the source of the quotation is the Septuagint (**Psm 21:19**): Διεμερι/σαντοτα.: ι(μα/τια/ μου ε(αυτοι/φ, και.: επι.: το.:ν ι(ματισμο/ν μου ε©βαλον κληρον (Bernard, 1942: 629; Lindars, 1972: 268; Dodd, 1963: 40; Brown 1970: 903; Schnackenburg, 1982 (3): 272; Carson, 1991: 612; Schuchard, 1992: 125-132). However, some have argued that the Septuagint Greek agrees exactly with the Hebrew of the passage quoted and, hence, it is not possible to decide whether John is using the Hebrew text or the Septuagint (Barrett, 1956: 28). Whilst it is true that the Septuagint correctly translates the Masoretic Text, it must also be acknowledged that an independent translation from the Hebrew text might not necessarily agree word by word with the Septuagint translation. John follows the Septuagint text even though it results in a distinction from the actual wording of one of the actions in his narrative, which scripture is claimed to have fulfilled: while the soldiers speak of ‘determining by lot’ or ‘toss’ (λα/ξωμεν), the quotation uses ‘casting lots’ or ‘roll dice’ (ε©βαλον κληρον). He also distinguishes between τα.: ι(ματια/ and το.:ν ξιτων/α, while the Psalm has only ι(ματια// ι(ματισμο/ν. Moreover, the Septuagint renders the Hebrew imperfects ωθλξψ and ωλψπψ with Greek aorists. In a free translation, the present tense would have been a more plausible option. The fact that John’s quotation contains the same aorists strengthens the possibility of Septuagintal influence (Freed, 1965: 100, 124; Moo, 1983: 253; Schuchard, 1992: 127). In the light of these observations, we may conclude that dependence on the Septuagint is a more plausible conclusion than a free translation from the Hebrew text.

John narrates two separate actions to which the quoted scripture is applied: the sharing of the clothes by soldiers and their casting lots over the tunic. This raises the question how could John overlook the parallelism in the verse quoted: ι(ατια/ and ι(ματισμο/φ (δγβ and Ξωβλ) are synonyms there; the same thing is said twice in different words. Barrett (1956: 550) suggests that John failed to understand the parallel form of the verse. Lindars (1961: 91) feels that John did understand the synonymous parallelism, but then he took advantage of it. Dodd (1963: 40) and Schnackenburg (1982. 3: 272, 273) hold that John was depending on a more extensive reflection of scripture. This suggestion makes John dependent on some tradition that led him to understand the quoted verse in the way he handled it in his narrative, which is a possibility, but there

have not been any convincing argument to establish this. Brown initially suggested a slight possibility of John's indebtedness to an Aramaic targum (1970: 920), but later he modified this position on account of the later dating of the targumim (1994: 951). Even if targumic tradition existed in John's time, a dependence on it is not clear in the text as he has quoted the Septuagint verbatim.

There are two observations that could strengthen the view that John missed the parallelism altogether. The first one is concerned with the text itself. Hoskyns (1947: 629) suggests that a distinction could be conceived of between outer and inner clothes respectively since the Septuagint shifts its accent from the plural (τα: ι(ματια)/) to the singular of another word (το: ν ι(ματισμο/ν). John missed the Hebrew parallelism probably because of this possible distinction in the text of the Septuagint. Secondly, there is some scholarly concern whether Hebrew parallelism was generally understood properly in the early Christian context (Barrett, 1956: 551). We have other examples for literalising similar parallelisms in the New Testament (**Mt 21:7**). John probably failed to understand the parallelism in the text concerned, which came to him in a Greek translation that has in itself some scope for misunderstanding.

John did not alter or modify the text itself to suit the event he is applying it to, but did he invent the incident under the influence of the text, as Cohn (1967: 236) suggests? The basic event, as such, does not appear to be an invention of John. The dividing of Jesus' clothes is in accordance with normal procedure because, according to the Roman custom, the clothes of the executed criminal were the perquisite of the soldiers (Sherwin-White, 1963: 46; Blinzler, 1959: 253). Secondly, the incident of dividing Jesus' clothes is attested by parallel traditions, though not in detail. The core of the event, the dividing of the clothes and the casting of lots, is recorded by the synoptics (**Mt 27:35; Mk 15:24; Lk 23:34**).

If the incident is not an invention of the Evangelist, how do we explain the interplay between the incident and the scripture? Raymond Brown suggests that the interpretation of scripture was stretched to accommodate the event John found in his tradition (1970: 920). However, John follows the text of the Septuagint word by word and there is no effort seen in the narrative to stretch the scripture quoted. The text here is fixed. John has not taken any freedom to modify the text or to rearrange the wording therein. In this context we need to keep ourselves open to one option: the scripture passage that John is

depending on here has shaped his narrative. Some scholars argue that if the Evangelist were inventing the event under the influence of the Psalm, he would have used the same verbal expression as in the Psalm: ἐβαλον κληῖρον instead of the unusual λαξωμεν in his narrative. The synoptics use the same verb as in the Psalm and this enables the reader to detect an allusion easily. Some scholars point out that if John was inventing the event he would have preferred ἱματισμοῦ instead of ξιτωῦ (Brown, 1970: 920; Moo, 1983: 254, 255). But John was not alluding to a scripture passage, in which case a clear presence of verbal similarity with the passage would have been necessary for the readers to make connection with the passage. He is quoting scripture explicitly and he underlines its connection with the event through the use of fulfilment formula. He has organised the details of the event in order to bring out the correspondence between the scripture quotation and the event. He has possibly created a second set of garments because the scripture quotation (in his understanding) has a second set of garments for which lot was cast. Therefore, we conclude that, whilst John did not invent the event as such, his description of the event was shaped by scripture.

The most important question is the essence of his scriptural application. What is John claiming to have been fulfilled and how does he conceive the whole process? Most recent commentators suggest that John's focus in this episode is on the tunic and this implies that there is something symbolic in the seamless garment of Jesus: for example, the priesthood of Jesus, the kingship of Jesus or the unity of the church (Barrett, 1956: 550; Brown, 1970: 920; Beasley-Murray, 1987: 347; Carson, 1991: 614; Schuchard, 1992, 128-131; Moloney, 1998: 503; Daly-Denton, 2000, 210-212; Howard-Brook, 2001: 420). However, there are a number of problems in all of these attempts to determine this symbolism. First of all, John's narrative does not provide any clue for any such symbolic interpretation of Jesus' seamless tunic. Secondly, the tunic is an undergarment, worn next to the skin (Liddell & Scott, 1961), and is not parallel to the kingly or priestly robes, which are outer garments. Thirdly, Jesus here does not retain his tunic, but it is taken away from him. If the tunic symbolises something, Jesus loses it at the end. As there is no suggestion for symbolism of the tunic in the narrative, we have to conclude that the description about the seamless tunic was a narrative necessity. The seamless nature of the tunic was highlighted in order to justify why it had to be allotted by casting lot. The concluding sentence of the episode does not underline any symbolic element of the narrative but just re-emphasises what the soldiers did.

Evidently, it is not the ‘robe’ that John was interested in, but the whole event of dividing the clothes and casting lots. Thus, the quoted verse does not give any special value to any garment. In the absence of clear guidance from within the text or in its context for a symbolic interpretation, we must look for the essence of John’s use of the Psalm text somewhere else. This does not mean that we should rule out any symbolism altogether, but that the symbolism involved there – if any exists – is not a dominant aspect to the interpretation of scripture there.

We must begin with the quoted text in its own context. The text is part of **Psalm 22**, a ‘righteous sufferer’ Psalm, which was widely used by early Christians to refer to the passion of Jesus (von Rad, 1975 (2): 377; Carroll & Green, eds, 1995: 207). The first part of the Psalm (**vv 1-21**) is a plea for deliverance from suffering, whilst the second part (**vv 22-31**) is thanksgiving for God’s vindication of the Psalmist’s cause. The verse quoted by John appears towards the end of the first part. The last part of the Psalm suggests that God’s vindication of the sufferer has universal consequences. The first part has the sufferer speaking in the first person; in the second part, it is the congregation that praises the Lord.

John quotes from ‘righteous sufferer’ Psalms on two other occasions in his passion narrative: at **19:28 (Psm 69:21)** and at **19:36 (Psm 34:21)**. In addition to these quotations, there are many allusions and quotations that are used in the Gospel with reference to Jesus’ rejection and suffering, for example, **John 2:17 (Psm 69:9); 13:18 (Psm 41:9); 15:25 (Psm 69:4)**. It is also evident that these Psalms were applied to Jesus in earlier Christian traditions other than or prior to the Fourth Gospel (in Malherbe & Meeks, eds, 1993: 122-136). John shares with the synoptics three quotations/allusions from these Psalms: **Psm 22:18 (Mt 27:35; Mk 15:24; Lk 23:24; Jn 19:24); Psm 41:9 (Mt 26:23; Mk 14:18; Lk 22:21; Jn 13:18)**, and **Psm 69:21 (Mt 27:34, 38; Mk 15:23, 36; Lk 23:36; Jn 19:28)**. Matthew has four references to **Psalm 22** itself (**27:35, 39, 43, 46**). **Psalm 22** was “a primary tool in the early church for the theological interpretation of the passion narratives” (Holladay, 1993: 119) and was widely used in the apostolic church in a messianic sense. Allusions to **Psalm 22** are found in many of the epistles too (**Rom 5:5; Phil 3:2; 2 Tim 4:17**).

Some scholars have argued that John was correcting the synoptic applications of the Psalm to Jesus (Kraus, 1986: 189, 190). They point out that the synoptic allusions to

Psalm 22:19 (Mk 15:24; Mt 27:35; Lk 23:34) are followed by strong verbal allusions to other parts of the Psalm that talk about the mockery of the bystanders. They also suggest the synoptic narratives betray a sense of abandonment through their surrounding scenes, which is absent in John (M^cPolin, 1979: 244). According to these scholars, instead of various synoptic allusions to Psalm 22, which recall rejection and suffering, John picks up one particular verse to suit the emphasis in his passion narrative: glory and protection, not abandonment (Daly-Denton, 2000: 209).

However, this explanation for the alleged difference between the synoptics and John in the use of **Psalm 22** rests on many assumptions that are difficult to establish. First of all, it presupposes that John's Jesus is not a victim or sufferer (Bultmann, 1971: 633; Haenchen, 1984 (2): 193-94). But the Johannine narrative clearly portrays Jesus as being struck (**18:22**), bound (**v 24**), flogged (**19:1**), stripped (**v 24**) and crying out with thirst (**v 28**). From the time he was arrested until his crucifixion, he remained a victim. Johannine emphasis on glory does not underestimate Jesus' suffering, but includes his suffering as an integral part of his glorification (Orchard, 1998). Secondly, it assumes that John is simply pulling out one verse from the Psalm, using it as a proof text without any reference to its overall background in the Psalm. Thirdly, it assumes that the verse from **Psalm 22** quoted by John in **19:24** is used there with some symbolism applied to the seamless tunic. Without the help of any symbolic interpretation, the verse quoted has nothing glorious and it has no dimension of protection or vindication. Moreover, without some reference to the overall theme of the Psalm, there is no element of protection in the use of the quoted verse and the description of the tunic. He died a victim's death. What is protected here is not the person but his undergarment, which is actually taken by the enemies.

We must now return to the scripture quotation, the precursor text, and see how it might speak to its audience through its present placement in the successor text. Verse eighteen of the Psalm unmistakably portrays the utter degradation that the sufferer could think about: he is envisaging an execution scene and is seeing his opponents already distributing his clothes in anticipation of his death (Anderson, 1972: 191). The successor text is narrating an event of crucifixion and the precursor text fits into this context with the sense that it brings from its own context. The sharing of or taking away someone's clothes highlights his or her total degradation (Rapske, 1994: 197-98). To be naked represents the depths of humiliation (cf **Deut 28:48; 2 Cor 11:27**). The

Evangelist uses an experience of suffering and degradation from a passage of scripture to illustrate and interpret the experience of suffering and degradation in the story of Jesus.

There is an ongoing dialogue between the precursor text and the successor text here. As Hollander (1981: 31-43) has pointed out, there is a reverberation bouncing back and forth between the two texts that produces a new figuration. The possibilities of the precursor text are exploited and stretched, and in turn the horizon of the successor text is enlarged with a new significance because of what the precursor text brings to it. **Psalm 22:18** (Septuagint – 21:19) extends the literal meaning of the parting of Jesus' clothes in **John 19:24** by bringing it in correspondence with the experience of the Righteous sufferer. At the same time, **John 19:24** extends the scope of the reference to the parting of garments in **Psalm 22:18** by connecting it to the experience of Jesus. The dialogue between the two texts produces a meaning that goes beyond the independent meaning of either text and, hence, the sense produced is figurative or metaphorical. On the one hand, **Psalm 22:18** would refer to the experience of the speaker in the Psalm without any application beyond that particular context, if it is considered on its own. On the other hand, however, the event described by John in **19:22-24** may be read without any significance attached to it, if the scripture quotation there is absent. But the dialogue between the two leads the readers to new levels of understanding that goes beyond the independent meaning of either text. What seems to be a commonplace element of an execution is now seen as part of a larger picture. All that the soldiers do is ordinary and customary; yet the scriptures are being fulfilled within it all (Fenton, 1961: 50). The soldiers, like other characters in the crucifixion story, are playing a role that they themselves do not understand. They act in a drama that scripture imagines and interprets.

John's scriptural interpretation here involves, in the first hand, an imaginative construal of the event narrated by a passage of scripture, namely **Psalm 22**. For this construal, he is indebted to his traditions, both textual and interpretative. As we discussed above, he is particularly indebted to a textual tradition, namely the Septuagint. If he had depended on a Hebrew text, the line of interpretation might have been different. He also stands within a particular interpretative community, and he shares a messianic interpretation of **Psalm 22** and its Christological application by Jewish followers of Jesus. All these contribute to his imagination of the event that scripture describes. He is able to imagine

the sufferer of the Psalms who is tortured and humiliated by men. The already existing forward-looking element of the righteous sufferer motif in Jewish thought and the concept of history – with provisions of correspondences between various events within it (Patte, 1975: 67-74) – enable the Evangelist to apply the experience of this particular character from the narrative world of the scripture to the experience of Jesus.

What is the scope of the scripture passage that John is bringing into his text? Is it limited to the text quoted or does the quoted text bring its larger context to the principal text? Dodd (1950: 126) has argued that, in the process of quoting from the Old Testament, the New Testament authors had in their mind the wider context of the text being quoted. There is no clear clue in the description of the event to help us to decide whether or not John is invoking the whole context of the verse quoted. The parallel traditions available to us, which are attested by the synoptic narratives, suggest that the whole of **Psalm 22** was used in connection with the passion of Jesus. Brown (1994: 1455-1465) provides a detailed survey on the use of **Psalm 22** in the Gospel narratives. John's use of **Psalm 22:18** here is not one of proof-texting (Barrett, 1947: 168; Culpepper & Black, eds, 1996: 158; Glasson, 1963: 46). He did not just pick up a verse from the Psalm to suit his episode, but he carefully shaped his episode in agreement with the verse quoted. It is unlikely that he did not take into account the context of the quoted verse even when he received the plot for his episode from that verse. Moreover, an allusion to the whole experience referred to in the Psalm will suit better the overall context of the Johannine crucifixion narrative. The narrative moves from a negative note of rejection to a positive description of divine protection and vindication and the nature of the last two scripture quotations in John's narrative (ie vv 36, 37), which has positive notes, confirms this. The vindication of the sufferer in **Psalm 22** would serve John's purpose and presentation of the Johannine passion narrative as a whole. Current discussions on intertextuality suggest that even an echo or allusion brings its own world to that of the new narrative in which it is incorporated (Greene, 1982: 53). The emphasis of the scriptural quote and of the immediate event in the Johannine narrative into which the quote is incorporated is suffering and degradation, but the overall emphasis of both **Psalm 22** and the Johannine passion narrative include divine guidance and vindication. It is unlikely that John missed the correspondence in the wider context, especially given that it underlines some of his theological concerns. The immediate context of the verse, the degrading experience of the sufferer, fits well the current episode of John, whilst the

larger context of the whole Psalm fits well with the overall emphasis of John's passion narrative.

Here, the basic pattern is one of understanding and explaining the present event in the light of or within the framework of scripture. One can argue that what we see here is the present event interpreting scripture, not scripture interpreting the event. However, John is describing a contemporary event rather than writing an exposition of scripture. He brings in scripture to help readers understand the present event. For John, it is a matter of scripture being performed or fulfilled in the contemporary event. As we observed earlier, the scriptural quotation seems to have influenced the shape of the narrative, not the other way around. The text remains fixed, but the event or the episode differs from what is available in the parallel traditions. For John, the experience of the righteous sufferer in the Psalm explains the degrading experience of Jesus and John uses the categories from the experience of the former to describe the experience of the latter. We cannot deny any influence of the contemporary event on the interpretation of scripture here, as in the case of the interpretation of scripture in any given context, but we are compelled to accept that scripture here is not 'servant' but 'master'. This may explain the detailed and distinctive description of the event in John; the narrative is shaped by the scriptural quotation itself (Clark-Soles, 2003: 288).

We find the dynamism of literary intertextuality here. The subtext brings its whole context into the conversation and it opens a view to the world of the text. In turn, the text provides the subtext with a reorientation. No interpretation of the resultant intertextual narrative can be sustained if it fails to take into account the two narrative worlds that the text and the subtext bring to each other. Both the experience of the righteous sufferer and that of Jesus need to find central place as dialogue partners in any attempt to understand the Johannine narrative in question and, particularly, the use of the scripture there.

The next place in chapter nineteen where a formal fulfilment formula appears is verse 28. In this fulfilment formula, however, John uses $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\exists/$ instead of his usual $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\exists/$. There are three preliminary concerns in our study here:

- i) does the $\iota\angle\nu\alpha$ clause go with what precedes it or what succeeds it?
- ii) why does the Evangelist use $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\exists/$, not the usual $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\exists/$?
- iii) what Old Testament passage is used?

The first question is the reference for fulfilment. Should the $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\exists/$ clause be construed with what is preceding (‘Jesus, knowing that all was now finished to fulfil the scripture, said “I thirst”’) or what is following (‘Jesus, knowing that all was now finished, said to fulfil the scripture “I thirst”’)? In the first case it is not what Jesus said (“I thirst”), but the fact that all was now finished that fulfilled the scripture (Bampfylde, 1969: 247-260). $\iota\angle\nu\alpha$ is normally related to a governing verb that precedes it, though most grammarians suggest that this is an example of the final clause preceding the main one (Blass & Debrunner, 1961: 478; Moulton, 1962 (3): 344). The clause $\iota\angle\nu\alpha \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\theta\exists/ \eta(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta/$ can then be taken as an introductory formula, which would be parallel to his usual $\iota\angle\nu\alpha \pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\theta\exists/ \eta(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta/$.

It is difficult to make an absolute choice between the two options. For our purpose in this study, it is not necessary to do so. As Brown (1970: 908) remarks, “the two possibilities should not be sharply separated.” It is suggested that a reading of the final clause in relation to what precedes would make the fulfilment of the scripture in general, not of any specific passage (in Sloan & Parsons, eds, 1993: 241). Similarly, some scholars suggest that a reading of the $\iota(\nu\alpha$ clause in relation to what succeeds would make the fulfilment very specific and, hence, a particular quotation from scripture is intended (Moo, 1983: 277; Bultmann, 1971: 674; Beasley-Murray, 1987: 351). But we have seen that, even when an introductory formula or fulfilment formula is used to introduce a particular scripture passage, ‘scripture’ in the formula might mean scripture in general, not necessarily the scripture quotation (see 2.2). Whether John has a specific scripture passage in mind cannot be decided on the basis of the presence of the fulfilment formula alone. It will have to be established through a detailed analysis of the particular scene in his narrative.

The next issue concerns the use of τελειωθη in the fulfilment formula. We should keep in mind that it is the scene of Jesus' death that we are looking at and, for John, this scene is of paramount importance. It is here that Jesus completes his work. John's narrative portrays Jesus as knowing that "all was completed" (πα/ντα τετε/λεσται) and, after expressing his thirst and drinking the vinegar, speaking out: "it is completed" (τετε/λεσται). He then gives up his spirit. It is not inconceivable that John uses scripture to talk about this 'completion' and, hence, he uses the same word τελειωθη in the fulfilment formula. As Lieu suggests: "narrator and Jesus speak and think the same language" (in Moyise, ed, 2001: 150). In this final scene of death, Jesus is performing a 'final fulfilment' of scripture (in Evans & Stegner, eds, 1994: 393). The 'completion' of Jesus' work has to be in accordance with scripture and it fulfils all that scripture has been looking forward to. Moreover, this is the last occasion of Jesus himself fulfilling scripture (except those that are fulfilled after his death, **19:36, 37**). In that sense too, it is a final fulfilment.

Is there a particular Old Testament passage that John might have had in mind? This has to be decided, not because of the presence of the fulfilment formula, but on the basis of what we see in the text. Those who think that there is a specific passage here have suggested various possibilities: **Psm 42:2** (Beutler, 1978: 54-56), **Psm 22:15** (Bousset, 1970: 113) **Psm 63:1** (Boman, 1963: 103-119) and **Psm 69:21** (Freed, 1965: 105; Hanson, 1991: 212, 213; Oberman, 1996: 350, 351). **Psalm 22** is a strong contestant because of its extensive use in passion narratives, but there is no verbal similarity between **22:15** and **John 19:28**. Psalms **22:15** and **63:1** have verbal forms of διψαω, but they are not in the first person singular, and there is no other echo in the narrative to suggest dependence on any of these texts.

Psalm 69:21 (Septuagint – 68:21), which reads ε(ι)φ τη.:ν δι/ψαν μου ε)πο/τισα/ν με ο@χοφ needs careful attention, even though there is no verb in the first person singular there. ο@χοφ appears three times in the episode and it is ο@χοφ that the soldiers gave in response to Jesus' "I thirst." A superficial reading of the narrative would suggest that the fulfilment of the scripture here is connected with what Jesus says: "I thirst." However, a close reading of the text would provide a further resonance of **Psalm 69:21**. The echo of the scripture becomes clear only with the response narrated in verse 29: "A vessel full of vinegar was lying there... and put it to his mouth." The reader would then be able to clearly hear the echo of "they gave me vinegar to drink." The reference here

is not to just what Jesus said. Jesus said: “I thirst,” and, for his thirst, the soldiers gave him vinegar to drink (Fortna, 1988: 269, 270). It is this whole incident that the narrator relates to the scripture quoted.

Two more considerations strengthen the case of **Psalm 69:21** over against other candidates: First of all, the use of this Psalm in the same context is attested in parallel traditions (Hanson, 1991: 212; Moo, 1983: 278-280). The synoptic evangelists use the same text in the same context (cf **Mt 27:34**; **Mk 15:23**). Thus, the application of this particular Psalm in the crucifixion narrative is not John’s invention. **Psalm 69** is the second most frequently quoted/alluded Psalm in the New Testament (Weiser, 1962: 493). Secondly, **Psalm 69** is one of the important scriptural sources for John (Reim, 1994: 94, 95). John has already invoked **Psalm 69** on at least two occasions: that of Jesus’ cleansing the temple (in **Jn 2:17** – “Zeal for your house will consume me” cf **Psm 69:9**) and in Jesus’ discourse (in **Jn 15:25** – “They hated me without a cause” cf **Psm 69:4**).

It must be noted that the allusion here is not established by volume on a phraseological level. Replication of the words alone cannot guide in detecting intertextuality. As Brawley (1993: 437) points out, allusions may “replicate the form, genre, and story line of their precursor.” In **John 19:28, 29**, in addition to the clues on the phraseological level, there is a high volume in pattern or plot: Jesus’ experience takes the pattern of the experience of the sufferer in **Psalm 69**. John’s concern here is not so much with the text of the scripture as with the events described by the text. He does not quote the text literally here. He weaves the scripture text into his narrative and warns the readers about the presence of the scripture through the introductory formula so that the reader would recognise the intended connection. The word quoted or echoed is an indicator or pointer.

John looks at Jesus’ experience on the cross through the suffering of the righteous one in **Psalm 69**. The sufferer’s enemies give him vinegar in the Psalm. Although John does not picture the soldiers as Jesus’ enemies, he considers them as agents of Jesus’ enemies acting on behalf of them (Keener, 2003: 1147). The intended contrast between the soldiers and the friends around the cross also suggests this. Probably the emphasis is not on who gave the vinegar. The New Testament often uses the Old Testament in a non-

literal way (Brown, 1970: 929). What is projected is the experience of thirst in extreme suffering, both by the sufferer in the Psalm and Jesus himself.

John's narrative leaves it to the reader to recall the Psalm. The readers who have noticed two former allusions to the same Psalm by John would not have any difficulty in connecting the world of the whole Psalm to the present context of the narrative. Moreover, through both those earlier quotations, John has already connected **Psalm 69** to the theme of Jesus' death. In the narrative following **John 2:17**, the saying is linked by the narrator to the death and resurrection of Jesus. The quotation in **John 15:25** is a likely allusion by Jesus himself to explain opposition. The symbolic world of **Psalm 69** projects the theme of suffering for God's sake. Vinegar for a thirsty Jesus is one aspect that helps John to assimilate the experience of Jesus into the symbolic world of **Psalm 69**.

However, **Psalm 69** does more than projecting the suffering of the righteous man. It talks about God rescuing the righteous one from death. Moreover, it relates the suffering one to the community. The restoration and vindication of the righteous one is tied up with the destiny of the community. The Psalm concludes with the hope of the restoration of Zion and the rebuilding of the cities of Judah (**vv 34-36**). There is a universal scope for salvation and restoration (Kraus, 1989: 62). This whole background is in agreement with John's understanding of Jesus' suffering, though in the present episode all these dimensions of the story are not present. The episode is about an aspect of the suffering of Jesus on the cross, for which the suffering of the righteous one in the Psalm is employed in a figural sense.

The meaning of **Psalm 69** in its original literary and historical context does not accommodate the experience of Jesus on the cross. The meaning that the Evangelist invokes is the result of its association with the particular incident in his narrative. As in the case of the previous quotation (**Psm 22:18** in **Jn 19:24**), the dialogue between the precursor and the successor texts extends the meaning of both. The figuration here is not allegorical as there are clear dissimilarities between the two textual worlds or events. Moreover, and an allegorical correspondence is absent in John's use of the scripture. What we see here is a revisionary relationship between the precursor text and the successor text resulting in metaphorical meaning. The imagery of suffering for God's sake in **Psalm 69**, the offer of vinegar for thirst, is refigured to give meaning to the

suffering of Jesus in **John 19**. There is another clue in the narrative which suggests that the meaning has to be figurative: the function of the ‘hyssop’. A branch of hyssop is not capable of holding a sponge full of vinegar. There is an inconsistency created by this conflict with normal reality and this leads interpretation to a metaphorical level. By putting the words “I thirst” in Jesus’ mouth, John seems to suggest Jesus’ own awareness of fulfilling scripture through his thirst.

The interpretation of scripture here involves the use of various interpretative traditions and hermeneutical axioms. The basic hermeneutical matrix is the interpretative framework of the Jewish followers of Jesus who applied the psalm to Jesus. Allusions to this Psalm in other parts of the New Testament suggest the widespread use of the Psalm by early Christians in a Christological perspective (cf **Phil 4:3; Rev 3:5; 16:1**). The use of **Psalms 22** and **69** together in the Johannine passion narrative recalls a tradition about the righteous one’s suffering because of faithfulness to God. John uses the scripture concerning the innocent sufferer to interpret the crucifixion experience of Jesus. Although the presence of the introductory formula may suggest a quotation, what we have in the narrative are intertextual echoes. These echoes suggest that **Psalm 69** lies behind the incident narrated by the Evangelist. It is a possibility that the scripture influenced the final shape of the narrative. John’s inclusion of Jesus’ thirst in the narrative may be a result of this influence. If John was aware of the tradition behind the synoptics where ‘vinegar’ was the only marker for an allusion, he is here making the allusion explicit by restructuring the whole incident and by increasing the volume of intertextuality.

3.4 “NO BONE SHALL BE BROKEN” (19:36)

The last two scripture quotations in John’s passion narratives come together under the authority of one introductory formula. As in **John 12:38-40**, where one fulfilment formula is employed to introduce two scripture passages, the second one is connected to the formula by $\kappa\alpha\lambda\iota\nu$. Soldiers came to break the legs of Jesus but, having noticed that he had already died, they pierced his side to verify death and, as a result, blood and water came out from his body. The author then pauses to give a defence of the authenticity of the eyewitness testimony and this defence seems to function as an extended introduction to the scripture quotations. Preceding $\iota(\nu\alpha$ in **19:36** is $\epsilon)\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \gamma\alpha\rho\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, which recall two events reported in verses **33** and **34**, not breaking

the legs of Jesus and piercing his side. He then provides two corresponding scripture citations (Bultmann, 1971: 677; Brown, 1994: 1184).

The first of these is in verse **36**, which reads: ο)στουίν ου) συντριβη/σεται αυ)του/. There are three texts suggested as the source of this quotation: **Exo 12:10, 46**: και.: ο)στουίν ου) συντρι/ψετε α)πᾶ αυ)του/(Westcott, 1898: 280; Bernard, 1942: 651; Freed, 1965: 113); **Num 9:12**: και.: ο)στουίν ου) συντρι/ψουσιν α)πᾶ αυ)του/(Reim, 1974: 52, 53); **Psm 34:20** (Septuagint 33:20): ο(κυ/ριοφ φυλα/σσει πα/ντα τα) ο)στα/αυ)των. ε)ν ε)χ αυ)των ου) συντριβη/σεται (Dodd, 1953: 233, 234; Ridderbos, 1997: 622). Some scholars argue for a Pentateuchal origin, but would not make a choice between **Exodus 12:46** and **Numbers 9:12** (Moo, 1983: 315; Morris, 1995: 727), whilst many modern commentators find a combination of **Psalms 34:20** with Pentateuchal texts (Menken, 1996: 147-166; Schuchard, 1992: 139, 140; Howard-Brook, 2001: 431).

None of these passages agrees precisely with the quotation found in **John 19:36**. In all three cases, the Septuagintal text is an adequate translation of the Hebrew. There are some verbal similarities between John's citation and the three Pentateuchal texts: singular ο)στουίν, singular αυ)του/, and the order of the wording. The prepositional phrase α)πᾶ αυ)του/ could lend itself to a personal possessive sense. However, the difference is in the verbal form: second or third person plural active in the Pentateuchal passages, but third person singular passive in **John 19:36**. But Moo (1983: 315) observes that: "the change in the voice of the verb is not unusual in quotations." Although such changes are possible in practice, there does not seem to be any sufficient reason for John to change the voice here. The preceding section of the episode describes the action of the soldiers. In this case the plural active form, as in the Pentateuchal texts, would be appropriate. Moreover, John seems to generally retain the same voice of the verbs as in the original form in his full-length quotations (cf **19:24, 37**). To conclude, the Pentateuchal texts (**Exo 12:46** and **Num 9:12** in both the Septuagint and the Hebrew text, and **Exo 12:10** in the Septuagint) are possible sources of the citation, but the verbal form does not seem to have come from any of those.

