Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Signature:

_____   _____
Meredith Elliott Hollman   Date

"So That Scripture Would be Fulfilled"

The Old Testament in the Johannine Passion Narrative

By

Meredith Elliott Hollman
Master of Theological Studies

Candler School of Theology

_____
Luke Timothy Johnson
Committee Chair

_____
Steven J. Kraftchick
Director of General and Advanced Studies

_____
Carl R. Holladay
Committee Member

_____
Luke Timothy Johnson
Committee Member

"So That Scripture Would be Fulfilled"

The Old Testament in the Johannine Passion Narrative

By

Meredith Elliott Hollman

Thesis Committee Chair: Luke Timothy Johnson, Ph. D.

An abstract of
A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Candler School of Theology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Theological Studies
2012

Abstract

"So that Scripture Would be Fulfilled"
The Old Testament in the Johannine Passion Narrative (John 18-19)
By Meredith Elliott Hollman

This thesis examines the use of the Old Testament in the passion narrative of John's Gospel (John 18-19). It considers this passage within the broader issue of intertextuality, the way texts relate to prior texts, and particularly within the discussion of the Old Testament in the New.

Chapter One lays the foundation for the more specific and technical analysis which follows. It provides an overview of intertextuality as a literary phenomenon, forms of OT references within the New Testament, and hermeneutical guidelines for evaluating a potential intertextual "echo."

The focus then narrows to the Johannine passion narrative. Chapter Two offers an exegetical analysis of John 18-19. Chapter Three describes references to the Old Testament which are generally accepted, first the three direct citations, and then a few representative examples of intertextual allusion.

Chapter Four, the focus of this thesis, explores a previously unidentified allusion in light of the preceding discussions. It will be argued that Pilate's announcement "Behold, the man!" (John 19:5) echoes a similar announcement in Zech 6:12, "Behold, a man! Branch is his name." Further, the ironic coronation scene in John 19:2-5 tropes the symbolic coronation of Joshua in Zech 6:10-15 (and the related episode in 3:1-10). Theological and thematic parallels between the two texts will be demonstrated. The result is that John draws upon the text from Zechariah to portray Jesus as the promised "Branch" – in other words, as the Messiah. The fifth and final chapter considers the implications of the proposed intertextual echo for the interpretation of John and for theories of intertextuality.

"So That Scripture Would be Fulfilled"

The Old Testament in the Johannine Passion Narrative

By

Meredith Elliott Hollman

Thesis Committee Chair: Luke Timothy Johnson, Ph. D.

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the
Candler School of Theology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Theological Studies
2012

CONTENTS

INTERTEXTUALITY

One of the most interesting aspects of New Testament studies is the way in which the authors drew upon their own Scriptures, which became our Old Testament. Christianity grew out of Judaism, and most of the NT authors thought of themselves as Jews. It was of utmost importance for the earliest Christians that the gospel of Jesus be understood in continuity with the covenant history proclaimed in the Hebrew Bible. If Jesus of Nazareth was not the promised Messiah, then the Way would be nothing more than a heretical sect of Judaism. For this reason, the NT authors went to great lengths to demonstrate how the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, as well as the subsequent growth of the Church, proceeded "according to the Scriptures" (κατὰ τὰς γραφάς, 1 Cor 15:3, 4; compare Luke 24:44). In the process, they reinterpreted Israel's sacred texts in light of the Christ event.

The use of Scripture within Scripture falls into the broader category of intertextuality - the way one text plays off of another, earlier text (or texts). Biblical studies has benefited from the insights of literary critics in this area. Semiotic linguists have also enriched our understanding of intertextuality, by describing it in terms of communication generally. In a very broad sense, all communication is intertextual, because it requires communicator and recipient to operate within a shared field of reference. The "text" in this case is not limited to a written document, but any prior

information needed to interpret the message.

Intertextuality within the Bible is a special case, in that the authors regarded their source texts as divinely inspired and thus of supreme authority (see, for example John 10:35b; Acts 1:16; 2 Tim 3:16; 2 Pet 1:20; see also Deut 4:1-9; 6:6-9; Josh 1:7-8; Ps 119:96). The reverence they had for their sacred writings placed certain restraints on the NT authors as OT interpreters. If "the Scripture cannot be broken" (καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή; John 10:35) and "not one iota or one serif will pass away from the Law" (ἰῶτα ἓν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου; Matt 5:18), the writer cannot simply contradict the source text (compare Paul's defense in Rom 3).[1] This reverence for the text, however, does not stop the authors from some creative interpretive moves. As they seek to understand their new faith in light of the Scriptures, their experience of the Christ event becomes the determinative hermeneutic for reading the Old Testament (see, for example, John 5:39-40; Matt 5:17; Luke 24:44; Rom 15:4). Richard Hays observes, "The voice of Scripture, regarded as authoritative in one way or another, continues to speak in and through later texts that both depend on and transform the earlier."[2] The use of the Old Testament in the New is not limited to any one mode or function. While they share certain features, each writer re-appropriates the texts he[3] has inherited in his own way. Even within one corpus, an author often demonstrates a variety of approaches to OT Scripture.

---

[1] Some scholars would disagree with this statement. See, for example, A. J. Droge, "'No One Has Ever Seen God': Revisionary Criticism in the Fourth Gospel," in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. Craig A. Evans; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 169-184.

[2] *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 14.

[3] The masculine pronoun is used here (rather than a gender-inclusive construction) because all of the NT authors are thought to be men.

Textual Considerations

When examining New Testament references to the Old Testament, biblical scholars must

consider which "Old Testament" the author was using. First, it is not certain to what

extent the Jewish canon was closed when the NT was being written. Was "Scripture"

already limited to those works which would be canonized at the Council of Jamnia, or

were other works given similar authority? Dennis Stamps asserts, "Historically, the

canonical boundaries of the OT were not fixed at the time the NT authors were writing.

While a concept of sacred writings was well established and the term 'the Law and

Prophets' was commonly used to designate such, the precise extent of this corpus was not

established."[4] Similarly, there are varied opinions concerning how fixed the text was.

How much freedom did an interpreter have to reshape the source text to suit his or her

own context?

There were also multiple versions and translations of these sacred texts in

circulation. In addition to multiple versions of the Hebrew text (at least four have been

identified at Qumran alone), there were Greek and Aramaic translations, which also

existed in multiple versions.[5] The Septuagint (LXX) was the most commonly used

version of the OT during the Hellenistic period, even among Jews living in Palestine.

Most NT quotations thus follow the LXX rather than the MT. Some citations do not

agree perfectly with any surviving version of the OT. In discussing possible changes an

NT writer has made in a source text, it is important to consider the diversity of

---

[4] "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 11.

[5] See discussion and bibliography in Craig A. Evans, "From Prophecy to Testament: An Introduction," in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New* (ed. Craig A. Evans; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004), 4-8.

manuscript traditions. Craig Evans cautions, "What at first may appear to be an inaccurate quotation, or a quotation of the LXX, itself thought to be an inaccurate translation of the Hebrew, may in fact be a quotation of a different textual tradition."[6]

Form: Quotations, Allusions, and Echoes

Intertextuality can take various forms, ranging from explicit citations of the source text to subtle resonances. I will discuss these as quotations, allusions, and echoes, although these are merely provisional categories. By "citation" or "quotation," I mean an explicit use of a source text, in which the author inserts entire phrases of a prior text into his or her own work. "Allusions" and "echoes" are intertextual references which are not explicitly identified. Words, phrases, images, and themes may be woven into the text in a way that recalls the source text without naming it. I will use the term "echo" as Richard Hays does in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul,* to mean an especially subtle allusion.

Most direct quotations are easy to recognize. They are usually demarcated with some sort of introductory formula, such as "it is written" (γέγραπται, Matt 4:4; Mark 1:2; Luke 2:23; John 6:45; Acts 15:15; Rom 9:33; 2 Cor 8:15; 1 Pet 1:16), "so that the Scripture would be fulfilled" (ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ, John 19:24, 36; similarly, Matt 2:23; Luke 4:21; Acts 1:16; Jas 2:23), or "for Scripture says" (λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή, Rom 10:11; 1 Tim 5:18; 1 Pet 2:6). Here are a few representative examples, with the OT citations underlined once and the introductory formulae underlined doubly:

> καὶ ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>γέγραπται</u> ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ᾽ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος (Luke 4:4 // Deut 4:4)

---

[6] "From Prophecy to Testament," 5.

> καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἕως τῆς τελευτῆς Ἡρῴδου <u>ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ κυρίου διὰ τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος</u> <u>ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου</u> (Matt 2:15 // Hos 11:1)
>
> διότι <u>περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ</u> <u>ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιὼν λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ</u> (1 Pet 2:6 // Isa 28:16)

Sometimes, it is unclear whether citing a source or not. For example, John 19:28 is sometimes considered a Scriptural citation[7] and sometimes not, depending on whether ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή modifies the clause before it (ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται) or the clause after it (λέγει διψῶ). More common is a case in which the author indicates a citation but the source is not clearly identifiable. John 7:38, for instance, includes a standard citation formula followed by a statement with no OT equivalent: ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ <u>καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή</u> <u>ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος</u>.[8] In cases like these, the line between citation and allusion is blurred. Most of the time, however, the form of a direct quotation is unmistakable.

On the other hand, even those uses of the OT which clearly take the form of quotations may *function* allusively within their NT context. A small excerpt from an OT passage may incorporate the whole by metonymy, especially if the source text is well-known to the intended audience.

---

[7] As in Andreas J. Köstenberger, "John," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 416-420. Although Köstenberger includes this verse in the charts of OT citations at the beginning of the chapter, he does not mention it in the analysis which follows.

[8] This verse is so problematic that the editors of NA 27 do not italicize ποταμοὶ … ζῶντος (as they do for direct OT quotations) and do not identify in the marginal notes any passage cited. There is instead the gloss "*unde?*" ("from where?"), followed by a list of similar, but not identical, OT passages (Isa 43:19 ff.; Ezek 47:1-12; Joel 4:18; Zech 14:8; Prov 18:4). In Appendix IV, "Loci Citati Vel Allegati," John 7:38 is listed among 6 NT texts that cite or allude to unidentified "Greek writings" (others are 1 Cor 9:10; 2 Cor 4:6; Eph 5:14; 1 Tim 5:18; Jas 4:5) (808).

Hearing an Echo

Because allusions are not set apart as quotations usually are, but woven into the text, their

presence can be difficult to determine. For very subtle echoes, especially those which are

not widely recognized, interpreters must consider whether the echo is natural to the text

itself or arises from the their own imaginations. While subject-oriented approaches to

intertextuality have value, this study will limit itself to intertextuality as intended by the

original author and intelligible to the first audience. The tools of literary analysis and

historical-critical exegesis will be used to measure a proposed parallel according to these

criteria. There will, nevertheless, always be judgment calls for an interpreter to make.

Hays offers seven helpful guidelines for evaluating the likelihood of an

intertextual echo:[9]

(1) *Availability:* Did the author have access to the proposed source text? Positive

evidence may be drawn from citations from or allusions to the same work elsewhere in

the author's corpus. Historical information regarding dates of composition is also an

important factor. In order for there to be an echo, the source text must be dated earlier

than the text which recalls it. Hays explains, "This criterion implies that echo is a

diachronic trope: analyses of literary echo are possible only where the chronological

ordering of different voices is known."[10] As this study will limit itself to John's use of the

OT, availability is not a major factor; the Old Testament writings certainly predate the

Gospel of John, and there is every reason to believe that John knew them well. The

question of availability does become an issue regarding whether the author had access to

---

[9] See *Echoes,* 29-32.
[10] *Echoes,* 30.

earlier gospel traditions, such as Mark, Q, or a collection of *testimonia*.[11] If so, then his incorporation of the Old Testament is likely to be affected by the way these source materials reference it.

(2) *Volume:* How explicit or prominent is the proposed echo? Hays explains, "The volume of an echo is determined primarily by the degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns, but other factors may be relevant." Lexical and stylistic parallels are usually the first clue and primary source of evidence in discerning an allusion within a text. This is simple concordance work. The "other factors," however, require a more synthetic approach, which considers how the texts under consideration function within their literary contexts: "How distinctive or prominent is the precursor text within Scripture, and how much rhetorical stress does the echo receive in [the author's] discourse?"[12] He cites as an example Paul's echo of Gen 1:3-5 in 2 Cor 4:6.[13] Although 2 Cor 4:6 has few exact verbal parallels with Genesis, it appears at the "rhetorical climax" of its literary unit and cites a theologically foundational, "distinctive and memorable" text from the Hebrew Bible.[14]

A comparable example from John is the prologue (1:1-5), which strongly echoes the Genesis creation account but uses few of the same words or constructions. Exact lexical parallels include only the opening ἐν ἀρχῇ (LXX Gen 1:1; John 1:1), ὁ θεὸς (6

---

[11] C. K. Barrett discusses John's use of the OT with the assumption that the author did have access either to the Gospel of Mark or to a circulating collection of *testimonia* in "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 38 (1947), 155-169.

[12] *Echoes,* 30.

[13] ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπών ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψει ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 4:6) // καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός γενηθήτω φῶς καὶ ἐγένετο φῶς· καὶ εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ὅτι καλόν καὶ διεχώρισεν ὁ θεὸς ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ φωτὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ σκότους· καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ φῶς ἡμέραν καὶ τὸ σκότος ἐκάλεσεν νύκτα καὶ ἐγένετο ἑσπέρα καὶ ἐγένετο πρωί ἡμέρα μία (LXX Gen 1:3-5)

[14] *Echoes,* 30.

occurrences in LXX Gen 1:1-5; John 1:2, 3), and the binary between light (φῶς) and

darkness (though John 1:5 has σκοτία rather than the equivalent σκότος of LXX Gen 1:2),

yet no biblically literate person is likely to miss the resonance. John even chooses

ἐγένετο (1:3) rather than ἐποίησεν (LXX Gen 1:1) to describe the act of creation, for no

immediately apparent reason. The prominent placement of the two passages in their

respective books and the memorable effect of ἐν ἀρχῇ increase the volume of this

parallel, which would appear faint based solely on lexical considerations. This aspect of

"volume" will be crucial to the argument in the fourth chapter of this essay.

(3) *Recurrence:* How often does the author refer to the same passage elsewhere?

This consideration includes not only the verse which is actually cited or echoed, but also

the wider textual unit from which it is taken. Repeated references to an OT text make

another reference to the same text more plausible. Hay explains, "Where such evidence

exists that [the author] considered a passage of particular importance, proposed echoes

from the same context should be given additional credence."[15] For example, because

John includes two direct citations from the latter chapters of Zechariah (John 12:15 //

Zech 9:9; John 19:37 // Zech 12:10) – and these at key points in the narrative -   there is

an increased likelihood that the temple episode in John 2:13-22 recalls the closing words

of Zechariah, "There will no longer be a merchant[16] in the house of the Lord" (14:21).

Luke Johnson provides a compelling illustration of this hermeneutical principle in

---

[15] *Echoes,* 30.