On the other hand, there is agreement on the verbal form between **Psalms 33:21** (LXX) and the Johannine quotation. The final part of this Psalm (**v 19ff**) is in the future tense, which gives the text the nature of a promise and it suits John's narrative context. But there are adaptations needed as far as the remaining part of the quotation is concerned.

He uses ο)στω)ν in place of ε)ν ε)χ αυ)τω)ν (which refers to πα)ντα τα) ο)στα). This can be considered as a natural way of contracting two lines in to one, but it agrees well with the form in the Pentateuchal texts, as we have seen. Moreover, the word αυ)τω)ν is at the end of the clause, which also resembles the Pentateuchal texts. In a natural contraction of **Psalm 33:21** (LXX), one would expect ο)στω)ν αυ)τω)ν ου) συντριβη)σεται.

The possibility is that what we have in the quotation in **John 19:36** is a combination of elements from **Psalm 34:21** (LXX 33:20) and the Pentateuchal texts (Barrett, 1956: 558; Schuchard, 1992: 139, 140; Menken, 1996: 147-166). Some other scripture quotations also attest to John's practice of combining analogous Old Testament passages into single quotations: **John 6:31** has a combination of **Exodus 16:4** and **Psalm 78:23-25**, whilst **John 7:38** has a conflation of **Isaiah 44:2, 3** and **Zechariah 14:18**. David Daube (1956: 309) points out that there was a pre-Johannine practice of combining the Pentateuchal (paschal) texts with **Psalm 34:21**, making a connection between not breaking the bones of the paschal lamb and the deliverance of Israel.

Psalm 34 seems to have been widely used by the early Christians (Dodd, 1950: 64-67; Lindars, 1961: 110), is frequently referred to elsewhere in the New Testament (**Heb 1:14; Jas 1:26; 1 Pet 3:10-12**) and the verse quoted here fits well in the narrative context. We have already noted elsewhere in this chapter (3.2 and 3.3) that John uses the experience of the sufferer in the Psalms to explain Jesus' passion. However, the Pentateuchal reference would mean a reference to the paschal lamb, which is also a clear possibility in line with John's redactional concerns. There are sufficient textual clues in the Johannine passion narrative to conclude that paschal imagery was an essential element in John's understanding of the passion of Jesus (see also 4.2). We need to use the lenses of both the references – Passover lamb and the innocent sufferer – to look at Jesus' experience.

The bones and the innermost level of being of a person were connected to each other in ancient thought. For example: τα) ο)στα) and η) ψυξη) are parallels in **6:3**. The Psalm talks about the righteous ones whose bones will not be broken, suggesting that their trust in God is honoured while the death of the wicked is an evil thing. In other words, the righteous ones' victory over or rescue from the danger is shown as the evidence of their righteousness. Through the use of this particular Psalm text, John establishes the

credibility of Jesus. Daube (1956: 309) points out that **Psalm 34:20** appears in an ancient Jewish prayer for the deceased, seen as a promise of the resurrection. This was related to the idea present in some quarters of Judaism that ‘broken bones’ would prevent resurrection. Keener (2003: 1155) draws attention to some early Christians’ concern with Jesus’ bones in the resurrection body. John’s quotation, therefore, might suggest to a Christian reader familiar with rabbinic exegesis a promise of the resurrection of Christ (Barrett, 1956: 556; Lindars, 1961: 96; Dodd, 1963: 44). It might be witnessing to God’s protection of Jesus beyond death.

The interpretation of the scripture here, like in the other two previous quotations in the Johannine passion narrative, is metaphorical. John is able to see Jesus through the window of **Psalm 34**, in which the righteous ones are afflicted, though God honours their cry. God protects Jesus, seeing that his bones are not broken. John probably refers to a turning point here: Jesus is no longer the object of the hostility of his enemies; having accomplished his task, he is not to be subjected to further mutilation. He is kept by God, about to be returned to his friends. There is an element of reversal here (Ridderbos, 1997: 623) and the following citation from **Zechariah 12** carries forward the tone of this reversal: mourning over whom they pierced.

On the other hand, Jesus is the perfect lamb for sacrifice. By alluding to the Pentateuchal texts, the Johannine narrative gives a new significance to Jesus’ experience. His death is interpreted as sacrificial. The essential meaning of the text is not lost: the legs of the sacrificial victim should not be broken. In the Johannine narrative, Jesus hangs on the cross at the same time as the paschal lambs are being slaughtered in the temple. The subtext brings new insight into the text here. The blood in the first Passover spelled the difference between life and death. The incident of blood coming out of his body that takes place right after this quotation may be an additional confirmation for the Passover imagery intended through the quotation. In John’s thought, the blood of Jesus gives life (**Jn 6:53-56**). As Barrett (1956: 177) observes, “By his amalgamation of Old Testament ideas John indicates that the death of Jesus was a new and better sacrifice.”

Is this quotation John’s unique contribution or something he has inherited from his tradition? The synoptic evangelists do not have any parallel for this quotation; nor do they have the incident of Jesus’ legs not being broken. The possibility of this quotation

coming from John's sources cannot be ruled out. However, if the quotation belonged to a pre-Johannine narrative it would have come immediately after verse 33 (Menken, 1996: 97). The placing of the quotation after John's editorial comment certainly suggests that John is responsible for placing it there. Verse 35 is typically Johannine, showing stylistic traits peculiar to John (van Belle, 1985: 100). The Evangelist's witness is not restricted to the mere facts of Jesus' death; it implies the significance of these facts through the invoking of the eyewitness tradition. The eyewitness testifies so that the hearers would believe in Jesus as the fulfilment of the scripture.

John's use of this quotation is in line with his redactional concerns. He often identifies Jesus with the righteous sufferer through the use of quotations from Psalms. (cp **Jn 2:17**; **Psm 69:10**; **Jn 13:18**; **Psm 41:10**; **Jn 15:25**; **Psm 35:19**; **69:5**; **Jn 19:24**; **Psm 22:10**; **Jn 19:28**; **Psm 69:21**). Many of them (or perhaps all) came to him from his tradition, but he retains them in his final narrative with an implied theological concern. John is engaged in a theological interpretation of the scripture.

John's use of scripture here involves some of the important hermeneutical practices in Jewish interpretation of scripture. Probably two of the seven rules ascribed to Hillel (Daube, 1956: 151-157) are operative here. The first is *Qal Wahomer*, "light to heavy." It means that what applies to a less important or general case will certainly apply in a more important or specific case; what applies generally to a righteous man applies all the more so to God's righteous one; what applies to Passover sacrifices in general applies all the more so to Jesus' perfect sacrifice. Another rule ascribed to Hillel could also have played a role in this multiple allusion: *Gezerah shawah*. This practice allows verbal analogy from one verse to another; the same consideration can apply to two separate cases where similar content is found. The words 'broken' and 'bones' in both **Psalm 34:20** and **Exodus 12:10, 46/ Numbers 9:12** receive the same consideration.

Combining two or more analogous passages from scripture was a common exegetical practice within Judaism. Brooke (1985: 297, 298) establishes how prevalent this practice in Qumran exegesis was. Moreover, part of a text could be used as substitute for a part of the other (Koenig, 1981). John himself involves this practice on several occasions (**Exo 16:4** and **Psm 78:23-25** in **Jn 6:31**; **Isa 44:2, 3** and **Zech 14:8** in **Jn 7:38**). The basic principle involved in this practice is that scripture is to be explained by scripture.

3.5 “THEY SHALL LOOK ON THE ONE THEY HAVE PIERCED” (19:37)

The actual formula that introduces the last of John’s scripture quotations is: “And again another scripture says” (19:37). It presupposes that some scripture has already been referred to (in v 36) and this is the second. It also implies some sort of connection or continuity of thought between the two. Because of the close relationship between these two quotations, the fulfilment formula in verse 36 seems applicable to this quotation also.

There is an agreement about the Old Testament source of the scripture quoted in 19:37; (Zech 12:10) (Barrett, 1956: 558; Brown, 1970: 938; Carson, 1991: 627; Morris, 1995: 727; Moloney, 1998: 506). It is a text associated with messianic time and deliverance (Torrey, 1947: 253-277). The context of this quoted verse in Zechariah has many details that must have helped John to associate it with Jesus. It mentions ‘an only child’, ‘a firstborn’ and ‘pouring out of a spirit of compassion.’ Zechariah chapters 9-14 are recognised as a block in the Jewish scriptures, which was used Christologically by early Christians. Matthew has three quotations from Zechariah: Mt 21:4, 5; 26:31; 27: 9, 10. John shares one of those quotations (Jn 12:14, 15) with Matthew (Mt 21:4, 5). Moo (1983: 222) provides a useful table showing that there are allusions in all the four Gospels to passages from Zechariah chapters 9-14.

The first issue to deal with is the textual form used. The text of Zechariah 12:10 in the Septuagint reads as follows: και .: ε)πιβλε/ψονται προ/φ με, α)νθ ε ω@ν κατωρξη/σαντο: και .: κο/ψονται επε αυ)το .: ν κοπετο/ν (“And they shall look upon me, because they have danced in triumph over (me), and they shall make lamentation for him”). The text of John’s quotation in 19:37 reads: ο@ψονται ει)φ ο@ν ε)χεκε/ντησαν (“They shall look on the one they have pierced”; the Septuagint has obviously read ωδθρ ‘they danced’ for ωρθδ ‘they pierced’). It is clear, therefore, that the source of John’s quotation is not the Septuagint.

A surprising observation is the similarities that John’s quotation shares with the two incidences of allusion to Zechariah 12:10 elsewhere in the New Testament: Rev 1:7 – (και .: ο@ψεται αυ)το .: ν πα/φ ο)φθαλμο .: φ και .: οι<τινεφ αυ)το .: ν ε)χεκε/ντησαν, και .: κο/ψονται επε αυ)το .: ν πα/σαι αι(φυλαι .: τη/φ γη/φ) and Mt 24:30 – και .:

το/τε κο/ψονται πα/σαι αι(φυλαι τη/φ γη/φ και.: ο©ψονται το.: ν υι(ο.: ν του/α)νθρω/ που ε)ρξο/μενον). As they are only allusions they do not quote the text in full, though verbal similarities are still obvious. **John 19:37** and **Revelation 1:7** share the same verbs ο©ψονται (**Rev 1:7** – ο©ψεται) and ε)χεκε/ντησαν. **Matthew 24:30** has ο©ψονται, but it shares κο/ψονται with **Revelation 1:7**, whilst the subject of the verbs κο/ψονται and ο©ψονται is πα/σαι αι(φυλαι.: τη/φ γη/φ in both texts. Each of these passages implies a ‘son of man’ imagery, with certain influence of **Daniel 7:13**, as the object of the verbs. There seems to be a coherent pattern behind these three New Testament passages (in Carson & Williamson, eds, 1986: 193-204). As it is highly unlikely that Matthew, John and the Revelation have influenced each other, the only possibility is a common source or tradition, which was available to each independently. The text of **Zechariah 12:10** used outside the New Testament in the early years of Christianity was in agreement with the basic form found in these three passages: ο©ψονται ει)φ ο)ν ε)χεκε/ντησαν (cf *Apology* 1.52.12; *Dialogue with Trypho* 14.8; *Epistle of Barnabas* 7: 9). This was the basic form in which this text was in use among early Christians and it does not seem to conform to a scriptural manuscript tradition. It was probably part of the testimonia in this form (Dodd, 1950: 65; Lindars, 1961: 122-127; Menken, 1996: 170, 171; Albl, 1999: 256). It is obvious from even a cursory look that this form of the text does not follow the Septuagint. On the other hand, it can possibly be a rendering of the Hebrew (MT) text: ωρθδ--ρ∇∃ τ) ψλ) ω+ψβηω – “And they shall look on me, whom they have pierced.” Theodotion and Aquila agree with John, so it is not unlikely that there was some proto-Theodotion/Aquila translation available to the early Christians (Morris, 1995: 727, 728). We may safely conclude that the textual form of **Zechariah 12:10** as we have in the New Testament and in the writings of Justin Martyr and in the *Epistle of Barnabas* is in all probability an independent Greek translation of the Hebrew, which found its way into the early Christian testimonia.

This passage was used in an eschatological sense, referring to the *παρουσια* of Christ in early Christian literature. That Justin Martyr (*Apology* 1.52.10-12; *Dialogue* 32.2) makes use of this text in an eschatological sense referring to the coming of Christ authenticates this view. That different writers in the New Testament have used this textual form from a very early stage, often also in an eschatological sense, suggests a very early acceptance of this text as a *testimonium*. In this tradition, looking “on him” is

maintained, rather than “on me” as attested by the readings in Revelation and Matthew and in other early Christian literature.

Thus, John shares an early Christian form of the text and its application to Christ. But two more questions remain to be settled. First of all, who will ‘look’? Are the subjects of ‘piercing’ and ‘looking’ the same or different? Secondly, what does this ‘look’ mean? When do they look and how? The early Christian use of the text suggests that the subjects of the two verbs were not considered exactly the same. In **Revelation 1:7** and **Matthew 24:30**, the subjects of ‘seeing’ are ‘every eye’ and ‘all tribes of the earth’ respectively. In the context of the Johannine narrative, the subjects of two verbs do not seem to be identical. It was one soldier who pierced Jesus, but the quotation retains the plural form of the subject. Even if we take ‘soldiers’ as the subjects, John does not seem to hold them personally responsible for Jesus’ death. They are acting on behalf of those who rejected Jesus. Most of the scholars feel that ‘Jews’ are included in the group designated ‘they’ (Westcott, 1898: 280; Bultmann, 1971: 677). The reference might be to all who are guilty of Jesus’ death, or of all those whose glance is now fixed on the crucified one, represented by the eyewitness himself (Schnackenburg, 1982 (3): 293).

What does John mean by ‘looking’? We should see whether the Johannine concept of seeing and looking elsewhere in his Gospel could help us. A number of scholars (Brown, 1970: 955; Moo, 1983: 214; Ridderbos, 1997: 623) have connected this quotation with **John 3:14, 15**, a passage that talks about the impact of the ‘lifted up’ Jesus on the believer. Moreover, John believes that Jesus’ crucifixion actually constitutes him being ‘lifted up’ (cf **12:32**). Looking at the Son of Man lifted up can be with belief or even with unbelief (see **8:28**). John often speaks about ‘seeing’ Jesus with faith (**6:40; 12:21; 14:9**) or with unbelief (**6:36; 15:24**). These indications suggest to us that ‘looking on the pierced one’ in the scripture quotation in **19:37** does not have to be taken in a literal sense. Menken (1996: 183) concludes that in John: “the believing look on the pierced Jesus consists in seeing the risen Lord, either directly or in the proclamation of the church, or... in seeing in the crucified Jesus the risen Lord, and vice versa.”

We can support this line of interpretation for ‘seeing’ with John’s redactional concerns. We have already noted that early Christian tradition, which was at least contemporary if not prior to John, considered ‘looking’ in this text as a reference to the *parousia*. John’s

understanding of ‘looking’ or ‘seeing’ here is in agreement with his tendency to interpret the traditions that carry a future orientation within the framework of a realised eschatology (cf **4:21-26; 5:19-27; 6:30-35**). What the tradition has been applying to the *parousia* can now be applied to the death of Christ. Barrett (1956: 493) suggests that John “consciously and deliberately used language applicable to both the resurrection and the *parousia*.” The disciple’s eyewitness testimony (“the one who has seen”) that comes as an interpolation before the quotation can make some sense here: he has already ‘seen’ and believed so that ‘you too may believe’, by seeing him. This quotation then carries on the idea of reversal that we noticed in the previous one. The one crucified and rejected is the one now no one can bypass.

Zechariah 12:10-14 is a lament about someone in the community who was killed, for which the Israelite community shares guilt. Mourning following the piercing suggests that death is represented (Mitchell, Smith & Brewer, 1912: 330). The pierced one’s sufferings and death are spoken of as God’s suffering and, hence, he must have been someone who was identified as God’s representative (Lamarche, 1961: 83). The lament functions as an expression of the community’s repentance. The context obviously heralds salvation (Schnackenburg, 1982 (3): 292-294). In the Johannine passion narrative, God’s salvation is now fulfilled in the crucifixion of Jesus (Bultmann, 1971: 677). Although the immediate narrative context of the quotation is the piercing of Jesus’ side in **John 19:34**, John seems to understand the ‘piercing’ in his quotation with a double sense: “immediately and literally of the piercing of Jesus’ side and indirectly and metaphorically of Jesus’ death” (Moo, 1983: 213). John, who uses other suffering figures in the Old Testament – sufferer in the Psalms and the suffering servant of Isaiah – to interpret Jesus’ sufferings, did not find anything unusual in applying this passage also to Jesus.

We have already noted that the early followers of Jesus had drawn insights from **Zechariah 9-14** in their understanding of Jesus. John uses **Zechariah 9:9** in a similar context as in Matthew’s passion narrative. All these passages (from Zechariah) in question feature an individual – or different descriptions of the same figure (Lamarche, 1961: 110; Bruce, 1960/61: 336-353). In all of the passages, Yahweh is closely identified with the individual concerned: the individual is Yahweh’s representative who enjoys an intimate relationship with Yahweh. The theme of a divinely-ordained leadership, characterised by humility or rejection, is present in all the four passages. For

our convenience, we shall call this figure the 'shepherd' in Zechariah, though he is not described as such in all the passages. As this figure reflected very much the style of Jesus' ministry, the early followers of Jesus found Messianic significance in the passages from **Zechariah 9-14** and it was an essential part of the early Christian testimonia (Lindars, 1961: 110-134). John shares this perspective and approach with his contemporary Christians.

John's hermeneutic here shows both a clear continuity and discontinuity with his tradition. He uses a scriptural passage that is already interpreted, accepting the basic framework of the interpretation that came to him in tradition. He accepts the meaning of the text as that understood by his tradition or community. But his specific theological concerns and the worldview transform the interpretation in the new context. He does it, not by rejecting or repudiating the tradition, but by reorienting the text, extending the meaning that he shares with the tradition and specifically applying it to a concrete situation. A passage that was used in reference to the *parousia* of Jesus in some other parts of the New Testament is here applied without any reference to the *parousia*.

3.6 SUMMARY

Our study of the fulfilment quotations in the Johannine passion narrative has given us some insights into John's way of using the Old Testament. The quotations come from the 'righteous sufferer' Psalms, **Zechariah 9-14**, and the paschal texts from the Pentateuch. We have noticed that all these sections of scripture were prominent in early Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. He did not search in isolation for the texts that could assist him in his theological enterprise. Many of those quotations, if not all, came to him in his tradition. He was part of a tradition that already recognised the significance of these sections of scripture. In all these passages there is some figure that generates figuration in John's hermeneutic.

John's understanding of scripture was guided by his tradition, too. The meaning of the scripture for him was the meaning that was appropriated by the community of the Jewish followers of Jesus. He stood within the tradition, broadly sharing the interpretative interests of the early Christians, but at the same time recognised specific interpretative interests peculiar to his own situation. Because of his particular interpretative interests, he is able to see what others do not see in a particular passage of scripture. For example, because of his view that the future is realised now, he is able to

apply a text that was used by the tradition for the *parousia* to the death of Christ. Even when he uses a particular scripture passage that came to him in his tradition, he places it in his narrative to serve his interpretative interest.

Scripture helps the Evangelist to understand Jesus. It is basic to all the scripture quotations that they are Christological in their application. Scripture as a whole witnesses to Jesus and, therefore, every individual passage that he employs serves this general purpose. He narrates the story of Jesus in scriptural terms. In fact, scripture interprets the story of Jesus. Because of this, at certain places, it looks as if scripture has shaped the narrative. The relationship between scripture and the contemporary event is figural. It is a correspondence between the event described by the text and the contemporary (Christological) event that makes the connection between the two. It is not a literal word-by-word fulfilment that is intended; in which case, many of the quotations would lose their theological significance for John. Neither is it allegorical, because the event described by the text and the contemporary event do not have detailed correspondence at every point. They have dissimilarities and discontinuity, which can be accommodated in a metaphorical relationship. There is a general respect for the overall context of a verse quoted, and both the event of the text and the event it is now adapted to are able to keep their separate identity and meaning. Joined together in a dialogue, however, they produce a meaning that goes beyond the independent meaning of each.

John is concerned with the fulfilment of scripture, not just the passage being quoted. The passage is important because it is from scripture. However, a passage quoted for a particular narrative context is not without relevance. It brings meaning and sense to an event that may not otherwise have much meaning. In this process, still, it is scripture that is fulfilled. For John, scripture “functions as a unity and not a patchwork of details to be matched” (in Moyise, ed, 2000: 151).

A meaningful and detailed discussion on John’s hermeneutics of scripture can only be done in the context of a detailed study of his use of the Old Testament, which involves numerous allusions to scripture. We shall conduct that study in the following chapter and then return to a detailed discussion on John’s interpretation of scripture. For the time being, however, we may conclude that – on the basis of the four scripture quotations in the Johannine passion narrative – John had a clear hermeneutical perspective and a consistent approach to reading various passages from scripture.

4.0 IMPLICIT ALLUSIONS TO SCRIPTURE IN THE JOHANNINE PASSION NARRATIVE

4.1 INTRODUCTION

In our discussion of the explicit quotations in the Johannine passion narratives – which are limited to four in number – we have seen some glimpses of the way John uses the Old Testament. In order to explore the dynamics of John’s hermeneutics, we must now turn to the possible allusions to scripture in his passion narratives.

Allusions are not limited to textual resemblances. An allusion can be made to the overall framework, the setting or the time references of a story. This broader concept of allusion demands some guidelines or criteria for recognising them in a text. Therefore, we first turn to criteria and then move on to various groups of allusions that can be recognised in the passion narratives of John.

4.2 CRITERIA FOR ALLUSIONS

Some methodological clarifications are needed as to how scriptural allusions can be identified in a particular text. A quotation, whether formal or informal, is distinguishable from its supporting text. A formal quotation is identified by the presence of some introductory formula, while informal quotations are simply citations without an introductory formula. It is the visibility of a quotation that can guide us. The more an Old Testament text is broken up and woven into the supporting passage, the more it loses its form as quotation. An allusion may also be overshadowed by the author’s modifications or changes.

When we come to the area of allusions critical difficulties arise. How can we guard ourselves against whimsical imagination or correlations between texts? Some scholars have formulated criteria for identifying the Old Testament allusions or echoes in the New Testament. Richard Hays (1989: 29-32) lists seven criteria: availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation and satisfaction. Dale Allison (2000: 9-13) proposes five tests for allusions: history of interpretation; sharing of vocabulary, word order, theme(s), imagery, structure, and

circumstances by the text and the intertext; prominence in the tradition; use by the author in related texts; and coherence.

Both Hays and Allison are using more or less the same standards, the difference being in the terminology and order. Allison places considerable weight on the history of interpretation, while Hays begins with the question of availability. For our purpose, we will bring together the sets of criteria given by Hays and Allison, combine them wherever we feel possible, and reorder them as we find it necessary. Our study begins with what can be recognised from within the text. In other words, the first clue or indication for an allusion should come from the text itself before we ask the question of availability and history of interpretation. So 'volume', to borrow Hays' category, is the basic criterion to begin with. Hays' (1989: 30) concern is primarily with "the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns," while Allison's (2000: 11) criterion involves some combination of the following: "common vocabulary, common word order, common theme(s), similar imagery, similar structure, and similar circumstance". Our criterion of volume takes into account Allison's broader perspective than Hays' narrower one.

We place 'availability' as the second criterion. The concern here is whether the source of the proposed allusion was available to the writer and the readers. As these sources normally come to the community as part of the tradition, Allison's third criterion – prominence in the tradition – can be included within that of availability. A source that is recognised in the tradition is surely available to the community. We recognise the availability of a particular source by its use in other contemporary and previous texts with which the community possibly has certain familiarity.

Thirdly, there is 'recurrence'. This criterion examines the place that the alluded text has in the author's overall use of Old Testament texts and traditions. If a suggested allusion points to a source in which the author is otherwise interested, the possibility is enhanced. Such interest on the author's side is normally revealed by the recurring use of that particular source in other texts by the same author and, in our case, in other parts of the same Gospel.

Our fourth criterion is 'coherence'. Does the proposed echo or allusion enhance meaning in a manner fitting into the argument or themes that the author is developing?

Is the effect of the allusion in line with other quotations and allusions in the same Gospel? Does the allusion help the author to communicate his point? This test will cause us to move from a mere recognition of the allusion to the question of interpreting it. Hays' last test, satisfaction, can be brought under this category. Coherence is the key to satisfaction in any exegetical exercise.

Our fifth criterion is 'history of interpretation'. This text – in which we find an intertext – has been read by many generations down through the centuries, some of them more closely to the time of its origin. Our case would be strengthened if the history of interpretation attests to the kind of echoes we hear in the text. Allison uses this criterion as a primary test, placing it as the first criterion in his list. But we would consider it as a criterion for verification and reassurance on a subordinate level rather than an important test to identify the allusions.

Apart from these criteria, there are certain pointers to an allusion sometimes provided by the textual patterns, particularly in the form of some logical inconsistency. Michael Riffaterre (1983) places much emphasis on what he calls 'ungrammaticality', a criterion that might point to an intertext beyond the successor text. These are textual patterns or signs that cannot be understood according to the normal rules of language and reasoning. They appear as obstacles to the reader in the construal of meaning. An ungrammaticality calls for interpretation at a metaphorical level because it resists interpretation at a literal level (Riffaterre, 1983: 30). Robert Brawley (1995) has successfully demonstrated the use of Riffaterre's criterion in his study of scripture in Luke-Acts. We shall use this criterion in our discussion, though we would avoid the term 'ungrammaticality'. In all these cases, we would find that there is no grammatical problem in the narrative; rather it is the logic of the narrative that is being affected. In this context, we would call this criterion 'narrative anomaly'.

We do not intend to use these criteria explicitly in a particular order in our study of the use of Scripture by the fourth Evangelist. Rather they lie behind our intertextual judgments. The set of criteria is suggestive rather than determinative. An allusion is never stated plainly, but merely suggested. As the burden of identification is on the readers, there is an element of subjectivity in recognising the allusions. The ancient readers had an advantage over against the modern readers in this connection. They inherited a small textual world and, hence, were more susceptible to recognising

intertextuality than modern readers who live in a world of textual proliferation. For the rabbis, coincidence of words or phrases was sufficient to establish a correlation between two texts (Young, 1997: 133) and, in many instances, we might feel such correlation is not justifiable. Therefore, for the purpose of our exercise, a more detailed set of guidelines has become necessary and thus we have identified certain criteria that can offer us assistance.

4.3 PASCHAL IMAGERY

Did John employ paschal imagery to explain the passion of Jesus? It would not be a surprise if John did so, as Passover traditions occupied an influential role in Jewish theology and eschatology (Gartner, 1959). In order to make a judgment on this question, we need to explore in detail various references in the Johannine passion narrative that could be pointing to the Passover lamb.

4.3.1 References about the Day/Time of Jesus' Death

John 18:28, 39 suggest that these events took place on the day before Passover, whilst **19:14** makes it clear that it was the day of Preparation for the Passover. In **19:31** and **42**, the reference is simply to the day of Preparation, either for Passover or Sabbath. In the context of the previous explicit references to the preparation for the Passover, it is reasonable to conclude that the reference in these instances is to the preparation for the Passover. Both the Sabbath and the Passover seem to have fallen on the same day according to John's account here. This is probably why John calls this particular Sabbath 'great' (Barrett, 1956: 555; Brown, 1970: 934).

The repetition of Passover references in the Johannine passion narrative provides a unity to the account. The narrator prepares the readers for the Passion events in a Passover context from chapter eighteen itself with two references (ie **18:28, 39**). In chapter nineteen, he presents the crucial passion events, linking them with the day of Preparation. He reminds the readers that it was the day of Preparation when Jesus was handed over (**v 14**), when his death was confirmed by breaking his legs (**v 31**) and at the end of the narrative, when the burial has taken place (**v 42**). Repeated reminders about the specific day are an invitation to the readers to connect the specific occasion with the events taking place. A similar attempt to place some events/teaching of Jesus in the

context of another Jewish festival is seen in chapters 7 and 8. John draws the attention of the readers to the context of the Festival of Booths, the events/teaching in these two chapters being presented in direct relevance to that context.

What is the significance of the day he is referring to and how are the readers expected to link it with the events surrounding the death of Jesus? It was on the day of Preparation that the Passover sacrifices were slaughtered (Gray, 1925: 388). John is specific about the time when Pilate sentenced Jesus to death: $\omega\lambda\rho\alpha\ \eta\pi\tau\upsilon\ \omega(\varphi\ \epsilon\lambda\kappa\tau\eta$, “about the sixth hour.” This would be around 12.00 noon, as John follows the reckoning of hours from daylight beginning at around 6.00 am (Walker, 1960: 69-73). Some scholars argue that this was the hour at which the slaughter of the Passover lambs began in the temple precincts (Bruns, 1966; Hengel, 1989: 66; Hanson, 1991: 219; Smalley, 1978: 224). If this was the case, “Jesus’ death is not only seen to occur on the day on which the Passover sacrifice was made, but is equated with that sacrifice itself by virtue of its contemporaneity” (Porter, Joyce & Orton, eds, 1994: 419).

From the evidence available to us, it is not possible to ascertain whether the ‘sixth hour’ was exactly the time when the slaughter of the lambs began, though we can conclude that the slaughter began sometime in the afternoon. The Law (**Exo 12: 6**) required that the lambs be slaughtered in the evening, but as the practice of slaughtering the lambs in the temple precincts by the priests came to be established, it became impossible to slaughter thousands of lambs at the sunset. The interpretation of ‘evening’ was stretched so that the slaughter begins early, giving adequate time for the priests to complete their work. *Jubilees* 49:10 allows the third part of the day, which might be around 2.00 pm to 6.00 pm. Josephus implies a mid-afternoon beginning of the sacrifices (*Jewish War* 6.9.3, 423). Philo acknowledges that the sacrifices were made from midday (On the Special Laws 2.27, 145). We should remember that it is not the hour of crucifixion or the death of Jesus that John gives us here; it is the time when he was sentenced to death. Therefore, we should not place undue emphasis on the importance of the ‘sixth hour’ in the Johannine narrative. However, it does seem certain that Jesus’ death, which took place some time later, broadly coincided with the slaughter of the lambs, which must have begun by then.