[16] The Hebrew כְּנַעֲנִי may be translated either "Canaanite" or "merchant" (*BDB* 488-89). Although the Septuagint uses Χαναναῖος, an echo in John would require that כְּנַעֲנִי be understood as "merchant." As will be discussed in the following section, John was probably familiar with both Hebrew and Greek versions of the OT (his quotation of Zech 12:10 agrees with the Hebrew against the Greek), so it is plausible that he has read Zech 14:21 as "there will no longer be a merchant..."

his article "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James."[17] It is generally

acknowledged that James cites LXX Lev 19 in 2:8 (= Lev 19:18b) and alludes to it in 5:4

(recalls Lev 19:13). Johnson argues that the influence of Lev 19 extends beyond these

isolated instances; "James used the LXX of Lev 19:12-18 as a whole." Despite the

paucity of explicit citations or strong verbal allusions, much of the parenetic material in

James bears strong thematic resemblance to the commands in Lev 19:12-18. Johnson

explicates each of several instances in which James "engages in halachic midrash" on Lev

19. The cumulative effect of these examples is greater than the sum of the parts; because

there are so many possible instances of an intertextual relationship, all focused on a small

portion of Leviticus, the "cluster effect" increases their likelihood. This example

illustrates an interpretive guideline which can be applied to other texts as well: "Where

we can show a cluster of allusions from one document to another, it is easier to argue for

the presence of other allusions in passages which, considered alone, might seem at first

unlikely candidates."[18]

(4) *Thematic Coherence:* How well does the proposed source text fit with the new

context? An echo is more likely if it can be shown to incorporate themes and images

consonant with the author's overall project. This criterion, as Hays notes, "begins to

move beyond simple identification of echoes to the problem of how to interpret them."[19]

To judge how an echo might function within a text, it is necessary understand the

structure and import of that text as a whole.

Hays does not mention here another layer of complexity which will affect an

---

[17] *JBL* 101 (1982), 391-401.
[18] "Leviticus 19 in James," 392.
[19] *Echoes,* 30.

interpreter's judgment: When a NT author incorporates a reference to the OT, to what extent is the original context considered? Put simply, do the writers just extract words and phrases divorced from their original meaning, or do the source passages continue to inform the significance of the selected text? Opinions an this fundamental issue vary widely. There is also variation among the NT authors, and often within the work of the same author. Hays' use of "thematic coherence" as a criterion assumes that the themes and images associated the source text in its original setting continue to shape its meaning. Because I essentially agree with Hays on this point, at least within the Gospel of John, I will devote much of my discussion in chapters two and three to the thematic coherence of the allusions in the passion narrative.

(5) *Historical Plausibility:* Could the author have intended the proposed echo, and could the audience have understood it? The likelihood of an intertextual echo is greater if it can be demonstrated that the author's usage resembles interpretive practices known to have existed in his or her community. For most NT authors, including John, the main frame of reference is, broadly, Hellenistic Judaism. The diversity among Jewish groups at the time of NT composition makes the issue more complex, as various schools had their own hermeneutical methods. The question of the audience's potential to understand is similarly complicated, but it remains a useful consideration. It is entirely possible that an author might communicate something the audience cannot understand (compare Peter's statement about Paul's letters, 2 Pet 3:16).

(6) *History of Interpretation:* Have other interpreters seen the same parallel between the texts? Hays himself, however, cautions that this text might not always be a

reliable criterion:

> While this test is a possible restraint against arbitrariness, it is also one of the least reliable guides for interpretation, because Gentile Christian readers at a very early date lost Paul's sense of urgency about relating the gospel to God's dealings with Israel and, slightly later, began reading Paul's letters within the interpretive matrix of the New Testament canon.[20]

Hearing and interpreting an intertextual echo requires the audience to infer additional information from a frame of reference they share with the author. For readers lacking this background cache of knowledge and experience, the echo may be obscured. In such a case, "A historically sensitive exegesis can recover echoes previously dampened or drowned out."[21]

(7) *Satisfaction:* Does the proposed intertextual relationship "make sense"? After delineating the first six guidelines in a scientific manner, Hays surprisingly identifies this "difficult to articulate" criterion as "finally the most important test." He continues, "It is in fact another way of asking whether the proposed reading offers a good account of the experience of a contemporary community of competent readers."[22]

Drawing on Riffaterre, Bryan Whitfield offers an additional guideline for locating intertextual allusions:

> In an initial reading of a text, Riffaterre notes, a reader discovers anomalies, or 'bumps in the text,' that disrupt her expectations and force her to search outside the linear constraints of an initial reading of the text to develop a deeper level of reading that can provide an explanation of the text's significance...[23]

---

[20] *Echoes,* 31.
[21] *Echoes,* 31.
[22] *Echoes,* 31.
[23] Bryan J. Whitfield, "Joshua Traditions and the Argument of Hebrews 3 and 4″ (Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 2007), 80-81.

This concept of "bumps in the text" fits well with Hays's discussion of "satisfaction" as a criterion. If a "bump" in the text can be resolved by reading in light of an earlier text, the effect of the proposed intertextual relationship will be more "satisfactory."

Traditioned Text

While Hays's work demonstrates an admirable focus on the text, he has justly been criticized for ignoring an essential piece of the puzzle – tradition. His stated methodological commitment to the Scriptural texts risks shutting out important voices that may inform a contextual reading. During the extended chronological gaps between the composition of the OT texts and their use by NT authors, those texts developed interpretive traditions which affected how they were understood. The writers of the NT read their Scriptures within the context of their communities' interpretations and hermeneutical practices.

EXEGESIS OF JOHN 18-19

In the Gospel of John, the crucifixion of Jesus represents the decisive "hour" of

revelation (7:39; 12:16, 23; 13:31; 17:1). On the cross, the Son of Man is "lifted up"

(ὑψόω, 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34) and "glorified" (δοξάζω, 12:23; 13:31; 17:1). Like many

other Johannine pericopes, the narrative functions on two levels – the perspective of "the

flesh" sees only an execution, but the true vision of the Spirit recognizes "the passion of a

sovereign king who has overcome the world."[24] Previously developed *leitmotifs*

converge into a kerygmatic portrait of Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of God" (20:31).

Gospel Context

John's account of Jesus' arrest, trials, and crucifixion is distinctive among the Gospels

because of its triumphant tone.[25] While it agrees with the Synoptics on the basic events, it

casts them in a different light. In the Synoptics, the cross is a place of humiliation, and

Jesus' vindication occurs at the resurrection (see Acts 2:22-36; compare also Gal 3:13;

Phil 2:8; Heb 12:2).[26] In John, the moment of triumph begins *on the cross* (τετέλεσται,

19:30; compare 17:4; Rev 21:6).[27] Jesus' being "lifted up from the earth" (12:32-33) on

---

[24] R. E. Brown, "The Passion According to John: Chapters 18 and 19," *Worship* 49, no. 3 (1975): 134.

[25] It is debated whether or not the evangelist had access to other sources, such as Mark's gospel or an independently-circulating passion narrative.

[26] (With the exception of Mark, which does not include the resurrection.)

[27] Compare Paul's theology of the cross in 1 Cor 1:18-25.

the cross begins his re-ascent and return to the Father;[28] the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascent are all of one piece.

The passion narrative stands at the climax of the Fourth Gospel. Following R. E. Brown, interpreters generally recognize two main sections in John, the Book of Signs (1:19-12:50) and the Book of Glory (13:1-21:23). In the Book of Signs, the incarnate Word reveals God to the world, through seven "signs" (σημεῖα) and seven discourses. Tension builds as opposition arises but Jesus' "hour" has not yet come (2:4; 7:30; 8:20). The Book of Signs concludes with a tragic verdict: "Even after Jesus had done all these miraculous signs [σημεῖα] in their presence, they still would not believe in him" (12:37). This has been described as the low point in John's gospel. In the Book of Signs, the plot progresses downward; Jesus "reveals his glory" (2:11; compare 1:14) but those who "love darkness instead of light" (3:19) respond to increasing revelation with increasing hostility and obstinate unbelief. Jesus' "hour" has at last arrived (12:23; 13:1; 17:1). Having completed his ministry of proclamation, he prepares to complete his mission and return to the Father (13:1; 17:4-5). He readies the disciples for his imminent departure, through extended discourses replete with Johannine theology. Once he has explained to the disciples what must take place, Jesus resolutely goes out to meet the arresting party (14:30-31; 18:1, ταῦτα εἰπὼν Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθεν).

Throughout the passion narrative, John emphasizes Jesus' intentionality, authority, and obedience to the Father (18:4-9, 11, 20-23, 32, 36-37; 19:11, 26-27, 28a, 30). Brown goes so far as to say, "The Jesus who comes at last to his hour (Jn 13:1) in the fourth

---

[28] See Godfrey C. Nicholson, *Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema* (Ph.D. Diss., Vanderbilt University, 1980; repr., Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1983).

gospel is a different dramatic character from the Jesus of the synoptic passion narratives."[29] There is no anguished Gethsemane (but see 12:27); Jesus has already resolved to "drink the cup the Father has given [him]" (18:11b; compare Matt 26:27; Mark 14:36; Luke 22:42). It is not Jesus who "falls to the ground" (in prayer; Matt 26:39; Mark 14:35; Luke 22:41), but his adversaries, as before the epiphany of a deity (18:6, ὡς οὖν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἐγώ εἰμι ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ ἔπεσαν χαμαί; the Divine Name is repeated in 18:8, ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι). While Judas is present as the "betrayer" (ὁ παραδιδοὺς, 18:2), he does not step forward to identify Jesus as in the Synoptics; Jesus hands himself over (18:4-8).

John devotes particular attention to the trials, as these provide an ideal opportunity for theologically-loaded dialogue. The courtroom setting brings the gospel's ongoing judgment/testimony motif to a crescendo (see, for example, κρίνω/κρίμα in 3:17-19; 5:22, 30; 7:24, 51; 8:15-16, 26, 50; 9:39; 12:47-48; 16:11 and μαρτυρία in 1:7, 19; 3:11, 32, 33; 5:31, 32, 34, 36; 8:13, 17; 21:24). John's gospel is unique in describing two separate Jewish trials – one with Annas (18:12-14) and another with Caiaphas (18:19-24).[30] He also devotes the most space to the trial before Pilate (18:29-38), in which he characterizes the Roman governor as a vacillating character torn between making a right judgment or maintaining his own political advantage (19:12; compare 12:43, ἠγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἤπερ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ).[31] The Synoptics emphasize Jesus'

---

[29] "The Passion According to John," 127.

[30] Mark reports trials before "the high priest" (14:53-65) and Pilate (15:2-5), Matthew includes "Caiaphas the high priest" (26:57-68) and Pilate (27:11-14), and Luke includes "the high priest" (22:54-55, 63-71. Elsewhere, Luke names both Caiaphas and Annas as high priests. See Luke 3:2; Acts 4:6), Pilate (23:1-5, 13-16), and Herod (23:6-12).

[31] Herod is not mentioned anywhere in the Fourth Gospel, despite multiple references to him in each of the Synoptics.

silence in the Roman trial (Matt 27:12-14; Mark 15:3-5; Luke 23:9-10), but in John he is

anything but silent. While he does refuse Pilate an answer at one point (19:9-10),[32] Jesus

dominates the conversation. Brown observes, "So eloquent and self-assured is Jesus that

we can scarcely speak of Pilate's trial of Jesus in the fourth gospel; it is Pilate who is on

trial to see whether he is of the truth."[33] The three trials are punctuated by Peter's denials

(18:15-18, 25-27), which contrast with Jesus' unwavering witness to the truth (18:20-23,

37). Even Peter's failure serves to remind readers of Jesus' foreknowledge (see 13:38).

Brown describes the crucifixion scene as "a series of short vignettes" which

become "vehicles of particularly Johannine theology."[34] John's account lacks many

darker details found in the Synoptics, such as the crowds' mockery, the darkness at noon,

and the cry of dereliction. Forestell observes, "In a general way the evangelist avoids

portraying Jesus in a humiliating light at the supreme moment of his career."[35] Jesus

actively and consciously participates in carrying out the Father's will. He goes to

Golgotha "carrying his own cross" (19:17). When he sees his mother standing nearby, he

provides for her future needs (19:25-27). Even at his death, Jesus acts with authority; he

declares, "It is finished," meaning that he has completed his Father's work (19:30;

compare 17:4), and then purposefully "hands over" his spirit (παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα,

19:30).[36]

---

[32] Probably an allusion to Isa 53

[33] "The Passion According to John," 129.

[34] "The Passion According to John," 132

[35] Terrence J. Forestell, *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974), 82-83.

[36] The verb παραδίδωμι occurs several times earlier in the narrative: Judas' betrayal (18:2; 5; 19:11), the chief priests' handing Jesus over to Pilate (18:30, 35, 36), and Pilate's handing Jesus over to be crucified (19:16). This may be another use of irony; Judas, the Jewish leaders, and Pilate think they are the actors, but in reality the Father and Son are in control the whole time. They do not take Jesus' life, but he "hands it over" by his own authority.

Joseph of Arimathea and Nicodemus give Jesus a burial fit for a king. Most

tombs in first-century Palestine held the remains of many bodies. Only the wealthy and

powerful had their own tombs (compare Matt 27:60). According to John, Nicodemus

brings *one hundred litras* (about seventy-five pounds) of mixed myrrh and aloes (19:39),

an enormous amount of spices for a single burial. This detail recalls Mary's anointing

Jesus at Bethany (John 12:1-8). She uses "a *litra* of pure nard" (12:3; λίτρα occurs only

twice in the NT – in John 12:3 and 19:39), and Jesus interprets her action as preparation

for his burial (12:7). The parallel cues the reader to remember the setting of this first

burial preparation: "Six days before the Passover … in Bethany, where Lazarus was,

whom Jesus had raised from the dead" (12:1). In the episode at Bethany, the audience

has seen both Jesus' foreknowledge of his coming death and his power to overcome death

(11:25). John uses this inner-textual allusion to incorporate into the burial account

anticipation of Jesus' resurrection. The passion narrative ends in a "garden" (κῆπος,

19:41), as it began in another κῆπος (18:2). This framing device adds to the sense of

divine control which pervades the narrative.

Metaphors of Duality and Dramatic Irony

John employs symbolic antitheses to cast the narrative in a theological framework. Light,

vision, and truth characterize the divine reality, while darkness, blindness, and falsehood

characterize the world. Those who belong to the former reality live according to the

Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμά), while those who are "of the world" live according to the flesh (ἡ

σάρξ). During the trials, the evangelist also uses the characters' movement between

"inside" and "outside" to provide theological commentary. In the symbolic universe of

the Fourth Gospel, there is no middle ground; whoever comes to Jesus "has crossed over from death to life," while whoever rejects Jesus "is dead, even while living" (5:24). These dualistic pairs run throughout the gospel, so that at this point the audience recognizes them easily. The literary conceit draws readers into John's conceptual world. To make sense of the narrative, we must learn the author's symbols and adjust our frame of reference. That shift in perspective is analogous to John's concept of conversion; the Spirit-filled believer sees the same events with new understanding.[37]

Those who reject Jesus' testimony, on the other hand, "see" but do not "understand" (12:40). They are, figuratively, "in the dark." John mentions the opponents' "seeing" Jesus at pivotal moments in the passion narrative. Pilate says, "Look (ἴδε), I am bringing him out to you, that you may know (ἵνα γνῶτε) I find no guilt in him" (19:4). He presents Jesus to them, dressed as a king, and proclaims, "Look (Ἰδού), the man!" (19:5). When they "see" him (ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτόν), they shout "Crucify!" (19:6). Pilate brings Jesus out to them again, saying, "Look (Ἴδε), your king!" (19:14; compare 12:15). Even with the Truth literally before their eyes, their spiritual blindness occludes understanding (18:38a; compare John 12:40).