But would John’s readers have understood this intended connection between the sacrifice of the Paschal lamb and the death of Jesus, particularly the coincidence of the

time of Jesus' death with the time of slaughtering Paschal lambs? As mentioned briefly in the introductory chapter to this work, if we accept that the Johannine community was essentially Jewish and had parted ways with the synagogue only recently, then they would still have been familiar with Jewish customs. In spite of the possibility that the Johannine community was geographically far away from Jerusalem, the Fourth Gospel has a strong temple symbolism running through it (Coloe, 2001). Some knowledge of the temple, temple practices and festivals is presupposed in many other parts of the Gospel. In the light of these considerations, we may conclude that Johannine readers were able to recognise allusions to the Paschal lamb in John's reference to the day and time of Jesus' passion, particularly in the overall context of repeated reminders about the festival in the passion narrative and other possible allusions, which we shall evaluate in due course.

Did John alter the chronological references in his passion narrative in order to bring out the paschal symbolism? In the synoptics, Jesus seems to have been crucified on Friday 15 Nisan, while in John it is Friday 14 Nisan. In the synoptics, crucifixion begins at the third hour, while in John it is the sixth hour. Chronological details of John's account offer a time sequence that projects Jesus' death in paschal imagery. Certainly, "if the Johannine narrative is read by itself in light of Jewish Paschal custom all is straightforward" (Gray, 1925: 389). There have been many attempts to reconcile the Johannine scheme with synoptic dating (Ruckstuhl, 1965; Hoehner, 1992: 81-93), but even if one of those attempts is accepted as valid, the theological impact of John's emphasis of his chronological references might not be nullified. The Evangelist seems to make a conscious effort to present Jesus as the true Paschal Lamb through his temporal references to the day and time of Jesus' death. John's "narrative chronology is... inseparable from narrative Christology" (Stibbe, 1993: 115).

4.3.2 Symbolism in the Hyssop Stem

John 19:29 has a rather strange reference to a stem of hyssop: the soldiers put a sponge full of sour wine on a branch of hyssop and held it to Jesus' mouth. How can small bushy hyssop support a sponge full of sour wine? This logical impossibility has raised the suspicion that John used the reference to hyssop deliberately with Passover overtones. Hyssop is associated with cultic sprinkling elsewhere in scripture (cf **Lev 14:6ff**; **Num 19:6**; **Psm 50:9**; **Heb 9:19**) and is specifically seen as the agent in the

sprinkling of the blood of the Passover lamb (**Exo 12:22**). Can the use of this one word recall the Passover ritual? We need to agree that the symbolism here is not clear, at least in a cursory reading of the passage. So Bultmann (1971: 674) finds it improbable that “Jesus should be designated as the Passover Lamb through the statement that a sponge with vinegar was stuck on a hyssop stem.” The volume of the allusion is minimal. The mere presence of the word ‘hyssop’ is not a sufficient indication for Paschal symbolism, but certain other factors might ask us to consider the possibility of such symbolism.

The first concern is the logical impossibility as we indicated above. The use of the word ‘hyssop’ stands out in the narrative creating an inconsistency, making the whole description a statement against normal reality. If we employ our criterion of narrative anomaly, it is a sign of the presence of an allusion. The inconsistency here is the result of an allusion, and such inconsistency resists interpretation on a literal level whilst demanding interpretation on a metaphorical level (Brawley, 1993: 433).

There is also the possibility that John consciously departed from the tradition available to him. For example, the Synoptic Gospels use *κα/λαμοφ* (**Mk 15:33; Mt 27:49**), ‘reed’ or ‘cane,’ a word that makes sense in the context. But John uses a term that, if taken literally, is unsuitable for the purpose. Barrett suggests that *υ/σσωποφ* is presumably an intentional alteration of Mark’s *κα/λαμοφ* (Barrett, 1956: 553; cf Grigsby, 1982: 57; Porter, Joyce & Orton, eds, 1994: 420). John seems to have brought in a term that was “prompted not by tradition, but by the motif of the Passover” Lindars, 1961: 101). Although a single term, ‘hyssop’ in this text is very unusual and easily noticeable.

John’s readers were able to associate hyssop with the Passover because of their Jewish background and practice. With other pointers to Paschal imagery readily available in the passion narrative, one would not struggle much to find an allusion here (Barrett, 1956: 460; Lightfoot, 1956: 317; Hanson, 1991: 213; Orchard, 1998: 236). It can be argued that the analogy is not precise in this case: hyssop is not used in this incident for exactly the same purpose as in the Passover ritual. However, Johannine symbolism is not expressed always in precise analogies, as Raymond Brown points out: “It is difficult to apply rigorous logic to Johannine symbolism” (1970: 930). Porter suggests a possible correlation of the use of a hyssop branch at Passover with its use at Jesus’ crucifixion: in both the cases it is used “to form a connection between the sacrificial victim and those for whom it or he is the sacrifice” (Porter, Joyce & Orton, eds, 1994: 420).

Porter's argument is less clear but, even without making a correlation on this detail, one could affirm the possibility of an allusion.

4.3.3 Blood and Water from the Body

Another remark in John's narrative that captures our attention is in **19:34**: "... and at once blood and water came out". The episode that involves this remark has no parallel in the Synoptics. That John found this detail very important, however, is clear from the fact that he has added an eyewitness testimony about it in the following verse. Yet the description raises some practical concerns. How does a dead body bleed and, even if that happens, how does water come out with it? The description is admittedly obscure but this "statement was evidently regarded by John as a matter of very great importance" (Barrett, 1956: 462).

This ambiguity is important for our analysis of the statement. What we have here is a narrative anomaly that points to some intertextuality in the narrative. This obscure statement stands out in the narrative, resisting our normal and logical ways of understanding. It is an indication that there is some dialogue going on between the incident the narrator is describing and some intertext he wants to bring in. Such conflict in the narrative points to some symbolism. John is probably using imaginative language to describe the event. We are not here entering into the debate whether the piercing of the side had any historical factual basis. The whole event is perhaps a construct of John's imagination. The importance of the incident in the context of this work, however, is the theological symbolism that John probably attaches to it.

There are many contestants for the meaning of the symbolism here: a sacramental view that considers blood and water representing Eucharist and baptism (Brown, 1970: 946-953), an anti-docetic apologetic to underline the humanity of Jesus and the reality of his death (Kysar, 1986: 292), a 'sign' of the life that flows from the crucified and risen Christ (Dodd, 1953: 428), a symbol of the emergence of a 'New Eve', the church, from the side of Christ (Hoskyns, 1947: 534, 535), water flowing from the Temple, an allusion to **Ezekiel 47** (Coloe, 2001: 206-208). There is another small detail in the statement that might direct us to a different symbolism. It has to do with John's emphasis that blood flowed 'immediately' from the lance wound in Jesus' side.

It was part of the Jewish sacrificial law that the blood of the victim should not be congealed, but should flow forth at the moment of death in order to aid its sprinkling (*Mishna Pesahim* 5.3, 5). In the Jewish practice, the priest slits the heart of the victim, making the blood come forth (Grassi, 1987: 28). In a sacrifice, if blood is ‘spurred forth’ when the victim is found dead or at the point of death, it is a ‘fit’ sacrifice (*Mishna Hullin* 2.6). John’s ἐχρηλθεν followed by εὐθυσ·φ may be equivalent to the Rabbis’ ‘spurred forth’ or ‘streamed forth’ (Malina & Rohrbaugh, 1998: 274). John’s narrative is emphatic about the flow of blood from the side of the crucified Jesus, for which an appeal to eyewitness testimony is also made.

The anomaly of water in the description here is a difficult one. Some scholars have suggested that it is reminiscent of the flow of blood and fluid out of the sacrificial animal (Porter, Joyce & Orton, eds, 1994: 420). The blood of a crucified person is referred to as ‘mixed blood’ in Talmud (*b. Ohalot* 3.5). Ford suggests that Rabbis spoke about the blood that streams forth ‘as water’: “Therefore it might be possible that St John’s και/ in the phrase αἷμα και/ υἰδωρ might be exegetical or ascensive and a translation might read: ‘and there came out immediately blood even fluid’” (Ford, 1969: 337, 338). It is also possible that ‘blood and water’ reflect some Jewish conception of a healthy human being (*Leviticus Rabbah* 15:2). Whatever was John’s intention in having ‘water’ alongside blood in his description here, it does not necessarily rule out the possibility of paschal imagery for blood coming out of Jesus.

Thus, it is possible that John intended through the last episode on the cross to emphasise that Jesus died as a sacrificial victim. Taken along with other allusions to Passover imagery in the episode such as unbroken legs, hyssop and piercing, the blood that “came out immediately” is a probable allusion to the blood of the Passover Lamb. What is interesting here is that John is not directly alluding to any passage from scripture. Rather, he alludes to some ideas and traditions that developed from the community’s interpretation of scripture. We have already noticed how scripture enabled John to interpret the present event. However, it is not scripture alone but the tradition, too, that shape his framework of thinking and interpreting; rather, scripture as it comes to him in his tradition.

4.3.4 Double Quotations from Scripture in 19:36-37

Our analysis in the previous chapter has established that there is a reference to the paschal sacrifice in John's scripture quotation in verse 36 of his nineteenth chapter: "not one of his bones will be broken". John's attempt here is to present Jesus as a perfect and valid sacrificial victim. We have also observed that the second passage from **Zechariah 12:10** is taken in support of the sacrificial imagery, in this context referring to the piercing of Jesus. It talks about the salvific and judgmental character of the sacrifice.

Thus, in the passion narrative of John, the issue of paschal imagery is not based on a particular quotation from scripture, but on consistent use of Passover language throughout. In a variety of ways John uses this imagery in order to understand and explain the death of Jesus. He quotes the scripture directly in verse 36, alludes to some interpretative traditions in verse 34, and further alludes to the temporal setting, time and an agent (hyssop) of the Paschal custom. When we put all these things together, it appears that there is sufficient volume of echoes for Passover imagery in the Johannine passion narrative. As far as the availability of these traditions is concerned, there is not much debate. In any case, the concept of Jesus as Paschal Lamb is pre-Johannine, as testified by Pauline literature (cf **1 Cor 5:7**).

4.3.5 Passover in the Fourth Gospel

Our conclusions above leave us with the task of placing them in the overall context of the Fourth Gospel. We need to clarify whether John had any concern with the Passover imagery in other parts of Gospel and, therefore, determine whether our conclusions stand the scrutiny of the criterion recurrence. Wilhelm Wilkens has suggested that the initial form of the Fourth Gospel, the original material before its second layer of editing, was a 'Passover Gospel'. It means that the Gospel evolved from a Passover framework (Wilkens, 1958: 54). Although the details of his argument have not found scholarly acceptance, his invitation to consider the Passover as a possible background to the whole Gospel – or at least some parts of the Gospel – did find some support. Bertil Gartner (1959) argued that John chapter six was originally a Passover *haggadah*, whilst Peder Borgen (1965) has also explored this same chapter within a Passover framework. Mark Stibbe (1993: 35) finds a Passover plot in the whole of John's Gospel.

It must be noted that the Fourth Gospel directly refers to the Passover more than any other New Testament book. Reference to the $\pi\alpha/\sigma\xi\alpha$ directly is found in **2:13, 23; 6:4; 11:5; 12:1; 13:1; 18:28, 39; 19:14**. It is referred to as $\epsilon(\sigma\pi\tau\eta/$ in **2:23; 4:45; 6:4; 11:56; 12:12, 20; 13:1, 29**. What is particularly striking is not so much the recurrence of the references to the Passover, as the placing of some of those references at crucial turns of his narrative. Three of these references are very important – in **2:13; 6:4** and **13:1** – being suggestive of a Passover plot that moves through three different Passover festivals. Passover seems to be an important context for each cycle of events in the Gospel (Brown, 1970: 95). It certainly appears that Passover occupies some important role in the plot of the narrative. Borchert (1987) and Parsons (in Sloan & Parsons, eds, 1993) have established that Passover is one of the narrative vehicles that highlights the role of the narrative cycles in the Fourth Gospel.

Apart from the narrative plot of the story, there are some individual passages and textual expressions that suggest that the Paschal lamb was important in John's theological expression. The first one is to be found in **John 1:29-36**. There are two acclamations in this passage, both from John the Baptist, that Jesus is 'the lamb of God.' These statements come at the initiatory part of the narrative, introducing the commencement of Jesus' ministry. Various alternatives have been suggested for the meaning of 'lamb' here: the Paschal lamb (Barrett, 1956: 176), some other lamb (Davies, 1992: 234), the suffering servant (Burney, 1922: 104-108; Evans, 1993: 182, 183) and the apocalyptic lamb of Revelation (Dodd, 1953: 230-238; Beasley-Murray, 1987: 24, 25). Most of the interpreters find at least some sort of Passover reference here (Barrett, 1956: 176, 177; Lindars, 1972: 109; Carson, 1991: 150), but it can be argued that the Passover sacrifice was not an expiatory sacrifice and, hence, the expression "that takes away the sins of the world" would not be appropriate for a Passover lamb. However, some argue that all sacrifice was held as expiatory (Morris, 1995: 127). Brown claims that a sacrificial aspect had come to be associated with the Passover by the time of Jesus, concluding that: "In any case, the difference between the lamb's blood smeared on the doorpost as a sign of deliverance and the lamb's blood offered in sacrifice for deliverance is not very great" (Brown, 1970: 62). This expiatory dimension was part of early Christian understanding of Christ as the Passover Lamb, as we see in Paul (**1 Cor 5:7**), whose writings predated those of John. We can conclude, therefore, that John's 'lamb of God' is a possible reference to Paschal imagery, though we are not able to establish it with any degree of certainty.

There are several other passages in the Fourth Gospel where the Paschal theme is evident: **2:13-25**; **6:1-14, 22-71**; **11:47-12:8**; **13:1-17:26**, apart from the relevant passages in the passion narrative. The reader of the Gospel is prepared to arrive at the climatic death of Christ the Passover Lamb in chapter nineteen by way of a plot developed through the whole Gospel, which is clearly projected in chapters **2, 6, 11, 13, 15** and **17**. For John, then, paschal imagery is not an *ad hoc* vehicle of expression in the passion narrative alone, but part of a central perspective through which he sees Jesus. Beginning with the acclamation by John the Baptist in **1:29**, there is a series of events in which Passover imagery plays a primary role, leading up to the culmination in chapter nineteen. Thus in John's Gospel, the "Passover is rarely out of sight for any great length of time" (Morris, 1964: 66).

By his interpretation of Jesus' death through paschal imagery, John gives a symbolic interpretation of Jesus' death and testifies that scripture had already attested this death (Obermann, 1996: 309). The primary purpose of the paschal blood is to provide a salvific sign, to mark the household (**Exo 12:3-13**). The feast of Passover is a celebration of God's deliverance of Israel from Egypt: "Its purpose was not sacrificial but apotropaic" (Ashton, 1991: 491). Passover imagery is able to accommodate John's understanding of the salvific dimension of Jesus' death. For John, Jesus' death is a means that gathers together the scattered children of God (**Jn 11:52**) and draws all men to Jesus (**12:32**). It is where Jesus is 'lifted up' (**3:14**) and God's saving power is known. Passover as the celebration of God's saving act is a fitting background for the saving act of God in Jesus. This probably constituted for John a replacement theme: Jesus in place of an important festival motif (Bultmann, 1971: 677; Brown, 1994: 847-848).

John has narrated the story of Jesus through a general Passover framework, with repeated references to the Passover and associated practices, and the placing of many important events and teachings in the context of Passover celebrations. Passover is a scriptural framework with which he approaches Jesus. By way of numerous allusions to various scriptural passages and practices, he invites the reader to join his world of scripture and make sense of Jesus' passion and death.

4.4 THE 'I AM' SAYINGS

Two final occurrences of ε)γω ε)μι pronouncements by Jesus occur at the beginning of the Johannine passion narratives (18:5, 8). Some scholarly discussions have taken place on the background and function of the 'I am' sayings in the Fourth Gospel (Harner, 1970; Ball & Dwyer, 1996; Williams, 2000), although not much attention is paid to these two occurrences of ε)γω ε)μι sayings.

4.4.1 Nature and Function

The question we need to ask here is why we should not take these ε)γω/ ε)μι sayings as mere self-identification with an implied predicate 'he'? We need to consider many aspects of these pronouncements in order to answer this question, the main concerns being textual variation, form of the saying and the function of the saying or formula in the narrative as a whole.

➤ Text and Form

Variant readings are found for the first ε)γω/ ε)μι pronouncement in verse 5. ο(Ι)ησουϕ ε)γω/ ε)μι is supported by κ1 'A, C, K, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ'. ε)γω/ ε)μι Ι)ησουϕ is supported by B. In the case of the first variant reading, it is more likely that ο(Ι)ησουϕ is understood to be taken along with the preceding λε)γει αυ)τοιϕ rather than with ε)γω/ ε)μι. The second variant reading almost suggests that Ι)ησουϕ is to be taken along with ε)γω/ ε)μι. But Codex Vaticanus is the only witness to this reading. The addition of Ι)ησουϕ has probably come by dittography of the letters that follow ε)γω/ ε)μι because ει(σ)τη/κει was often spelt ι(σ)τη/κει (Barrett, 1956: 520). It could also be the result of a scribal attempt to show Jesus identifying himself in these words (Brown, 1970: 810).

These variant readings do not help us to answer the ambiguity surrounding the ε)γω/ ε)μι sayings in the account of Jesus' arrest. There is no addition of Ι)ησουϕ in any textual tradition at the two repeated occurrences of ε)γω/ ε)μι in verses 6 and 8. Even where the narrator repeats Jesus' pronouncement verbatim in verse 6, there is no similar textual variation. Therefore, even if we concede that the pronouncement in verse 5 is "I am Jesus", we still have to deal with the absolute "I am" in verses 6 and 8. Textual

variations in verse 5 do not answer the questions of nature and function of ε)γω/ ει)μι in the narrative as a whole.

As far as the form of the saying is concerned, it must be affirmed that there is no predicate for the ε)γω/ ει)μι sayings in this account of Jesus' arrest. This should lead us to conclude that what we have here are absolute ε)γω/ ει)μι sayings, which should be taken to stand alongside other absolute ε)γω/ ει)μι sayings in the Fourth Gospel (cf 4:26; 8:24, 28, 48; 13:19).

➤ Narrative Function

We need to ask whether the 'I Am' sayings have any significant function in the narrative of John 18. The first eleven verses of this chapter form one unit describing Jesus' encounter with those who came to arrest him. Jesus' self-declaration in verses 5 and 8, together with the narrator's reiteration of that self-declaration in verse 6, provide a centre for the movement and action within this narrative. The scene is essentially one of a confrontation – a confrontation with Judas, the traitor, and the captors. The scene is set in verses 1-3. In verses 4 and 5a, Jesus confronts his captors with ε)γω/ ει)μι. In verses 5b and 6a, the narrator confirms the presence of Judas among the captors and repeats Jesus' ε)γω/ ει)μι pronouncement. Verse 6b reports the reaction to Jesus' self-identification. In verses 7 and 8, Jesus again confronts his captors declaring ε)γω/ ει)μι, whilst verse 9 is a sort of reflection and summary in which the narrator underlines the fulfilment of the word that was spoken earlier.

The Johannine Jesus does not passively accept what comes upon him, but actively confronts the captors. He knows all that is to happen to him and he steps forward seeing his captors (v 4). Here Jesus takes away the initiative from his captors. He challenges them with the question: "who do you seek?" It happens twice and, on both occasions, the conversation ends with Jesus' declaration: ε)γω/ ει)μι. Although on one level these words are the means of a simple self-identification in the given context, the narrative demands some implication beyond the ordinary. The first clue for its special importance is the repetition of Jesus' pronouncement and its redescription by the narrator. The emphasis is on the words ε)γω/ ει)μι and it is attested by the deliberate repetition of these words, which is "sufficiently unnatural to draw the reader's attention" (Dodd, 1963: 75). If the emphasis was on the reaction of the captors, the narrator would have

probably said: “When he said this...” Moreover, the narrator preserves the words “in the form of an indeclinable citation”, not in the form of indirect speech (Williams, 2000: 289). The ‘I Am’ saying here is consciously emphasised by the narrator.

The second clue for the importance and meaning of the ‘I Am’ sayings in the arrest narrative is the dramatic reaction of the hearers: they stepped back and fell to the ground. It has been suggested that the reaction is due to amazement in finding the elusive Messiah (Stibbe, 1993: 28). However, such amazement does not fully explain the captor’s reaction because they had come to the garden with the very purpose of finding Jesus. On the other hand, the construction of the sentence in verse 6 gives an impression that the reaction of the captors is linked to Jesus’ ε)γω/ ε)μι statement. It could be an act of awe and reverence at what those words represented, though it could be argued that the captors would not have understood the meaning of those words in the same way that the readers are able to. But the reader already has in mind the earlier ε)γω ε)μι and, hence, would hear more than the context actually says (Bultmann, 1971: 639). It is conceivable that John wanted his readers to understand this ‘falling down’ as a reaction to divine revelation. This can be confirmed if we are able to establish that Jesus was actually invoking the divine name, a possibility that we shall now explore.

The use of an ‘I Am’ saying in the arrest account points the reader back to some of the other absolute ‘I Am’ sayings in the Fourth Gospel. Two instances are clear possibilities. One incident portrays a surprising reaction from the hearers, which suggests that the hearers were in some way shocked by what Jesus said. The pronouncement of ε)γω/ ε)μι in 8:58 provokes Jesus’ opponents to anger and it makes them pick up stones to throw at him. In the face of their hostility Jesus “drew back”, whilst in chapter eighteen he hands himself over to them. Much earlier, Jesus had told his opponents that, when they lifted up the Son of man, they would know that ε)γω/ ε)μι (Jn 8:28). The repeated use of ε)γω/ ε)μι at the beginning of the Passion, when he is about to be lifted up, seems to function as a cross-reference to its use in chapter eight (Ball & Dwyer, 1996: 143).

Another statement of ε)γω/ ε)μι that was reported earlier in the Gospel may also be recalled in the present context. The narrative comment in 18:5 not only emphasises the fact that Judas was present when Jesus said ε)γω/ ε)μι, but it also describes his particular role in the event – he was the “one who betrayed him”. This may take the

reader back to another statement of ε)γω/ εΙ)μΙ, which was made in the context of Jesus' prediction of his betrayal: "I tell you this now, before it takes place, that when it does take place you may believe that ε)γω/ εΙ)μΙ" (13:19). Now is the time that Jesus' words in 13:19 are to be fulfilled. ε)γω/ εΙ)μΙ here may be taken as a cross-reference to 13:19, "intended to call to mind the tragic irony of the situation" (Lindars, 1972: 541).

It is clear from our analysis that the words ε)γω/ εΙ)μΙ play an important and decisive role in the structure of the account of Jesus' arrest in the Fourth Gospel. The focus is on Jesus and his self-identification. The statement of self-identification is, in effect, a declaration of his authority and it goes well with the details of the narrative. The narrator shows that Jesus is in control of the events; Judas becomes an onlooker and the captors are in awe and shock. Jesus is not caught, but he gives himself up, conducting himself with authority and self-assurance because he knows who he is. But Peter, another character in the story, resorts to some act of defence, thereby displaying a somewhat deficient understanding of who Jesus is. Thus, the main question in the story is Jesus' identity.

4.4.2 Old Testament Background for ε)γω/ εΙ)μΙ

Many suggestions have come up about the Old Testament source of ε)γω/ εΙ)μΙ sayings. Most of them concentrate on the sayings with predicates (Smalley, 1978; Painter, 1979: 37-49). They rightly point out various Old Testament images behind the 'I am' sayings in the Fourth Gospel, though their attempts do not really enlighten us about the 'I am' sayings that do not have predicates. For example, Margaret Davies (1992: 82-87) concludes that all types of 'I am' sayings in the Gospel come from the Wisdom literature, thereby failing to take note of the distinctive form of the absolute 'I am' sayings. Those who have considered this distinctive group of sayings have pointed to one possible source: the)ωη ψν) sayings in the book of Isaiah (Harner, 1970; Ball & Dwyer, 1996; Williams, 2000). There are five occurrences of)ωη ψν) in Isaiah (41:4; 43:10, 13; 46:4; 48:12), and in most of these cases the Septuagint translates it as ε)γω/ εΙ)μΙ. The only occurrence of the same declaration outside Isaiah is found in **Deuteronomy 32:39**. These six occurrences in the Old Testament are absolute uses of ε)γω εΙ)μΙ without any predicate.

All these are divine pronouncements made by Yahweh. It is possible that the Isaianic use of $\omega\eta\psi\nu$) as a formula emerged in dialogue with Near-Eastern hymns of self-praise, where gods and saviour figures resort to I-style speeches and pronouncements (Harner, 1970: 8) or is derived from the biblical revelatory formula $\eta\omega\eta\psi\psi\nu$), as in **Exodus 3:14** (Zimmermann, 1960: 54-69). Whatever the origin of this pronouncement formula, this expression has an important role in the poetry of Deutero-Isaiah and it asserts Yahweh's identity as the one and true God (**Isa 43:10-13**). It affirms his sovereignty; he controls the course of events both past and present (**41:1-5**) and manifests unceasing care for his people (**46:4**). To summarise, $\omega\eta\psi\nu$) is Yahweh's self-description of his identity, not a mere statement of his existence. Brown (1996: 537, 538) suggests that in the Septuagint version of Deutero-Isaiah, $\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$) came to be understood as a divine name. In Isaianic context, this title is both eschatological, referring to the time of Lord's visitation to Zion (**52:6, 7**), and soteriological, because the purpose of that visitation is salvation of his people.

The only other $\omega\eta\psi\nu$) pronouncement in the Old Testament outside of Isaiah is found in the Song of Moses (**Dt 32:39**). This song seems to be a much later addition to the remaining part of Deuteronomy and it shares some themes and features of prophetic traditions. Many scholars have pointed out that this song presupposes the development of monotheistic thought as reflected in Deutero-Isaiah (Mayes, 1979: 381; Keck, ed, 1998: 527; Barton & Muddiman, eds, 2001: 154). It is beyond the brief of this work to discuss whether Deutero-Isaiah influenced the Song of Moses or vice versa. However, the similarities are clear. Both Deutero-Isaiah and the Song of Moses defend monotheism by denying the existence of other gods. In this context, the use of $\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$) in Moses' song carries more or less the same emphasis and purpose as similar pronouncements in Deutero-Isaiah. The identity and the sovereignty of Yahweh are the elements defended in the context of the pronouncement.

If these Old Testament $\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$) pronouncements lie behind Jesus' $\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$) sayings, Jesus' claim is appalling to the Jews. Jews would either pick up stones to throw at him, as they should normally reject such a claim by a mere mortal, or fall back in fear and awe if forced by the narrator to take up the claim at its face value. Jesus makes an assertion that only God can properly make and, thus, identifies himself with God's creative and salvific actions. Jesus is shown to be in control of the events in the account of his arrest; he has foreknown what would happen to him. It must be noticed that

ὤν ψν) is also associated with God's foreknowledge of events in **Isaiah** (cf **43:10; 44:7**).

In line with the theological framework of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus can claim a divine name. The unity between the Father and the Son is central to Johannine Christology. This distinctive Sonship is allied to the concept of his pre-existence (de Jonge, 1977: 141). He is the only one who can reveal the Father (**Jn 1:18**). The prologue asserts that the word was with God and was God. In the shepherd discourse, the Johannine Jesus declares unequivocally: "I and the Father are one" (**10:30**). In the eyes of the Jews, this is a blasphemous claim (**v 33**). It is no surprise that they picked up stones in anger (**v 31**). The fact that Jews were prepared to stone Jesus at the hearing of an ε)γω/ ει)μι pronouncement (**8:58**) suggests that they found the statement and the implied claim blasphemous. For John, Jesus' uniqueness is not just because of what he does on behalf of the Father, but also because he himself is divine (Wright, 1990: 22). Therefore, it is conceivable that the Johannine Jesus assumes a divine self-identification that carries with it ontological and soteriological claims: "Both John's view of sonship and his use of ε)γω/ ει)μι present a portrait of Jesus which is unacceptable to the narrative audience and is interpreted as blasphemy" (Ball & Dwyer, 1996: 278, 279). In the account of Jesus' arrest, the narrator gives the description of a strange reaction by the hearers to the ε)γω/ ει)μι statement.

It might be argued that the hearers, which included Roman soldiers, did not understand the essence of the claim, though it is equally possible that those from the chief priests and Pharisees recognised it. In any case, our concern is the narrative effect, which could be a deliberate creation of the narrator. The ε)γω/ ει)μι of the Old Testament is the sovereign Lord, who controls the course of history and acts to protect and save his people. The ε)γω/ ει)μι of the Fourth Gospel, Jesus the unique Son, conducts himself in a similar manner, taking control of the events and acting to protect and save his disciples.

There is another element in the context that is shared both by the Isaianic ε)γω/ ει)μι declarations and the Johannine ε)γω/ ει)μι pronouncements: the setting of a trial. The Isaianic ε)γω/ ει)μι pronouncements appear in the poetic pieces that are set in the context of trial, called trial songs (cf **41:4; 43:10, 13**). It is self-revelation in the context of a trial, a trial between God and the nations. The Gospel narrator continues to

highlight the dualistic setting of dialogue and opposition, which has been part of the Gospel all through, in his account of Jesus' arrest. Jesus and his disciples, on one side, and Judas and the captors, on the other, form confronting poles in this trial. Jesus asserts himself with his ε)γω/ ε)μι statement and silences the opposing group. The themes of judgment, witness, light, darkness and the metaphor of a cosmic trial are noticeably present in the context of the 'ε)γω/ ε)μι' sayings both in the Fourth Gospel and Isaiah (Lincoln, 1994: 3-30).

These observations compel us to take the relationship between the Johannine framework of thinking and the Isaiah traditions seriously. They suggest that when John alludes to the ε)γω/ ε)μι sayings, he has in mind not only those words, but also the context in which such pronouncements were found. Thus, Isaiah functions as a source of language and ideology in the Johannine understanding of Jesus (Young, 1955: 467-497; Evans & Stinespring, eds, 1987: 226-236). The 'I Am' sayings are, in that sense, pointers to the larger context of Deutero-Isaiah.

One should ask whether we have any other clues in the Passion narrative for John's use of Deutero-Isaiah. There seems to be some places where intertextual echoes of Deutero-Isaiah are probable; in all these cases the reference is to 'the servant of the Lord'.

4.5 THE SERVANT OF YAHWEH

We shall now consider some of the less explicit allusions in the Johannine passion narrative. The volume of echoes in each of these individual cases is minimal.

The first aspect to examine is the description of the mockery of Jesus. **John 18:22-24** and **19:1-3** are the key passages where the humiliation is depicted. Both **18:22** and **19:3** use the word ρ(α)πισμα, a word that occurs in the Septuagint only at **Isaiah 50:6**, used in connection with the mockery of the servant. In the New Testament, it occurs elsewhere only in **Matthew 26:67**, where the context is the mockery of Jesus. In **John 19:1-3**, in addition to ρ(α)πισμα, we have the verb μαστιγο)ω (v 3), the verbal form of μαστιγαφ, which is found in **Isaiah 50:6**. The use of μαστιγο)ω alone would not establish an allusion to **Isaiah 50:6**, but its use here along with another rare word from the same verse strengthens the possibility of such an allusion. The same verse from Isaiah has influence on some of the Passion predictions (**Mk 10:33, 34**; both

ε)μπτω and μαστιγω appear here) and mockery scenes (**Mk 14:65; 15:19; Mt 26:67; 27:30**) in the synoptic tradition, which strengthens the case for the availability of the concerned text or passage for the narrator.

The next instance is in **John 19:5**, where Pilate says: “Behold the man!” This could simply be an expression of pity: ‘look at this poor fellow’. However, some scholars suggest that the word ‘man’ has a pregnant meaning on several occasions in John’s testimony. The use of ‘man’ at **9:11; 10:33; 11:50; 18:4** are examples (Suggit, 1982/83: 333, 334). One echo suggested is **Zechariah 6:12** (Meeks, 1967: 70; Howard-Brook, 2001: 405), in which case a deeper meaning or reference is possible and our search for an allusion is justified. Another possibility is **Isaiah 53:3b**: “a man (α)νθρωποφ who had been beaten and who knew how to bear sickness...” In the narrative Jesus is scourged, insulted and struck and the man in **Isaiah 53** (the servant) would be the most appropriate figure to be alluded to here. The Isaianic passage fits well the narrative context. Moreover, Zechariah has α)νηρ, while John uses α)νθρωποφ. Pilate is “unwillingly presenting the Jews with the suffering servant of the Lord” (Hanson, 1991: 204-5). There is not sufficient volume to establish an allusion here, but it must be acknowledged that in the overall context the possibility is very strong.

Jesus’ silence at his trial (**Jn 19:9**) is a possible parallel to the silence of the Isaianic servant (cf **Isa 53:7**). There is no linguistic similarity between the two passages. Isaiah has ου)κ α)νοι)γει το) στο)μα, while John has α)πο)κρισιν ου)κ ε)δωκεν α)τ)%. The correspondence is in the parallel emphasis on the same theme. The passive endurance of suffering is clearly a point of interest in both **Isaiah 53:7** and **John 19:9**. Morna Hooker suggests that the silence motif in the trial of Jesus is a definite pattern; Jesus refuses to respond to the false accusations. As this is a pattern in the Gospel narratives, there is no reason to trace this silence motif to **Isaiah 53:7** (Hooker, 1959: 88, 89). But **Isaiah 53:7** itself comes from a trial scene (Westermann, 1969: 257) and, hence, the correspondence is strengthened if we take into account the trial context of both this and **John 18:9**. The use of **Isaiah 53:7** in this context would be appropriate and fitting. The description of John, as well as other Evangelists (cf **Mk 14:61; 15:5; Mt 26:63; 27:12, 14; Lk 23:19**), evokes the picture of the Servant’s submissiveness (Moo, 1983: 148). We cannot rule out the possibility of an allusion here.

Another allusion may be detected in **John 19:17**, where the narrator makes Jesus: “carry the cross by himself.” The synoptics have Simon of Cyrene carrying Jesus’ cross (**Mk 15:21; Mt 27:32; Lk 23:26**) and if John knew this tradition, he must have avoided it in his narrative, probably to show Jesus as bearing the cross himself (Lightfoot, 1956: 33). Many scholars find here an Isaac typology, recalling Isaac carrying the wood for his own sacrifice (Macgregor, 1928: 344; Tasker, 1972: 210). The concept of Isaac carrying the wood “as one bears the cross on the shoulder” (*Genesis Rabbah*, 56.4) and the associated atonement theology were part of a developed *aqedah* tradition that was available from the fourth century (Brown, 1994: 1435-1443). The Fourth Gospel does not betray knowledge of – or dependence on – the *aqedah*, although allusions to **Genesis 22** cannot be ruled out altogether in the Gospel. Isaac’s story, as given in **Genesis 22**, does not portray him as suffering willingly, accepting the will of God while the Isaianic servant does so. Moreover, Isaianic texts present the suffering of the servant as somewhat vicarious, bringing healing/deliverance to the community, while the Isaac story in Genesis does not have any such implication. Therefore, more appropriate and natural in the Johannine passion context here seems to be an allusion to **Isaiah 53:11** where it is recorded: “and he shall bear our iniquities” (Septuagint: κα.ι τα.φ α(μαρτι/αφ αυ)των αυ)το.φ ανοι/σει). John does not use the word is found in the Septuagint, but he employs βασταζων, which is found in Aquila at **Isaiah 53:11**. It is more probable that John has the Servant of the Lord in mind rather than Isaac, when it comes to the suffering of Jesus.

The very next verse (**v 18**) may also have an allusion present. All the four Gospels mention the detail that Jesus was crucified along with two criminals. Glasson (1963: 41) concludes that ‘one on either side’ is an allusion to Exodus 17:12, where Aaron and Hur held up Moses’ hands “one on one side and the other on the other side.” In this case, however, we are not able to recognise any clear typological correspondence. Such correspondence is more easily defended if the allusion is to **Isaiah 53:12**: “... and he was numbered with the transgressors.” Hanson feels that if John’s use of βασταζων in verse 17 is deliberate, then the readers’ attention would already be drawn to **Isaiah 53:12** (1991: 208), whilst Carson concludes that: “It is hard to imagine that the Evangelist who uses Isaiah 53 so effectively in John 12 is not now thinking of Isaiah 53:12: Jesus ‘was numbered with the transgressors’” (1991: 610). There is no textual resemblance in the verse, though the possibility of a conceptual allusion cannot be ruled out. Synoptic tradition connects **Isaiah 53:12** to the position of Jesus on the cross along

with the criminals in a clear manner. Luke (22:37; 23:33) quotes **Isaiah 53:12** as a prophecy about Jesus being crucified alongside the criminals. This suggests that John would not have had any problem with the availability of the scripture verse alluded to.

John 19:30 says: "...and he gave up his spirit." There seems to be an element of voluntariness in the death of the Johannine Jesus. This is an unusual way of referring to death (Morris, 1995: 721). We are able to find a similar expression in the Old Testament, in the description of the death of the suffering servant of Isaiah. The Hebrew of **Isaiah 53:12**: "he poured out his soul unto death" can be translated *παρεδωκεν εις θανατον τη .: ν ψυξη .: ν αυτου* (Bernard, 1942: 641). This gives us a verbal link between **Isaiah 53:12** and **John 19:30**. Both the servant and Jesus 'give up' their life. For the servant, the suffering is so severe that death is imminent; in the case of Jesus, death takes place in reality.

In summary, the possibility that John looked at the suffering Jesus with the lens of the 'suffering servant' of Isaiah cannot be rejected without due consideration. There are small markers here and there in the narrative, which may not prove the test of volume if taken independently. When they are placed together in their context and compared with similar words and concepts in the Isaianic context, echoes begin to sound. As the Isaianic text concerned is well attested in parallel traditions in a similar context and it was one of the most important scripture texts for the early followers of Jesus, availability of the text to John seems certain.

There is coherence in the whole process of using Isaianic servant traditions by John. Both the servant and Jesus share intense physical and mental pain, they are both spurned by the authority in the society and both are innocent victims. Moreover, their sufferings result in the benefit of others and seem to have the divine seal of approval on them (Orchard, 1998: 230-235). Like the servant in the Isaianic songs, Jesus too endured intense pain and torture, though innocent, despised and spurned by society; like the Isaianic servant, his suffering is vicarious, redemptive and in accordance with the will of God. Scripture is used directly. No illegitimate modification of the Old Testament text is made to suit the current application; nor are there actions invented merely on the basis of Isaianic narrative or sayings.

The case for these allusions from **Isaiah 53** is strengthened by the way John uses the same passage elsewhere in his Gospel (Young, 1955; Evans & Stinespring, eds, 1987). John uses the figure of suffering servant to understand and explain Jesus and his Passion. In the Johannine passion narratives Jesus assumes the role of both God and his servant. In the arrest narrative he controls the course of events, making the divine declaration $\epsilon\gamma\omega/\epsilon\iota\mu\iota$. He then gives himself into the hands of his captors and suffers in their hand like the servant of God. The sovereign one is a suffering victim. To keep these two dimensions of the Johannine Jesus together in a healthy tension and balance, Isaiah traditions are of paramount importance to John. They provide him with the point of view with which he understands and describes Jesus.

John understands and explains Jesus through the conceptual point of view provided by Isaiah. This is not to deny that John's understanding of Isaiah was shaped by his Christological convictions. Like all the other early followers of Christ, John's new Christological context enabled him to read Isaiah in a 'Christian' manner. As in any other hermeneutical process, the context of the reader gave a new overall perspective to the text or the narrative. But in the ongoing dialogue, scripture provides the categories, language and framework to understand the new Christological context, or specifically Christ. John is not writing a commentary on Isaiah; neither is it his primary purpose to interpret scripture for his readers. Rather, he is making sense of the life, work and passion of Jesus; and he does so in scriptural terms. Isaiah, along with some other Old Testament sources, shapes John's Christology. The very language of the narrative, "its vocabulary and some of its idioms, its focus through the omniscient narrator, its theological presuppositions, its themes and motifs, are all reminiscent" of scripture (Davies, 1992: 355). John's conceptual world is shaped by scripture, particularly in this case by Deutero-Isaiah. He thinks, understands, explains and describes in scriptural terms.

4.6 THE ISAAC STORY

Some scholars have argued for an *aqedah* motif in the Gospel of John (Lightfoot, 1956: 316; Swetnam, 1981; Stegner, 1985: 35-45). *Aqedah* comes from the root 'to bind', based on the presupposition that Isaac was bound like the lamb used in the burnt offering. Some traditions consider the offering of Isaac as an actually accomplished sacrifice with bloodshed, having expiatory implications (Davies, 1979). The tradition in

early targumic narrative consists of Abraham's disclosure to Isaac that he was the sacrificial victim, Isaac's consent to be sacrificed, his request that he be bound, a heavenly vision to Isaac as the symbol of God's favour, Abraham's prayer that this act of obedience and willingness on both Abraham's and Isaac's side be remembered by God, and God's answer to that prayer (Vermes, 1973: 195). Targums and Midrashim have references to the blood of Isaac (*Mekilta*, 7: 79-81) and Isaac is identified as the 'servant of Yahweh' (*Targum on Job* 3:19). A direct parallel between the sacrifice of Isaac and the sacrifice of Jesus was also drawn in some of the early Christian writings (*Epistle of Barnabas* 7: 2). Grigsby (1982: 59) claims that by "relating Christ to the 'aqedah' motif, the Evangelist has assigned to Christ's death the same expiatory force which Isaac's death contained in contemporary Rabbinic thought."

The questions this evokes are: Has John related Christ to the *aqedah*? And does John show familiarity with *aqedah* traditions? First of all, there is the question whether there is any evidence for a well developed *aqedah* theology in the first Christian century (Brown, 1994: 1435-1443). It has been argued that, as the earliest Rabbinic writings probably come from the fourth century AD, they tell us much of how the *aqedah* theology developed during the second and third centuries. However, Vermes suggests that most of the aspects of the Isaac story as developed in the early targums were already part of the tradition by the first century AD. He provides support from Philo and Josephus for this (Vermes, 1973: 194-202). Although Vermes has faced some criticism for the way he emphasised and defended his theory on *aqedah* theology (Sanders, 1977: 28), he has successfully shown that some sort of *aqedah* theology existed in the first Christian century. Some of the pre-Christian writings have certain elements of a developed tradition of the Isaac story. For example, Jubilees (17:15-16) suggests that the offering of Isaac has been transformed into an etiology of Passover. There are references to other pre-Christian writings also (1 Macc 2: 52; Sir 44: 20). In the light of all these observations, we need to accept that the Isaac story was one of the foundational narratives for Judaism and there was a considerable development in the understanding of that story in the first Christian century: the *aqedah* tradition was being developed and shaped. Many of the core elements of *aqedah* theology were available to the New Testament writers. There has been some defence in support of Paul's use of *aqedah* theology (Schoeps, 1946; Vermes, 1973: 218-221). In spite of some scholarly objections to the influence of the *aqedah* motif on Paul and other New Testament

writers (Barrett, 1962: 27-30), however, the strong possibility of *aqedah* presence cannot be denied.

Given the fact that the *aqedah* theology was available in some form in the first century AD, we need to ask whether John shows any evidence of dependence on this tradition. We need to now return to the Johannine narrative in order to assess that possibility. There is one instance in the Johannine passion narrative where some scholars (Macgregor, 1928: 344; Tasker, 1972: 210) have found an allusion: **John 19:17**, where Jesus is shown as “carrying the cross by himself.” It is suggested that Jesus carrying his own cross alludes to Isaac carrying wood for his own sacrifice. We have already suggested an allusion to the Servant of the Lord here but an allusion to Isaac story in this verse cannot be ruled out. If there is an allusion to the Isaac story in **John 3:16**, that would mean John used this tradition along with other Old Testament traditions to describe the experience of Jesus. We cannot rule out a double allusion, including one to the Isaac story, particularly if the strand of thought that brought together the servant of Yahweh and the Isaac story was beginning to develop in the first Christian century. Vermes (1973: 202) thinks that such a mutation was present at Jesus’ time. We conclude, therefore, that the Isaac story was one of the Old Testament traditions – alongside the Paschal story in the Pentateuch, the Servant of the Lord in Isaianic writings and the Righteous Sufferer of the Psalms – that John used in his interpretation of Jesus’ event.

4.7 SUMMARY

Our analysis of the Old Testament allusions in the Johannine passion narrative has shown us that the major sources for John’s thinking about Jesus’ Passion are from the Psalms (particularly those that have come to be called ‘righteous sufferer’ Psalms), Deutero-Isaiah, Paschal imagery and – to some extent – from the Isaac story. These have shaped the Johannine understanding of Jesus’ Passion. We have observed that in these cases it was a matter of biblical traditions and stories shaping John’s understanding of Jesus, rather than his experience of Jesus interpreting the Old Testament. Scripture is not John’s servant; rather, it functions as the authoritative source, the master.

An allusion, even if it is to a word or phrase, takes us back to the whole story that the parent text describes. This has been upheld by studies in modern intertextuality. In John's narrative, the connection between the alluded Old Testament story or tradition and the event in the life of Jesus is typological. The connection is established, not between two texts, but between the events that the texts signify. Ancient Jews did not have a strictly linear understanding of history. It is the idea of repetition that dominates typology and this idea corresponds to the conception of the world process as a cyclic movement, which involves recurrence of similar events. But what typology requires is not a mere repetition or recurrence of events; there is an element of progress. Typological alignments read "one historical moment in terms of another, and thereby project the powerful associations of the past into future images of longing and hope" (Fishbane, 1985: 371).

This means that John did not empty the Old Testament text or story of its own meaning. The metaphorical meaning is a natural theological extension of the plain sense of the text. One does not just supersede the other. The Old Testament stories do stand on their own without reference to the future events with which they would eventually find correspondence. Typology remains faithful to the narrative, whilst allegory translates narrative into propositions (Frye, 1981: 85). We also need to remind ourselves that concern for history in the sense of factuality was alien to the New Testament writers; we should not expect them to share our concept of history, which is a product of the Enlightenment. The ancients had their own interests in history, which are not shared by us. They probably made "no self-conscious connection between history and typology of the kind proposed" (in Porter, Joyce & Orton, eds, 1994: 34). Here, the use of the category 'narrative' instead of 'history' might be useful. John took the narrative world of the scriptures seriously. It is there that he found correspondences. John's metaphorical interpretation was a serious work of looking at contemporary situations through the window of the scriptures. It was scripture interpreting the world.

5.0 JOHN'S HERMENEUTIC OF SCRIPTURE IN HIS PASSION NARRATIVE

5.1 INTRODUCTION

Human frailty dictates that all interpreters of scripture are subject to external influences to some degree or other. These may include the perceived necessity to make the text of scripture applicable to the cultural and historical context that is meaningful to him or her. This process of interpretation involves hermeneutical assumptions that come from the interpreter's own context, of which the tradition of the text is itself a part. The interpretative process also includes engaging certain methods or techniques of appropriation. In this chapter, I propose to evaluate how the context of the Johannine community shaped its interpretative approach, examine the methods and techniques they employed and the issues involved in that interpretative process. Whilst undertaking this attempt, we are also examining Johannine hermeneutic in the light of the primary issues at debate in Johannine scholarship today as identified in chapter two: context, sources, purpose and techniques, before finally drawing together the insights gained from our exegetical explorations of scripture quotations and allusions in the Johannine Passion story.

5.2 JOHN'S HERMENEUTICAL CONTEXT

We must recognise that, for John, the most important point in history – which gave a new perspective and meaning to the Holy Scriptures – was the Christ event: the life and work of Jesus, inclusive of his death and resurrection, in which John found the fulfilment of all the scriptures. Like all the other New Testament writers, he also interprets the scriptures Christologically. We shall briefly look at various other aspects of the context in which John carried out his interpretative work, observing how these aspects of context influenced his interpretative presuppositions.

5.2.1 Aspects of Johannine context

There are four specific aspects of context for Johannine interpretative context: the specific situation of his own community, the Christian tradition in which the community

found its existence, the Jewish origin and tradition (to which the community still identifies itself to a great extent), and the general Hellenistic culture and language.

i) The Johannine Community

In dialogue with Louis Martyn's suggestion of a "two-level drama", where the story about Jesus also reflects the experience and convictions of the Johannine community (1979: 18-22), Raymond Brown has worked out a complete history of the Johannine community (1979). Although this reconstruction is highly speculative, the core of the argument is generally accepted: the determinative factor in the milieu of the Johannine community was its expulsion from the synagogue and the consequent conflict between the two (Keener, 2003: 195-214; Moloney, 1998: 9-11).

Thus, this community was part of the Jewish society until its expulsion thence. Its roots are found in Judaism and its adherence to Jewish scriptures combine to ensure that it retains a certain 'Jewishness' in its theology. What we see in the Fourth Gospel, therefore, is a "Christological apologetic that is not only rooted in the Jewish Scriptures but which also presupposes Jewish assumptions and thinking" (Evans, 1993: 172). Moreover, in the decades from AD 70 onwards, as Gentile Christians made their presence felt in the Church, radical Gnosticising groups questioned both the authority of the Scripture and the earthly life of Jesus (Hengel, 1989: 23). John's Gospel account attempts to show that these criticisms and objections are without force. The authority of the Scripture is upheld and the earthly life of Jesus is established as in accordance with that Scripture.

John's special links with the thought of the Dead Sea Scrolls (in Stendahl, ed, 1958: 183-207) suggests an affinity with the Qumran sect (identified by many scholars with the Essenes) or other mystical and dualistic tendencies in ancient Judaism (Kysar, 1975: 102-146). If the Qumran sect forms the background of the Johannine community in some way, then the exegetical practices found within the Qumran tradition might possibly enlighten us on the Johannine use of the Old Testament. For example, the Johannine use of scripture at many places shares a *peshet* motif that is also found in the Qumran tradition.

An understanding of the Johannine community also helps us to understand why hermeneutics is a pastoral exercise for John, for he could not differentiate sharply among exegesis, theology and pastoral concerns (Miller, 2006: 127). His community was one that struggled to affirm the Lordship of Christ in the face of determined opposition. John's theology – as well as his hermeneutics – received their shape in dialogue with the Jews, who continued to reject Jesus and possibly used their understanding of scripture as the basis for doing so. An inappropriate process of searching of scripture on the part of the opposition to Jesus is illustrated in John's Gospel (**Jn 7:42, 52**). The Jewish preconditioned mindset largely precluded the possibility of them listening to Jesus. John's interpretation of scripture was also conducted in the context of competing truth claims, which is why we find him interpreting scripture with a pastoral burden. There is also a clear apologetic function of scripture. For John, being pastoral in his use of scripture also meant being apologetic about the community's identity and its use of the Holy Scriptures, which the Jews used in a different manner.

ii) The Christian Tradition

We must look at the Johannine community in the overall context of the early Christian Church, rather than seeing it in isolation. The Johannine community stands in the tradition of the Church at large and, to a great extent, depends on the Christian tradition for its use of the Old Testament. John was aware of the synoptic tradition, though Freed's suggestion that John's school was trying to strengthen and defend the synoptic presentation of Jesus through the use of additional Old Testament texts (1965: 130) seems implausible. We have not been able to detect any attempt in John to correct earlier Christian sources. Moreover, he deviates from the synoptic outline of the whole story. But the fact that certain Old Testament quotations are common to both the Johannine and the synoptic literature would at least suggest a common tradition to which both had access.

John was undoubtedly in touch with primitive Christian thought. Barnabas Lindars points out that John draws his Old Testament quotations frequently from the stock of the "Passion apologetic" (1961: 270). Dodd argues that the New Testament community engaged in the exegesis of the Old Testament in conjunction with the accepted kerygma of the Church. Their choice of the Old Testament text was decided by apologetic

concerns (Dodd, 1953). Reim has even gone so far as to suggest that John did not have any Old Testament text before him, but that he drew his references to scripture from his tradition (1974: 188). There are several examples of scriptural allusions in the Fourth Gospel that are not paralleled in synoptic, Pauline and other traditions of Christian writings. The inevitable conclusion, however, is that John and his community stood well within the Christian tradition and that their use of the Old Testament was greatly determined and shaped by its influence.

This discussion has some bearing on John's use of his sources. Among the allusions he makes to scripture, the Pentateuch is a very strong source. However, we have seen that many scholars did not see the Pentateuch as part of early Christian testimonia. John was not restricted to the tradition that was commonly used by other early Christian traditions. He seems to have had access to a wide range of scripture sections and his use of those sources was creative. We also observe that John's approach in scriptural interpretation is essentially Christocentric. He drew passages common to the New Testament tradition (eg **Psm 22** in **Jn 19:24**), as well as highly unusual texts (eg **Zech 12:10** in **Jn 19:37**). In all of these cases, Christology was the determining factor. John's interpretative interests are not hidden. He is convinced that scripture tells the story of God's action. Therefore, it must witness to God's special and historic action in Jesus. John's reading of scripture is confessional in that he and his community recognised scripture as a word that is indispensable in order to view their own context realistically. Scripture is the functional centre of their life, so that it has a central role in their deliberations and arguments. This is evident in the way John uses scripture in his narrative of Jesus' Passion. He is unapologetic about reading scripture in the context of Christian faith and practice. Scripture is accepted as the divine word, which is powerful and effective to interpret our experience – the experience of Jesus in John's Gospel.

iii) The Jewish Religion

Another important aspect of John's context that has a bearing on his use of the Old Testament is the Jewish religion of his time. Barrett has identified three marks of Judaism in the Johannine period: the disappearance of the apocalyptic, the advent of the Gnosis, and the advance of institutionalism (1975: 58). John demonstrates that he is familiar with contemporary rabbinic disputes (**Jn 5:17; 6:45**). The Gospel reflects a post-Jewish war context. Pharisees are left in sole possession of Jewish loyalty. John's

use of the Old Testament must be seen in this context: he is claiming the authority of the same scriptures that his opponents (Jews) are upholding and defending. As Moody Smith observes: “The Scriptural apologetic of the Fourth Gospel is basically what we should expect in a document designed to defend Christianity in a Jewish context” (1984: 84).

Some scholars have recognised that the use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel supports the idea that it was written in a sort of dialogue with the synagogue. We can trace the origin of many of the Old Testament citations in disputations with the Jewish opponents (Hengel, 1989: 395). William Davies suggests that in the Fourth Gospel “there is a deliberate presentation of the replacement of ‘holy places’ by the person of Jesus” (1974: 334). Donald Carson also explores this replacement motif with regard to Jewish institutions, events and themes in the Fourth Gospel (1991: 248). Our exegetical analysis has shown that John attempts to present Jesus as the new Paschal lamb. The apologetic function of John’s use of scripture is underlined in these discussions.

John’s exegetical categories and many of his hermeneutical presuppositions also come from his Jewish background. His understanding of corporate solidarity and the totality and authority of scripture are examples of his Jewish heritage. He employs midrashic, peshet, targumic and typological categories to appropriate the message of the Scriptures in his situation. There is a scholarly consensus on this today, though there are differences of opinion as to which particular appropriation technique was used in John’s handling of certain Old Testament texts (cf Borgen, 1987: 75-204; Ellis, 1992: 77-124).

iv) The Hellenistic Culture and Language

The Hellenistic milieu of John involves a wide range of systems. Although some of these were not well established by John’s time, they were there in incipient forms. As we consider the Johannine literature, which was written in Greek language, we cannot underestimate the Hellenistic influence on John. Moreover, it is clear that John preferred the Greek version of the Scriptures (ie the Septuagint) for his interpretative purpose. We have established that almost all his scripture quotations are from the Septuagint.

Overemphasising the Hellenistic influence in the Johannine Gospel, Bultmann consistently held on to a negative view on the importance of the Old Testament for

understanding it (in Westerman, ed, 1963). This Bultmannian extremism is not regarded with much favour within current New Testament scholarship (Reim, 1974). It was quite probably the Gnostic and docetic challenges that led the Johannine community to a strong defence of its faith by looking back to the scriptures, where it thought it could claim authority and support. Hellenistic influence on John's use of the Scripture is not evident in the Passion narrative, but the use of concepts like 'the Word' and the personification of 'wisdom' in the earlier part of the Gospel bears the hallmarks of Hellenistic influence.

It is clear that John had a multi-layered context. The questions for our hermeneutical inquiry are similarly multifarious: What were the contributions of his context for his hermeneutical process? How much contextualisation do we see in his hermeneutical procedure? How did he try to bridge the gap between the ancient text and his contemporary context? How did he approach his own context in his interpretative effort? Is there an uncritical acceptance of the context or a critical engagement with the context? What is new and unique in his hermeneutic that is not paralleled in the hermeneutic of his contemporaries? We shall have some conclusions on these issues in the remaining part of this chapter.

5.2.2 Assumptions and Presuppositions

Interpreters of scripture are unavoidably guided by their own convictions and presuppositions about scripture itself and the way in which they are affected by it. Such convictions, in turn, play a role in determining the interpretative concerns or interests. Longenecker (1977: 55-60) shows how two groups within Judaism produced distinctive features in their exegetical practices, working from very different ideological commitments. The interpreter shares these convictions and presuppositions with his or her community and normally receives them from the community. We call these convictions 'hermeneutical axioms.' These axioms together make up the hermeneutical matrix. This matrix actually involves the entire theological system and the worldview, but two broad areas are important in the hermeneutical process: the understanding of the nature of scripture and the interpreter's (community's) own sense of self-identity.

i) The Nature of Scripture

By the first Christian century, scripture had taken a central place within Judaism, providing evidence for the identity of the community and direction for their life (Eissfeldt, 1965: 564-568). That the Johannine community inherited this hermeneutical matrix is evident in its use of scripture in the narrative, though it was transformed due to the new revelatory basis in Christ, as we shall see.

➤ The Authority of Scripture

John generally refers to the Old Testament as $\eta(\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta)$. This term implies authority (Ellis, 1956: 20-28). In the Greek world, the formula $\kappa\alpha\theta\omega/\varphi\ \gamma\epsilon/\gamma\rho\alpha\pi\tau\alpha\iota$ signified the terms of an unalterable agreement (Deissmann, 1926: 101). For the Jews, however, it implied much more – the unalterable word of God (Ellis, 1956: 48, 49). For John, scripture is authoritative. He frequently turns to scripture in his Passion narrative, almost as if the community requires the authority of scripture to accept and understand the suffering and death of Jesus. His use of scriptural themes, symbols and implied stories to describe the Passion of Jesus demonstrates the importance of scripture for his community. But what does it involve in asserting scripture's authority? We have observed that John's use of scripture is generative. Scripture helps him to understand Jesus' suffering, enables him to explain the story of Jesus to his community and, in so doing, it shapes the narrative that binds the community. For John, scripture is definitely not a servant but a master, which guides his concepts and shapes his imagination and story.

Two passages in John should be considered here. **John 10:35** states: "Scripture cannot be broken," meaning that it "cannot be emptied of its force" (Morris, 1995: 527) or "its validity cannot be dissolved" (Schnackenburg, 1982: 310; cf Brown, 1970: 404). There is no thought of possible inerrancy or fallibility of the words in the text. **John 5:39** and **40** represents a high point in the Christological interpretation of the Scripture in primitive Christianity: scripture testifies to Jesus. Barrett puts it this way: "So far from being complete and life-giving in itself, it points away from itself to Jesus" (1975: 268). For John, the authority of scripture is Christological and functional, not an inherent quality of the words and phrases in the text. That John does not consider scripture as an inerrant phenomenon is evident in the remarkable freedom he exercises in handling it (Dunn, 1987: 89-135). For example, he combines two different sets of scripture

passages, which are obviously not concerned about the same thing, in 19:36 (cf Exo 12:10, 46; Num 9:12; Psm 34:20). The authority of scripture is that of a faithful witness and, hence, is not inherent, but derived. Scripture functions authoritatively only when it functions as witness to God and Jesus. For John, the whole scripture witnesses to God and Jesus.

➤ **The Unity and Totality of Scripture**

We have observed that John uses η(γραφή/ as a reference to the whole scripture, not just to a particular passage. In John's fulfilment scheme, the whole scripture is the promise and an individual passage becomes a promise because of its being in scripture. Even when a particular passage is quoted, what is fulfilled is scripture as such, not just the passage concerned. To use a modern term, John's approach to individual texts and their interpretation is 'canonical'. A particular text finds its significance in its context of the whole body of literature.

That John holds the whole of scripture in unity is clear from the way he employs passages from diverse sections of the Old Testament for the same purpose. For example, Pentateuchal texts referring to Passover lamb, Isaianic passages about the servant, references to the righteous sufferer in the Psalms and references to Zechariah's shepherd can all be used to describe the Passion and death of Christ. He approaches individual passages against the assumed background of a single story of God's work in the world to give and to restore life. He summarises this story in the prologue of his Gospel, using creation and incarnation as major events therein. What enables John to do this is his narrative perspective. He finds everything as part of one story, a story that he finds in the scriptures.

The centrality of the Christ event is another important unifying factor in John's approach to various sections of the Old Testament. The new revelational basis in the life and teaching of Jesus is the most fundamental presupposition in John's use of scripture. John is convinced that the decisive eschatological irruption of God's rule had come in the Christ event. This conviction legitimised for him the general transfer of Old Testament texts to Christ and, consequently, to the new community in Christ (M^cKim, ed, 1983: 50).