These symbolic binaries contribute to heavy dramatic irony, as "the light shines in the darkness, but the darkness did not grasp it [κατέλαβεν]" (1:4). The narrative proceeds in a series of ironic misunderstandings, in which the characters' words and actions bear a significance they themselves fail to see. The world believes that Jesus is on trial, but in

---

[37] See especially the ironic exchange in 9:39-41, immediately following the "sign" of Jesus' healing a man born blind: Jesus said, "For judgment I have come into this world, so that the blind will see and those who see will become blind." Some Pharisees who were with him heard him say this and asked, "What? Are we blind too?" Jesus said, "If you were blind, you would not be guilty of sin; but now that you claim you can see, your guilt remains."

truth it is being judged (19:10,13; compare 3:19; 12:31,48). The crowds choose Barabbas

("son of the father") and reject the Son of God. Pilate and his minions proclaim Jesus'

kingship in mockery, while Jesus' own people insist, "We have no king but Caesar!" The

Jewish leaders carefully avoid ritual impurity because of Passover (18:28), even as the

institution finds fulfillment in Jesus. Pilate is perhaps the most ironic, as the vacillating

judge whose supposed "authority" (19:10) is undermined by the crowd: "Inside the

praetorium he is the judge who gradually turns out to be the accused, as representative of

the unbelieving world; outside the praetorium he is Jesus' advocate whose utterances

have a deeper meaning than he realizes himself."[38] When Pilate claims, "I have power

(ἐξουσία) either to free you or to crucify you" (19:10), he is blind to the truth. It is Jesus

who has the authority (ἐξουσία) to lay down His life and take it up again (10:18; compare

14:30-31; 18:11; 19:11). Only those who recognize who Jesus is can understand the

cosmic significance of the events taking place. At the center of each of these

misunderstandings is the question of Jesus' identity and mission.

"The King of the Jews"

Throughout John's gospel, people have been asking who Jesus is (8:25; 12:23). These

questions find their answer when "the Son of Man is lifted up" (12:32-34 ; 8:28). Jesus is

revealed as the true king and the obedient Son.

John's literary artistry is at its peak for the ironic coronation scene in 19:1-5. It

has been observed that the Roman trial is arranged in an elaborate chiastic pattern, with

this pericope in the emphatic center.[39] The soldiers put a royal robe on Jesus and crown

---

[38] Martinus de Jonge, "Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel," *ETL* 49 (1973), 175.
[39] Gary M. Burge, *John* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 488-489.

Him as king, but they do not realize who He is.

The crucifixion scene continues the presentation of Jesus as suffering king. John's description, "Here they crucified him, and with him two others – one on each side and Jesus in the middle," pictures "Jesus on the throne of the cross, in the midst of his two assistants."[40] Pilate has prepared a notice (τίτλος) declaring Jesus' kingship, and he emphatically refuses to alter it. Sabbe has suggested that "The term τίτλος (John 19:19), a Latin loanword, was perhaps chosen instead of αἰτία (Matt 27:37) or ἐπιγραφή (Mark 15:26, Luke 23:38) because it could imply a connotation of honour."[41] The sign in John includes Jesus' full title, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων (19:19; contrast Mark 15:26 and Luke 23:38, which include only ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων and Matt 27:37, which reads οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων), which may add solemnity. Pilate is merely mocking the Jews when he says, "What I have written, I have written" (19:22), but John sees deeper significance, comparable to the unwitting prophecy of Caiaphas (11:49-52; 18:14).

Because the sign is written "in Aramaic, Latin, and Greek" (19:20; in John only), "the title functions as a public proclamation of Jesus' kingship to the whole world, to Jews and Gentiles."[42] Jesus' promise is coming true: "I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself" (12:32). It is possible that in this context the soldiers' division of Jesus' clothes into four parts has significance; four can suggest universality, as the "four corners of the earth" (Rev 7:1; 20:8) or the "four winds" (Jer 49:36; Ezek 37:9; Dan 7:2; 8:8; 11:4; Zech 2:6; Matt 24:31; Mark 13:27; Rev 7:1). The

---

[40] Maurits Sabbe, "The Johannine Account of the Death of Jesus and Its Synoptic Parallels (Jn 19:16b-42)," *ETL* 70 (1994), 56.

[41] Sabbe, "The Johannine Account," 57.

[42] Sabbe, "The Johannine Account," 57.

exiles of Israel are sometimes described as being scattered "to the four winds" and in the last days they will return (Zech 2:6; Matt 24:31; Mark 13:27). There is also a garment that is "seamless, woven in one piece from top (ἄνωθεν) to bottom." On the symbolic level, these details bring to mind Jesus' purpose to die "for the scattered children of God, to bring them together and make them one" (John 11:52; compare 17:21).

Behind Pilate's question "Are you the King of the Jews?" lies a misunderstanding that has been going on throughout the Gospel (see 10:24-25). The passion narrative shows that Jesus *is* a king, but in a redefined sense of kingship. The title βασιλεύς is applied to Jesus early in the Gospel, when Nathaniel confesses, "You are the Son of God; you are the King of Israel" (1:49). This is the proper way to understand Jesus' kingship, in light of His Sonship.

Throughout the Gospel, others fail to believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and they misunderstand what sort of king he is. After the feeding of the five thousand, the Jews try to "come and make him king by force" (6:14). Just as they are looking for physical bread, rather than spiritual bread (6:26-27), so they are seeking an earthly king, not a king "from above."

A similar misunderstanding is evident at the Triumphal Entry. The crowds come out to meet Jesus as if they are welcoming a political liberator; the construction ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ (12:13) suggests the παρουσία of a ruler after a military victory.[43] Their shouts of "Hosanna" (ὡσαννά, a transliteration of a shortened form of הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא - "save us" - in Ps 118:25; LXX renders the phrase σῶσον δή) have a double meaning they cannot understand yet; they will be saved not from the Romans but from their sin

---

[43] Compare Polybius 5.26.8; Diodorus Siculus 18.59.3; Josephus, *Ant.,* 13.101

(compare the similar misunderstanding in 8:32-36). The crowds' cheer, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord," comes from Ps 118:25-26, but they significantly add "blessed is *the King of Israel*," which does not appear in that Psalm. John is again playing with double meanings; Jesus *is* the King of Israel, but he is not the earthly king the crowds want. He comes "gentle and riding on a donkey" (i.e., in peace). The wider context of the Ps 118 quotation contains the propheψy of the rejected cornerstone (118:22) which will be fulfilled that very week (cited in Matt 21:42; Mark 12:10; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; 1 Pet 2:7; see also Zech 4:7, "Then he will bring out the capstone to shouts of 'God bless it! God bless it!'"). Pilate's announcement, "Behold, your king" (19:14), recalls the quotation of Zech 9:9 in John 12:15.

During the trial before Pilate, these conflicting ideas of kingship contribute to the irony. The Jews accuse Jesus of being a political agitator, but even Pilate sees that this is a false charge (18:38; 19:4). They charge Jesus with "making himself a king" (βασιλέα ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν, 19:12b), yet earlier he resisted their attempts to "make him king" (ἵνα ποιήσωσιν βασιλέα, 6:15). They do not want a king "from above," but an earthly king. Jesus is a king "from above," and they will not receive him (compare 5:43). This is clear in the bitter irony by which they demand the release of Barabbas, a λῃστής, but have Jesus crucified.[44] A λῃστής is not merely a "thief," but a revolutionary who engaged in violent acts against the Roman government. John makes this clear: "Now Barabbas had taken part in a rebellion" (18:40).

Inside the Praetorium, Jesus reveals the nature of his kingship. His kingdom is

---

[44] Significantly, the word λῃστής also occurs in chapter 10 (vv. 1, 8, and 10), for the thief who tries to trick the sheep. The true sheep will not listen to the thief, but only to the voice of their shepherd (compare 19:37, "Everyone who is of the truth listens to my voice.") By rejecting the Shepherd and choosing a λῃστής, the crowd shows that they are not God's sheep (10:26).

"not of this world," but "from another place" (18:36). Jesus has come into the world "to testify to the truth" (18:37), which in Johannine language means revealing the Father (see 12:27b-28a; 17:4, 6). Framing the coronation scene in 19:2-5 are two reminders of Jesus' Sonship: a play on the name Barabbas (which means "son of the father") and the real charge of the Jews, "He claimed to be the Son of God" (19:7). When a frightened Pilate asks Jesus, "Where do you come from?" (19:8), the reader of John knows the answer: "from above."[45] It is by virtue of his origin with the Father that Jesus is the true King of Israel. Throughout the Gospel are affirmations of Jesus' oneness with the Father and his obedience (1:1; 5:20-38; 10:30; 17:1-5). Thus, Kingship for Jesus means being the obedient Son of the Father, who lays down his life and takes it up again (10:17-18; 12:27-28; 14:31).

Since Jesus' kingdom is heavenly, not earthly, he is a persecuted king (18:36; 1:10-11; 17:14). Jesus takes on the role of the Suffering Servant. John plays on the double meaning of ὑψόω, which means literally "to lift up." In most cases, this means exaltation, but it can also mean to "lift up" on a cross.[46] Jesus' statement, "When you have lifted up [ὑψώσητε] the Son of Man, then you will know that I Am [ἐγώ εἰμι]" (8:28) echoes LXX Isa 52:13, "My servant…will be lifted up and glorified" (ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται). The Isaiah prophecy goes on to speak of one who reveals God but is rejected: "Who has believed our message and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?" (cited in John 12:37-38). The description of Jesus' death, "He handed over his spirit" (19:30, παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα), recalls LXX Isa 53:12, "He gave his life over to

---

[45] Questions about Jesus' origin have been raised in 6:42; 7:27-28; 8:14; 9:29-30.
[46] BDAG, ὑψόω.

death … and because of their sins he was handed over" (παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ … καὶ δία τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη).

Conclusion

John's testimony presents a theological portrait of Jesus which demands a response. The vignettes and dialogues function much like the σημεῖα in the Book of Signs: They point beyond themselves to the incarnate Word (who in like manner makes known the unseen God; 1:18). The evangelist *shows* who Jesus is, inviting us to "come and see" (1:46; 4:29; 12:21). For John, "there is no disciple at second hand,"[47] because faith is not merely knowledge about Jesus but participation in him by the Spirit. Through Jesus' words to Thomas, John addresses the audience(s) who will receive his testimony: "Because you have seen me, you have believed. *Blessed are they who have not seen, yet have believed*" (20:29, emphasis added).

---

[47] In the words of Sören Kierkegaard. "There is no disciple at second hand. The first and the last are essentially on the same plane, only that a later generation finds its occasion in the testimony of a contemporary generation … The immediate contemporaneity is so far from being an advantage that the contemporary must precisely desire its cessation, lest he be tempted to devote himself to seeing and hearing with his bodily eyes and ears, which is all a waste of effort and a grievous, aye a dangerous toil … If the successor therefore understands himself he will wish that the contemporary testimony be not altogether too voluminous, and above all not filling so many books that the world can scarce contain them." *Philosophical Fragments* (Translated. Repr., Knoxville, Ken.: Feather Trail Press, 2009). This excerpt from Kierkegaard is also a fantastic example of intertextual echo, because it contains strong resonances with the Gospel of John but does not cite John or even indicate its dependence on a prior text.

OT CITATIONS AND ALLUSIONS IN JOHN 18-19

Since John gives his testimony (μαρτυρία) in order that his audience "may believe that Jesus is the Christ" (20:31), he must demonstrate how the Jesus he depicts fulfills Israel's Messianic expectations. To construct his case, John interweaves his account of the events with Scriptural quotations and allusions. It is vital to the evangelist that Jesus' work is in continuity with the eternal purpose of Israel's God (see John 1:1-5). In the Fourth Gospel, to "believe in Jesus" is to acknowledge him as the Messiah foretold in the Old Testament. Philip claims to have found ὃν ἔγραψεν Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ καὶ οἱ προφῆται (1:45). Rather than provide a list of proof-texts demonstrating Jesus' Messianic credentials, John invites readers to "come and see" (1:46). His symbolic world creates in the audience a new way of seeing. As John incorporates elements of Scripture, by both direct citation and allusion, readers come to understand the source texts in a new light. Not only does the source text illuminate the gospel narrative, but John's Messianic vision transforms the readers' perception of the original. The old and the new become inextricably melded together.

"Fulfillment" Citations

John's passion narrative includes three direct citations of the Old Testament - 19:24 (LXX Ps 21:19), 19:36 (LXX Exod 12:10, 46 and/or LXX Ps 33:21), and 19:37 (MT Zech

12:10).[48] I will begin with these, because the clarity of their use may help elucidate less

clear allusions. The formula ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ introduces the quotations in 19:24

and 19:36, and the construction καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει links the citation in 19:37 to

that of the preceding verse (see also John 12:39, ὅτι πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας). The purpose

clause ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ announces Scriptural citations only in the second half of

John's gospel (12:38; 13:18; 15:25; 17:12; 19:24,36), marking a transition from the

"Book of Signs" to the "Book of Glory." In the Book of Signs, most quotations are

introduced by ἐστιν γεγραμμένον (2:17; 6:31,45; 10:34; 12:14). The similar formula

καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή occurs in 7:38 and 7:42, while 1:23 and 12:13 contain clear OT

citations in dialogue, with no explicit marker. From 12:38 on, however, ἵνα πληρωθῇ

introduces *all* quotations of Scripture (12:39 and 19:37 by their pairing with 12:38 and

19:36). The shift in formulae corresponds with the transition from the time of

expectation, in which Jesus' "hour" (ὥρα) has not yet come (2:4; 7:30; 8:20; see also 7:6,

which uses καιρὸς) to the time of revelation: "The hour has come for the Son of Man to

be glorified" (12:23).

For all John's emphasis on the fulfillment of Scripture (1:45; 2:22; 5:39; 12:38-

41; 19:28), explicit quotations seem curiously sparse in the climactic passion narrative.

The three that are present appear clustered together (19:24; 36, 37), leaving the rest of

this long account devoid of citations. It seems to me that in these two chapters, as is

---

[48] Many interpreters also include 19:28 (μετὰ τοῦτο εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή λέγει διψῶ). They read ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή as another introductory formula ("Knowing that all was now completed, and so that the Scripture would be fulfilled, Jesus said, 'I am thirsty,'" NIV) and look for a citation in λέγει διψῶ or the events immediately following. No clear source text can be identified, though Ps 22:15 and Ps 69:21 are popular candidates. I attach ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή to the preceding clause, ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται ("Everything was already accomplished so that Scripture would be fulfilled.")

often the case with the Fourth Gospel, John intends his audience to infer more from the text than is stated explicitly.   There is a dizzying substructure of allusions, but seeing it requires knowledge of both the Old Testament and the rest of John's gospel. I will attempt to demonstrate that each of the explicit citations functions metaleptically, guiding readers to consider the source text and the Johannine narrative in correspondence with one another.

John 19:24

The source of the first OT citation is the least difficult to identify. John 19:24 reads Διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον, which exactly matches Ps 21:19 in the Septuagint. The LXX accurately translates the Hebrew יְחַלְּקוּ בְגָדַי לָהֶם וְעַל־לְבוּשִׁי יַפִּילוּ גוֹרָל׃ (MT Ps 22:18). John makes an interesting exegetical move, however, in treating the semitic parallelism as two separate events rather than as a hendiadys. The soldiers both divide Jesus' garments among themselves (19:23) *and* cast lots for the undivided tunic (19:24a). They thus unwittingly fulfill twin prophecies simultaneously (Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιῶται <u>ταῦτα</u> ἐποίησαν, 19:25).[49]

Although the Synoptics also recall LXX Ps 21:19 (Matt 27:35; Mark 15:24; Luke 23:34), they use allusion rather than direct citation.[50] Mark and Matthew do include a (possible) quotation of Ps 22:1, on the lips of Jesus himself.[51] It is intriguing that John does not avail himself of more proof-texts from this psalm, despite his probable familiarity with them. Perhaps John intends his reference as *metalepsis*, pointing his biblically literate audience to the entire source psalm. This is a psalm of praise, attributed

---

[49] Compare the similar literalism in Matt 21:2-7 (citing LXX Zech 9:9): ἤγαγον τὴν ὄνον καὶ τὸν πῶλον καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ ἐπεκάθισεν ἐπάνω <u>αὐτῶν</u>.

to King David, in which a righteous servant of God experiences suffering and humiliation but is in the end vindicated and exalted. Typological associations with the death and resurrection of Jesus are obvious. The phrase John cites occurs at the end of the first portion of the source psalm, which contains the psalmist's complaint, immediately preceding the shift in tone from mournful to triumphant. A first-century Jewish audience would likely have recognized the cue and understood the unwritten foreshadowing of Jesus' resurrection.

John may also intend his audience to see the connection with David. By demonstrating a prophetic utterance of David fulfilled in Jesus, the evangelist portrays Jesus as the promised Davidic king.[52] Despite the motif of Jesus' kingship (1:49; 6:15; 12:13; 18:33, 37, 39; 19:3, 12, 14-15, 19-21), explicit references to King David are curiously absent in the Fourth Gospel. While David receives mention seven times in Mark,[53] fourteen times in Matthew,[54] and twelve times in Luke,[55] his name appears only once in John (7:42), and that in the context of the crowds' doubting Jesus' messianic qualifications. John insists that although Jesus *is* a king (18:37), his kingdom is "not

---

[50] (I am not calling these "quotations" because they are not identified by any citation formula and do not break the flow of the narrative. A reader unfamiliar with LXX Ps 21 would not suspect that the gospel writers are referencing an earlier work.) In all three, the most significant alteration is the shift from a first person pronoun (LXX Ps 21:19 - διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον) to the third person (Matt 27:35 - διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ βάλλοντες κλῆρον), so that the statement refers to Jesus. Other differences from the LXX merely alter the syntax for stylistic purposes. For example Matthew and Mark replace ἔβαλον with the participle βάλλοντες, while Luke retains ἔβαλον as the finite verb but replaces διεμερίσαντο with the participle διαμεριζόμενοι. The dependence on LXX Ps 21:19 is so clear that both NA[27] and Aland's *SQE* display Matt 27:33, Mark 15:24, and Luke 23:34b as direct citations. The *Textus Receptus* for Matt 27:33 even includes the additional clause ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ προφήτου, διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια μου ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον, under the influence of John 19:24.

[51] It is debated whether or not the evangelists present Jesus' *intentionally* quoting the psalm.

[52] On the theme of Jesus' kingship in the Gospel of John, see Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Leiden: Brill, 1967).

[53] 2:25; 10:47, 48; 11:10; 12:35, 36, 37

[54] 1:1, 6, 17, 20; 9:27; 12:3, 23; 15:22; 20:30, 31; 21:9; 21:15; 22:42, 43, 45

[55] 1:27, 32, 69; 2:4, 11; 3:31; 6:3; 18:38, 39; 20:41, 42, 44

from this world" (18:36; compare 6:15). In the κόσμος that rejects God's truth, the Son of

God encounters hostility (1:11; 3:19-20; 15:18-25). For John, it is this role of righteous

sufferer that links Jesus with David.

Aside from the use of Ps 21:19 (LXX), a geographical detail recalls David's

rejection by Israel (and his later restoration). John locates Jesus' arrest πέραν τοῦ

χειμάρρου τοῦ Κεδρὼν (18:1). The Kidron Valley receives no other mention in the NT.

In the OT, however, we read that King David crossed the Kidron Valley (ὁ βασιλεὺς

διέβη τὸν χειμάρρουν Κεδρων; 2 Sam 15:23) and went up the Mount of Olives (καὶ

Δαυιδ ἀνέβαινεν ἐν τῇ ἀναβάσει τῶν ἐλαιῶν; 2 Sam 15:30) as he and his entourage fled

Jerusalem during Absalom's rebellion. In both cases, the rightful king goes out from

Jerusalem across the Kidron Valley, accompanied by followers, and is betrayed by a close

associate (2 Sam 15:12, 31; John 13:21-30; 18:5b).[56]

John 19:36

The source of the second OT citation is more difficult to identify. When the soldiers

decide not to break Jesus' legs, the witness sees Scriptural significance: ἐγένετο γὰρ

ταῦτα ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ· Ὀστοῦν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ. It is debated which

γραφή John has in mind. One candidate is LXX Ps 33:21 (MT 34:20), which reads

κύριος φυλάσσει πάντα τὰ ὀστᾶ αὐτῶν ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ συντριβήσεται. John's wording

differs only slightly, replacing ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν with the antecedent ὀστᾶ and replacing the

plurals τὰ ὀστᾶ and αὐτῶν with the singulars ὀστοῦν and αὐτοῦ. The use of αὐτοῦ may

be John's adaptation of the LXX to suit the context (in which it refers to Jesus). Another

---

[56] Brown names several scholars who have also made this connection. See R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John, XIII-XXI* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1970), 806.

possibility is that John is translating from the Hebrew, which uses a singular pronominal suffix (עַצְמוֹתָיו, antecedent צַדִּיק). There is, however, another possible source text - LXX Exod 12:10, ὀστοῦν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ (= Exod 12:46; compare Num 9:12). This text has the singulars ὀστοῦν and αὐτοῦ, but uses an active verb (συντρίψετε) rather than the passive (συντριβήσεται), and although the form is indicative, it has the force of an imperative (translating the Hebrew categorical injunction לֹא תִשְׁבְּרוּ, MT Exod 12:46). In the MT of Exod 12, the command not to break any bones appears only once (v. 46), but in the LXX it also occurs in verse 10, perhaps by a scribal error. The absence of ἀπ᾽ in John 19:36 may be evidence against this source or may simply reflect John's correction of the LXX's wooden translation.[57]

It seems likely to me that John is drawing on both of these texts, conflating them to combine two OT motifs – the Paschal Lamb and the righteous sufferer. Various scholars have traced the passover lamb imagery in the Gospel of John. When the Baptist first sees Jesus, he proclaims, "Look, the lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world!" (1:29). The eucharistic language after the feeding of the 5,000 (John 6:35, 48-58), in a setting reminiscent of Israel's exodus and wandering with Moses,[58] suggests that Jesus has come as the passover lamb of a new covenant. John emphasizes this connection by the chronological setting of the feeding miracle and the "Bread of Life" discourse: ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων (6:4). Within the passion narrative, John includes several reminders that it is the time of Passover (18:28b, 39; 19:14; see also 11:55; 12:1; 13:1). John's chronology diverges from the Synoptics', so

---

[57] The use of the prepositional phrase ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ reflects the Hebrew בּוֹ but is unnatural to Greek, which would normally use a possessive pronoun.

[58] C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 38 (1947), 157.

that the crucifixion takes place on the day the passover lambs were slaughtered. Just

before Jesus' death, John writes, one of the soldiers places a wine-soaked sponge "on (a

stalk of) hyssop [ὑσσώπῳ]" (19:29) to give him a drink. While the Synoptics also report

Jesus' being given wine-vinegar to drink, none details what sort of stick is used. For

John's audience, "hyssop" would have immediately brought to mind the first Passover

(Ex. 12:22), as well a broader association with ceremonial cleansing (Lev 14:4-6, 49-52;

Num 19:6, 18; Ps 51:7; see also Heb 9:19). It is worth noting that LXX Exod 12:13

refers to the lamb's blood on the doorposts as a "sign" (καὶ ἔσται τὸ αἷμα ὑμῖν ἐν σημείῳ),

John's favorite term for a miracle - a visible manifestation of divine power which points

toward faith in Jesus (2:11, 23; 3:2; 4:48, 54; 6:2, 14, 26, 30; 7:31; 9:16; 10:41; 11:47;

12:18, 37; 20:30). Since John presents Jesus as the one to whom the books of Moses bear

witness (1:45; 5:39, 45-46; compare 1:17), it is within the book's theological trajectory to

see Jesus' vicarious death as the salvific event prefigured in the "sign" of the Passover.[59]

While the passover lamb tradition emphasizes the sacrificial nature of Jesus'

death, the righteous sufferer tradition from Ps 34 (LXX Ps 33) stresses the Father's

providential control of these events (John 14:31; 16:32b; 18:11b; compare 10:17-18;

12:27-28). In its original context, the verse John cites expresses assurance of divine

protection in the midst of affliction: "A righteous man may have many troubles, but the

LORD delivers him from them all; he protects all his bones, not one of them will be

broken" (Ps 34:19-20). Despite appearances, the world has no power over Jesus except

what is given "from above" (John 19:11). The Son obediently lays down his life, "in

---

[59] Similar associations appear in Heb 9-10; 13:10-12; Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 5:7-8, 1 Pet 1:18-19; see especially 1 John 2:2; 4:10; Rev 5:6-14.

order to take it up again" (10:17). To one who recognizes the source context, John's selection of this verse is another reminder of the coming resurrection.

John 19:37

John's third citation, Ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν (19:37) quotes Zech 12:10, with some interesting variations. This is a rare instance in which the evangelist agrees with the Hebrew of the Masoretic text against the Septuagint. While the Hebrew text for this verse reads וְהִבִּיטוּ אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ ("And they will look upon me, the one they have pierced"), the Greek has instead καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο ("and they shall look to me because they have danced triumphantly," NETS). It is possible that the translator transposed the dalet and resh in דקר ("to pierce"), reading instead רקד ("to dance"). It is also possible that the LXX reflects a textual tradition different from that which survives in the MT. In any case, the LXX version does not allow the application to Jesus that John intends. Furthermore, John uses Ὄψονται εἰς rather than ἐπιβλέψονται πρός (LXX) to translate the Hebrew הִבִּיטוּ אֶל. The lexical choice suits its Johannine context. The motif of "seeing" runs throughout the Fourth Gospel, and John consistently employs ὁράω,[60] rather than a form of βλέπω,[61] when he intends a theological/epistemological connotation. Either the evangelist had access to another

---

[60] 1:18, 33, 34, 39, 46, 48, 50, 51; 3:3, 11, 32, 36; 4:29, 45, 48; 5:37; 6:14, 26, 30, 36, 46; 7:52; 8:38, 56, 57; 9:37; 11:32, 40; 12:9, 21, 41; 13:3; 14:7, 9; 15:24; 16:16, 17, 19, 22; 18:26; 19:6, 35, 37; 20:8, 18, 20, 25, 27, 29 (1:47; 5:6; 6:22, 24; 9:1; 11:31, 33, 34; 19:26, 33; 21:21)

[61] Βλέπω occurs in 1:29; 5:19; 9:7, 15, 19, 21, 25, 39, 41; 11:9; 13:22; 20:1, 5; 21:9, 20. In most of these cases, it refers specifically to the capacity for physical sight, as opposed to blindness (all uses in chapter 9) or to observation without comprehension (as in 11:9; 13:22; 20:1, 5). ὁράω is used for witnessing revelatory events that should lead to faith. The juxtaposition of the two terms in 20:1, 5 and 20:9 is illustrative: Mary Magdalene "sees" (βλέπει) that the stone has been rolled away from the tomb, and Peter "sees" (βλέπει) the strips of linen, but they do not understand the significance of these observations. The "beloved disciple," on the other hand, "saw [εἶδεν] and believed." The compound ἐπιβλέπω does not occur in John, and is used only three times in the NT (Luke 1:48; 9:38; Jas 2:3).

Greek translation or he is translating directly from the Hebrew. The second option

challenges some scholars' claim that the author of the Fourth Gospel relies exclusively on

the Septuagint for his OT citations. If John did have recourse to Hebrew texts, as this

instance suggests, it will be necessary to bear in mind not only the LXX but also the MT

in searching for Scriptural allusions and echoes.

This quotation does not, however, agree perfectly with the MT. The evangelist

omits the first person pronominal suffix on אֵלַי ("upon *me*"), retaining only the relative

pronoun (ὃν, for אֵת אֲשֶׁר). Such a redaction facilitates incorporation into John's narrative,

in which ὃν refers to Jesus. It also avoids an awkward shift in the Hebrew source text

from the first person to the third in the middle of Zech 12:10: "They will look on <u>me</u> [

אֵלַי], the one they have pierced, and they will mourn for <u>him</u> [עָלָיו], as one mourns for an

only son." The unusual first person in the Hebrew may, however, be significant by its

absence. In a first-century audience steeped in Israel's Scriptures, there were bound to be

those familiar enough with the source text to notice the redaction – and to remember the

original wording. Within its context, the "me" of MT Zech 12:10 can be none other than

YHWH himself:

> This is the word of the LORD concerning Israel. The LORD, who stretches out
> the heavens, who lays the foundation of the earth, and who forms the spirit of man
> within him, declares: [...]
> And I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit
> of grace and supplication. They will look on me, the one they have pierced, and
> they will mourn for him as one mourns for an only child, and grieve bitterly for
> him as one grieves for a firstborn son. (Zech 12:1, 12)

In selecting this particular bit of text and applying it to Jesus, John may be making a

radical christological claim – Jesus of Nazareth, the incarnate Word, is one with the One

God (θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, John 1:1; μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, John 1:18; compare 1:14; 10:30; 14:9-10; 17:21a).[62]

Even if the christological implication is a stretch, there are other elements in the Zechariah context which have clearer relevance. This four-word quotation anchors a web of symbolic allusions, linking John's account of Jesus' "hour" to prophecy about the eschatological "day" in Zech 12-14. The phrase immediately preceding John's citation reads, "And I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit of grace and supplication" (Zech 12:10a). Jesus' ministry of the Spirit features prominently in John. The verb ἐκχεῶ (LXX Zech 12:10) depicts God's "pouring out" the spirit (πνεῦμα) like water (Compare Isa 44:3, "For I will pour water on the thirsty land [LXX: δώσω ὕδωρ ἐν δίψει τοῖς πορευομένοις, "I will give water to those going about in thirst"] and streams on the dry ground; I will pour out my Spirit [LXX πνεῦμά] on your offspring, and my blessing on your descendants." See also Ezek 39:29; Joel 2:28-29). In John's symbolic world, the Holy Spirit is often paired with water imagery (1:33; 3:5; 4:10-14). An audience familiar with Zechariah could recall the context of John's brief citation, reread the original text in light of John's water-Spirit symbolism, and discover links with nearby Zechariah prophecies involving life-giving water (see also the more extensive allusion to Zech 12:10-12 in Rev 1:7).[63] Immediately following the prophecy

---

[62] The puzzling apposition of the first and third persons in the source text provides a foothold for John's early Trinitarian theology.

[63] Revelation 1:7 picks up the idea of "looking upon" one whom "they have pierced" (following the MT rather than the LXX). It goes beyond the allusion in John 19:37 to include the "mourning" by all "the clans of the earth."

(Rev 1:7) ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν καὶ ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν καὶ κόψονται ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς ναί ἀμήν

(Zech 12:10-12) καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο [אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ] καὶ κόψονται ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν κοπετὸν ὡς ἐπ᾽ ἀγαπητὸν … καὶ κόψεται ἡ γῆ κατὰ φυλὰς φυλάς φυλὴ καθ᾽ ἑαυτὴν

of looking upon and mourning over "the one they have pierced" (Zech 12:10b-14), God

promises, "On that day [בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא] a fountain will be opened to the house of David and

the inhabitants of Jerusalem, to cleanse them from sin and impurity" (13:1).[64] Also "on

that day," (בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא), "living water will flow from Jerusalem" (14:8).

The witness testifies that when the soldier pierced Jesus' side, "there immediately

came forth blood and water" (ἐξῆλθεν εὐθὺς αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ, 19:34). The Johannine

context elucidates the theological message behind this detail, which is not mentioned in

the Synoptics but receives special emphasis in John (19:35). Water constitutes a subtle

but pervasive motif in the Fourth Gospel, where it symbolizes new life in the Spirit.