➤ **The Historical Nature of the Revelation**

For John, Scripture is the witness to the historical revelation of God, which culminated in the revelation through the historical person of Jesus. Because of this underlying conviction about the historicity of God's word, John does not perceive scripture as being detached from its original setting in the wider story. This historical perception of God's saving work is implied in John's use of typology as a major category of appropriating scripture for his time. The historical context of an Old Testament incident is not ignored; rather, the allusion to the incident makes sense only with a reference to its context. John does not simply transfer the message from some Old Testament text to his situation as if the Old Testament passage is an allegory. As a Jew and a Christian, for John, historical occurrences are built upon a certain pattern corresponding to God's design for man.

➤ **Scripture as the Community's Property**

John reads the Old Testament as the community's scripture. His community is estranged from the synagogue, but John has the conviction that this new community are not thereby exempted from its ownership. Their faith and conduct must of necessity be according to the pattern of the Scriptures. The purpose of John's Gospel account is the faith of the community and, for this purpose, he uses scripture in such a way that it is the substructure of his theology. The community seems to be deeply involved with scripture if the innumerable allusions to scripture in the Fourth Gospel are any signal. He is able to evoke their memory of Old Testament stories and traditions by simple allusions to scripture. In such a community, he is not apologetic about his communal reading of scripture. Scriptural narratives, or the 'story', shape the identity of the community and the community perceives everything through the eyes of scripture.

ii) **The Community's Self-Understanding**

The interpreting community's self-understanding is another featured component of the hermeneutical matrix. John's Gospel is the product of a community. Within its narrative, Jesus is presented as the representative of the community (Rensberger, 1989: 38). For John, then, the interpretation of scripture was also a community act (Clark-Soles, 2003). We shall look at some aspects and presuppositions regarding the Johannine community.

➤ **Corporate Solidarity**

Since Wheeler Robinson's pioneering essay in 1935 (now in Robinson, 1964: 1-20), there has been some recognition for the importance of the concept of 'corporate solidarity' or 'corporate personality' in biblical studies. It is defined as that Semitic complex of thought in which "there is a constant oscillation between the individual and a group – family, tribe or nation – to which he belongs." In this thought pattern, some representative figure may be said to embody the group, or the group may be said to sum up the host of individuals. There seems to be no doubt about the presence of this concept among the New Testament writers (Hanson, 1983: 41).

In Johannine scriptural exegesis, this concept comes to the fore in the treatment of relationships between the nation or representative figures within the nation, on the one hand, and the new community or the Messiah, on the other. For example, **Isaiah 53:1** ("Lord, who has believed our report...?") has to be understood in the context of the corporate community. However, when text is cited by John (in **Jn 12:38**), the reference is to Jesus individually. Here, "the fulfilment theme is explicated on a corporate solidarity basis" (Longenecker, 1977: 155). Indeed, it is the presupposition of this corporate solidarity that makes switching or oscillating between a community and its representative or member possible.

➤ **Tradition and Experience**

Just as the early followers of Jesus inherited a holy book, they also acquired a holy tradition, which interpreted that book. Jews understood and practised tradition as a living force (Dunn, 1987: 84). In the Johannine community, the Jewish components of tradition became fused with the Jesus tradition, which was thence further developed by means of many other elements. The Johannine community's separation and the resultant conflict with the synagogue provided the community with a distinctive face in the development of its tradition (Smith, 1984: 26-31). As tradition is not static but is constantly emerging, the Johannine community found its tradition moving beyond the stage of the tradition represented in the Synoptic Gospels and the early Pauline corpus.

The authority of the Johannine community, like that of other strands of early Christianity, should be seen in the relationship between scripture and the tradition. Both scripture and the tradition were authoritative, though not in themselves. They functioned

not as independent authority so much as interpreted authority (Dunn, 1977: 77, 94). Both the tradition and scripture interpreted each other; they were not taken independently of each other. The Johannine community's dependence on *testimonia* and its use of Jewish lectionaries must be seen in this light; they are part of that tradition.

What bound together the Johannine community was its common experience of Christ. Faith in Christ was central to its existence as a community. The Johannine community, which is presupposed in the writing of the Gospel, is a Christ-centred community, expected to witness him (**Jn 15:27**), chosen to bear fruit (**15:26**), and supposed to bring others to faith (**17:20**). The two great symbolic discourses, those of the shepherd (**10:1-16**) and of the vine (**15:1-6**), together sum up the religious experience of the community. The community conceives itself as the true descendants of Abraham and as standing within the true revelatory tradition (**8:39ff**). John's hermeneutic is confessional in the sense that faith is presupposed in a profitable reading of scripture. The Jews fail to receive the word from scripture because they are unwilling to come to Jesus (**5:38-40**). Faith is openness to God and is, therefore, necessary for any adequate interpretation of scripture because the text's claims bear upon our understanding of God.

5.3 APPROPRIATION TECHNIQUES

Some methods and appropriation techniques are operational in every hermeneutical process. First of all, we shall isolate some of the exegetical categories employed by John and then make some observations about John's use of them.

5.3.1 Exegetical Categories

Some of the broad categories of exegesis that were used in Jewish hermeneutics can be distinguished in the Fourth Gospel, though we cannot take them as fixed categories.

➤ *Midrash*

We have seen traces of midrashic interpretation in the Johannine passion narrative. In **19:36**, John uses the principle 'light to heavy': what applies generally to the sacrificial animal applies specifically to the perfect sacrifice of Christ, or what applies generally to a righteous man applies all the more so to God's righteous One. In this practice of

application, the assumption is that what applies to a less important or general case will certainly apply in a more important or specific case.

As we have observed, the practice of combining passages on the basis of verbal and thematic parallels is also midrashic. Hillel's rule (*Gezerah shawah*) could also have played a role in such multiple allusions. This practice allows verbal analogy from one verse to another; the same consideration can apply to two separate cases where similar content is found. The words 'broken' and 'bones' in both **Psalm 34:20** and **Exodus 12:10, 46** (cf **Num 9:12**) receive the same consideration. The basic principle involved in this practice is that scripture is to be explained by scripture.

➤ *Pesher*

A clear *pesher* motif is seen in most of the Old Testament quotations in John. The fulfilment motif is normally invoked under a *pesher* treatment. John has a clear tendency to highlight the consonance between prophecy and fulfilment in his Passion narrative. Almost all the Old Testament quotations are introduced by citation formulas that refer to the fulfilment of scripture. Basic to this tendency is the conviction that biblical prophecy has fulfilment in the present events. This proclivity reflects the exegetical practice used in *pesharim*, the biblical commentaries of the sectaries of Qumran.

In a *pesher* quotation, the actual quotation of the text embodies its interpretation within the quotation itself. In order to incorporate the interpretation into the text the actual text form may itself be modified or a shift in meaning be invoked (in Marshall, ed, 1979: 199-219). There is a distinctive *pesher* motif in quotations like the one in **John 19:36**, where we also find minor textual modifications. The scripture text quoted in **19:24** is interpreted by means of "separation of two parts of a verse in synonymous parallelism" (Moo, 1983: 377). The synonymous parallelism of the Old Testament text, which originally referred to a single action, is reinterpreted in a literalistic manner as a reference to two actions. This makes the consonance between Old Testament prophecy and New Testament fulfilment amazingly exact.

➤ *Targum*

Targums are interpretative translations in which the text and the interpretation are combined through paraphrase. John's choice of the Septuagintal text in many situations seems to have a Targumic significance. For example, only the Septuagint's punctuation of the text would be apt for John's interpretation of **Isaiah 40:3** in **John 1:23** (Lindars, 1961: 105). It is also likely that John was citing the Palestinian Targums themselves in **3:4**; **6:38** and **12:41** (Brown, 1970: lxi).

Targum takes the text seriously. John's use of scripture in **19:24** suggests that there is nothing without meaning in the sacred Scripture. John seems to shape his narrative of the seamless tunic basing on what he thought he found in the text. Targumic use of scripture involves a synthetic view of scripture and of sacred history, telescoping of all the elements of scripture around a limited number of locations, dates and personages (Patte, 1975: 67-68). History is a synthetic unity and its different periods are closely interrelated.

➤ *Typology*

The Johannine Passion narrative has shown us that typology is one of the most significant exegetical patterns for John. We have seen many examples for John's use of typology: the paschal lamb, the sufferer of the Psalms, the Servant of Yahweh in Isaiah. In John's view, all possible titles or types that characterise the eschatological saviour may be applied to Jesus.

John's interpretation of scripture is basically figural. The correspondence with the past is not found within the written text but within the historical event that the text describes. John does not translate narrative into propositions, thereby avoiding the danger of allegorisation. He remains faithful to the narrative. For him, typology is making historical connections between certain events or objects in the Old Testament and similar events or objects in the life and death of Jesus. The connection is established not so much between two texts as between the events that the texts signify. This is what John has done with the types of righteous sufferer, paschal lamb and the Servant of the Lord. As John regarded scripture as describing a story and situated events in the Old Testament in the overall context of that story, the context of the event never became

neglected in his exegetical appropriation. Moreover, the Old Testament event does not lose its significance for its own time by pointing forward to the event in Jesus' life.

5.3.2 John's Use of Jewish Exegetical Categories

We have illustrated that John employed in his use of scripture the appropriation techniques that were commonly used in Jewish interpretation of scripture in his time. He shared many presuppositions with his contemporary Jewish interpreters: everything in scripture is meaningful; scripture is to be explained by scripture; it is about us that the scripture talks ('this' is 'that'); scripture 'telescopes' events and experience that we come across today; random events are intelligible by a vertical connection to a creative God.

John's exegetical tools come from his Jewish tradition. He uses them because they can be used in accordance with his vision and goal in interpreting scripture. But he does not resort to all the practices of his contemporary exegetes of scripture. For example, he does not resort to prooftexting and fancy allegory (Morgan, 1957: 165). Prooftexting does not fit his perspective because he has a general respect for the context of the scripture passages. Allegory would not help him because he is not willing to empty the content of the quoted passage. He does not resort to the practice of combining quotations based on mere verbal resemblance. He can accept combining passages about the Paschal Lamb and the Righteous Sufferer not only because of verbal coincidences, but also because of the similarities of the type they represent.

The methods John employed were generic, but he used them creatively. The most creative aspect of early Christian interpretation of scripture is its Christocentric approach. Jews used their exegetical methods to read scripture as testimony against Jesus, while John and other Christians used the same methods to read scripture as testimony on behalf of Jesus. Whilst the rabbinic *midrash* seeks to discover some hidden element within the scripture text itself, Johannine *midrash* makes a theological application of the text to some aspect of Jesus' life. John seems to use his contextually derived tools with caution and care, adapting them for his purpose and making them to serve his interpretative goals.

5.4 HERMENEUTICAL ISSUES

As that of every other age, the hermeneutics of the first Christian century was a complex affair. It involved several issues that demand our special attention. We shall highlight a few of them that have a bearing on our hermeneutical debates today. In this discussion we need to use the insights from modern hermeneutical debates and even use some of the categories involved in contemporary hermeneutics for our analysis, because pre-modern interpreters like John did not reflect on their hermeneutical activity in the way we do; they simply interpreted scripture.

5.4.1 The Text and the Interpreter

How should we understand the relationship between the present interpreter and a text with its pastness? Traditional hermeneutics began with the recognition that a text was conditioned by a given historical context. However, this historical conditionedness is two-sided, as will be perceived in the more recent sense of the term ‘hermeneutics.’ The interpreter himself or herself, no less than the text, stands in a given historical context and tradition. Thus, there are two horizons: one of the text and the other of the interpreter (Gadamer, 1975: 271). How an interpreter in a distant context understands the text in a past context is part of the hermeneutical debate in modern times.

The two-sided nature of the underlying problem of hermeneutics was very much present in the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament. John is no exception. It is true that the philosophical and theological world pictures of John and that of the Old Testament writers were very similar, in spite of the intrusion of Greek ideas into Judaism and Christianity, but Judaism itself had changed so much and the theological milieu, especially after the Christ event, had altered so considerably as to render a purely detached exegesis impossible (Gresh, 1973: 322). John, therefore, had to come to terms with the hermeneutic gap that existed between the Old Testament writers and his own day.

We shall take one example. **Psalm 22:16** is quoted in **John 19:24**. This may be classed as the fulfilment of scripture based on typological correspondence. Basic to typological method is the conviction that the “history of God’s people and of his dealings with them is a single continuous process in which a uniform pattern may be discerned” (Lampe,

1953: 201). Some particular presuppositions on history are the factors that help bridging the gap between the ancient text and the present event here. For John, history is not a collection of unconnected incidents; it is a continuous process wherein God works out his purposes. With such an understanding of history, John is able to apply the text to his own context with a greater degree of confidence. The Righteous One in the Psalm, the Servant of God in the book of Isaiah and Jesus of Nazareth are parts of the same story. History, therefore, is one category that bridges the gap between the past text and the present interpreter.

The second category that helps in bridging the gap between the present and past is tradition. John's presuppositions about the text and the context are mediated to him by his tradition (Dodd, 1963: 40). In the case of the Old Testament quotation in **John 19:24**, John's interpretation is Messianic. This has been possible because John stands within a tradition that had been interpreting Psalm 22 with Messianic overtones. This means that scripture did not reach John from across the past in splendid isolation. Tradition functions as another category that brings the past text and the present interpreter together. John is part of a tradition where the Righteous Sufferer and the Servant of God are also characters. Moreover, scripture itself is part of his tradition and his understanding of scripture is shaped by his tradition. Tradition makes John an insider of the story; he does not read the story as an outsider.

Another element that helps John to bridge the gap is language. The original text that was written centuries ago in another language is brought forth to the readers in their own language. John's own interpretative tradition accepted translation as an interpretative method as shown in the use and development of targumic activity. John has drawn textual materials from targums and to some extent engaged in targumic activity while interpreting the text in his own community. The most important aspect of the use of this element in interpretation is the choice of the Septuagint as the main source for his scripture text. A language brings with it thought forms and patterns of thinking and, by choosing to use the Greek version of scripture, John brought the text closer to his own context and community.

Thus, the gap between the ancient text and the present interpreter was bridged, in the case of John, by means of history, tradition and language. He affirmed history as a positive and progressive process in which God is active and is the scriptwriter. His

Judeo-Christian tradition enabled him to see the ancient scripture as his community's own text and to read it as his and his community's story. He used the text in the language of his contemporary readers, thereby reducing the distance between the ancient text and the contemporary context.

5.4.2 The Text and its Context

In a stricter sense, this is part of the wider hermeneutical problem we have discussed above. But this aspect deserves closer attention because of the widespread feeling that the interpretation of scripture by the New Testament writers is an arbitrary and ingenious twisting of the biblical texts going beyond the limits of any proper hermeneutic (M^cCasland, 1961: 144-148; Westermann, ed, 1963: 50-75).

There are two dimensions to what we call the original context of a text: literary and historical. The literary context lies within scripture in what both precedes and follows the portion under review. A verse stands in syntagmatic and paradigmatic relationship with other verses and units in the chain in which it occurs (Robins, 1964: 47-50). The historical context lies outside the written text. Although it is generally construed from the narrative itself, it refers to the event that the text describes and the wider historical setting within which that event occurs.

It is our conclusion that John takes into account both these dimensions of context. Dodd's conclusion about the New Testament quotations of scripture in general is fitting for John's scripture quotations in particular: "In the fundamental passages it is the total context that is in view, and is the basis of the argument" (1953: 23). His concern for the literary context is clearly seen in the quotations in **John 6:45** and **10:34**. In **6:45**, where **Isaiah 54:13a** is quoted, a reference to the whole surrounding text on re-creation is implied. Similarly, **Psalms 82:6a**, which is quoted in **10:34**, does not make complete sense unless we find that the second half of **Psalms 82:6** is also in the mind of the author (Lindars, 1976: 61). We have also seen that, in the overall context of the Johannine Passion narrative, John probably had the whole of **Psalms 22** in mind when he applied one verse to Jesus' Passion.

John's concern for the historical context is best seen in his use of typological method. Typology is not about finding correspondence within the text but within the historical

event. At many instances, John, like other New Testament writers, seems to have in mind the fulfilment of the larger context of salvation history as well (see Cullman, 1967: 132, 133). Thus, specific fulfilments of passages from the Psalms “may be related to the general *heilsgeschichtlich* identification of Jesus with the figures in these passages” (Moo, 1983: 385). When John quotes a verse that traditionally referred to the Righteous One of God, he was not stating that the verse referred to Jesus directly, but that the suffering of the Righteous One in the Psalmist’s historical context prefigured the suffering of Jesus. He was not merely proof-texting, but was trying to see the Righteous Sufferer in Jesus. The intention was the same in the case of texts related to the Paschal lamb. John is well aware that the Pentateuchal command about ‘not breaking the bones’ concerned the Paschal lamb. He also understands that it is part of the guidelines for a ‘perfect’ sacrifice. But he could see the Paschal lamb in Jesus. In this sense scripture is fulfilled. Without accepting the general historical context of the text, the reader would not understand John’s implied argument.

All of these clearly suggest that John did not consider the mere text as the Word. He saw the text only in its context. He invokes the context consciously and unconsciously in his interpretative process. In each case where he used scripture, therefore, he remains broadly loyal to the intention of the narrative. For John, the text is not totally autonomous and independent from its original context and the author. But whatever the original context and the author have to say is found in the text, not behind or outside the text. The author and the original context have left some markers in the text itself and these indicators guide the reader.

5.4.3 Canon within the Canon?

The discussion on the necessity to speak in terms of ‘canon within the canon’ has now been alive for more than four decades (Kasemann, 1964: 103; Wright, 1969: 179-183). James Dunn has taken the discussion a stage further by pointing out four levels of canonical authority in relation to the New Testament canon: tradition history level, final composition level, canonical level and ecclesiastical level (1982: 13-60). Hanson observes that, by concentrating their attention on certain parts of scripture and giving less attention to the rest, the New Testament writers admitted that some parts of scripture were more amenable to a Christocentric interpretation than others (Hanson, 1980: 14, 15).

This is also true of John, his texts being mainly drawn from certain blocks in the Prophets and the Psalms, along with some Paschal references in the Pentateuch. All Johannine testimonies are drawn from the Old Testament passages that are identified as the early Christian *testimonia* (Freed, 1965: 20). Dodd points out that no distinctive Johannine consideration is involved in the selection of his testimonies (1963: 46). John functioned with a canon within the canon in much the same way as his contemporary Christian interpreters of scripture.

We have also observed that the 'Jesus-logion' had become authoritative in the Johannine community, enjoying the function of scripture as far as the community's faith and practice was concerned. This prompts us to suggest that the 'Jesus-logion' functioned as a canon for them which, in turn, helps us to give credit to John's Christocentric interpretation of the Old Testament. It seems that for John, too, there were levels of canonical authority: Christ is the norm of all norms; the 'Jesus-logion' comes from him; the Old Testament passages that were more amenable to a Christocentric interpretation thus come to the fore. But this process never rejects the authority of the Scripture as a whole. John seems to suggest that everyone works with a canon within the canon. A canon within the canon is not in and of itself an unhealthy interpretative principle unless that leads to the rejection of the witness borne by other parts of the Scripture.

Is John's canon open or closed? We do not have all the data required to make such an assessment. What we have noticed, however, is the development of the 'Jesus-logion' alongside scripture as an authoritative source for the disciple's remembrance in the Fourth Gospel. Jesus' words can also be 'fulfilled' in the same way that scripture is fulfilled. Both the word of God in scripture and the word of Jesus in the memory of the disciples have authority over the community. John could not call Jesus' word 'scripture' simply because it was not yet written down, though the unwritten word of Jesus stands alongside the written word of God. Such a conception of scriptural unity with the word of Jesus implies that John's canon remains open. As a witness to faith, in principle, it should thereby remain subject to revision. The canonical boundary is not drawn so definitively as to preclude further recognition of any other writing as authoritative by the community.

Although the hermeneutical elements in John's use of scripture are not exhausted by our survey, we have investigated the core of his hermeneutical system. He was guided by hermeneutical axioms that he shared with his own community and he creatively used the exegetical methods provided by his own context. In his interpretative process he successfully handled the gap between the ancient text and his contemporary readers, even though he was probably unaware of how he was doing so. He respected the text and its authority and, hence, allowed the text to interpret the story of Jesus and his community. His approach was contextual like every other interpreter of scripture, but he did not take scripture out of its own context.

The conclusion is that John was not twisting the Scripture to suit his own ends, but skilfully interpreting it. There is some kind of coherence within his own interpretative approaches and practices. The findings of this chapter strengthens our central argument that John has a coherent hermeneutic, which addresses concerns that are similar to those in contemporary hermeneutics, and his way of dealing with these concerns has parallels in some of the recent hermeneutical trends. It is clear, without further explanation, that John has much to offer us in our hermeneutical reflection today.

6.0 JOHN'S USE OF SCRIPTURE IN THE LIGHT OF OUR CONTEMPORARY HERMENEUTICAL QUEST

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Having undertaken a detailed exegetical survey of John's use of scripture in his Passion narrative, we have concluded that John's interpretation of scripture is a coherent exercise. He was a product of his time and tradition. Like every other interpreter, he was conditioned by his own interpretative context. In this last chapter, we would establish that John's interpretative paradigm is not outdated; rather, many of John's interpretative concerns are re-emerging in our post-modern or late-modern context. Our intention is not to critically examine all the contemporary hermeneutical trends we are referring to, but just to point out the connections and correspondence between John's hermeneutics and some contemporary trends in hermeneutics. These connections are found with some literary-critical approaches and post-liberal and post-critical trends merging in the post-modern context.

First of all, however, we must determine whether it is possible to learn from John in our quest for the faithful interpretation of scripture. Are we to learn anything from the New Testament interpretation of the Scripture for our hermeneutical task today? Or should we set it aside as outdated and irrelevant to us? A discussion on this topic is essential to justify the basic approach taken in this research. We begin this chapter, therefore, with a discussion on this topic of relevance of the New Testament interpretation of the Old in our contemporary discussions.

6.2 IN SEARCH OF A PARADIGM

As a preliminary observation, we should take into account the renewed interest shown by many scholars today in a positive evaluation of the work of pre-modern interpreters. With the apparent failure of the modern critical methods to do justice to meaningful interpretation of religious texts and an increasing acceptance of the inadequacy of modernistic framework and paradigms, there is an openness to appreciate pre-moderns. Thiselton (1992: 148) finds many parallels between pre-modern and post-modern approaches in biblical interpretation and discusses the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament in this context. With such openness we begin this study. Although

only a very few scholars have attempted to discuss the relevance of New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament to our hermeneutical inquiry, it would be appropriate to consider the opinions emerged so far under some broad categories

6.2.1 New Testament Interpretation of Scripture as Irrelevant

As early as in 1913, Percy Gardner concluded that the use of the Old Testament by New Testament writers, especially within the Pauline corpus, is unacceptable to us. He felt that Paul's use of scripture was:

... not in accordance with true critical methods... The close attention to the words of scripture which came of the careful study of them in rabbinic schools, made him lay upon particular words and forms a stress quite foreign to the writers.

(Gardner, 1913: 215.)

Most of the scholars who deny the relevance of the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament for our hermeneutical reflection today do so on the ground that the kind of interpretative procedures and the presuppositions of the New Testament writers are no longer acceptable as they cannot be so easily accommodated into our modernistic framework. The exegesis of the Old Testament in the New Testament thus becomes an arbitrary and ingenious twisting of the texts that exceeds the boundaries of any proper hermeneutic (M^cCasland, 1961: 143-148). Our modern self-understanding and the historico-critical approach of modern study combine to create a gulf between us and the early Christian interpreters (Westermann, ed, 1963: 134-159). Hanson also fails to find any cause for us to follow the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament on three grounds: that we cannot accept the concept of a superhuman form of prediction that is divinely guaranteed; that we cannot understand Messianic prophecies in exactly the sense in which the New Testament writers understood them; and that, in many cases, what they regarded as history we regard as legend or myth (1983: 185).

Hanson's conclusions are a warning to those who would like to follow the interpretative practices of the early Christians uncritically. However, the issues involved in the arguments of Hanson and the others we have surveyed above demand closer attention. One clear difference between Hanson and his predecessors must be noted here. Whilst Gardner, Harnack and Bultmann argued that the Old Testament did not play any importance in the development of Pauline or Johannine thought and the Old Testament

references are only peripheral to the experience and the consequent reflection, Hanson firmly asserts that the Scripture played a prescriptive role in the early Christian community and it was one of the major sources and causes of theological thinking in the community. For him, scripture played the role of a master, providing even the agenda for early Christian writers (in Evans & Stegner, eds, 1994: 377).

Is it legitimate to conclude, therefore, that the New Testament writers did not have a proper hermeneutic? A hermeneutic is the sum total of the presuppositions, approaches and categories used in a given interpretative situation. Some recent studies (Hays, 1989; Ellis, 1993) have unreservedly shown us that not only did the New Testament interpreters of the Scripture share a framework of hermeneutical convictions and approaches, but also that the methods they employed were in accordance with their perception of the interpretative process. In this sense, the early Christians had a hermeneutic. How are we to decide whether their hermeneutic was appropriate? This should not be done on the basis of a comparison with another hermeneutic that evolved in another context. It would not be right to say that their hermeneutic is inappropriate simply because it is not consistent with our hermeneutic. Assessment of a hermeneutic should be made in its own historical context and on the basis of a consistency within the same system. Even if we are not able to accept such a hermeneutic for our interpretative task today, we cannot thereby condemn it as improper.

Now we may turn to Hanson's reservations on accepting the New Testament's interpretation of the Scripture. We, the moderns, may not accept the superhuman form of prediction as did the early Christians. But is a belief in such superhuman prediction necessary to appreciate the scriptural interpretation of the early Church? There is a growing consensus among the scholars who have studied the New Testament interpretation of the Scripture that the prediction-fulfilment use of the scripture by New Testament authors are to be understood in the context of a perspective of history with correspondence of events within this scheme (Pannenberg in Westermann, ed, 1963). A host of hermeneutical presuppositions, especially the concept of corporate solidarity in the Jewish society, enabled the interpreter to transfer the focus from an individual to the community or vice versa while interpreting a text. It must also be noted that there are comparatively few passages in the New Testament that quote an Old Testament 'promise' to demand a strictly literal fulfilment in a specific sense. Davidson points out

that, whilst typology had been traditionally considered as having a predictive function, many recent advocates of the method look at it as entirely retrospective (1981: 33-36).

Hanson's second reservation is also related to this perspective: we cannot understand Messianic prophecies in exactly the sense in which the writers of the New Testament understood them. Surely, we do not share predictive dimension of these prophecies. We do not need to consider any of the Messianic prophecies as originally having a predictive function in order to appreciate the interpretative procedure of the first Christians. We are not sure whether in all these passages the New Testament writers found particular predictions. Rather, it is possible to explain that an extension of the promise or an application of a general promise to the Messiah was done by the New Testament interpreters in a retrospective reflection of the passage. Hanson's own understanding of prophecy and fulfilment is helpful here. He defends the element of "looking forward to a time when God would manifest himself" and accepts that Messianic hope grew out of this forward-looking element. The New Testament writers found the fulfilment of this forward-looking element in the coming of Jesus. In this sense, the prophetic message was fulfilled in the coming of Jesus. He concludes that:

... a genuine connection can be seen between the Old Testament prophets and the coming of Jesus Christ, so that he can join with sincerity in what the Nicene Creed says about the Holy Spirit: 'He spoke by the prophets.'

(in Hanson & Hanson, 1989: 82.)

The question of history is more complicated. We accept that the New Testament writers considered the story in the Old Testament as history. Many of the events that they considered as historical do not appear to be historical to us because our worldviews differ from theirs. Whilst the New Testament writers subscribed to Israel's own conception of what happened in her past, we subscribe to the modern knowledge of Israel's actual history. Scholars have tried to grapple with this problem in various ways. Gerhard von Rad (1962: 106-108) argued that the Old Testament interpreter's task is to set forth the history as Israel remembered it. To the other extreme, however, Franz Hesse (1960: 17-26) maintained that our decision should be against this kerygmatic history, as Israel's kerygma was based on 'facts' that never actually took place. We should ask whether it is required to maintain such a clear distinction between two versions of history. It operates with a sharp antithesis between fact and interpretation. Israel's understanding of an event is as much a historical experience as the event. As

Carl Braaten has observed: “When we speak of the act of God in Israel’s history, there is no reason to confine this activity to a few bare events that modern research can verify by cross-checking with other historical evidences” (1968: 113). God’s act should be seen in the totality of Israel’s history, including the diverse ways in which she developed and transmitted her confessional traditions.

Another point of contention is the nature of legends or myths. Do all that are legendary and mythical have to be totally emptied of any content that is real or, for that matter, even historical? If we accept that myths and legends are amongst the means by which Israel interpreted and transmitted the acts of God in history, then we can still hold on to a historical perspective of the story of Israel. Many of the Old Testament myths can be demythologised without denying the historical nature of the basic events embedded in them. The Exodus story in the Old Testament and the birth narratives in the New Testament are such examples. We must accept that this demythologising tendency is essentially a modern academic interest, which was alien to Jewish and early Christian interpreters of the Old Testament. Mythical language in the Bible is an interpretative vehicle for the significance of a historical event (Pannenberg, 1973: 70-74). It is a fallacy to set history and myth in sharp antithesis. Fawcett has shown with examples from the Old Testament and the New Testament that there is historicisation of myths and mythicisation of history. Thus, “historicisation made myth relevant, while mythicisation made history meaningful” (Fawcett, 1973: 30).

This means that it is not absolutely necessary to draw a clear line between ‘history’ and ‘myth’ to appreciate the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament. It would be sufficient to keep in mind that what early Christians and their contemporary Jews considered as history was much more than what we would refer to as history. In short, our concept of history does not have to be a hindrance to understanding the hermeneutics of the early Christians whose concept of history was different. The difference between these two concepts of history does not have to be magnified or excused. Rather the gulf can be bridged to a great extent.

Therefore, the objections raised against a positive evaluation of the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament do not have to be really hindrances in our study of the Old Testament in the New Testament. Early Christian interpretation of the Scripture does not have to be totally irrelevant to us. Most of the objections we have examined

come from a purely historico-critical approach. It would not be a justifiable procedure to make the historico-critical method, which itself is the product of a particular culture that followed the Enlightenment, a standard to evaluate another method that was evolved in different cultural situation.

6.2.2 New Testament Interpretation of Scripture as Normative

Many conservative interpreters have held an uncritical acceptance of the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament as normative. They would insist that the interpretative practices of Jesus and his disciples should control and guide our interpretative procedures today (Berkhof, 1957: 140). The justification in this school of thought is simply literal obedience to the Scripture: the Bible does it; so we must do it. It stems from an inappropriate concept of the authority of the Scriptures.

Many scholars from the Roman Catholic tradition justify the New Testament interpretation of the Scripture by connecting it to the notion of *sensus plenior*, which means 'fuller sense'. The basic idea is that there is in many scriptural texts a 'fuller sense' that was not clearly intended by the human author but by God, the ultimate Author of the Scripture. Although many have tried to relate *sensus plenior* to typology, they are not the same. Whilst *sensus plenior* is all about deeper meaning of words, typology has to do with the extended meaning of things or events. Moreover, this 'fuller sense' as promoted by Roman Catholic exegetes is adduced on the basis of "revelation or further development in the understanding of revelation," which is understood in terms of the Magisterium of the Church (Bierberg, 1948).