Jesus tells the Samaritan woman, "If you knew the gift of God and who it is that asks you

for a drink, you would have asked him and he would have given you living water [ὕδωρ

ζῶν]" (4:10). At the Feast of Tabernacles,[65] Jesus proclaims, "Whoever thirsts [διψᾷ], let

him come to me and drink ... as Scripture has said, 'Streams of living water will flow

from within him [ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος]'" (7:37-38;

compare 4:14; τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου εἰς

ζωὴν αἰώνιον). John explains, "He said this about the Spirit, whom those who believed in

him were going to receive" (7:39). The phrase "living water" (ὕδωρ ζῶν) is unique to

John in the NT, and it occurs exactly once in the OT. LXX Zech 14:8, which accurately

---

[64] MT; LXX reads ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἔσται πᾶς τόπος διανοιγόμενος ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Δαυιδ (NETS: "On that day, every place will be opened for the house of David"), reading מָקוֹר ("fountain") as מָקוֹם ("place"), in addition to other changes. Since John's citation of Zech 12:10 matches the Hebrew rather than the LXX, it is reasonable to assume his familiarity with the Hebrew in this case as well.

[65] The Feast of Tabernacles emphasized water (and light). The phrase ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ recalls frequent references to "the day of the Lord" or "that day" in OT prophetic literature. Zechariah, in particular, repeatedly uses "in that day" (LXX, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ) with an eschatological connotation (2:11; 3:10; 9:16; 12:3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11; 13:1, 2, 4; 14:4, 6, 8, 9, 13, 20, 21; compare also 3:9b, "I will remove the sin of this land in a single day").

reflects the Hebrew, reads καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐξελεύσεται <u>ὕδωρ ζῶν</u> ἐξ Ιερουσαλημ. John's description ἐξῆλθεν … ὕδωρ (19:34) recalls ἐξελεύσεται ὕδωρ (LXX Zech 14:8).

In the Book of Signs, "The Spirit was not yet [given],[66] because Jesus had not yet been glorified" (7:39; compare 16:7). At the moment of Jesus' death, however, he "hands over" the spirit (19:30; παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα). John's phrasing invites a double meaning. Literally, it means that Jesus died. In John's symbolic world, however, the language suggests Jesus' "handing over" the promised Holy Spirit. Grammatically, τὸ πνεῦμα could mean either "his [Jesus'] spirit" or "the spirit."[67] It is unconventional to use παραδίδωμι to describe death (Matt 27:50 reads ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα). Following τετέλεσται (19:30), παρέδωκεν connotes intentionality and purpose (compare 10:11, 17-18). The verb also implies that τὸ πνεῦμα is "handed over" *to someone* - the community of believers who will carry on Jesus' mission from the Father (20:21-22; compare 14:12, 16-17; 16:13-15).[68]

Allusions

Aside from the explicit citations and their concurrent webs of allusions, there are several more subtle echoes of Scripture woven into the passion narrative. It is not clear in every case whether the author is consciously troping the OT or these turns of phrase flow naturally from a mind formed by Jewish Scripture and tradition. Of the numerous possible echoes, I will present a few of the clearest, from the Servant Songs in Isaiah.

(1) When Jesus replies to the high priest, "I have spoken openly to the world [Ἐγὼ

---

[66] οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα; literally, "for there was not yet a spirit."
[67] Note that τὴν κεφαλὴν also does not have αὐτοῦ or a possessive adjective.
[68] It has been suggested, from patristic interpreters to the present day, that the outpouring of "blood and water" symbolizes the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. As Jesus "hands over" the Spirit, his work of salvation is accomplished, and the Church is born.

παρρησίᾳ λελάληκα τῷ κόσμῳ] … I said nothing in secret [ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν]"

(19:20), a biblically literate audience might recognize the words of YHWH in Isa 45:6:

> I have not spoken in secret [LXX: οὐκ ἐν κρυφῇ λελάληκα], from somewhere in a
> land of darkness; I have not said to Jacob's descendants, 'Seek me in vain.' I, the
> LORD, speak the truth; I declare what is right.

John's motifs of darkness/secrecy versus light/openness, revelation, testimonial speech,

and divine truth are interwoven in this verse from Isaiah. The immediate context in

Isaiah is also full of Johannine themes and images. These pieces of John and Isaiah

blend easily. Read together, they become mutually interpreting.

(2) When describing the abuse Jesus endures at the hands of the soldiers, John's

lexical choices echo LXX Isaiah in a way the Synoptics' do not:

> τὸν νῶτόν μου δέδωκα εἰς <u>μάστιγας</u> τὰς δὲ σιαγόνας μου εἰς <u>ῥαπίσματα</u> (LXX Isa
> 50:6)
> Τότε οὖν ἔλαβεν ὁ Πιλᾶτος τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ <u>ἐμαστίγωσεν</u> (John 19:1)[69]
> καὶ ἐδίδοσαν αὐτῷ <u>ῥαπίσματα</u> (John 19:3b)[70]

These faint echoes become more compelling in light of the Isaianic context. The Servant

of YHWH is given words to speak (50:4; compare John 12:49-50), obediently endures

suffering, and confidently awaits vindication (50:4-9). He confronts his accusers with

legal language (50:9), well-suited to the extended trial setting in John. The light/darkness

motif concludes this section in Isaiah (50:10-11) in a way that perfectly suits John's own

usage (John 1:5; 3:25; 12:50; etc.).

(3) Finally, the expression παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα (19:30) not only resonates with

its Johannine context (see above), but may also create another link between John's Jesus

and Isaiah's Servant of the Lord. A similar construction with παραδίδωμι appears in the

---

[69] Mark and Matthew use φραγελλόω (Mark 15:15; Matt 27:26). Luke omits this incident.
[70] Mark and Matthew use τύπτω (Mark 15:19; Matt 27:30). Again, Luke is silent.

triumphant conclusion of Isa 53:

> Therefore he shall inherit many,
>   and he shall divide spoils with the strong,
> because his soul was given over to death [παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ],
>   and he was reckoned among the lawless,
> and he bore the sin of many,
>   and because of their sins he was given over [παρεδόθη].[71]

Paul's use of Isa 53:12 in Rom 4:25 (ὃς παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἠγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν) provides evidence that the early Church considered it a prophecy fulfilled by Jesus. John's explicit quotation of LXX Isa 53:1 at the end of the Book of Signs (12:38-41) adds credence to this possible echo. In Isa 53:12, however, we find ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ instead of τὸ πνεῦμα (without αὐτοῦ) as in John 19:30 (but see 15:13, μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει ἵνα τις τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῇ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ). If John is indeed troping Isaiah here, he alters the source in a significant way to allow a double interpretation – not only a sacrificial death, but also the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit. The echo from Isaiah may also foreshadow Jesus' imminent resurrection, because its context refers to one who has been "handed over" to death but restored to life (Isa 53:10-12).

John's description of Jesus' death may draw on the Hebrew of this verse *in addition to* the LXX.[72] Where the LXX has ἀνθ᾽ ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ ("Because his soul was given over to death") the MT reads תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱרָה לַמָּוֶת נַפְשׁוֹ ("Because he poured out his life unto death"). The Hebrew of Isa 53:12 naturally recalls

---

[71] LXX Isa 53:12, NETS
[72] John's use of both LXX and a Hebrew version in direct quotations (as discussed above, with reference to Zech 12:10 in John 19:37) suggests that he had access to both.

a similar idiom in Ps 22:14, "I am poured out like water" (כַּמַּיִם נִשְׁפַּכְתִּי).[73] John's description of the blood and water flowing from Jesus' side (19:34) may also allude to this text, though to a lesser extent than to the prophetic texts discussed above. The shared "pouring out" imagery connects the role of righteous sufferer (Ps 22:14 and context) with that of vicarious sacrifice (MT Isa 53:12) in a way which suits John's portrayal of Jesus' "hour" (compare 1:29; 3:16; 10:11; 12:27; 15:13; 18:11b).

Following any of these strands further can lead to an even more complex web of lexical, thematic, and theological parallels between John and Isaiah. For a community familiar with the wider contexts – as John's readers almost certainly were[74] - simple cues like these could evoke a treasury of Scriptural knowledge.

Implications

There are no doubt many other Scriptural allusions in John's passion narrative, but these are sufficient to demonstrate that John's use of OT texts also recalls their original contexts. Some of these echoes are faint, only a word or phrase, but they may serve as cues pointing to their OT contexts. When these texts' original and new contexts are read alongside one another, they become mutually informing. To an audience well-versed in Scripture, John's interwoven quotations and allusions create a powerful demonstration that Jesus of Nazareth truly is "the one Moses and the prophets wrote about" (1:45).

---

[73] A connection with Psa 22:14 is supported by the likely allusion to Psa 22:15 ("My strength is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue sticks to the roof of my mouth; you lay me in the dust of death") in John 19:28 (λέγει διψῶ). Psa 22:19 is also cited explicitly in John 19:24. The clustering of these three (potential) references to Psa 22:14-19 within John 19:24-34, one of them a direct quotation (John 19:24 // Psa 22:19), increases the likelihood of the proposed allusions in 19:28 (// Psa 22:15) and 19:34 (// Psa 22:14).

[74] The Servant Songs of Isaiah, and especially the portion in chapter 53, were favorites for first-century Christian apologists.

Though I have attempted to pick apart these symbolic webs for analysis, they cannot be properly appreciated on a solely cognitive level. It may be part of their rhetorical power that these allusions are so inter-tangled. Affectively, the result is breathtaking. The subtlety with which John weaves in biblical language makes his testimony all the more compelling; in working to catch the author's cues, we are drawn in, and without trying find ourselves seeing as John sees.

"BEHOLD, THE MAN!"

A PROPOSED ALLUSION IN JOHN 19:5

Having examined these generally recognized allusions in John's passion narrative, I

propose one that is more subtle. In the middle of the trial, Pilate presents Jesus to the

crowd with the words Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος (19:5), "Behold, the man!"[75] This seemingly

inane statement has baffled modern commentators, who offer divergent explanations of

its function in the narrative.[76] One interpreter admits, "The meaning of [Ἰδοὺ ὁ

ἄνθρωπος] in the immediate context of the Gospel of John is by no means clear."[77] I

suggest that it is one of the "bumps in the text" Riffaterre describes, signaling the

---

[75] Ἰδού and ἴδε, like the similar הִנֵּה in Hebrew, is notoriously difficult to translate. Although they derive from the verb εἴδω (to see), they usually function merely as particles. Colloquial English equivalents might include "Here's [noun]" (as in the NIV translation for John 19:5, "Here is the man!"), "All of a sudden" (before a clause), or our similar usage of "Look" to direct someone's attention to something (as in "Look, a frog!") or to introduce an idea (as in "Look, I know you're upset."). In some cases, the most idiomatically sensitive translation choice may be to omit Ἰδού entirely. See discussion in BDAG, ἰδού. Because a detailed discussion of the form is beyond the scope of this paper, I will simply use the common but wooden translation, "Behold!"

[76] See, for example, David Flusser's article, which surveys some prominent theories and presents Flusser's own interpretation. "What Was the Original Meaning of *ECCE HOMO*?" *Immanuel* 19 (Winter 1984/85), 30-40.

audience to look for an intertextual echo.[78] A similar phrase appears in Zech 6:12, ἰδοὺ

ἀνήρ Ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτῷ (LXX; MT הִנֵּה־אִישׁ צֶמַח שְׁמוֹ): "Behold, a man, Shoot is his

name" (NETS). The context in Zechariah bears striking resemblances to the scene John

depicts. Its themes and theological significance also suit John's passion narrative

particularly well. Further, it has been demonstrated in the preceding chapter that John

knows Zechariah (in both Greek and Hebrew versions) and that it is one of his favorite

sources of OT references. To use Hays's criteria, the "availability" of this text to John is

nearly certain, the "recurrence" of its neighboring passages is exceptionally high, and the

strong "thematic coherence" (which will be elaborated below) is perhaps the most

compelling evidence in favor of the echo. This allusion would not be merely

ornamentation for John's narrative; it would have enormous theological significance for

the Fourth Gospel as a whole. By placing the words Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος on the lips of

Pilate at this critical moment in the passion narrative, John is making a bold

christological statement for those who can recognize it.

Context in John

The proclamation Ἰδού ὁ ἄνθρωπος appears in the second of three confrontations

between Pilate and the Jewish leaders during Jesus' trial (18:38b-40; 19:4-7; 19:13-15).

In each of these episodes, Pilate exits the Praetorium and presents Jesus to the crowd.

---

[77] Flusser, "*ECCE HOMO,"* 40. Flusser argues that although the meaning is not clear from the Johannine context, it can be explained by historical data (concerning the cruel nature of Pilate) and its form as a "formula of acclamation" comparable to usage in Greco-Roman literature. I see merit in the *acclamatio* connection, but I think Flusser tries too hard to make the Pilate who appears in John's Gospel match the historical details about him. John uses Pilate to shape the narrative. He is not primarily concerned with providing an accurate transcript of Pilate's words.

[78] See discussion in Bryan Jay Whitfield, "Joshua Traditions and the Argument of Hebrews 3 and 4" (Ph. D. diss., Emory University, 2007), 81 ff.

John casts the Roman governor as an ironic figure, whose statements about Jesus are true in a sense he neither intends nor realizes. By his use of dramatic irony, the evangelist inserts theological commentary into the narrative. In the first and third presentations, Pilate refers to Jesus as "king" (βασιλεύς; 18:39b; 19:14b), a title which occurs frequently in John's passion (18:33, 37, 39; 19:3, 14, 15, 19, 21) and contributes to the kingship motif described earlier in this essay (see Chapter 3). In the second presentation, however, he calls Jesus simply ὁ ἄνθρωπος (19:5b). Contextual cues suggest reading more into these words than just "Here he is!" The soldiers have just placed the crown of thorns on Jesus' head and clothed him in royal purple (19:2). They ironically proclaim, "Hail, King of the Jews!" (19:3). When Jesus emerges from the Praetorium, John repeats that he is "wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe" (19:5a). The preponderance of royal imagery suggests that Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος parallels Ἴδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν (19:14b) not only stylistically but also thematically. Though within the narrative Pilate means nothing more than "the man," John characteristically intends an ironic double meaning. This is also the only episode of the three which mentions the christological title "Son of God" (19:7b). In between the two βασιλεύς presentations, this announcement of Jesus as ὁ ἄνθρωπος may provide the interpretive key to understanding the nature of Jesus' kingship (compare 18:33-37; see also 6:15).

Outside of the passion narrative, two other Ἰδού statements inform the one in 19:5 – the first at the opening of the Book of Signs and the second at its close. At Jesus' first appearance in this gospel, the Baptist twice proclaims, "Behold, the Lamb of God!" (ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; 1:29, 36). Jesus' public ministry concludes with the Triumphal Entry,

where John quotes Zechariah, "Behold, your king is coming" (ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεται; 12:15; citing Zech 9:9). The theme of "seeing" in the Fourth Gospel adds theological significance to Ἰδού and ἴδε (aorist of εἴδω).[79] These "behold" statements occur at crucial points in the narrative, when the characters - as well as the audience - are confronted with Jesus and must decide who he is. The evangelist guides his audience not only to recognize that Jesus is the Messiah, but also to understand what his messiahship means. Together, the Ἰδού proclamations in John present Jesus as "Lamb of God" (1:29, 36), "King" (12:15; 19:14), and ὁ ἄνθρωπος (19:5). Reading Zech 6 into John 19:5 allows ὁ ἄνθρωπος to incorporate the other two titles; the "man, whose name is Branch" is to be both priest and king (Zech 6:13).

<div align="center">

Context in Zechariah

</div>

The Zechariah text under consideration belongs to the pericope in 6:9-15, which corresponds to an earlier episode in Zech 3:1-10. Each of these describes a symbolic action involving the high priest Joshua, coupled with a prophecy about a figure called "Branch." In each, Joshua receives a promise conditional on his obedience to the Lord (3:7; 6:15b). The two pericopes share a concern with the temple, the priesthood, and the restoration of Israel after the exile.

In 3:1-5, Joshua stands in the heavenly court as a representative of Israel, and Satan accuses him before the angel of the Lord. He is wearing "filthy clothes," which

---

[79] Although they usually function as particles, John loves double meanings. εἴδω and its cognates are perfect for John's motif of "seeing" and "knowing." In the present tense, εἴδω meant "to see," but this tense fell out of common usage in Koine, and in the present system ὁράω was used instead. In the aorist, εἴδω maintained the meaning "to see," but in the perfect (οἶδα) its semantic range shifted to "to know." The perfect form came to function as a present, and the pluperfect as an imperfect. These etymological relationships probably play into John's "seeing"/"knowing" motif.

represent the people's guilt. God rebukes Satan and orders that Joshua's garments be replaced with clean ones, to show that his sin has been removed (3:2-5). He promises Joshua, "If you will walk in my ways and keep my requirements, then you will govern my house and have charge of my courts, and I will give you a place among these standing here" (3:7). God then declares, "Listen, O high priest Joshua and your associates seated before you, who are men symbolic of things to come: I am going to bring my servant, the Branch" (3:8). The coming of this "Branch" corresponds with the eschatological Day of the Lord: "I will remove the sin of this land in a single day [LXX ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ]. In that day [LXX ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ], each of you will invite his neighbor to sit under his vine and fig tree" (3:9-10).[80]

In 6:9-15, God commands the prophet to "make a crown and set it on the head of the high priest, Joshua son of Jehozadak" (6:11). The symbolic coronation is unusual, since Joshua is a priest, not a king. After this symbolic action comes another prophecy about the Branch:

> Tell him this is what the LORD Almighty says: 'Here is the man whose name is the Branch, and he will branch out from his place and build the temple of the LORD. It is he who will build the temple of the LORD, and he will be clothed with majesty and will sit and rule on his throne. And he will be a priest on his throne. And there will be harmony between the two.' (6:12-13)

Following instructions to place the crown "in the temple of the Lord" as a "memorial" (6:14), the prophecy about the Branch continues: "Those who are far away will come and help to build the temple of the LORD, and you will know that the LORD Almighty has sent me to you. This will happen if you diligently obey the LORD your God" (6:15).

Taken together, these two pericopes describe the eschatological renewal which

---

[80] Compare John 1:48, 50.

will occur on the Day of the Lord. God promises to remove Israel's sin and restore them

after the exile. The priesthood and the monarchy will be reinstated, and the temple

rebuilt. All of these promises center around the Branch, who will build the temple and

unite the offices of priest and king.

Verbal and Contextual Parallels

The lexical similarity between these two texts is thin. As Hays would say, the echo's

"volume" is low. The phrases share the construction ἰδού + noun, but this is common in

Koine Greek, especially in texts influenced by Hebrew or Aramaic.[81] John's use of ἰδού

(middle) rather than ἴδε (active) weighs in favor of an intertextual echo. While the two

forms do not differ substantially in meaning, John almost always uses ἴδε (1:29, 36, 47;

3:26; 5:14; 7:26; 11:3, 36; 12:19; 16:29; 19:4, 14, 26, 27). Of the three other instances of

ἰδού in John (4:35; 12:15; 16:32), at least one is a direct quotation from Zechariah

(12:15). In the remaining two (4:35; 16:32), ἰδού introduces a prophetic proclamation in

which Jesus attributes eschatological significance to the events surrounding his ministry.

The use of ἰδού in these verses may reflect the influence of OT prophetic texts (such as

LXX Jer 31:31; LXX Mal 3:19) or John's own use of Septuagintal diction to create a

prophetic tone (note context in 4:19, "I see that you are a prophet"). Such stylistic

observations suggest that the ἰδού in 19:5 has added significance. It is all the more

conspicuous because even in the parallel declarations in the same pericope (19:4, 14),

Pilate uses the more common ἴδε. By elevating Pilate's diction, John makes him speak

ironically; the Roman governor means no more than "Look, here he is!", but he fills the

---

[81] Ἰδού usually translates הִנֵּה in the LXX. See BDAG, ἰδού.

role of an unwitting prophet (like Caiaphas in

11:49-52).

The major difficulty is that LXX Zech 6:12 reads ἰδοὺ <u>ἀνήρ</u>, while John 19:5 has

Ἰδοὺ ὁ <u>ἄνθρωπος</u>. John also uses the definite article, which is absent in Zech 6:12 (both

LXX and MT). Although ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος are virtually synonymous, one would

expect John to use the same word if he is really troping Zechariah, especially in such a

short phrase. The difference cannot be explained by John's use of the Hebrew,[82] because

the MT uses אִישׁ (usually translated ἀνήρ) rather than אדם (usually translated ἄνθρωπος).

It could be for stylistic reasons; John prefers ἄνθρωπος, using ἀνήρ only when he means

specifically "husband" (1:13; 4:16, 17, 18) or "male" (1:30; 6:10). ὁ ἄνθρωπος has the

advantage of evoking ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and the images associated with that title (see

John 1:51; 3:13, 14; 5:27; 6:27, 53, 62; 8:28; 9:35; 12:23, 34; 13:1). Aside from its

occurrence in Dan 7:13, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου also appears in LXX Ps 79:16, where the

MT has "son" (בֵּן, MT Ps 80:15). This psalm is a prayer for the restoration of Israel, and

it describes the nation as a "vine" (ἄμπελος) which God brought out of Egypt (79:9).

Later Jewish interpreters understood this vine as a representation of the messiah. It is

also possible that the evangelist has chosen this synonym in order to conflate the

Zechariah prophecy about the "Branch" with related texts which use ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

If John is troping Zechariah here, he has included only the first half of the

statement. It is, however, the second half – Ἀνατολὴ ὄνομα αὐτῷ (MT צֶמַח שְׁמוֹ, "Branch

is his name") – which is the focus of the proclamation in Zechariah. John expects his

---

[82] Unless the author of John had access to another Hebrew text (or another Greek translation). There are, however, no known textual variants at this point.

audience to recognize the allusion and supply this crucial second half. He may, however, include a lexical hint by calling Jesus "the Nazarene" (ὁ Ναζωραῖος; 18:5, 7; 19:19), a designation which John uses only in the passion narrative.[83] Though the etymology of "Nazareth" is debated, recent archaeological findings support hypothesis is that it comes from the Hebrew root נצר, meaning "branch."[84] This is not the same term found in Zech 6:12 (צֶמַח), but צֶמַח and נצר are nearly synonymous. A text from Qumran treats them as equivalents (4Q161, line 18). The title ὁ Ναζωραῖος is prominently displayed on the τίτλος, "written in Aramaic, Latin, and Greek"(19:19). While this sign is mentioned in all four gospels, John's inclusion of ὁ Ναζωραῖος is unique. He also devotes more attention to this sign than any of the Synoptics (19:19-20). A double meaning like "Nazarene"/"Branch" suits John's literary style. Elsewhere, the names of people and places take on symbolic import (for example, "Siloam"[85] and "Malchus"[86]). The use of names to convey prophetic oracles is also well attested in the Old Testament.

Similarly, it is significant that the high priest in Zechariah, who is "symbolic of things to come" (Zech 3:8) and on whom symbolic actions are performed, bears the name Ἰησοῦς.[87] At critical moments in the passion narrative, which contain the clearest echoes

---

[83] The only other mention of "Nazareth" is in 1:45-46, significantly in the context of Philip's telling Nathaniel, "We have found the one Moses wrote about in the Law, and about whom the prophets also wrote – Jesus, the son of Joseph, from Nazareth [Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ]." John includes the detail that Nathaniel was "sitting under a fig tree" when Philip called him. There is likely a resonance with Zech 3:10 ("In that day each of you will invite his neighbor to sit under his vine and fig tree."). The "day" envisioned is when God will bring the promised Branch; Zech 3:10 immediately follows the first of the two "Branch" prophecies (3:8-9).

[84] See the excellent discussion in Mary Coloe, "Raising the Johannine Temple (John 19:19-37)," *ABR* 48 (2000), 47-58.

[85] 9:7; καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὕπαγε νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται ἀπεσταλμένος· "And he said to him, 'Go wash in the Pool of Siloam' (which means 'sent')."

[86] 18:10; ἦν δὲ ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος· "And the servant's name was Malchus."

[87] LXX; the Greek form of יהושע (variant of יהושע)

of Zechariah's Branch, John includes Jesus' name. All three times Jesus is called ὁ

Ναζωραῖος, this geographical designation appears in the formula Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος

(18:5, 7; 19:19). The description ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω φορῶν τὸν ἀκάνθινον

στέφανον καὶ τὸ πορφυροῦν ἱμάτιον (19:5) recalls the earlier Joshua/Jesus, symbolically

robed and crowned.

Read together, the two "Branch" scenes from Zechariah bear remarkable

similarities to Jesus' trial in John. Both involve a courtroom scenario, in which a hostile

party accuses a servant of God (Zech 3:1; John 19:7). The scene then shifts from a

courtroom to a coronation. The central figure is dressed in fine garments (Zech 3:3-5;

John 19:2), receives a crown (Zech 6:9-10, 14; John 19:2), and is presented before an

assembly of witnesses (Zech 3:7-8; 6:14; John 19:5;).

> καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται πλέξαντες <u>στέφανον</u> ἐξ ἀκανθῶν <u>ἐπέθηκαν</u> αὐτοῦ <u>τῇ κεφαλῇ</u>
> (John 19:2)
> ποιήσεις <u>στεφάνους</u> καὶ <u>ἐπιθήσεις</u> ἐπὶ <u>τὴν κεφαλὴν</u> Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ιωσεδεκ (Zech
> 6:11)

Immediately before Pilate's "Ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος" (19:5b), John reminds readers that Jesus

is "wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe" (19:5a). The unnecessary repetition

of this detail suggests that John does not want us to miss the allusion.

"Branch"

Biblical and extrabiblical texts attest that "Branch"/"Shoot" in its various forms (צֶמַח ;

נֵצֶר; Ἀνατολὴ; βλαστος; etc.) had become a Messianic title long before the composition

of John's gospel.   The symbolism of vineyards, vines, and branches was not limited to

any one term. Instead, similar meanings and shared horticultural imagery allowed

interpreters to weave texts together by juxtaposing and interchanging related words.

The "branch" metaphor grew out OT imagery for the community of Israel as a vine or a vineyard (Ps 8; 76:9-12; Isa 5: etc.).[88] God "brought a vine out of Egypt … drove out the nations and planted it" (Ps 80:8; compare Jer 2:21; Hos 10:1). When the vineyard failed to produce good fruit, God allowed it to be destroyed by the gentiles in the Babylonian exile (Isa 5:3-6; Ezek 15:1 ff.; 19:12). The prophets describe Israel's return to the land as a re-planting of the vine and the restoration of the vineyard. Visions of the eschaton frequently include agricultural imagery; the land and people will be fruitful and flourish. While many of these descriptions may easily be read literally, some are so exaggerated that they require a metaphorical interpretation. In these cases, the flourishing of the land functions metonymically for a state of blessedness caused by the restored covenant relationship between Israel and YHWH (compare Zech 3:10, "In that day, each of you will invite his neighbor to sit under his vine and fig tree"). Since the Messiah was to be the ideal leader and representative of God's people, "branch" serves as an appropriate metaphor. As a branch grows from a vine, the Messiah was to come from the line of Abraham's descendants. A branch (or especially "shoot") also becomes a source of new growth. If the vineyard of Israel was ruined, a planting from the original vine could become the starting-point for the vine's regrowth (see Isa 11:1; compare the olive tree metaphor in Rom 11).

Within some interpretive communities, various messianic texts had been conjoined under the metaphor of Branch. The Branch was to be a king from David's line, who would reign forever and build the ideal temple. John had only to begin a well-

---

[88] See Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," 164.

known prophetic statement to evoke this web of Scripture and tradition:

> "Look, the man …" (John 19:5)
> "… Branch is his name." (Zech 6:12)

The most important reference to the Davidic "Branch" comes from Isa 11:1 - "A shoot will come up from the stump of Jesse; from his roots, a Branch [נצר] will bear fruit." Ancient manuscripts attest that this verse was interpreted messianically before the Christian era. This promise of an ideal ruler from David's line reflects God's covenant with David in 2 Samuel 7 - "I will raise up your offspring [זרע; LXX σπέρμα; lit. "seed"] to succeed you, who will come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He is the one who will build a house for my Name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever" (vv. 12-13). The "shoot" in Isa 11, which refers to a plant's first growth, metaphorically corresponds to the "seed" in 2 Samuel. A text from Qumran incorporates the "Branch of David" into its explication of 2 Samuel:

> 'The Lord declares to you that he will build you a house.' 'I will raise up your seed after you.' 'I will establish the throne of his kingdom [forever].' 'I [will be] his father and he shall be my son.' *He is the Branch of David* who shall arise with the Interpreter of the Law [to rule] in Zion [at the end] of time. (4QFlorilegium 10-12a, emphasis added)

Jeremiah also refers to a coming "Branch of David":

> "The days are coming," declares the Lord, "when I will raise up to David a righteous Branch [צֶמַח], a King who will reign wisely and do what is just and right in the land. In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in safety. This is the name by which he will be called: The Lord (YHWH) Our Righteousness." (23:5-6)
> "The days are coming," declares the Lord, "when I will fulfill the gracious promise I made to the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days and at that time, I will make a righteous Branch sprout from David's line [אַצְמִיחַ לְדָוִד צֶמַח]; he will do what is just and right in the land." (33:14-15)

Jeremiah 33:15 is of particular interest because it uses the same word for "branch" as that

in Zech 3 and 6. It even uses the same wordplay as that found in Zechariah:

הַהִיא **אַצְמִיחַ** לְדָוִד **צֶמַח** צְדָקָה
"I will cause to sprout up for David a righteous sprout." (Jer 33:15)[89]
צֶמַח שְׁמוֹ וּמִתַּחְתָּיו **יִצְמָח** וּבָנָה אֶת־הֵיכַל יְהוָה:
"Branch is his name; he will branch out from his place and build the temple of the Lord" (Zech 6:12).

Targum Jonathan explicitly identifies this Branch of Jer 33 as "the messiah of righteousness." Even though Isa 11 uses נֵצֶר rather than צֶמַח (as in the Zechariah text under consideration), the two terms were conflated so that these texts were read together. A fragmentary manuscript from Qumran, containing what appears to be a paraphrase of Isa 11:1-5, substitutes צֶמַח for נֵצֶר

(4Q285, frag. 5, ln. 2). It would be consistent with this stream of tradition for John to incorporate both the "Branch" from Zechariah (in 19:5) and the "Shoot" from Isaiah (in "Nazarene").

The "branch of David" was also incorporated into the blessing on Judah in Gen 49:8-12. A midrashic interpretation of Gen 49:10 ("The scepter will not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until he comes to whom it belongs and the obedience of the nations is his.") expounds, "Until the coming of the messiah of righteousness, the branch of David. For to him and to his seed have been given the covenant of kingship for his people, for everlasting generations…" (4Q252). The Septuagint also reflects the influence of the Davidic Branch tradition on this text in Genesis. Where the MT reads, "You return from the prey, my son" (Gen 49:9; מִטֶּרֶף בְּנִי עָלִיתָ כָּרַע רָבַץ), the LXX has, "From the shoot, my son, you came up" (ἐκ βλαστοῦ υἱέ μου ἀνέβης). This image resembles that in LXX Isa 11:1, "A shoot will come up

---

[89] This verse is absent from the Septuagint.