Amongst other scholars who look at the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament positively, Ellis is prominent. He considers the New Testament exegesis of the Old Testament as "grammatical-historical exegesis plus" (1992: 147, 148). He feels that the New Testament writers worked broadly within an interpretative system that honoured the principles of grammar and history, but that their interpretation had an added factor by which they sought a wider meaning than its immediate historical application. This was possible due to their presuppositions as to the nature of the Old Testament and of its history.

But then this raises a problem. What are we to do with this extra element that is not justifiable according to the norms of grammatico-historical exegesis? Longenecker offers a solution. We can reproduce the exegesis of the New Testament where it treats the Old Testament in a more literal manner, following the course of what we call today historico-grammatical exegesis without being expected to follow the New Testament exegesis where it is “based upon a revelatory stance, where it evidences itself to be merely cultural, or where it shows itself to be circumstantial and *ad hominem* in nature...” (Longenecker, 1977: 219). Longenecker’s proposal raises some fundamental problems. If we strictly apply the principles of modern historico-critical approach, most – if not all – of the New Testament interpretations of the Scripture would become unacceptable to us. In effect, he suggests that the New Testament writers were inspired by God to use pre-critical methods, but the believing community of the later generations have been forbidden from the use of same or similar methods. Longenecker grants an exalted status to past interpretations of the Scripture that are otherwise considered by moderns as unjustifiable and beyond the limits of widely acknowledged hermeneutical norms, reverently attributing all of them to revelation. Yet he suggests that we should reproduce the teaching of the New Testament writers, but should not exercise the freedom with which they read the Scripture. Longenecker makes a particular modern critical method the standard for evaluating pre-critical methods.

Richard Hays argues that “Paul’s readings are materially normative (in a sense to be specified carefully) for Christian theology and his interpretative methods are paradigmatic for Christian hermeneutics” (1989: 183). He sets Paul as an example of dialectical engagement with the Scripture. He makes it clear when he speaks of Pauline hermeneutics as paradigmatic, it is not intended “to be understood in a narrowly prescriptive sense” and the “paradigm must function analogically, not as a cookie-cutter” (Hays, 1989: 228). Hays presents a detailed account of what he thinks we should do if we learned from Paul how to read Scripture: read it primarily as a narrative of election and promise, read it ecclesiocentrically, read it in the service of proclamation, read as participants in the eschatological drama of redemption, and read with an appreciation of the metaphorical relation between the text and our reading of it (1989: 183-189). He suggests three criteria for identifying constraints in such hermeneutical freedom: the criterion of God’s faithfulness, the criterion of witness to Jesus Christ and the criterion of the intention to shape readers into a community of God’s love (1989: 190, 191).

Hays' approach is more logically consistent than that of others who have argued for a 'normative' approach to the New Testament interpretation of the Scripture. He is not suggesting a blanket reproduction of the hermeneutical categories of the early Christians. He neither imposes an external norm to control the hermeneutical freedom nor evaluates the earlier methods of interpretation on the basis of a later one. But our reservation with his approach is the way he conceives the hermeneutical freedom: it can result in total discontinuity with what the text has had communicated in its past. He asserts that: "the ideal of a perspicuous authoritative text that contains an unchangeable meaning is untenable because it denies the necessary contribution of the reader and the reader's community in the act of interpretation" (Hays, 1989: 189). We cannot claim the text to have an unchangeable meaning as such. But at the same time is it necessary to hold the text totally autonomous to enable the reader to participate in the act of interpretation? Hays does not address this question. Is there not an element of continuity between the past and the present of the text? If we do not accept this continuity, there is a possibility that the act of interpretation becomes a monologue in which the modern interpreter projects his meanings into the text (an otherwise meaningless entity) and, thereby, making what Hays calls 'dialectical engagement' an almost implausible ideal. A dialogue can take place only if both the partners in the dialogue have something to contribute to the conversation. To avoid a hermeneutical anarchy, Hays will have to define and reorganise the constraints.

Thus, we find that the various 'normative' approaches to the New Testament interpretation of the Scripture we have surveyed have their limitations. Those who belong to the most conservative camp have based their arguments on an unbiblical understanding of the Scripture: text as an inerrant phenomenon; and what is done within the Scripture we must seek to reproduce. Those from the Roman Catholic tradition have made an external authority, namely the Magisterium, as the norm in their normative approach. Others like Longenecker have made a particular hermeneutical approach, namely grammatico-historical method, their norm. Hays' approach is free from such external norms, though it is not clear about the constraints that can prevent interpretation from slipping into hermeneutical anarchy.

James Dunn has tried to derive certain principles of interpretation from the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament (1987: 81-102). He suggests that a proper hermeneutic does not have to be imposed on the Scripture from outside, but can be derived from the Scripture itself and, for this purpose, the use of the Old Testament by early Christians can be of some guidance (1987: 89). Dunn uses 'dialogue' as the paradigm for interpretation and finds that the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament was dialogical: a dialogue between the text in its context and the New Testament interpreters in their context.

Although it is not necessary that a hermeneutic for the interpretation of the Scripture today should evolve from the Scripture itself, we are certainly justified in listening to the Scripture on matters of faith and practice and especially on a proper approach to the Scripture itself. Dunn's 'dialogue' paradigm for interpretation takes into account various components of the interpretative process – text, its context, interpreter and his/her context – seriously.

However, without talking about the New Testament interpretation of the Scripture as 'normative' and even avoiding the question of the New Testament providing us the models for our interpretation, are we not able to explore the New Testament interpretation of the Scripture without passing moral judgments upon it? If there is a 'hermeneutic' involved in the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, can we not learn from it, not just because it is found in the Bible but because it is a hermeneutic that seems to be somehow dynamic and effective?

This outlines broadly the approach we have accepted in this research. We do not bind ourselves with a 'normative' value given to the New Testament interpretation of the Scripture. Rather, we accept that the New Testament writers had a hermeneutic that was proper in their situation. We explore this hermeneutic with the tools available to us. In that inquiry we will be able to find whether there are correspondences and parallels with our contemporary hermeneutics. A hermeneutic of scripture in one cultural and historical context has some continuity with another hermeneutic of the same scripture in another condition. A dialogue between these two can enrich the continuing process of interpretation of the Scripture. It is such a dialogue that we have set up in this thesis.

John's hermeneutical matrix, into which scripture was poured in order to be shaped, consisted of realities of his context, assumptions concerning scripture itself and the nature of his own interpretative community. Our observations in these broad areas lead us to discussions on contexts for engaging scripture, the nature of scripture and the nature of the interpretive community.

6.3.1 Contexts for Engaging Scripture

No one reads and appropriates scripture in a vacuum. Scripture can be studied as a purely academic discipline and as a matter of historical interest. However, the proper use of scripture is in the believing community. John's use of scripture in his community was in three specific contexts. First of all, there is the context of discipleship. For John, scriptural interpretation was a pastoral function helping the community to understand their own identity, strengthening their faith in Jesus and enabling them to see that they were still within the world that the Hebrew Scriptures described. Secondly, there was inquiry. The Johannine community searched the Scriptures and found help in defending themselves and in proclaiming their message. Thirdly, scripture was engaged in the context of witness. There was an apologetic dimension to the community's use of scripture, especially in the context of dialogue and dispute with the Jews. These three aspects of contexts have been given some attention in the contemporary hermeneutical debate.

i) Discipleship

The role of faith narratives in shaping the identity of a religious community cannot be underestimated. Figural reading of the narratives in particular has a significant part in the fashioning of identity (Dawson, 2002; Frei, 1997: 186-195). The Early Church Fathers had recognised this dimension of scripture reading, it being particularly articulated in the writings of Augustine. Augustine's theological reflections were shaped by his congregation's developing relationships with scripture and with various practices of Christian living, and with an aim to: "hear what the faith and pattern of Christian life should be" (Augustine, *De fide et operibus* 6.9). There are numerous examples for this in the modern age. For example, Richard Lischer (1995) convincingly explores how the

words of scripture significantly shaped Martin Luther King Jr's community practice, as well as his rhetoric. The post-liberal and post-critical interpreters of scripture insist on the effect of faithful interpretation of scripture in the community of God. Thus, Hays (1989: 191) suggests that a reading of scripture cannot be legitimate "if it fails to shape the readers into a community that embodies the love of God as shown forth in Christ." Meeks (2002: 185-195) calls for 'a hermeneutics of social embodiment', the goal of which is the "formation of a community whose forms of life correspond to the symbolic universe signalled by the text."

Johnson (1998: 11) concludes that the "cultivation of communities of readers whose appropriation of scripture is grounded in practices of Christian piety" is a necessary step towards a theology with scriptural imagination. This conclusion is representative of various hermeneutical trends today that emphasise Christian piety and practice as the proper context for biblical interpretation (Hauerwas, 1993: 47-52). The most important aspect of Christian practice is worship because it expresses and enacts the world revealed by scripture through praise of God (Saliers, 1994: 21-38). But the practices of piety include also all the transformative behaviours associated with the mind of Christ, such as sharing, healing, and caring (Hauerwas, 1993). The faithful interpretation of scripture is done in vigilant communities of virtuous readers (Fowl, ed, 1996: 62-96) and it follows the rules of faith, hope and love (in Seitz & Greene-M^cCreight, 1999: 113-128). This context for interpretation also acts as a restraint as far as interpretative freedom is concerned. Scripture must be read as a witness to God's acts and to the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Such interpretation is essentially theological and avoids reading scripture for purely historical purposes. Rather, the emphasis is on practising or performing the text.

ii) Inquiry

Searching scriptures with a particular intention is not a process found only with the New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament. Every reading is in some sense an inquiry as there cannot be a disinterested or neutral reading. Yet such inquiry into scripture with a particular interpretative concern is explicitly proclaimed in the instances of the reading of scripture in basic communities, socially or politically oppressive contexts and feminist approaches. In some of these contexts an inquiry is not always easy, because the Bible has been used in the past to fuel and underpin abusive

interpretations that cause degradation and damage to many groups. But a vigilant and virtuous community of faith wanting to be faithful to God would be able to carry out fresh inquiries into the Scriptures with a view of responding to the issues confronted by the community (Ballard & Holmes, eds, 2005: 184-189).

These inquiries are critical by their nature. Pre-moderns did not engage in critical readings in the way we understand them in terms of the methods of higher criticism, which is not to say that their readings have been uncritical. They had to struggle with issues and perplexities, such as reconciling diverse textual variants, gaps in the narratives and apparent conflicts. Moderns are not so different from pre-moderns as far as the nature of these struggles is concerned, though the methods and approaches of dealing with those struggles are different today. But these modern methods are called into question. There is a growing consensus about bankruptcy of modern historical-critical methods and their inadequacy in dealing with the struggles of the text (Frei, 1974; Green, 2000; Hays, 2005; Adam, 2006) and their inability to be critical of their own theoretical foundations (Fowl, ed, 1997). If we are willing to refrain from judging the methods employed in a particular period of history by those of another period, we shall conclude that inquiry into the text has always been a critical practice. As in the New Testament interpretation of the Old, all interpretative practices have to be critical of some presuppositions and ideologies with which scripture comes down to the interpreter. For this purpose, both the ancient and modern interpreters use diverse literary, rhetorical and philosophical tools.

iii) Witness

A third context where scripture travels with us is witness. Scripture comes to our defence when our faith is threatened and, as it witnesses to us about God, we learn to witness alongside scripture to those outside. This has always been the practice of the community of faith. The Johannine community engaged with scripture in the context of dialogue with Jews; the Church Fathers did so in the context of heresies and unhealthy doctrinal emphases; great teachers of medieval and modern era engaged with scripture in the context of various philosophical trends. In all of these cases witness, as well as defence, was an essential context. Although the modern interpreters were reluctant to talk about witness explicitly, the post-critical interpreters are unashamedly open about

witness as a context for biblical interpretation (Marshall, 1990; Phillips & Okholm, 1996).

There has been one consistent problem with most of the modern attempts to engage with scripture in the context of witness. The specific occasion of witness, be it an ideology or situation, overshadowed scripture itself with the result of producing something like semi-secular ideologies instead of biblical theology. The issue was one of methodology. The attempts were to interpret scripture in the light of some specific ideology or context. As a result, scripture lost its cutting edge. The pre-modern approach of interpreting a contemporary situation in the light of scripture, however, is re-emerging in the post-critical tradition (Pecknold, 2005). Evangelistic and homiletical fruitfulness of this post-critical emphasis is currently receiving scholarly attention (Campbell, 1997; Bartholomew, ed, 2003).

6.3.2 The Nature of Scripture

Interpretative goals and effects are to a great extent related to the interpreter's understanding of scripture itself. His/her interpretive approach and method would depend on what he/she considers the scriptures to be. Emerging out of John's way of handling scripture and the insights we have drawn from him, we might now focus on four specific aspects of the nature of scripture.

i) Inspiration

Conservative evangelicals generally hold a view of verbal inspiration and a propositional view of revelation. Thus, Athyal (in Douglas, ed, 1975: 1003) ties up God's revelation in the Scriptures to the words in the Scriptures: "It is, therefore, correct to think of propositional revelation as verbal." Conservative-critical scholars accept a dynamic view of inspiration as the overall guidance of God in the whole process of the composition and transmission of scripture (Carder, 1972). The radical position tries to look at the phenomenon of scripture as a mere human product (Gibbs, 1974). We have observed that John's sense of freedom in using scripture points to a mediating position as far as the concept of inspiration is concerned. Scripture should be regarded not as an absolute creation, but an actualisation of the experience; an experience that is Christocentric and an actualisation that is Spirit-guided. But both this experience and

actualisation are multi-layered. The primacy of the spoken word is a focal point of debate in the discussions on scripture (Oliver, 2006: 23-26). This raises an important question about how we should consider the written word, which involves human hearing and recollection.

Ward (2004: 3-10) argues that inspiration means 'God-breathed' or 'brought to life by God,' which does not necessarily include dictating particular words and sentences. Revelation is the unveiling of the reality of God, especially in the person of Jesus. It is not primarily the communication of propositions. Achtemeier (1999: 109-121) clarifies that we are to understand the inspiration of scripture in convergence of three components: tradition, situation and respondent. It is in the interrelationship of these three components of scripture that the inspiration of scripture is located. All of these contributions fit in well with the recent emphasis of scripture as a sacrament, or the sacramental word (Burgess, 1998: 42-46; Wright, 2002: 81). A sacrament points beyond itself. Scripture as a sacrament sets forth the living Christ, draws us to his presence opening the possibility of relationship between the divine and the human. In this sacrament, the drama of holy words and of divine and human actions are held together. Like the pre-modern interpreters, we can be marvelled by 'holy mysteries' in this sacrament. We can continue to use the Bible as formative and central to Christian life and worship, but at the same time treat it seriously as a collection of human documents.

ii) Authority

The concept of the authority of scripture is closely related to the concept of inspiration. Those with a fundamentalist understanding of inspiration look at the question in terms of literal obedience to the words, whilst others with a liberal persuasion settle with general guidelines or for certain examples worthy to follow. John's understanding of authority is Christological and functional. But he finds scripture shaping his story thereby functioning as his master in his theological enterprise. The authority of the Scriptures is the authority of an event, the 'Christ event' being central (John, 1965: 49). The writings of the Bible have authority because: "they bring out the ultimate significance of history as preparation for God's saving action in Jesus Christ" (Fjaerstedt, 1974: 110). It is in this function that we find authority. It is not something that has been inserted into the Bible that can then be found, abstracted, analysed and either followed or ignored (Fowl, ed, 1996: 2003).

Moreover, John's entire way of using scripture as the narrative that shapes the community and interprets the world is paralleled in recent hermeneutical discussions on the authority of scripture. As Jenson (in Davis & Hays, eds, 2003: 30) argues: "not only is scripture within the church, but we, the church, are within scripture: our common life is located inside the story scripture tells." Faithful interpretation means living faithfully in that story. Our beliefs, relationships, behaviour and our whole life are to be shaped by the story in which we live, our real story that the Bible describes (Jones & Buckley, eds, 1998: 10-12; Bartholomew, ed, 2003: 495-497). In such faithful interpretation or performance of scripture, we hear scripture's critique of us (Hays, 2005: 191). Because of this authority of scripture, biblical interpretation is an act of obedience and obedience is an act of interpretation (Brueggemann, 1991).

iii) Historicity

Is the story described by scripture historical? While some radicals continue to undermine the historicity of biblical narratives, many conservatives hold that: "scripture does not speak in error on matters of fact and history" (in Ro & Eshenauer, eds, 1984: 9). John's reading of the Old Testament upholds the historical nature of revelation and reads the narratives in a broader historical perspective. But he does not make historical inquiries into the details of the narratives. We have also noted that our modern concept of history would have been alien to the ancient interpreters. History behind the text was not a determinative factor in meaning-making until more recent times. However, in the postmodern context many historians argue that a discovery of an accurate recounting of historical events in time is an impossible task (Carr, 1986). This challenges the foundations of modern historiography. Writing history has to do with inventing meaning rather than finding mere facts. In this sense, the Bible does not simply refer to historical incidents, but it also interprets historical realities (Bartholomew, ed, 2003: 492).

There is an emphasis today on Christian interpretative communities nurturing historical imagination (Green, 1998; Jones & Buckley, eds, 1998). Walter Brueggemann (2001: 15) says, "The notions of *historical* (which means rooted to the meanings of a particular community) and *imagination* (which means open to the surging pulses of meaning) are dialectical to each other." This would involve having confidence in the historical nature of the core elements of our story while accepting that our story consists of expanded and

derivative narratives. The manner of making connections in this historical imagination is figural reading. We are witnessing a renewed interest in the figural interpretation of scripture in recent times (Fowl, ed, 1996; Green, 2000; Dawson, 2002). Figural interpretation makes a connection between two events or persons: “The two poles of the figure are separate in time, but both, being real events or figures, are within time, within the stream of historical life” (Auerbach, 1984: 53). Figural reading enables Christian interpreters today to practise historical imagination. Wright (in Bartholomew, ed, 2003: 508-511) rightly points out that figural interpretation is necessarily spiritual, ecclesial and prophetic. This reaffirms not only the historicity of divine revelation, but also the historicity of the current realities that we are interpreting through scripture.

iv) The Unity of Scripture

How do we uphold the unity of the whole body of literature gathered together as the Bible? For John, ‘scripture’ was one entity by the very fact that it was recognised as such by his community, even though we cannot accurately assess how much of the sacred literature was available to them. We have also seen that their understanding of the centrality of Christ and their narrative approach to scripture helped them to affirm the unity and totality of scripture. By ‘unity’ we mean that which binds us to take the whole scripture in its totality. It does not deny the diversity within, but rather affirms that all those diverse forms belong together in some distinct way.

The concept and category of canon has been effectively used in recent discussions, among other purposes, to underline the unity of scripture (Scalise, 1994; Seitz & Greene-M^cCreight, eds, 1999). Brevard Childs (1993) develops his canonical approach with witness as the binding force; all the biblical writings are to be construed theologically first as witnesses. In their function as witnesses to the same reality, biblical writings have an essential unity. Others (Lindbeck, 1977; Meeks 1993; Hays, 1996) have worked on a canon with an emphasis on narrationally structured symbolic worlds. They have argued that this symbolic world that scripture describes is a coherent one that unites the whole body of the Scriptures together. Although there are considerable differences among these scholars regarding methods of interpretation and approach to individual narratives, they all agree that the category of canon is an important concept to the understanding of the unity of scripture. It is no mere coincidence that all these attempts have a Christological focus, for it is God and God’s

work in Christ that unites the diverse body of literature as scripture. There would not be a Christian canon or a Christian narrative without Christ (Childs, 1993: 60-63).

A narrative approach is central to the unity of scripture. There are stronger voices in the hermeneutical discussions today than ever before for reading scripture as a coherent story. On the face of the postmodern criticism of metanarratives, many scholars have attempted to present the biblical story as a non-modern metanarrative (Placher, 1994; Davis & Hays, eds, 2003). These approaches have been able to uphold the unity of the biblical story and, hence, the Bible itself, while responding to the incredulity towards metanarratives in postmodern thinking. Scripture's story becomes a larger narrative in these narrative approaches, a narrative that binds the whole body of literature together (Davis & Hays, eds, 2003: 34).

6.3.3 Interpretative Community

The next sets of presuppositions are related to the community. An interpretative community's self-perception is an important component of its hermeneutical matrix. We will consider three aspects of this component that came to focus in John's interpretation of scripture: community as interpreter over against an individual interpreter, tradition as a living force and the experience of the community.

i) Community as Interpreter

One of the scathing criticisms about most of the modern critical practices of biblical interpretation has been about their individualistic nature. Studies are performed by individuals or small groups who do not really represent or belong to the practising and confessing community of faith. But the interrelationship between the text and the community in which the text finds its life was always affirmed in the hermeneutical discussions in the East. For example, the Oriental Orthodox approach locates the dynamic existence of the text in the traditioning process of a community of interpretation. The living community is the real hermeneutical matrix (George, 1982: 207). The emphasis on community over against an individual interpreter functions also as a means of control to check against distortions and deviations (Boyd, 1975: 21).

Various post-critical strands of hermeneutical reflection have a similar emphasis on the role of the community in interpretation. Sainly interpreters can arise only out of the wider community of faith (Fowl, ed, 1996: 22). For Meeks (2002: 192, 193) and Hays (1989: 191), the goal of hermeneutics is not belief in objectively true propositions learnt from the text, nor the adoption by individuals of an authentic self-understanding evoked by the text, but the formation of a community whose forms of life correspond to the symbolic universe rendered by the text. Jones (in Davis & Hays, eds, 2003: 146) emphasises that communities and saintly interpreters are crucial to embodying scripture faithfully, which essentially means a community embodying scripture in its life. Christian interpretative action consists in the performance of texts by the community of the faithful, being witness to the One whose words, deeds, discourse and suffering rendered the truth of God in human history (Lash, 2005: 37-46).

A post-critical approach to the text also has the community at its heart. Scripture is not an autonomous text, but it must be approached within the context of the practices and conventions of the community within which it functions as the sacred text (Frei, 1992: 13-14). Believers learn to interpret scripture not by becoming familiar with general hermeneutical or literary theories, but by being trained to apply the informal rules and conventions embodied in the language and practices of the Christian community (Campbell, 1997: 84). The first rule in order to understand the plain sense of the text also affirms the communal context: the literal sense is fundamentally the consensus reading of the Christian community (Lindbeck, 1977: 118-124). Thus, the community is the context and goal of interpretation and it is the community of faith that can make sense of the sacred text. John and other pre-modern interpreters practised scriptural interpretation this way and we are recovering that community dimension in this late modern period.

ii) Tradition as a Living Force

Tradition received very little attention in modern historical-critical hermeneutics. Most of the critics did not pay attention to the fact that any hermeneutical practice presumed a tradition and took a position within the flow of that tradition (Boff, 1987: 139). Hans-Georg Gadamer played a major role in rehabilitating the place of tradition in the contemporary hermeneutical debate. He argued that prejudices are conditions of

understanding: “Understanding is to be thought of less as a subjective act rather than as participating in an event of tradition” (1975: 290).

Various post-modern strands of biblical hermeneutics have a distinctive emphasis on tradition as a living force. The reader is not a free agent but “a member of a community whose assumptions about literature determine the mind of attention he pays” (Fish, 1980: 11). Both the reader and the text are subservient to tradition; both are effects of interpretative traditions. This means that we have to acknowledge the ‘interestedness’ of every text and every reading. Scripture and tradition are both ideological (Vanhoozer, ed, 2003: 158). More attention must be paid, therefore, to understand the interpretative interests of each community. It is in this context that most post-critical interpreters talk about the ‘Rule of Faith.’ In this context, faithfulness is not a matter of adhering to an abstract set of biblical propositions so much as continuing a particular tradition of interpretation. Tradition is the process of socialisation in which members learn how to use scripture a Christian manner (Lindbeck, 1977: 115). ‘Ruled reading’ is the practice of interpreting the Bible as sacred scripture in the interpretative tradition known as the ‘Church.’ The authority of the ecclesial tradition is pronounced more emphatically in Stanley Hauerwas’ writings. In order to read the Bible from a Christian perspective, interpreters need training in Christian virtue, which they receive within their Christian tradition (Hauerwas, 1993: 155).

On this theological account, tradition is not merely human, but a way of participating in the work of the Spirit of God. The core practices of the Church, by which members claim their tradition and learn the skills of interpretation like baptism, Eucharist, communal prayer and hospitality, are not simply cultural but pneumatological (Buckley & Yeago, eds, 2001). This tradition, which is guided by the work of the Holy Spirit, goes some considerable way towards bridging the gap between the past and the present. It is a hermeneutical category that makes the contemporary community’s access to an ancient text more easy and smooth (George, 1982: 207-8). The Johannine community’s understanding of scripture being part of its tradition, its ‘interestedness’ in the theological interpretation of scripture, and its understanding of the work of the Spirit in leading them to truth are not alien thoughts to our current debates in biblical hermeneutics.

iii) The Experience of the Community

Liberal biblical hermeneutics in the West has generally underestimated the place of experience in biblical interpretation. The so-called scientific methods sought authority with the reason over against revelation with the result of losing religious significance of the narratives. Therefore, a return to biblical experience has become the call for community-oriented and faith-ruled interpretative attempts. As Abraham (1982: 246-7) has suggested, the hermeneutical problem “is not essentially an intellectual problem but an experiential problem.” He adds: “An encounter with the person, the author and perfector of our faith highlights the specificity of Christian hermeneutics.” In such experience of Christ in the community of God, “the Holy Spirit liberates the Christian faith from becoming dead doctrine or sterile logic, and grants the gift of interpretation to the inspired interpreter” (Gregorios, 1982: 155).

Post-critical and post-liberal approaches to scripture underline the importance of faith-experience in biblical interpretation. For this purpose there is a deliberate attempt to distance from the requirement of ‘reason’ as it was understood in the high days of historical criticism (Placher, 1989: 24-54). The emphasis is more on coherence and consistency within a system: between faith, practice, understanding and interpretation (Wood, 1981). Faith-experience is part of the necessary presupposition in interpretation. Our interpretation is determined by our faith-experience and our faith, in turn, is shaped by our appropriation of scripture.

The insights we have received from the Johannine interpretation of scripture on community, tradition and experience are not considered outdated in today’s discussions. On the contrary, there are indications of reclaiming some of those insights that were lost in the stringent application of historical-critical methods and convictions.

6.4 HERMENEUTICAL METHOD

One of the important observations for a student of post-liberal and post-critical hermeneutics is the minimal room – in some cases, none at all – devoted to the question of method. This underlines what Ellis (in Marshall, ed, 1979: 209) commented in his brief study of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: “Method is inherently a limited instrumentality and, indeed, a secondary stage in the art of

interpretation.” Telford Work (2002: 204) concludes that the most striking consistency in the New Testament’s use of scripture is the priority given to Christological and eschatological assumptions rather than technical ones in choosing which texts to read and how to read them. All methods are in some way deficient, though they are indispensable to any exploration.

6.4.1 Methodical Observations

We can now make two observations based on the methods or appropriation techniques used by John in his interpretation of scripture. These observations are supported by contemporary discussions in hermeneutics.

i) Hermeneutical Method is Subserving to Hermeneutical Goal

The results of our study underline the fact that: “Jews and Christians in late antiquity agreed that a set of fundamental attitudes mattered more than method” (Kugel & Greer, 1986: 2002). More fundamental than method are the perspective and presuppositions with which one approaches the text. What was in accordance with these fundamental attitudes and what served the goal were accepted and employed. It is not the method that made Christian interpretation of scripture different from the Jewish one; both the Jewish and Christian exegetes employed similar appropriation techniques, but they produced different results because they had different interpretative interests and goals (Conn, ed, 1988: 109).

This observation is borne out by various hermeneutical trends today. Those who approach scripture with a historical purpose continue to use historical-critical methods, whilst those who read scripture with literary goals use literary-critical methods. The strands that read the Bible with a socio-economic interest employ Marxian and other social theories. Post-liberals and post-criticals suggest that specific methods are *ad hoc* in nature and they are used as long as they are helpful in understanding the story and message of the Bible for the living community of believers that embody scripture in life itself.

ii) **Hermeneutical Method is Contextual and is a Product of Worldview**

John did not invent any of these hermeneutical methods or appropriation techniques; rather, he used what was provided by his context. All of the exegetical categories employed by John were widely used in the Jewish exegesis of scripture. John employed them, along with other New Testament writers, with a Christocentric perspective and aim. Methods that are provided by one's cultural context is acceptable provided it is compatible with the attitudes, presuppositions and the goal of interpretation. Worldview is a person's or community's way of looking at all reality. We do not escape from our socially and culturally induced way of viewing reality. This allows certain limits, but it also enables us to see reality as a coherent whole (in M^cKim, ed, 1986: 34). John's presuppositions of correspondence in history and corporate solidarity are elements of his worldview, which enables him to use typology as a hermeneutical method. In other words, John's hermeneutical method is a product of his world view.

The hermeneutical methods and tools used in the modern period were very much products of the modern worldview. The underlying approach was one that claimed to be objective, scientific and positivistic and the conclusions reached were considered to be both universal and timeless (Brueggemann, 1993: 1-6). This worldview was not only rationalistic and individualistic, but also based on a false confidence of objectivity. Post-criticals have turned their attention to the text itself rather than the event/situation behind the text, inviting the believers to understand their particular story as part of the much larger world depicted by the Bible (Dawson, 2002; 143). In this worldview, scripture should interpret our current context and not the other way around. Methods are secondary and they should help believers to recognise the world that scripture describes as their own.

6.4.2 **Continuing Relevance of Ancient Techniques**

There has been a renewed interest in the Jewish hermeneutical techniques in late modern discussions (Boyarin, 1990; Fishbane, 1992). Caldwell (1987) argues that an examination of the hermeneutical methods of the New Testament writers have much to offer to contemporary hermeneutics. The ancient techniques that John used – *targum*, *midrash*, *peshet* and typology – are guided by some interpretative interests that postmodern interpreters pursue in their theological hermeneutics.

Targums were translations. All translations are hermeneutical. Translation is a major step in biblical interpretation in a cross-cultural context (Kraft, 1979: 261-72). A translation that transposes the sense of the text in to a new cultural situation is necessary for understanding (Keitzar, 1982: 308). The theological and philosophical terminology of the cultural milieu is a constant challenge for biblical interpretation and, for this reason, scripture will have to be translated afresh several times in the same geographical context (Boyd, 1973: 159). Samartha (1987: 47) calls for the kinds of translations where we abandon our search for the exact meanings of texts, instead seeking to transpose metaphors, symbols and visions from one context to another. This means that the formal-correspondence translations that simply “transfer the word forms of the source language into corresponding word forms of the receptor language” will not serve the purpose (Kraft, 1975: 271). All these discussions underline the ‘targumic’ dimension of hermeneutics today.