[ἀναβήσεται] from the stump of Jesse" (though LXX Gen 49:9 uses ῥίζῃ rather than βλαστος).

Eleazar of Modin, bar Cocheba's uncle, interpreted the βλαστούς in the dream of Pharaoh's cupbearer according to the βλαστός in LXX Gen 49:9, which he understood to mean the Messiah. The steward tells Joseph, "In my sleep a vine [ἄμπελος] was before me. And on the vine were three stems, and it was flourishing, having produced shoots [βλαστούς]" (LXX Gen 40:9-10, NETS). Through the verbal parallel βλαστός (LXX Gen 49:9), Eleazar interprets this vine as a symbol of the priestly messiah.[90] He also draws a connection to Isa 11:1, "A bloom shall come up from the root"(LXX). This exegesis suggests a preexisting tradition which linked the βλαστος of Judah (LXX Gen 49:9) to the נצר of Judah's descendant David (LXX Isa 11:1). Such a connection also appears in Revelation: "See, he has triumphed, the Lion from the tribe [lit., "branch"] of Judah, the Root of David" (5:5; ἰδοὺ ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα ἡ ῥίζα Δαυίδ). Like Eleazar, the author of Revelation juxtaposes the prophecies from Genesis (49:8 "Judah is a lion's cub...") and Isaiah (11:1), using the agricultural metaphor as a bridge. If tradition is correct in attributing Revelation to the same author(s) as the Fourth Gospel, it becomes all the more likely that John knows and uses the "Branch" tradition.

In her careful analysis of the temple theme in John's passion, Mary Coloe asserts, "Evidence from the Targums and Qumran scrolls support the hypothesis that by the first century C.E. the term 'Nazarene' had developed associations with a Davidic Messiah who would build the eschatological temple."[91] This finds support in Matt 2:23, ὅπως

---

[90] See William Horbury, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians* (Edinburgh: T& T Clark, 2003), 132.

[91] "Raising the Johannine Temple," 53.

πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται ("So the word of the prophets was fulfilled: 'He will be called a Nazarene.'").

The treatment of Zech 3 and 6 in *Targum Jonathan* provides further evidence that "Branch" had acquired messianic associations. In Zech 3:8 and 6:12 - as well as in Isa 4:2 and Jer 23:5 and 33:15 - the word צֶמַח ("branch") is rendered "anointed one." John and the authors of this targum might even have been heirs of the same exegetical tradition. The redactional touches on the "Branch" texts in Zechariah sound Johannine:

> "For behold, I will bring my servant the anointed One, and he shall be revealed" (*Tg. Zech* 3:8)
> "Behold, the man whose name is Anointed will be revealed, and he shall be raised up, and shall build the temple of the Lord" (*Tg. Zech* 6:12).

The targum emphasizes revelation; "he shall be revealed" does not appear in either the MT or the LXX. Revelation is also a central theme in John's gospel. The Son reveals the Father (12:38; 17:6), and his own glory is revealed (1:14, 31; 2:11). The expression "he shall be raised up" (Tg. Zech 6:12), which deviates from both the MT and LXX, has special resonance for a reader of John.[92] John uses ὑψόω to describe Jesus' crucifixion, playing on its double meaning (1. literally "to raise up," and, by extension, "to crucify"; 2. figuratively, "to exalt" or "to glorify").[93] The targum's pairing of revelation and being "raised up" fits easily with John's theological interpretation of the crucifixion. When Jesus is "lifted up" on the cross, his glory is revealed:

> "Just as Moses lifted up the snake in the desert, so the Son of Man must be lifted up." (3:14)
> "When you have lifted up the Son of Man, then you will know that I Am [ἐγώ εἰμι]" (John 8:8).

---

[92] The MT has "he shall branch out from his place" (וּמִתַּחְתָּיו יִצְמָח), and the LXX has "he shall sprout from below him" (NETS; ὑποκάτωθεν αὐτοῦ ἀνατελεῖ).
[93] BDAG, ὑψόω

"But I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all people to myself"
(12:23).

John's usage reflects LXX Isa 52:13 (ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου καὶ <u>ὑψωθήσεται</u> καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα). *Targum Jonathan* probably draws from this same text to incorporate "he shall be raised up" into Zech 6:12. Conversely, the targum demonstrates the influence of Zech 6:13 in its translation of Isa 52-53: "Behold, my servant the Messiah…and he will build the sanctuary which was profaned for our sins, handed over for our iniquities" (52:13; 53:5).

John also makes reference to the "Branch" tradition outside of the passion narrative. The well-known "Vine and Branches" discourse in 15:1-8 incorporates OT imagery of Israel as a vine/vineyard and the Messiah as the chosen Branch.

Temple

Zechariah prophesies that the Branch will build the eschatological "temple of the Lord" (6:13). The Branch's role as temple-builder corresponds with his royal office, because temple construction in the Ancient Mediterranean world was the responsibility of kings.[94] Meyers and Meyers discuss this royal jurisdiction as the background of Zech 6:12-13. They cite an "inextricable connection of temple building with political sovereignty in the ancient Near East and in [Israel's] own monarchic past"[95] and posit that the people might have been apprehensive about supporting a temple when there was no king. Therefore, "the prophet suggests that Zerubbabel's participation in the project represented the royal

---

[94] See Donald Juel, *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark* (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1973; repr., SBL Dissertation Series 131; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977).
[95] Carol L. Meyers and Eric M. Meyers, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987), 356.

component demanded by ideological and traditional patterns."[96] Zerubbabel was a

descendent of David, but he was only governor, under Persian rule. The prophet assures

the people that there will be a greater fulfillment later, when the true Davidic king arrives

and builds the ideal temple (see 3:8).   Wright claims, "Only the true King, the proper

successor of Solomon the original Temple-builder, had the right to build the Temple."[97]

So central was temple-building to kingship that kings often tried to gain "dynastic

legitimacy through the vehicle of temple building."[98] Runnals[99] also affirms that only the

king could legitimately build the temple, citing Haggai, Zechariah, and especially the

Chronicler's picture of Hezekiah and Josiah. Herod's efforts at beautifying the temple

can be understood as an attempt to claim legitimacy. Josephus recounts the extent of

Herod's renovations on the temple in Jerusalem immediately following an account of

Manaemus' prophecy that Herod would be "the King of the Jews."[100] Building a

magnificent temple would earn Herod credibility, because many Jews believed that "the

reality of the dynastic restoration was to be made both visible and authentic by the

rebuilding of the temple."[101]

Traditions existed in at least some Hellenistic Jewish communities that the

Messiah would rebuild the temple. Many of these rely heavily on the text under

consideration (Zech 6:12-13), which became fused together with similar texts. *Tg. Isa*

52:13-53:5: "Behold, my servant the Messiah…and he will build the sanctuary which

---

[96] Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah, 356.

[97] *The New Testament and the People of God*, 225-6.

[98] *The New Testament and the People of God,* 358.

[99] Donna Runnals, "The King as Temple-Builder: A Messianic Typology," in *Spirit Within Structure* (ed. Dikran Hadidian; Allison Park, Penn.: Pickwick, 1983), 15-38.

[100] Runnals, "King as Temple-Builder," 28-29.

[101] Runnals, "King as Temple-Builder," 22.

was profaned for our sins, handed over for our iniquities." Donald Juel reasons from this passage, "At some point in the development of the targumic tradition, it became customary to refer the prophecy in Zech 6:12-13 to the Messiah, and that at some point the phrase was added to Isa 53:5, reflecting the belief that the Messiah would rebuild the fallen temple."[102] The temple was inseparable from Israel's theology of exile and restoration.[103] N.T. Wright calls it "the heart of Judaism," from which holiness spread to the land and people[104] (see 2 Macc 5:27 and 1 QS 8:13, in which the temple's desecration defiles the city). G. K. Beale claims that in ancient Jewish thought, "the Old Testament temple was a microcosm of the entire heaven and earth," made after the pattern of the heavenly temple (Exod 25:9, 40; compare Exod 26:30; 27:8; Num 8:4; Heb 8:5; 9:23-24).[105] There was an expectation of a new, ideal temple In the Messianic age (11QT 29:6-10), at the center of a new creation in which God would dwell with his people (*Jub.* 1:17, 26-29; compare Ezek 37; 40; Isa 66:1-2).

The Jews *did* have a temple, begun in the time of Ezra and extravagantly renovated by Herod. Attitudes towards Herod's temple were mixed, however, and some Jewish communities were still looking for an eschatological temple to take its place. The Essenes rejected the temple as impure (CD 4:18; 5:6; 6:11-16; 20:22). The Pharisees were critical of the Hasmonean priesthood but tolerated the temple enough to continue participation. Numerous texts from the Second Temple period rail against the corrupt priesthood. Some parties, such as the Pharisees and Essenes, were fundamentally

---

[102] Juel, *Messiah and Temple,* 189.

[103] N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* (vol 1. of *Christian Origins and the Question of God,* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 299.

[104] Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, 226.

[105] *The Temple and the Church's Mission* (Downer's Grove, IL: IVP, 2004), 31-32.

opposed to the Hasmonean priesthood because as non-Zadokites they were not of the high priestly line (*Test. Moses* 6). Similarly, a major mark against this temple was that it had been built by the wicked King Herod, who was not the true Davidic king and thus lacked the authority to build the temple.[106]

Even after the exiles' return to Judea and the construction of the second temple, the literature still pictures Israel in exile, awaiting a temple (*Test. Moses* 3; Jub. 1:7-18; Tobit 13-14; CD 1:5-11).[107] Bradley Gregory has called this a "theological exile," caused by "the disillusionment during the postexilic period that the sweeping visions of restoration found in Jer 30-33, Ezek 20; 40-48, and especially Deutero-Isaiah, had not come to pass according to expectations."[108] The historical exile became a paradigm for the deeper theological exile. The cause of the exile was Israel's sin, which had to be atoned for before the restoration (2 Macc 7:37-38; Azariah and the Three Jews 1:1-22; Dan 9; Tob 3:2-5; compare Isa 40:2).[109] The Qumran community understood themselves to be atoning for the nation's sin by their strict obedience to Torah, during their symbolic exile in the wilderness. By their holiness they believed they could speed the Messiah's coming (1QS 8:12-16).

While they awaited the Messiah, the Jews shifted their focus from the temple *cultus* to Torah. Righteous keeping of the Law became a substitute for animal sacrifices

---

[106] Beale, *Temple,* 225.   Compare the controversy in John 2: "By what authority? ..."

[107] Compare Jas 1:1; 1 Pet 1:1, in which the NT authors adopt the theme of "Israel in exile" and apply it to the Church.

[108] Bradley C. Gregory, "The Postexilic Exile in Third Isaiah: Isaiah 61:1-3 in Light of Second Temple Hermeneutics," *JBL* 126 (2007), 475, 490. N. T. Wright goes so far as to claim, "Only when [the rebuilding of the temple by the Messiah] was done would the new age arrive. Conversely, if the new age was not yet present, and it was not…any building that might happen to occupy the Temple mount could not possibly be the eschatological Temple itself." (*The New Testament and the People of God*, 226.)

[109] Note that Isa 54's restoration is preceded by Isa 53's Suffering Servant, who must make atonement for the *plethos*, the exiled community.

(Tob 4:10-11),[110] and even the temple was considered illegitimate apart from obedience (compare Jer 7:1-11; Isa 58; Hos 6:6). Part of the exile was that Israel was sinful and could not keep the Law properly. In the Messianic age, Israel would be able to fulfill Torah in a way it could not at present.[111] The Messiah would be perfectly righteous, and his holiness would spread to the whole nation (*Pss. Sol.* 17). Part of the Messianic idea was that the Messiah would become the head of the community, which would not only be covered by his righteousness, but also share with him in his offices of prophet, priest, and king.[112] The Qumranites took this idea a step further, to claim that their community not only shared in the Messiah's calling but was itself the new temple (1QS 5:5 ff; 8:4ff.; 9:3 ff).[113] They set themselves up as a community of priests. Their priestly role motivates their laws of uncompromising holiness.

It is debated whether the Essenes were still looking forward to a physical, earthly temple or considered it obsolete, replaced entirely by their community. Most hold that the Essenes viewed their community "temple" as an interim substitute, before the Messiah came and the true temple was established. Gärtner states their belief that though the temple was currently profaned, "at the end of the evil age through which the world was passing, the temple cultus would once more be set up in all its majesty; then the precepts of the Law would be followed, and the sacrifice would be pure and pleasing to

---

[110] See esp. Ed Condra, *Salvation for the Righteous Revealed: Jesus amid Covenantal and Messianic Expectations in Second Temple Judaism* (Boston: Brill, 2002).

[111] Lawrence Schiffman, "The Concept of Messiah in Second Temple and Rabbinic Literature," *Review and Expositor* 84, no. 2 (1987): 239.

[112] Cynthia Long Westfall, "Messianic Themes of Temple, Enthronement, and Victory in Hebrews and the General Epistles," in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*, ed. Stanley Porter, 210-229 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007): 215.

[113] See Bertil Gartner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965).

God."[114] He interprets their rationale to be that "the entire fulfillment of the Law – the condition on which victory in the final conflict depended – demanded the fulfillment of the Law in respect of the temple as well."[115] The Temple Scroll seems clearly to indicate that an earthly temple must be built and animal sacrifices performed, but the text suggests that this temple too is only temporary: "For I will cause My glory to dwell upon it *until the Day of Creation, when I Myself will create My temple"* (11QT 29:9, emphasis added). Kampen, following Wacholder, has argued to the contrary that there is only one temple in 11QT, based on the tiny word עד, which can mean either "until" (as it is generally translated) or "while"/"during" (his opinion).[116] In that case, 11QT 29:9 reads, "I will cause My glory to dwell on it *during the Day of Creation*, when I Myself create My temple," and the temple whose dimensions are given is indeed the final temple. A central text for this discussion is the commentary on 2 Sam 7:11-14 in 4Q174, which describes God's establishing "a Temple of Adam (or Temple of Humankind)" (3:6). The commentator seems to be identifying the community as the temple here,[117] but the text may be referring to a literal temple.[118]

The reconstitution of temple worship is has been identified as an important theme in the Fourth Gospel.[119]   John places the cleansing of the temple near the beginning of Jesus' ministry, while the Synoptics locate it at the end. Most of the Seven Signs and

---

[114] Gartner, *Temple and Community*, 20.

[115] Gartner, *Temple and Community*, 21.

[116] John Kampen, "The Eschatological Temple(s) of 11QT," in *Pursuing the Text: Essays in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 85-97.

[117] As in John J. Collins, *Scepter and Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 106; Condra, *Salvation for the Righteous*, 142; Juel, *Messiah and Temple,* 176-179.

[118] As in Kampen, "Eschatological Temple(s)," 96; Rikk E. Watts, "The Lord's House and David's Lord: the Psalms and Mark's Perspective on Jesus and the Temple," *BibInt* 15 (2007), 310.

Seven Discourses are centered around one of the cultic institutions of Judaism.[120] Each of

these is reinterpreted and fulfilled in Jesus' ministry of the Spirit, as the eschatological

age of messianic abundance has arrived.

Those who see from the perspective of the "flesh" are preoccupied with the

temple as a physical building. The chief priests and Pharisees fret that because of Jesus'

ministry "the Romans will come and take away from us both the place [τόπος], here

meaning "temple"] and the nation" (11:48). When Jesus challenges them, "Destroy this

temple and I will build it again in three days" (2:17), they suppose he means Herod's

temple ("It has taken forty-six years to build this temple," 2:18).   John explains, "But the

temple of which he had spoken was his body" (2:21). A similar irony occurs in the

Jewish leaders' concern with ritual purity during the Passover (18:28; compare the

concern with the Sabbath in 19:31), as they unwittingly kill the "Lamb of God" and fulfill

the institution. By describing Jesus' trial before both Annas and Caiaphas, John may be

reminding readers that the earthly temple has been compromised; Annas had been the

high priest until the Roman authorities replaced him with Caiaphas. The empire had

arrogated to itself the power to replace the Jewish high priest, and since then certain sects

(including the Pharisees and the Essenes) maintained that the priesthood was illegitimate.

The leaders' proclamation "We have no king but Caesar" (19:15, οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλέα εἰ

μὴ Καίσαρα) parodies the nationalist slogan "no king but God." John thus portrays their

rejection of Jesus as a loss of faith in God's promises to Israel (see 5:39-40; 8:39-42).

In John's theology, the true temple is not a building but the indwelling presence of

---

[119] See, for example, Aileen Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960); Mary Coloe, "Raising the Johannine Temple (John 19:19-37)," *ABR* 48 (2000), 47-58.

[120] See Guilding, *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship*.

the Holy Spirit, beginning with Jesus and spreading to the community of believers. By

the Incarnation, "The Word became flesh and *tabernacled* [ἐσκήνωσεν] among us"

(1:14).   "The time has come" when believers will worship "neither on this mountain [in

Samaria] nor in Jerusalem," but "in the Spirit and in truth" (John 4:21, 23). The raising of

the new temple corresponds to the resurrection of Jesus and the outpouring of the Holy

Spirit.

IMPLICATIONS

The proposed echo of Zech 6:12 in John 19:2-5 has significant implications for both

Johannine studies and discussions about New Testament authors' use of the Old

Testament.

John

This connection sheds new light on John's passion narrative as well as the Gospel as a

whole. From a literary-critical perspective, an echo of Zechariah's הִנֵּה־אִישׁ in John's ἰδοὺ

ὁ ἄνθρωπος (19:5) resolves a "bump in the text." Without this background, Pilate's

statement would serve no function in the narrative. Its sense would be, "Look, here he

is!" There is no need to state this obvious fact, and the narrative reads more smoothly

without it: "So Jesus came out wearing the crown of thorns and the purple robe … When

the high priests and the officials saw him, they shouted, 'Crucify! Crucify!'"[121] The use

of a paratactic construction (ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς … καὶ λέγει …) rather than a

subordinate clause[122] makes the inanity of ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος all the more conspicuous; it

unnecessarily slows down the flow of the narrative. It would seem uncharacteristic for

John, who crafts his composition so meticulously, to lapse into filler material at such a

---

[121] ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω φορῶν τὸν ἀκάνθινον στέφανον καὶ τὸ πορφυροῦν ἱμάτιον … ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες σταύρωσον σταύρωσον. Translation mine.

[122] As in the NIV translation, "*When* Jesus came out … Pilate said …" (emphasis added). Such a construction would elegantly parallel the following verse, ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτὸν … ἐκραύγασαν.

climactic moment in his gospel. In addition, this presentation of Jesus to the crowd by

Pilate structurally parallels a second episode in 19:14-15:

> καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς **ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος**· ὅτε <u>οὖν</u> εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ
> ὑπηρέται <u>ἐκραύγασαν</u> λέγοντες <u>σταύρωσον, σταύρωσον. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος</u>
> … (19:5-6)
> καὶ λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις **ἴδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν**· <u>ἐκραύγασαν οὖν</u> ἐκεῖνοι <u>ἆρον,</u>
> <u>ἆρον, σταύρωσον</u> αὐτόν. <u>λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος</u> … (19:14-15)

Within this construction, ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος corresponds to ἴδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν. Their

incongruity seems puzzling. The allusion I have suggested solves both of these apparent

problems. ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος is not a space-filler but another instance of double entendre

in John. It metonymically incorporates Zech 6:12 and its surrounding material, with huge

christological significance appropriate to its emphatic place in John's gospel. Similarly, if

ὁ ἄνθρωπος represents the "Branch" of Zechariah, it is not at all mismatched with

βασιλεὺς.

Thematically and theologically, the echo brings together aspects of Jesus' identity

and mission which run throughout the Gospel. The "Branch" is a king and a priest, both

roles in which John has portrayed Jesus. The Branch is also the one who will build the

true temple of YHWH. The temple is a central theme in the Fourth Gospel. It is

reconceptualized as the presence of God (particularly the Spirit) in the world, which does

not depend upon a physical building. This spiritual temple is identified first with the

body of Jesus, the incarnate Word who "tabernacled among us" (1:14). After Jesus has

died and risen, he enables the disciples to "receive the Holy Spirit." The temple of God's

presence on earth is then expanded to include the entire community of believers, by the

indwelling of God's Spirit. The Branch's role as temple-builder makes sense of the temple

conflict in John 2. Jesus' crucifixion is interpreted by his words at the beginning of his ministry: "Destroy this temple, and I will raise it again in three days" (2:19).

By troping Zechariah, John also makes an implicit apologetic argument for his claim that Jesus is the Messiah. He sets up the scene in 19:2-5 so that it resembles the coronation in Zech 6, but in an unexpected, upside-down way. John completely subverts human notions of glory and kingship. Logically, crucifixion is *not* exaltation, but the most debasing form of execution the Roman empire could devise. The Fourth Gospel's *Christus Victor* portrayal of Jesus' passion must have seemed bizarre to the first readers, who would likely have witnessed crucifixions before. The radicality of John's re-envisioning may easily be lost to modern interpreters. The early Christian community had to reconcile their conviction that Jesus was the Messiah (and beyond that, "the Son of God") with the reality of his horrific and shameful death on a Roman cross. John's dualistic vision of human history makes it possible to believe in a Christ who does not appear so majestic. The evangelist's theological shaping of the passion narrative corrects the faulty perspective of "the flesh" (σάρξ) with the true vision of "the Spirit" (πνεῦμα). Rather than simply stating that Jesus is "the Branch" foretold in Zechariah, John guides the audience to see the resemblance for themselves. The use of subtle allusion rather than direct citation makes the apologetic force greater, because in making the connection and mentally supplying the necessary background material, the reader becomes a participant in John's imaginative world. The "aha" moment when the "behold, the man" statement in Zech 6:12 clicks into place with ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος (John 19:5) effects a sudden shift in perspective, as though a blurry image has suddenly become sharp.

Finally, this exegetical study may provide support for the hypothesized connection between the Johannine community and the Qumran community. Some of John's interpretive approaches to OT texts strongly resemble hermeneutical strategies found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. John also seems to favor similar texts, use the same metaphors, and address some of the same themes. Commentaries and targums from Qumran often tie together OT texts in a manner comparable to John's.

Intertextuality

The potential implications for interpretive theory may be of even greater significance. First, this case study suggests that intertextuality is not limited to verbal parallels. The echo I have presented is incredibly quiet, at least to modern ears. Based solely on verbal parallels, it would not pass as an allusion at all. On the other hand, when we expand our field of vision to consider the whole scene John has depicted, parallels between the two coronations arise naturally. When the "Branch" passages from Zechariah are read alongside John's passion narrative (specifically 19:2-5), the theological connections appear very strong and enhance our reading of both texts. While concordance work and lexical studies are important elements of biblical exegesis, we should not become so entrenched in grammatical minutia that we miss the forest for the trees. The writings of the NT were originally meant to be read and heard by religious communities. Within such a context, it makes sense for people to see connections with earlier texts based on images or themes, not only by shared lexical forms. Verbal parallels are likely to be present, but sometimes we may miss significant connections if we limit our scope. *Theological* reading of biblical passages may be integral to thorough scientific/critical

exegesis, not a secondary or optional endeavor.

Secondly, this analysis highlights the importance of tradition as a mediator of texts. It is easy to overlook the chronological distance between the NT authors and their OT source texts. The writers of the New Testament inherited not only the sacred writings of their community's faith, but also centuries' worth of tradition and interpretation surrounding the text itself. Accessing these interpretive traditions is difficult, because of the relatively small number of surviving works and the diversity within Judaism during the Hellenistic period. The findings at Qumran provide invaluable evidence about Jewish hermeneutical practices contemporary with the composition of the NT, but these works represent only one small, isolated sect of Second Temple Judaism. My discussion in Chapter Five would have benefitted from more data in this area.

Last, my investigation of Zech 3 and 6 in John's passion narrative contributes to studies of the relationship between the Testaments. The conclusions I have drawn suggest that John incorporates OT texts in a thematic and contextually sensitive way. In John 18-19, at least, the quotations are not used merely as isolated proof-texts, but they create links between their source context and John's composition. Sometimes the references appear in the usual form of a proof-text, but they function as part of a broader intertextual relationship. John also demonstrates a strong sense of continuity with the OT Scriptures, both in his explicit statements about the fulfillment of Scripture and in the way he deftly weaves important OT texts and themes into his gospel account. My observations from the Fourth Gospel will not necessarily apply to books by other authors, who will have their own styles and tendencies, though some similarity may be expected.

This thesis explores some interesting and important issues surrounding the OT in Gospel of John and the broader topic of inner-biblical intertextuality. It leaves many questions open and invites further insights and data from future studies. I hope that the intertextual relationship I have described may further enrich the reading of John, both in the Church and in the academy. I would be delighted if this study encouraged other interpreters to examine the texts for themselves and offer further evaluation, either for or against the allusion I have suggested.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barrett, C. K. "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel." *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1947): 155-169.

Beale, G. K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. NSBT 17. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2004.

Bauer, W. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Revised and edited by F.W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

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

Block, Daniel I. "My Servant David: Ancient Israel's Vision of the Messiah." Pages 17-56 in *Israel's Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by Richard Hess and M. Daniel Caroll R. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003.

Brown, R. E. *The Gospel According to John.* Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1970.

_____. "Messianism of Qumran." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19, no. 1 (1957): 53-82.

_____. "The Passion According to John: Chapters 18 and 19." *Worship* 49, no. 3 (1975): 126-134.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: a Commentary.* Trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray, R. W. N. Hoare, and J. K. Riches. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Burge, Gary M. *John.* NIV Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.

Charbonneau, André. "Jésus en Croix (Jn 19,16b-42), Jésus Élevé (3,14ss; 8,28s; 12,31ss)." *Science et Espirit* 45, no. 2 (1993): 161-180.

Collins, John J. "The Nature of Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 199-217 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context.* Edited by Timothy Lim. New York: T & T Clark, 2004.

_____. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

Collins, John J., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *Christian Beginnings and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.

Coloe, Mary. "Raising the Johannine Temple (John 19:19-37)." *Australian Biblical*

Review 48 (2000): 47-58.

Coloe, Mary and Tom Thatcher, eds. *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate.* Early Judaism and Its Literature 32. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.

Condra, Ed. *Salvation for the Righteous Revealed: Jesus amid Covenantal and Messianic Expectations in Second Temple Judaism*. Boston: Brill, 2002.

The Dead Sea Scrolls. Trans. Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1996.

Droge, A. J. "'No One Has Ever Seen God': Revisionary Criticism in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 169-184 in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New.* Edited by Craig A. Evans. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.

Duke, Paul D. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel.* Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.

Evans, Craig A. "From Prophecy to Testament: An Introduction." Pages 1-22 in *From Prophecy to Testament: The Function of the Old Testament in the New.* Edited by Craig A. Evans. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.

Evans, Craig, and Peter Flint, eds. *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The One Who is to Come*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Flusser, David. "What Was the Original Meaning of *ECCE HOMO*?" *Immanuel* 19 (Winter 1984/85): 30-40.

Forestell, J. Terence. *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel.* Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974.

Gärtner, Bertil. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Gregory, Bradley C. "The Postexilic Exile in Third Isaiah: Isaiah 61:1-3 in Light of Second Temple Hermeneutics." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (2007): 475-496.

Guilding, Aileen. *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960.

Harris, Rendel. "The Sinless High Priest." *Expository Times* 33 (1922): 217-218.

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

_____. "Kerygma and Midrash: A Conversation with Luke Timothy Johnson and C. H. Dodd." Pages 105-126 in *Between Experience and Interpretation: Engaging the Writings of the New Testament*. Festschrift for Luke Timothy Johnson. Edited by Mary F. Foskett and O. Wesley Allen Jr. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008.

Holladay, Carl R. "Luke's Use of the LXX in Acts." Pages 233-253 in *The Septuagint and Christian Origins*. Edited by Thomas Scott Caulley and Hermann Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Horbury, William. *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Biblical and Historical Studies.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2003.

Johnson, Luke T. "The Use of Leviticus 19 in the Letter of James." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 391-401.

Jonge, Martinus de. "Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 49, no. 1 (1973): 160-177.

Juel, Donald. *Messiah and Temple: The Trial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark.* Ph.D. diss. Yale University, 1973. Repr., SBL Dissertation Series 131. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.

Kierkegaard, Sören. *Philosophical Fragments.* Translated. Repr., Lexington, Ken.: Feather Trail Press, 209.

Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G., eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76.

Loeb Classical Library.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology.* Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Menken, Maarten J. J. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form.* Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 15. Kampen, Netherlands: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1996.

Merril, Eugene H. *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi: An Exegetical Commentary*. Chicago: Moody, 1994.

Miller, Paul. "'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him': The Gospel of John and the Old Testament." Pages 127-151 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Myers, Carol L. and Eric M. Myers. *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1987.

Nicholson, Godfrey C. "Death as Departure: The Johannine Descent-Ascent Schema." Ph.D. Diss., Vanderbilt University, 1980. Repr., Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1983.

Puech, Émile. "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament." Pages 235-256 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*: *The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

Richard, E. "Expressions of Double Meaning and their Function in the Gospel of John." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 96-112.

Runnals, Donna. "The King as Temple Builder: A Messianic Typology." Pages 15-38 in *Spirit within Structure: Essays in Honor of George Johnston on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday.* Edited by Dikran Y. Hadidian. Allison Park, PA: Pickwick Publications, 1983.

Sabbe, Maurits. "The Johannine Account of the Death of Jesus and Its Synoptic Parallels (Jn 19:16b-42)." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 70, no. 1 (1994): 34-64.

Schuchard, Bruce G. *Scripture Within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John.* SBL Dissertation Series 133. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. "The Concept of the Messiah in Second Temple and Rabbinic Literature." *Review and Expositor* 84 (1987): 236-246.

Stamps, Dennis L. "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical Device: A Methodological Proposal." Pages 9-37 in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Messianic Ideas in the Apocalyptic and Related Literature of Early Judaism." Pages 90-113 in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Ulfgard, Hakan. "The Branch of the Last Days: Observations on the New Covenant Before and After the Messiah." Pages 233-247 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context.* Edited by Timothy Lim. New York: T & T Clark, 2004.

VanderKam, James. "Messianism in the Scrolls." Pages 211-234 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*: *The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

Watts, Rikk E. "The Lord's House and David's Lord: the Psalms and Mark's Perspective on Jesus and the Temple." *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007): 307-322.

Westfall, Cynthia Long. "Messianic Themes of Temple, Enthronement, and Victory in Hebrews and the General Epistles." Pages 210-229 in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Whitfield, Bryan J. "Joshua Traditions and the Argument of Hebrews 3 and 4." Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 2007.

Wise, Michael O. *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior Before Jesus.* San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1999.

Wolters, Al. "The Messiah in the Qumran Documents." Pages 75-89 in *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Wright, N. T. *Christian Origins and the Question of God.* 5 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.