Midrash, in general, is what we refer to as commentary. This is based on a text and attempts to expound the text. This is a form of theologising seen in many ancient religions. For example, the most typical shape of Hindu theology is a *bhashya* (commentary) on one of the fundamental scriptures (Dubey, 1982: 170-71). Boyd (1975) has attempted a Christian *bhashya* through a commentary on the book of **Romans**, a systematic theology in commentary form. Douglas-Klotz (1999: 181-93) seeks the relevance of *midrash* in post-modern hermeneutical inquiry. Boyarin (1990) and Fishbane (1992) expand on the hermeneutical implications of *midrash* today. *Midrash* is defined not only in terms of form, that is, a cited text plus a commentary, but also in terms of content and procedure, that is, the reapplication of biblical language or the contemporising redaction of a biblical text (Ellis, 1993: 66-68). In this sense, *midrashic* activity is common in contemporary hermeneutics. The New Testament *midrash* with its eschatological orientation applied the text theologically to aspects of Jesus life and ministry rather than, as in most of the rabbinic *midrash*, seeking to discover some hidden meaning in the text. Our contemporary turn to a theological interpretation of scripture is a healthier sign, which shares some positive *midrashic* presupposition.

Pesher is an attempt to contemporise the Word. Caldwell (1987: 95-98) points out that *pesher* interpretation is a model for relating the text to the readers’ context and this motif is in operation in contemporary hermeneutics. *Pesher* method suggests ‘this’ is

‘that’: ‘this’ of some situation or event today is the ‘that’ of some scriptural narrative. This approach in interpretation accepts that the meaning of the text goes beyond what was understood by those who received it in the past. It also affirms that our experience today is mirrored in the biblical narratives (Carr, 1992: 56-62). The late modern period has witnessed the rise of contextual interpretations of scripture that are attempts to relate scripture to specific social, cultural, economic and political situations. *Pesher* motif is present in these attempts for contextual interpretation. Brownlee (1979: 25-31) suggests that *pesher* should be defined, not in terms of structure of a specific subject matter, but in terms of method and of a prophetic perspective focused on the eschatological time. It reflects a situation in which an interpreter gives the text an interpretive shaping so that present events may be more clearly seen in the light of scripture. The post-liberal emphasis on scripture interpreting the outside world has much in common with the *pesher* approach.

Typology is the most prominent among the pre-modern techniques that has found use in the post-modern era. Typological interpretation is not so much about a method of exegesis as an approach to the narratives of scripture. It is based on the belief that the biblical story (of the past) has some bearing in the present or, to turn it around, that the present is foreshadowed in the biblical story; our story is seen as part a larger story that scripture narrates. Typological interpretation does not set aside the plain sense of the narrative, but it extends the sense of the text in order to embrace the present event. Random events in history are intelligible by a vertical connection to a creative God. These underlying assumptions or possibilities are underlined by post-critical and post-liberal interpreters of scripture today and their metaphorical or figural interpretative approaches (Frei, 1974; Hays, 1989; Dawson, 2002). We shall consider this approach in more detail later in this chapter.

The inevitable conclusion is that many of the presuppositions and approaches observed in the Johannine community’s interpretation of scripture are paralleled in contemporary hermeneutical trends. As hermeneutical methods are subservient to hermeneutical aims and products of the interpreters’ worldview, this conclusion would also suggest that we are currently realising much more commonality with the ancient communities and that we are willing to appreciate them and learn from them.

6.5 THE NATURE OF HERMENEUTICS

We have already looked at some aspects that make up the nature of hermeneutics in Johannine and in post-critical traditions. In this section we shall bring together some of those insights and look at further implications. We shall keep in mind the questions related to what we call the ‘hermeneutical problem.’

6.5.1 A Textual Hermeneutic

There are text-oriented, author-oriented and reader-oriented emphases and approaches in biblical interpretation today. Our study of the Johannine hermeneutic has shown that John generally goes beyond the intention of the author. At the same time, the text does not function as a totally autonomous object from the past. This is because the text itself has the markers from the author and a distant context. Those markers helped John to use the text in a justifiable manner. He did not have some technique to investigate the historical background of the text and the psychology of the author. John’s starting point is what he finds within the text.

As in Johannine hermeneutics, there is no separation between what the text says and what ‘happened’ in post-critical tradition. Frei (1974: 2-3) suggests that we should return to the kind of ‘realistic’ reading that was practised until the Enlightenment. This kind of reading was simultaneously literal and historical: What the text said was taken to be a rendering of, though not ‘evidence for’, what actually happened (Dawson, 2002: 143). Interpreters belonging to this tradition are not distracted by the ‘failure’ of the Bible to refer to objective history, but recognise that biblical narratives are ‘history-like’, realistic narrative (Fowl, ed, 1996: 5). This approach builds the interpreter’s confidence in the text. Faithfulness in biblical interpretation is intratextuality (Lindbeck, 1977: 114).

Intertextuality is a major emphasis in the post-liberal hermeneutics, which underlines the focus on the text. The Bible is seen as a ‘work’, rather than simply as a diverse collection or conglomeration of traditions of Jewish and Christian origins (Frye, 1982). No part of the text is independent of the other parts. Intertextuality is the phenomenon of “imbedding of fragments of an earlier text within a later one” (Fishbane, 1985: 36). All discourse is intertextual in some sense because a text’s conditions of intelligibility

are given by a previously given body of discourse. A text is interpreted, illuminated or corrected by other texts. Post-critical interpreters have used intertextuality in their study of inner-biblical exegesis and the use of the Old Testament in the New (Hays, 1989; Brawley, 1995; Allison, 2000). This emphasis on intertextuality underlines the unity of scripture and the practice of scripture interpreting scripture, boosting the interpreter's confidence in the text as we have it rather than something that lies behind or beyond the text. This also provides a connection with traditional or pre-critical hermeneutics, which simply assumed the unity of the biblical narrative as a hermeneutical axiom.

A text's verbal meaning is construed on the basis of its own linguistic possibilities. These are not given from somewhere outside, but must be learned or guessed at. The reference of the text is the 'text-world': a world that the text opens up to the interpreter. When the interpreter enters into that world and appropriates the possibilities, the meaning of the text is actualised in the interpreter's understanding (Ricoeur, 1976: 142-50). However, the interpreter does not go to the text empty handed. A host of presuppositions and his contextually conditioned worldview together represent a new horizon. Thus, it is only a 'fusion of horizons' (Gadamer, 1975) that can aid comprehension.

The gulf between the text and the reader is to a great extent bridged by the text itself. A text is historical in its origin, but it is also present in its power to communicate its sense and to open a world to its reader by what it describes. It is this text that is the object of John's interpretation. It is not a distant object belonging to an author and historical context in the distant past; it is part of his tradition and, hence, it is present. As scripture, it has shaped the identity of his community. He has grown with scripture and he finds himself within the story that scripture opens up. It is text in this sense that is the focus of interpretation in post-critical traditions today. Text is not a source for historical investigation or expressions of human experience, but narratives that describe our story (Wells, 2004: 55). Biblical interpretation is intratextual in that believers make the story of scripture their story letting scripture define being, truth, goodness and beauty: "It is the text, so to speak, which absorbs the world, rather than the world the text" (Lindbeck, 1977: 118). We do not have to depend on extratextual categories to determine the validity of the theological claims of scripture (Frei, 1974: 130). The pre-moderns and the post-liberals share this focus and emphasis on the text, taken as it is and received by the community.

6.5.2 A Canonical Hermeneutics

John's focus on the whole of scripture, rather than on the individual passages, has already been noted. A particular passage becomes a promise because of its place in scripture, which actually is the promise. Whilst scripture contains different voices of testimonies, all of them witness to the same story of God. Although a technical category called 'canon' was not available to John, he works with what we today call a canonical perspective. For him, 'scripture' meant an authoritative body of religious literature, identified and brought together by the faith community. This understanding provided a pattern in which different parts of scripture cohere, that is, they hang together as a whole. To use our modern category, canon gave the Johannine community the context for particular narratives, and purpose, pattern and coherence for the whole body of literature called 'scripture'.

This resonates well with current attempts of reading scripture canonically. The intent in these attempts is to read scripture not as a modern 'objective' reader, but to read it as an assenting member of a faith community; as a member of the church that reckons scripture as normative teaching (Ballard & Holmes, eds, 2005: 158). The text is not a mere ancient document, but because of its canonical shape it has ongoing authority for the believing community. A canonical approach also implies that scripture is to be interpreted by scripture. A text is governed by the scope and goal of the biblical book in the context of the scope and goal of the canonical revelation of God (Muller & Thompson, eds, 1996: 340). A canonical reading will have a primary interest in the texts in their 'final' or canonical redaction.

The primary context for biblical interpretation is the canon, not history. The reason is that the canon is the arena where the struggle for understanding takes place (Childs, 1993: 15). The interpreter receives an initial set of hermeneutical clues from "consideration of both the placement and titles of New Testament writings, which are properties of their canonization" (in Green & Turner, eds, 2000: 174). For example, the literary design of the New Testament canon suggests that its discrete units have particular roles to perform within the whole. This helps the interpreter to understand the theological function of different parts within the whole body of literature. A canonical reading of texts will have regard for the way they are ordered and grouped within the canon. Canonical hermeneutics not only finds the canon as its context, but also has a

theological understanding of pattern in scripture. This answers the question of what Christians discover in scripture. Green responds thus:

Everything we perceive or know depends on our grasping a particular pattern by which diverse parts present themselves as a whole... Having a world means seeing according to a pattern, having a vision of how things hang together as the precondition for recognizing the parts as parts in the first place.

(2001: 85.)

For canonical hermeneutics, the patterns that Christians discover in scripture are the elements they use to guide and warrant their individual and communal religious practices.

A canonical approach provides for conversations within canon. Conversations between different traditions within scripture are part of a canonical interpretation of scripture. There is theological plurality that the interpreting community encounters within scripture, but a canonical approach helps them to facilitate conversations between those trends. This again establishes the principle we have already come across: biblical texts are to be read with reference to other texts for illumination because of their networking and interconnectivity. But all this is done with a respect for the final form of scripture, which provides a “hermeneutical key to correct interpretation” because it “performs a crucial hermeneutical function in establishing the peculiar profile of the passage” (Childs, 1978: 76, 77). Theological meaning and authority should be based on the final form of the text because this form was shaped purposefully to function as a permanent theological witness. The pre-critical interpreters, including John, would feel comfortable with this direction in biblical hermeneutics.

6.5.3 A Confessional Hermeneutics

John’s hermeneutic is confessional in the sense that he reads the Old Testament as the community’s scripture, with a theological interest and the presupposition of faith. The emphasis on the Bible as the community’s scripture is dominant in contemporary post-critical theology. It is the character of the Christian community that shapes its reading of scripture (Hauerwas, 1993). This reading is communal, transformational and unashamedly religious, and the Church should be unapologetic about this task (Placher, 1989). Reading the Bible confessionally means “recognizing it as a word that is

indispensable if we are to view the world realistically and hopefully” (Davis & Hays, eds, 2003: 9).

Reading with a theological interest is defended by various strands of theological reflection today that advocate a theological interpretation of scripture. The focus is on fruitful theological wondering through the Scriptures. What is required is the use of a theologically nurtured imagination. This is not to deny any historical dimension, but theology in this sense embraces historical imagination, too. Green (1998: 109-10) argues that the biblical term ‘heart’ in many instances refers to what we call imagination. Johnson (in Jones & Buckley, eds, 1998: 9) asserts that theology’s recovery of imagination must come from a relationship with scripture that is mediated by a faith community, whose practices are ordered to the transformation of humans according to the world imagined by scripture; a world that expresses the mind of God. This can take place only in the community of God, the Church. This means biblical hermeneutics is the Church’s struggle to make sense of the world, living faithfully within the world that scripture imagines. Every act of interpretation is a confession of God.

Engaging in confessional hermeneutics means reading with an understanding of scripture as witness to Christ. Confessional hermeneutics is unashamedly Christological. Like John, we should have the confidence to see a pattern in God’s action throughout the story that the Bible tells us; like John, we must positively appropriate the characteristic of the text that allowed pre-modern readers to trace the scriptural witness to Christ, namely the prominence of symbolic, or poetic, language (Davis & Hays, eds, 2003: 19). An allowance for the metaphorical and multiple senses of scripture, the need for faith presuppositions, the goal of edification of the Church to produce greater love for God, and respect for the rule of faith are important aspects of this confessional hermeneutics (Dockery, 1992: 157-58).

We are not getting involved in a theoretical discussion about meaning or going to define meaning philosophically; rather, we make two observations that have a bearing upon the question of meaning in the text.

6.6.1 Meaning as Underdetermined

We have observed that John's focus is on the text and the story that it tells, rather than the story behind the text. But will John agree that the meaning of the text is readily lying there in the words of the text, to be picked up by the reader? In other words, does his view of interpretation suggest 'determinate' meaning? This would imply that there is an unchangeable meaning contained by the text, which can be uncovered through the application of some set of procedures (Watson, 1997: 97). John's answer would be in the negative. If he believes that there is a single unchangeable meaning in the text, he would not have used **Psalm 22:18 in John 19:24** or **Zechariah 12:10 in John 19:37** in the way he has used them. The meaning that he finds now was never recognised by any of the pre-Christian interpreters of **Psalm 22** or **Zechariah 12:10**.

Is the meaning then 'indeterminate,' as most of the post-modern deconstructionists would suggest (Derrida, 1988: 143-50; Critchley, 1992: 24-28)? This would mean that the text does not offer anything particular to us. Meaning is what we bring to the text. To this view John's answer would also be in the negative. Our study has shown that John's interpretation of scripture shares much with those who have interpreted it before. The past interpretations and John's contemporary use are not disconnected exercises; rather, they have some aspects in common.

John's approach to meaning in the text is neither determinate nor indeterminate. It rather involves meaningful dialogue with the text, on the one hand, and the reader with his interpretative interests, on the other. The expression 'underdetermined' may be a more useful description for our discussion here. The meaning ascribed to any text is underdetermined to the extent that its use is unspecified (Rogers, 1996; Fowl, ed, 1996: 56-61). This approach gives text the credit for what it has. The text offers some markers and pointers in the process of interpretation, but at the same time it does not offer a meaning ready just to be picked up by the reader. The meaning is underdetermined.

Readers with their different interpretative interests would read the same text differently. An underdetermined approach to meaning “recognizes a plurality of interpretive practices and results without necessarily granting epistemological priority to any of these” (Fowl, ed, 1996: 33). Being part of a community, the interpreter is informed by the hermeneutical conventions already applied to the text. However, his own interpretative interests help him find new emphasis and new levels of understanding. In Brueggemann’s words: “Interpretation is... local praxis” (1997: 112).

6.6.2 Meaning as Metaphorical

We have repeatedly noted that John’s use of Old Testament quotations and allusions are in some sense metaphorical. Concluding his study of Paul’s use of the Old Testament, Richard Hays (1989: 186) suggests that: “If we learned from Paul how to read Scripture, we would learn to appreciate the metaphorical relation between the text and our own reading.” It is not easy to define metaphor in the sense we are using it here. Sandra Schneiders (1999: 30) posits: “A metaphor is a proposition that, if taken literally, is absurd. Scripture is so connected with the present reader and the present situation in a metaphorical way that a literalization of that relationship would just look meaningless.”

Two components together make up a metaphor, describing one thing in terms of the other. Metaphor “selects, emphasizes, suppresses and organises features of the principal subject by implying statements about it that normally apply to the subsidiary subject” (Black, 1962: 44). Metaphor, then, is not just a matter of words but also of thoughts. It is generated in the drive to understand experience. It is not just naming one thing in terms of other, but “seeing, experiencing and intellectualising one thing in the light of the other” (Avis, 1999: 97). It is not so much an interaction between words as “a borrowing between, and intercourse of thoughts” (Richards, 1965: 94).

Allusion to a text sets up the world of the precursor text in a dialogue with the world of the successor text. The result or the process of this dialogue is metaphorical. Intertextuality alters what the two texts mean in their own independent contexts. They stand in tension with each other and extend the sense of each other at the same time. This dialectical relationship is metaphorical because it goes beyond the independent meaning of either text (Hollander, 1981: 62). This process implies some imaginative construal of the past. The two symbolic worlds are set in dialogue, each vulnerable to

criticism and interpretation by the other (Greene, 1982: 46). Such dialogue demands imaginative seriousness.

John's use of scripture calls for an imaginative construal of the world of the text. John, like other New Testament writers, was "concerned not with interpreting the Old Testament, but with interpreting an event in terms of the Old Testament" (Leon-Dufour, 1968: 215). Many scholars agree on the point that certain Old Testament elements were integral to the description of Jesus' Passion from the beginning, suggesting an interpretative function for the Old Testament traditions employed (Dodd, 1963: 31; Lampe & Woollcombe, 1957: 24, 25). The categories and images that John employed from Paschal sacrifice, the innocent sufferer and the suffering servant are not mere modes of expression; rather, they provide essential categories through which Jesus' death is understood.

John understands Jesus' suffering and death in terms of scripture. It suggests a hermeneutical use of scripture by John in his Passion narratives. The events outside the text are interpreted in terms of the events within the text. In the communities that embody scripture, members are not outside the story that scripture tells; they are in the story. "Scripture's story is not a part of some larger narrative; it is itself the larger narrative of which all other true narratives are parts" (in Davis & Hays, eds, 2003: 34). The world of the Bible is still in a real sense our world, imagination being necessary for us to be active in that world. John suggests to us that we must read the scriptural text with imaginative seriousness; we must have imaginative engagement with the text and its story.

6.7 VALIDITY OF INTERPRETATION

Is there anything certain in interpretation? With a serious use of imagination, the effect of our presuppositions on our interpretation, permissiveness with regard to methods and the absence of a determinate meaning in the text, how do we know an interpretation is acceptable? First of all, it is not appropriate to talk about a correct meaning of the text as there is no absolute single meaning that constitutes the meaning of the text. The focus then is on the validity of the proposed meaning. All that we can employ here is logic of probability rather than logic of verification, which would consist in a convergence of specific criteria rather than apodictic demonstration (Ricoeur, 1976: 76-79).

Does John have a set of criteria to validate his interpretation of the Old Testament in his narrative? He certainly should have some criteria, though we cannot easily identify them from his narrative. But looking at the way he uses scripture in the narrative, it would not be improper to draw up a list of criteria.

First of all, there is criterion of witness. Scripture is witness to God and his action in Jesus. Scripture must be read as a witness to the Gospel of Jesus. Any reading that is not in accordance with the overall purpose and function of scripture would not be valid. Secondly, there should be accountability for the text. Our interpretation should account for the text as it stands. One should not lose the text in the process of interpretation. The text should be able to stand as text and we should be able to establish the text independent of its interpretation. We have noticed that in John's interpretative practice, the text is not superseded as in case of allegories; rather, the text talks in the narrative. Thirdly, there should be internal coherence. A valid interpretation cannot be blamed for internal contradictions. For example, John's use of Paschal imagery and the image of the servant of Yahweh for Jesus is consistent within his interpretative system. He can weave those images into his narrative without creating any inconsistency in his narrative or framework of thought. Fourthly, the interpretation should have compatibility with what is believed and affirmed in the tradition. John's interpretation of scripture shares broadly the concerns and affirmations of the early Christian tradition. Even the texts he chose are generally the ones that were interpreted in a similar manner in that community. His interpretation is validated by similar interpretations in his situation. We have seen in this chapter that all these criteria have become important concerns for discussion in contemporary hermeneutical debate.

A valid question at this stage would be the place of historical-critical apparatus. Should we not consider historical-critical concerns in deciding the validity of our interpretation? A response in the negative would mean that we are undermining the rich tradition of biblical scholarship of about two centuries. We have not suggested that historical-critical tools are irrelevant or totally unnecessary; rather, our contention was that they are inadequate by themselves. They are inadequate for a faithful reading of religious literature. On the other hand, John and other pre-modern interpreters provide us with what we might be lacking in our rigorous historical-critical analysis of scripture. But they don't give us all that we need in order to understand scripture today. We cannot go back to pre-modern tools for interpretation, but we can be enlightened by and

stand corrected by pre-modern interpreters' intentions and approaches to scripture. Hays (1989: 180, 181) and Meeks (2002: 185-195) have both shown how insights and tools from modern biblical research can be effectively used with the concerns and approaches that we can learn from pre-modern interpreters. Contemporary literary-critical methods, canonical approaches and narrative analysis have effectively used historical-critical tools without succumbing to the purpose of rigorous historical-critical interpretations. As we have already observed, methods are relatively insignificant instruments, though presuppositions, approaches and interpretative interests are of paramount importance. All methods are to be used on an *ad hoc* basis.

6.8 SUMMARY

John is a faithful and imaginative interpreter of scripture. The vision of a unified narrative that scripture witnesses to is the basis of his imagination in the appropriation of scripture. Rooted in his tradition and faith, he has confidence in reading the narratives that witness to God and his deeds. He is creative, even when he is using the methods given to him by his religious and cultural context; he is free in his approach to the letter of the text, even though he is guided by the authority of the story that the text tells.

Our study has suggested that a dialogue with John and other pre-modern interpreters of scripture can enlighten us in our own hermeneutical task. We can no longer look at them as people who just twist scripture passages in an ingenious manner. This underlines our central argument that the Fourth Evangelist has a coherent hermeneutic, which addresses concerns that are similar to those in contemporary hermeneutics, and his way of dealing with these concerns has parallels in some of the recent hermeneutical trends. With a renewed interest among post-modern critics in pre-critical hermeneutics, there is a greater possibility to explore the challenge of interpretation along with our predecessors. If biblical exegesis is not supposed to be a purely individualist, academic and rational exercise, the New Testament writers can offer us some help.

7.0 CONCLUSION

Our aim in this research was to examine the way in which the Fourth Evangelist interpreted his scripture, namely the Old Testament. Our central argument was that the Evangelist had a coherent hermeneutic, and the issues he faced and the way he dealt with them are paralleled in many late-modern or post-modern trends in hermeneutics.

We began with a review of the state of scholarship today, which has shown us that much has been done in the area of the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament, particularly so in the Fourth Gospel. We have observed that there are major areas of consensus: that most of John's scriptural quotations came to him from his tradition is accepted by almost all scholars. However, the identity and details of the sources are not agreed upon, though there is a greater consensus on some form of *testimonia*. On the question of the nature and purpose of John's interpretation of the Old Testament, there is emerging a focus on the generative use of scripture over against the assertion in earlier scholarship of its polemical nature. As far as the text is concerned, there is consensus on the Septuagint as the major text of John, while most scholars – with the notable exception of Schuchard – hold that John knew some other text form(s), too. On exegetical categories and interpretative methods, the agreement is clear that they come from the Jewish traditions.

Yet, there were areas still to be explored. Most of the studies in the use of the Scripture in the Fourth Gospel have focused on the explicit Old Testament quotations. It is the allusions that could be considered distinctive and unique to John, but sufficient attention is not given to this area in scholarly studies. Moreover, most of the studies on John's use of the Old Testament have concentrated on basic technical targets of scholarship: sources, context, text form and purpose. The purpose of these studies differs from one work to another: establishing John's provenance, inquiring into his redactional concerns, or seeking the substructure or origin of his theology. These pieces were of immense importance for our research, which aims to look at and evaluate John as an interpreter of scripture. The questions that have already been addressed in previous studies became very much part of our larger question: what is John's hermeneutic? John's use of the Old Testament involves a hermeneutic and a comprehensive study of this hermeneutic was needed in which the insights and the results of the previous studies are drawn together and systematised. Our research then went beyond the domains of

previous studies not only in its aim to understand John's hermeneutic of scripture as a coherent system, but also in conducting such a study in the light of our contemporary hermeneutical discussions, attempting to probe the significations created by a representative sampling of Johannine use of scripture.

One insight from previous scholarship that we picked up for our further discussion was the possibility that John used the term 'scripture' not so much to refer to the individual passages from scripture but to scripture as such. This line of thought was also supported by the observation that whenever John refers to the fulfilment of scripture using his fulfilment formulae, he possibly means fulfilment of the whole scripture: scripture as a whole is forward-looking and can be fulfilled. The vision of a unified narrative that scripture witnesses to is the basis of his imagination in the appropriation of scripture. This vision enables him to relate his contemporary stories to the story that scripture tells by means of creative analogical reasoning. Rooted in his tradition and faith, he has confidence in reading the narratives that witness to God and his deeds. He is creative even when he is using the methods given to him by his religious and cultural context; he is free in his approach to the letter of the text even though he is guided by the authority of the story that the text tells.

Our study of the fulfilment quotations in the Johannine Passion narrative gave us some insights into John's way of using the Old Testament. The quotations came from the 'righteous sufferer' Psalms, **Zechariah 9-14**, and the Paschal texts from the Pentateuch. We had noticed that all these sections of scripture were prominent in early Christian interpretation of the Old Testament. He did not search in isolation for the texts that could assist him in his theological enterprise. Many of those quotations – if not all – came to him in his tradition. He was part of a tradition that already recognised the significance of these sections of scripture. In all of these passages, there is some figure that generates figuration in John's hermeneutic.

John's understanding of scripture was guided by his tradition, too. The meaning of the Scripture for him was the meaning that was appropriated by the community of the Jewish followers of Jesus. He stood within the tradition, broadly sharing the interpretative interests of the early Christians, but at the same time he recognised specific interpretative interests peculiar to his own situation. Because of his particular interpretative interests, he is able to see what others do not see in a particular passage of

scripture. For example, because of his view that the future is realised now, he is able to apply a text that was used by the tradition for the *parousia* to the death of Christ. Even when he uses a particular scripture passage that came to him in his tradition, he places it in his narrative to serve his interpretative interest.

Scripture helps the Evangelist to understand Jesus. It is basic to all the Scripture quotations that they are Christological in their application. Scripture as a whole witnesses to Jesus and, therefore, every individual passage that he employs serves this general purpose. He narrates the story of Jesus in scriptural terms. In fact, scripture interprets the story of Jesus. Because of this, at certain places, it looks as if scripture has shaped the narrative. The relationship between scripture and the contemporary event is figural. It is a correspondence between the event described by the text and the contemporary (Christological) event that makes the connection between the two. It is not literal word for word fulfilment that is intended, in which case, many of the quotations would lose their theological significance for John. Neither is it allegorical, because the event described by the text and the contemporary event do not have detailed correspondence at every point. They have dissimilarities and discontinuity, which can be accommodated in a metaphorical relationship. There is a general respect for the overall context of a verse quoted, and both the event of the text and the event it is now adapted to are able to keep their separate identity and meaning. By being joined together in a dialogue, however, they produce a meaning that goes beyond the independent meaning of each.

John is concerned with the fulfilment of scripture, not just the passage quoted. The passage is important because it is from scripture. But a passage quoted for a particular narrative context is not irrelevant. It brings meaning and sense to an event that may not otherwise have much meaning. In this process, still, it is scripture that is fulfilled. For John, scripture “functions as a unity and not a patchwork of details to be matched” (in Moyise, ed, 2001: 151).

A meaningful and detailed discussion on John’s hermeneutics of scripture can only be achieved in the context of a detailed study of his use of the Old Testament, which involves numerous allusions to scripture. We devoted a whole chapter to explore these allusions, which are basically about the Paschal Lamb, the Righteous Sufferer, the Servant of the Lord and – to some extent – the Isaac story. Some of these figurations

were already seen in our study of the four scripture quotations in the Passion narrative, but they are more imaginatively weaved into the narrative through multiple allusions. Our study of possible allusions to scripture in the Johannine Passion narrative demonstrated that the major sources for John's thinking about Jesus' Passion were from the Psalms (particularly those that have come to be called the 'righteous sufferer' Psalms), Deutero-Isaiah and Paschal imagery. These had helped to shape the Johannine understanding of Jesus' Passion. What John's gospel account lacks in the quantity of scripture citations, it makes up for in its overall indebtedness to the Jewish Scriptures for its typology, symbols, allusions and patterns of thought. We noticed that recent emphasis in literary studies on intertextuality is an appropriate context to evaluate John's use of scriptural allusions. An allusion is not just about a particular word, phrase or symbol, but it is also an invitation to the whole world of the story it represents. For John, allusions are signs of scriptural process and expression. They are signs of John's habit of interpreting the world outside the Scripture through the eyes of scripture.

We then proceeded to bring together the hermeneutical insights that emerged from our exegetical studies. John's hermeneutic is observed as one of coherence with justifiable presuppositions about scripture, interpreting community and tradition. John's dialogue with his own religious, cultural and social context is reflected in his hermeneutical method and appropriation techniques. His hermeneutic is one of confidence in the methods provided by his context, but at the same time one of suspicion about some elements of the practice. He is creative in adapting the models he makes use of. Hermeneutical goals and interpretative interests are more important than a set of methods. Specific methods are actually used on an *ad hoc* basis. In his interpretative process he successfully handled the gap between the ancient text and his contemporary readers, even though he was probably unaware of how he was doing so. He respected the text and its authority and, hence, allowed the text to interpret the story of Jesus and his community. His approach was contextual like every other interpreter of scripture, but he did not take scripture out of its own context. All these show that John was not twisting the scripture, but skilfully interpreting it. There is some kind of coherence within his own interpretative approaches and practices. This underlines our central argument that the Fourth Evangelist has a coherent hermeneutic, which addresses concerns that are similar to those in contemporary hermeneutics, and his way of dealing with these concerns has parallels in some of the recent hermeneutical trends.

Our study suggested that a dialogue with John and other pre-modern interpreters of scripture can enlighten us in our own hermeneutical task. We can no longer look at them as people who just twist scripture passages in an ingenious manner. In the context of a renewed interest among post-modern readers in pre-critical hermeneutics, there is a greater possibility to explore the challenge of interpretation along with our predecessors. If biblical exegesis is not supposed to be a purely individualistic, academic and rational exercise, the New Testament writers can offer us some help. With this confidence we set out to look for parallels between the Johannine hermeneutic and post-modern hermeneutic, specifically in post-liberal or post-critical traditions.

We have concluded that in case of the presuppositions and the axioms that guide our act of interpretation, the Johannine community and the post-critical communities share similar approaches to the nature of the Scripture and the self-understanding of the interpreting community. They also consider 'methods' as less privileged instruments in comparison with the set of values and presuppositions they uphold. Methods are subservient to the hermeneutical goal and product of the communities' worldviews. They have greater agreement on the textual, canonical and confessional nature of interpretation. For both the pre-critical and the post-critical interpreters, the meaning of the text is underdetermined and metaphorical. They do have much in common with each other over against the modern interpretative paradigms, which have now failed to bring out the power of the word from the words of scripture. Yet, post-critical is not the same as pre-critical in that post-criticals do not neglect the insights we have gathered from the use of historical critical methods in the study of the scriptures, however insufficient those methods were for a proper reading of the Scriptures.

John is a faithful and imaginative interpreter of scripture. The vision of a unified narrative that scripture witnesses to is the basis of his imagination in the appropriation of scripture. Rooted in his tradition and faith, he has confidence in reading the narratives that witness to God and his deeds. He is creative even when he is using the methods given to him by his religious and cultural context; he is free in his approach to the letter of the text even though he is guided by the authority of the story that the text tells. The Johannine interpretation of scripture has its orientation towards theology and has an insistence on the unity of theology and life, of vision and virtue. Interpretation is not an end in itself; neither is a text studied in isolation, apart from its meaning to the community and its effects on the life of the community. The focus of his interpretative

process is the primary narrative meaning of the text; his use of the text in a given context is consistent with that meaning of the text.

John's interpretative work shows that pluralism is not a disadvantage, but an abundant blessing. The socio-cultural-religious pluralism in the context of the interpreter offers him a convenient opportunity that enables him to bring out the meaning and significance of the scripture powerfully. Moreover, the cultural diversity of his context will provide him with rich and plural techniques and models, with which he can handle the text. Thus, pluralism makes the biblical exegesis rich and deep. We have here the strong biblical basis for a contextual hermeneutics in our post-modern pluralistic context. At the same time, the exegete has to be critical of his context, too. John does not give us any warrant for blind and uncritical acceptance of cultural forms and methods. The interpreter must allow the critical edge of the biblical message function freely in any given context.

John's interpretative procedure demonstrates beyond any doubt that biblical interpretation is a dialogue – a dialogue between the present interpreter in his own historical context and the biblical text in theirs. It is much easier and convenient to turn it into a monologue. When we do not take our own context seriously, we end up in receiving an ancient monologue through the Bible; when we neglect the context of the biblical texts themselves, we produce a modern monologue in biblical interpretation. Johannine interpretative practice sets up a dialogue and, hence, sets forth an example for us.

New hermeneutic in any specific context cannot be entirely new as such. There is continuity with the earlier attempts on interpreting scripture in other contexts. But there is freedom to go ahead with our attempts to interpret scripture in our context. The challenge in this study is to embrace a hermeneutic of freedom with regards to methods and models, suspicion with regards to ideological and cultural presuppositions, and confidence in the efficacy of scripture in talking to us and in the tradition that mediates the text to us. The recent trends in hermeneutics reaffirm to us that we can be confident and imaginative in our interpretative engagement, just as John and his community were in theirs.

8.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, MV. 1982. The Specificity of Christian Hermeneutics. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 31, 243-249.
- Achtemeier, PJ. 1999. *Inspiration and Authority: Nature and Function of Christian Scripture*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 176pp.
- Adam, AKM. 2006. *Faithful Interpretation: Reading the Bible in a Postmodern World*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press. 208pp.
- Albl, MC. 1999. "And Scripture Cannot be Broken": *The Form and Function of The Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. Leiden: Brill. 335pp.
- Allison, DC. 2000. *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International. 306pp.
- Anderson, AA. 1972. *The Book of Psalms*. London: Oliphants.
- Ashton, J. 1991. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 599pp.
- Auerbach, E. 1984. Figura. *Theory and History of Literature*, 9, 11-76.
- Avis, P. 1999. *God and Creative Imagination*. London: Routledge. 197pp.
- Ball, DM & Dwyer, T. 1996. 'I Am' in John's Gospel. *Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Ballard, PH & Holmes, SR (eds). 2005. *The Bible in Pastoral Practice*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd. 320pp.
- Bampfylde, G. 1969. John xix. 28: A Case for a Different Translation. *Novum Testamentum*, 11, 247-260.

- Barrett, CK. 1947. The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel. *Journal of Theological Studies*, 48, 155-169.
- Barrett, CK. 1956. *The Gospel According to St John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. London: SPCK. 531pp.
- Barrett, CK. 1962. *From First Adam to the Last: A Study in Pauline Theology*. London: A & C Black. 124pp.
- Barrett, CK. 1975. *The Gospel of John and Judaism*. London: SPCK. 112pp.
- Bartholomew, C (ed). 2003. *Behind the Text: History and Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan. 553pp.
- Barton, J & Muddiman, J (eds). *The Oxford Bible Commentary*. Oxford: OUP. 1488pp.
- Beasley-Murray, GR. 1987. *John*. Waco, TX: Word Books. 441pp.
- Berkhof, L. 1957. *Principles of Biblical Interpretation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker. 169pp.
- Bernard, JH. 1942. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St John* (2 vols). Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 740pp.
- Best, E & Wilson, RM (eds) 1979. *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Cambridge: CUP. 268pp.
- Beutler, J. 1978. Psalm 42/43 im Johannesevangelium. *New Testament Studies*, 25, 54-56.
- Bierberg, R. 1948. Does Sacred Scripture have a Sensus Plenior? *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 10, pp 182-195.
- Black, M. 1962. *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. 265pp.

- Black, M. 1967. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 359pp.
- Blass, F & Debrunner, A. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. 325pp.
- Blinzler, J. 1959. *The Trial of Jesus: The Jewish and Roman Proceedings Against Jesus Christ Described and Assessed from the Oldest Accounts*. Westminster, MD: Newman. 312pp.
- Block, DL. 1987. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Boff, C. 1987. *Theology and Praxis: Epistemological Foundations*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis. 416pp.
- Boman, T. 1963. Das letzte Wort Jesu. *Studia Theologica*, 17, 103-119.
- Borchert, GL. 1987. *Assurance and Warning*. Nashville, TN: Broadman.
- Borgen, P. 1965. *Bread from Heaven: An Exegetical Study of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. Leiden: Brill. 217pp.
- Borgen, P. 1972. Logos was the True Light. *Novum Testamentum*, 14, 115-130.
- Borgen, P. 1976. The Place of the Old Testament in the New Testament Theology: Response. *New Testament Studies*, 23, 70-71.
- Borgen, P. 1987. *Philo, John and Paul: New Perspectives on Judaism and Early Christianity*. Atlanta: Scholars Press. 324pp.
- Bousset, W. 1970. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginning of Christianity to Irenaeus* (translated by JE Steely). New York, NY: Abingdon Press. 496pp.

- Boyarin, D. 1990. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock. 161pp.
- Boyd, R. 1973. The Use of the Bible in Indian Christian Theology. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 22, 141-162.
- Boyd, R. 1975. *An Introduction to Indian Christian Theology*. Madras: CLS
- Braaten, CE. 1968. *History and Hermeneutics*. London: Lutterworth Press. 205pp.
- Brawley, RL. 1993. An Absent Compliment and Intertextuality in John 19: 28, 29. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 112/113, 427-443.
- Brawley, RL. 1995. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press. 178pp.
- Brodie, TL. 1993. *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. Oxford: OUP. 640pp.
- Brooke, GJ. 1985. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Brown, RE. 1970. *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols). New York, NY: Doubleday. 1208pp.
- Brown, RE. 1979. *The Community of the Beloved Disciple*. New York, NY: Paulist Press. 204pp.
- Brown, RE. 1994. *The Death of the Messiah* (2 vols). New York, NY: Doubleday. 1603pp.
- Brownlee, WH. 1979. *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press. 232pp.

- Bruce, FF. 1960/61. The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 42, 336-353.
- Bruce, FF. 1983. *The Gospel of John*. Basingstoke: Pickering & Inglis. 425pp.
- Brueggemann, W. 1991. *Interpretation and Obedience: From Faithful Reading to Faithful Living*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press. 325pp.
- Brueggemann, W. 1993. *The Bible and Postmodern Imagination: Texts Under Negotiation*. London: SCM Press. 117pp.
- Brueggemann, W. 1997. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press. 777pp.
- Brueggemann, W. 2001. *The Bible Makes Sense*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press. 102pp.
- Bruns, JE. 1966. The Use of time in the Fourth Gospel. *New Testament Studies*, XIII, 285-290.
- Buckley, JJ & Yeago, DS (eds). 2001. *Knowing the Triune God: The Work of the Spirit in the Practices of the Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 296pp.
- Bultmann, R. 1971. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (translated by GR Beasley-Murray *et al*). Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press. 744pp.
- Burgess, JP. 1998. *Why Scripture Matters: Reading the Bible in a Time of Church Crisis*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press. 200pp.
- Burney, CF. 1922. *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 176pp.
- Caldwell, LW. 1987. Third Horizon Hermeneutics: Re-evaluating New Testament Hermeneutical Models for Intercultural Bible Interpreters Today. *Asian Journal of Theology*, 1, 314-333.

- Campbell, CL. 1997. *Preaching Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 289pp.
- Carder, MM. 1972. The Use of the Bible in the Church's Ministry. *Bangalore Theological Forum*, 6, 17-49.
- Carr, D. 1986. *Time, Narrative and History*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. 189pp.
- Carr, D. 1992. *Sword of the Spirit: An Activist's Understanding of the Bible*. Geneva: World Council of Churches. 82pp.
- Carroll, JT & Green, JB (eds). 1995. *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 318pp.
- Carson, DA. 1991. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 715pp.
- Carson, DA & Williamson, HGM (eds). 1986. *It is Written: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*. Cambridge: CUP. 381pp.
- Childs, BS. 1978. *The Exegetical Significance of Canon for the Study of the Old Testament*. Leiden: Brill.
- Childs, BS. 1993. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press. 745pp.
- Clark, EA. 1999. *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 436pp.
- Clark-Soles, J. 2003. *Scripture Cannot be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden: Brill. 360pp.
- Cohn, HH. 1967. *The Trial and Death of Jesus*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson. 419pp.

- Coloe, ML. 2001. *God Dwells with us: Temple Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel*.
Collegeville, MN.: Liturgical Press. 252pp
- Conn, HM. (ed). 1988. *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
276pp.
- Critchley, S. 1992. *The Ethics of Deconstruction*. Oxford: Blackwell. 312pp.
- Cross, FM. 1964. The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the
Judean Desert. *Harvard Theological Review*, 57, 282-283.
- Cullman, O. 1967. *Salvation in History*. London: SCM Press. 352pp.
- Culpepper, RA & Black, CC (eds). 1996. *Exploring John: In Honour of D Moody
Smith*. Westminster, PA: Westminster/John Knox Press. 409pp.
- Daly-Denton, M. 2000. *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the
Psalms*. Leiden: Brill. 375pp.
- Daube, D. 1956. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Athlone. 460pp.
- Davidson, RM. 1981. *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Typos
Structures*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press.
- Davies, M. 1992. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. Sheffield: Sheffield
Academic Press. 412pp.
- Davies, PR. 1979. Passover and the Dating of Aqedah. *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 30,
59-67.
- Davies, WD. 1974. *The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial
Doctrine*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 521pp.
- Davis, EF & Hays, RB (eds). 2003. *The Art of Reading Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI:
Eerdmans. 334pp.

- Dawson, JD. 2002. *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 302pp.
- de Jonge, M. 1977. *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press. 236pp.
- de Varebeke, AJ. 1962. La Structure des Scenes du Recit de la Passion en John xviii-xix. *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 38, 504-522.
- Deissmann, A. 1926. *St Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 323pp.
- Derrida, J. 1988. *Limited Inc*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. 160pp.
- Dockery, DS. 1992. *Biblical Interpretation then and Now: Contemporary Hermeneutics in the light of the Early Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books. 248pp.
- Dodd, CH. 1950. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Collins. 145pp.
- Dodd, CH. 1953. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: CUP. 477pp.
- Dodd, CH. 1963. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: CUP. 454pp.
- Douglas, JD (ed). 1975. *Let the Earth Hear His Voice*. Minneapolis, MN: World Wide. 1471pp.
- Douglas-Klotz, N. 1999. Midrash and Postmodern Inquiry: Suggestion towards a Hermeneutic of Indeterminacy. *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*, 7, 181-193.
- Dubey, SP. 1982. Hermeneutics and Sankara. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 31, 166-74.
- Dunn, JDG. 1977. *Unity and the Diversity in the New Testament*. London: SCM Press. 470pp.

- Dunn, JDG. 1982. Levels of Canonical Authority. *Horizons in Biblical Theology*, IV, 13-60.
- Dunn, JDG. 1987. *The Living Word*. London: SCM Press. 196pp.
- Efird, JM (ed). 1972. *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and other Essays*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 332pp.
- Eissfeldt, O. 1965. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell. 861pp.
- Ellis, EE. 1956. *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. 204pp.
- Ellis, EE. 1992. *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker. 188pp.
- Ellis, EE. 1993. *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in the Early Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr. 289pp.
- Ellis, P. 1984. *The Genius of John: A Composition-Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Minnesota, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Evans, CA. 1993. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 243pp.
- Evans, CA & Stegner, WR (eds). 1994. *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 505pp.
- Evans, CA & Stinespring, WF (eds). 1987. *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Fawcett, T. 1973. *Hebrew Myth and Christian Gospel*. London: SCM Press. 325pp.
- Fenton, JC. 1961. *The Passion According to John*. London: SPCK. 73pp.

- Fish, S. 1980. *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretative Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 394pp.
- Fishbane, M. 1985. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 617pp.
- Fishbane, M. 1992. *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press. 155pp.
- Fitzmyer, JA. 1957. 4Q Testimonia and the New Testament. *New Testament Studies*, 18, 513-537.
- Fjaerstedt, B. 1974. The Authority of the Bible Today. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 23, 104-111.
- Ford, JM. 1969. Mingled Blood from the Side of Christ (John XIX, 34). *New Testament Studies*, 15, 337-338.
- Fortna, RT. 1988. *The Fourth Gospel and its Predecessor: From Narrative Source to Present Gospel*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press. 332pp.
- Fortna, RT & Thatcher, T. 2001. *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press. 300pp.
- Fowl, SE (ed). 1996. *The Theological Interpretation of Scripture*. Oxford: Blackwell. 440pp.
- Freed, ED. 1965. *The Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. Leiden: Brill.
- Frei, HW. 1974. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth-Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 355pp.
- Frei, HW. 1992. *Types of Christian Theology*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 180pp.

- Frei, HW. 1997. *The Identity of Jesus Christ*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock. 201pp.
- Frye, N. 1982. *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich. 261pp.
- Gadamer, H-G. 1975. *Truth and Method*. New York, NY: Seabury Press. 551pp.
- Gardner, P. 1913. *The Religious Experience of St Paul*. New York, NY: Putnam's Sons. 263pp.
- Gartner, B. 1959. *John 6 and the Jewish Passover*. Lund: Gleerup.
- George, KM. 1982. Oriental Orthodox Approach to Hermeneutics. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 31 (3/4), 203-211.
- Gerhardsson, B. 1966. *The Testing of God's Son (Mt 4: 1-11 and Par): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash* (translated by John Troy). Lund: Gleerup.
- Gibbs, JM. 1974. The Bible in the Church: A Radical View. *Bangalore Theological Forum*, 6, 1-28.
- Glasson, TF. 1963. *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*. London: SCM Press. 115pp.
- Goppelt, L. 1982. *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. (translated by D Madvig). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 288pp.
- Goulder, MD. 1964. *Type and History in Acts*. London: SPCK. 252pp.
- Grassi, JA. 1987. Eating Jesus' Flesh and Drinking his Blood: The Centrality and Meaning of John 6: 51-58. *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 17, 24-30.
- Gray, GB. 1925. *Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 434pp.

- Green, G. 1998. *Imagining God: Theology and the Religious Imagination*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 196pp.
- Green, G. 2000. *Theology, Hermeneutics and Imagination: The Crisis of Interpretation at the end of Modernity*. Cambridge: CUP. 241pp.
- Green, G, (ed). 2001. *Scriptural Authority and Narrative Interpretation*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock. 224pp.
- Green, JB & Turner, M (eds). 2000. *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies and Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 256pp.
- Greene, TM. 1982. *The Light in Troy: Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 354pp.
- Gregorios, PM. 1982. The Hermeneutical Discussion in India Today. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 31, 153-155.
- Gresh, P. 1973. The Testimonia and Modern Hermeneutics. *New Testament Studies*, XIX, 318-324.
- Grigsby, BH. 1982. The Cross as an Expiatory Sacrifice in the Fourth Gospel. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 15, 51-80.
- Guilding, A. 1960. *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study in Relation of St John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 247pp.
- Haenchen, E. 1984. *A Commentary on the Gospel of John* (2 vols – translated by RW Funk). Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press. 308/366pp.
- Hanson, AT. 1980. *New Testament Interpretation of Scripture*. London: SPCK. 237pp.
- Hanson, AT. 1983. *The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd. 250pp.

- Hanson, AT. 1991. *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament*.
Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 393pp.
- Hanson, AT & Hanson RPC. 1989. *The Bible without Illusions*. London: SCM Press.
150pp.
- Harner, PB. 1970. *The 'I Am' of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Johannine Usage and
Thought*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress. 66pp.
- Harris, JR. 1920. *Testimonies* (2 vols). Cambridge: CUP.
- Hauerwas, S. 1993. *Unleashing the Scripture: Freeing the Bible from the Captivity of
America*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press. 159pp.
- Hays, RB. 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, CT: Yale
University Press. 240pp.
- Hays, RB. 1996. *The Moral Vision of the New Testament*. San Francisco, CA:
HarperSanFrancisco. 508pp.
- Hays, RB. 2005. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's
Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 213pp.
- Hengel, M. 1989. *The Johannine Question*. London: SCM Press. 240pp.
- Hesse, F. 1960. Kerygma oder Geschichtliche Wirklichkeit? *Zeitschrift für Theologie
und Kirche*, 57, 17-26.
- Hoehner, HW. 1992. *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ*. Grand Rapids, MI:
Zondervan. 180pp.
- Holladay, WA. 1993. *The Psalms through Three Thousand Years: Prayer Book of a
Cloud of Witnesses*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press. 408pp.

- Hollander, J. 1981. *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 155pp.
- Hooker, MD. 1959. *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: SPCK. 230pp.
- Hoskyns, EC. 1947. *The Fourth Gospel*. London: Faber & Faber. 604pp.
- Howard-Brook, W. 2001. *Becoming Children of God: John's Gospel and Radical Discipleship*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis. 510pp.
- John, MP. 1965. The Use of the Bible by Indian Christian Theologians. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 14, 43-51.
- Jones, LG & Buckley, JJ (eds). 1998. *Theology and Scriptural Imagination*. Oxford: Blackwell. 144pp.
- Jungkuntz, R. 1964. An Approach to the Exegesis of John 10: 34-36. *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 35, 556-565.
- Kasemann, E. 1964. *Essays on New Testament Themes*. London: SCM Press.
- Keck., LE (ed) 1998. *The New Interpreter's Bible* (vol 2). Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1998.
- Keener, CS. 2003. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson. 1696pp.
- Keitzar, R. 1982. Tribal Perspective in Biblical Hermeneutics Today. *Indian Journal of Theology*, 31, 293-313.
- Koenig, J. 1981. *L'hermeneutique analogique du Judaisme antique d'apres les temoins textuels d'Isaie*. Leiden: Brill.

- Kraft, CH. 1979. *Christianity in Culture: A Study in Dynamic Biblical Theologizing in Cross-cultural Perspective*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis. 445pp.
- Kraus, H-J. 1986. *Theology of the Psalms*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg. 235pp.
- Kraus, H-J. 1989. *Psalms 60-15: A Commentary*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg. 587pp.
- Kugel, JL & Greer, RA. 1986. *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press. 220pp.
- Kysar, R. 1975. *The Fourth Evangelist and his Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg. 296pp.
- Kysar, R. 1986. *John*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg. 333pp.
- Lamarche, P. 1961. *Zacharie IX-XIV: Structure litteraires et messianisme*. Paris: Gabalda. 168pp.
- Lampe, GWH. 1953. Typological Exegesis. *Theology*, 56, 201-208.
- Lampe, GWH & Woollcombe, KJ. 1957. *Essays on Typology*. London: SCM Press. 80pp.
- Lash, N. 2005. *Theology on the Way to Emmaus*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock. 252pp
- Leon-Dufour, X. 1968. *The Gospels and the Jesus of History*. London: Collins. 288pp.
- Liddell, HG & Scott, R. 1961. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 910pp.
- Lightfoot, RH. 1956. *St John's Gospel: A Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 368pp.
- Lincoln, AT. 1994. Trials, Plots and the Narrative of the Fourth Gospel. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 56, 3-30

- Lindars, B. 1961. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press. 303pp.
- Lindars, B. 1972. *The Gospel of John*. London: Oliphants. 648pp.
- Lindars, B. 1976. The Place of the Old Testament in the Formation of New Testament Theology: Prologomena. *New Testament Studies*, 23, 59-66.
- Lindbeck, GA. 1977. *The Nature of Doctrine: Religion and Theology in a Postliberal Age*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press. 142pp.
- Lischer, R. 1995. *The Preacher King: Martin Luther King Jr and the Word that Moved America*. Oxford: OUP. 344pp.
- Longenecker, RN. 1977. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 246pp.
- Macgregor, GHC. 1928. *The Gospel of John*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 378pp.
- Malherbe, AJ & Meeks, WA (eds). 1993. *Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E Keck*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press. 265pp.
- Malina, BJ & Rohrbaugh, RL. 1998. *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress. 326pp.
- Marshall, BD. 1990. *Theology and Dialogue: Essays in Conversation with George Lindbeck*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press. 302pp.
- Marshall, IH (ed). 1979. *New Testament Interpretation*. Exeter: Paternoster. 406pp.
- Martyn, JL. 1979. *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press. 176pp.
- Mayes, ADH. 1979. *Deuteronomy*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott. 416pp.

- M^cCasland, SV. 1961. Matthew Twists the Scriptures. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXXX, 143-148.
- M^cKim, DK (ed). 1983. *The Authoritative Word: Essays on the Nature of Scripture*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 270pp.
- M^cKim, DK (ed). 1986. *A Guide to Contemporary Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 385pp.
- M^cNamara, M. 1972. *Targum and Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 227pp.
- M^cPolin, J. 1979. *John*. Dublin: Veritas & Wilmington. 231pp.
- Meeks, WA. 1967. *The Prophet King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Leiden: Brill.
- Meeks, WA. 1993. *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 275pp.
- Meeks, WA. 2002. *In Search of the Early Christians*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 314pp.
- Menken, MJJ. 1996. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Kampen: Kok.
- Mitchell, HG; Smith JMP & Brewer JA. 1912. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Jonah*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 516pp.
- Moloney, FJ. 1998. *The Gospel of John*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press. 608pp.
- Moo, D. 1983. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- Morgan, R. 1957. Fulfilment in the Fourth Gospel. *Interpretation*, 11, 155-165.

- Morris, LL. 1964. *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries*. London: Tyndale. 78pp.
- Morris, LL. 1995. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 824pp.
- Moule, CFD. 1967. Fulfilment-words in the New Testament: Use and Abuse. *New Testament Studies*, 14, 293-320.
- Moulton, JH. 1962. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (3 vols). Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Moyise, S (ed). 2001. *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*. London: Continuum. 153pp.
- Mulder, MJ (ed). 1988. *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press. 929pp.
- Muller, RA & Thompson, JL (eds). 1996. *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 351pp.
- Neusner, J. 1987. *What is Midrash?* Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.
- Obermann, A. 1996. *Die Christologische Erfullung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr. 346pp.
- Oliver, G. 2006. *Holy Bible, Human Bible: Questions Pastoral Practice Must Ask.* London: Darton, Longman & Todd. 171pp.
- Orchard, HC. 1998. *Courting Betrayal: Jesus as Victim in the Gospel of John*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 293pp.
- Painter, J. 1979. *John: Witness and Theologian*. London: SPCK. 160pp.

- Painter, J. 1991. *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 425pp.
- Pannenberg, W. 1973. *Basic Questions in Theology* (vol 3). London: SCM Press.
- Patte, D. 1975. *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press. 344pp.
- Pecknold, CC. 2005. *Transforming Postliberal Theology: George Lindbeck, Pragmatism and Scripture*. London: T & T Clark. 166pp.
- Phillips, TR & Okholm DL (eds). 1996. *The Nature of Confession: Evangelicals and Postliberals in Conversation*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP. 298pp.
- Placher, WC. 1989. *Unapologetic Theology: A Christian Voice in a Pluralistic Conversation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press. 178pp.
- Placher, WC. 1994. *Narratives of a Vulnerable God*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press. 188pp.
- Porter, SE & Evans, CA (eds). 1997. *New Testament Text and Language*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 311pp.
- Porter, SE; Joyce, P & Orton, DE (eds) 1994. *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D Goulder*. Leiden: Brill.
- Rapske, B. 1994. *The Book of Acts and Paul in Roman Custody*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 524pp.
- Reim, G. 1974. *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*. Cambridge: CUP. 315pp.
- Rensberger, D. 1989. *Overcoming the World: Politics and the Community in the Gospel of John*. London: SPCK. 168pp.

- Richards, IA. 1965. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. New York, NY: OUP. 144pp.
- Ricouer, P. 1976. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University Press. 124pp.
- Ridderbos, HN. 1997. *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary* (translated by John Vriend). Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmanns. 735pp.
- Riffaterre, M. 1983. *Text Production*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. 341pp.
- Ro, BR & Eshenauer, R (eds). 1984. *Bible and Theology in Asian Contexts*. Bangalore: Asia Theological Association.
- Robins, RH. 1964. *General Linguistics: An Introductory Survey*. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 390pp.
- Robinson, HW. 1964. *The Corporate Personality in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press. 40p.
- Rogers, EF. 1996. How the Virtues of the Interpreter Presuppose and Perfect Hermeneutic: The Case of Thomas Aquinas. *Journal of Religion*, 76, 64-81.
- Ruckstuhl, E. 1965. *Chronology of the Last Days of Jesus: A Critical Study*. New York, NY: Doubleday. 143pp.
- Saliers, DE. 1994. *Worship as Theology: Foretaste of Glory Divine*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press. 255pp.
- Samartha, SJ. 1987. *The Search for New Hermeneutics in Asian Christian Theology*. Bangalore: BTE of Serampore College. 50pp.
- Sanders, EP. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia, PA: Augsburg Fortress. 627pp.

- Sanders, JN. 1968. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St John*. London: A & C Black. 480pp.
- Scalise, CJ. 1994. *Hermeneutics as Theological Prolegomena: A Canonical Approach*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press. 155pp.
- Schnackenburg, R. 1982. *The Gospel According to St John* (3 vols; translated by C Hastings). London: Burns & Oates.
- Schneiders, SM. 1999. *The Revelatory Text: Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press. 206pp.
- Schoeps, HJ. 1946. The Sacrifice of Isaac in Paul's Theology. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 65, 385-392.
- Schuchard, BG. 1992. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars' Press. 174pp.
- Seitz, C & Greene-M^cCreight, K (eds). 1999. *Theological Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Brevard Childs*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 396pp.
- Sherwin-White, AN. 1963. *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 204pp.
- Sloan, WD & Parsons, MC (eds). 1993. *Perspectives on John: Method and Interpretation in the Fourth Gospel*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen.
- Smalley, SS. 1978. *John, Evangelist and Interpreter*. Exeter: Paternoster. 285pp.
- Smith, DM. 1976. The Setting and Shape of a Johannine Narrative Source. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 95, 236-241.
- Smith, DM. 1984. *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources and Theology*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press. 234pp.

- Stegner, WR. 1985. The Baptism of Jesus: A Story Modelled on the Binding of Isaac. *Bible Review*, 1, 35-45.
- Stendahl, K (ed). 1958. *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. London: SCM Press. 308pp.
- Stibbe, MWG. 1993. *John*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 153pp.
- Stibbe, MWG. 1994. *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: CUP. 228pp.
- Strachan, RH. 1941. *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment*. London: SCM Press. 344pp.
- Suggit, J. 1982/83. "John 1:5: Behold the Man. *Expository Times*, 94, 333-334.
- Sundberg, AC, 1959. On Testimonies. *Novum Testamentum*, 3, 268-81.
- Swetnam, J. 1981. *Jesus and Isaac: A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of the Aqedah* (Analecta Biblica 94). Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Tasker, RVG. 1972. *The Gospel According to St John*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 237pp.
- Thiselton, AC. 1992. *New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan. 703pp.
- Thompson, BP (ed). 1987. *Scripture: Meaning and Method Essays Presented to Anthony Tyrell Hanson*. Hull: Hull University Press.
- Torrey, CC. 1947. The Messiah Son of Ephraim. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 66, 253-277.
- van Belle, G. 1985. *Les Parentheses dans l'évangélie de Jean*. Leuven: Leuven University Press. 381pp.

- Vanhoozer, KJ (ed). 2003. *Cambridge Companion to Postmodern Theology*.
Cambridge: CUP. 312pp.
- Vermes, G. 1973. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. Leiden: Brill.
- von Rad, G. 1962. *Old Testament Theology* (vol 1). Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd. 483pp.
- von Rad, G. 1975. *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols). London: SCM Press. 483/470pp.
- Walker, N. 1960. The Reckoning of Hours in the Fourth Gospel *Novum Testamentum*,
4, 69-73.
- Ward, K. 2004. *What the Bible Really Teaches: A Challenge to Fundamentalists*.
London: SPCK. 185pp.
- Watson, F. 1997. *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology*. Edinburgh: T & T
Clark. 344pp.
- Weiser, A. 1962. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.
841pp.
- Wells, S. 2004. *Transforming Fate into Destiny: The Theological Ethics of Stanley
Hauerwas*. Eugene, OR: Cascade. 210pp.
- Westcott, BF. 1898. *The Gospel According to St John*. London: John Murray. 307pp.
- Westermann, C (ed). 1963. *Essays on Old Testament Interpretation*. London: SCM
Press. 361pp.
- Westermann, C. 1969. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. London: SCM Press. 429pp.
- Wilkins, W. 1958. *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums*. Zollikon:
Evangelischer Verlag.

- Williams, C. 2000. *I am He: The Interpretation of 'Ani Hu' in the Jewish and Early Christian Interpretation*. Tübingen: Mohr.
- Wood, CM. 1981. *The Formation of Christian Understanding: An Essay in Theological Hermeneutics*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press. 128pp.
- Work, T. 2002. *Living and Active: Scripture in the Economy of Salvation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans. 364pp.
- Wright, AG. 1967. *The Literary Genre – Midrash*. Staten Island, NY: Alba House. 164pp.
- Wright, CJH. 1990. *What's so Unique about Jesus?* Eastbourne: MARC.
- Wright, GE. 1969. *The Old Testament and Theology*. New York, NY: Harper & Row. 190pp.
- Wright, SI. 2002. The Bible as Sacrament. *Anvil*, 19, 79-88.
- Young, FM. 1997. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: CUP. 325pp.
- Young, FW. 1955. A Study on the Relationship of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel. *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 46, 467-497.
- Zimmerman, H. 1960. Das Absolute 'Ego Eimi' als die Neutestamentliche Offenbarungsformal. *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 4, 54-69.