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PREFACE

I am sympathetic with a Johannine scholar who once expressed the inevitable indebtedness of scholarly adventures: "In many ways scholarship is a parasitic venture." I could not agree more with the true nature of the statement especially in undertaking of writing this dissertation. A number of individuals sacrificially put into this study their time, finances, and much prayer. There is no way I will be able to pay back or even thank enough for their perpetual contributions. Acknowledging their names here is my pleasant duty and is the only way to express my sincere gratitude.

The idea of writings a dissertation like this one was conceived about two and a half years ago. Since then, my academic advisor, Dr. John B. Polhill made himself available to train and nurture a young seminary student become mature in a critically theological inquiry. However, it is his character and passion for the body of God which have made a strong impression on me. He saved me from a number of mistakes and provided guidance and encouragement so that I could reach this far. Dr. Robert H. Stein, for whom I had privilege to serve as his teaching assistant, has instilled in me the virtue of precision in theological discourses. Drs. Mark Seifrid, Rob Plummer (both as my committee members), and Andreas Köstenberger (as the external reader) also deserve my appreciation for the keen insights they shared with me. All the scholars mentioned above shaped the present work much better in form and content. But any shortcomings strictly remain upon myself.

I would also like to recognize very special friendship I have been privileged to enjoy with fellow students at SBTS, revs. Jaein Chong and Jaeyul Choi. Many prayers my family and I had with them are pricelessly precious. Prof. and Mrs. Tom Song of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and the members of East Audubon Baptist
Church, Louisville, Kentucky and Onnuri All Nations Baptist Church, Arlington, TX also reduced the burden of writing a dissertation with their prayer and expressions of care. Mr. Alan Pearce and Dr. Michael Nicholson also rendered their service in proofreading the earlier drafts of this study. If this work sounds less wooden, they deserve the credit.

My family members willingly bore the burden concomitant to the completion of this project more directly than any other persons. My parents, Ghilsoo Ahn and Okhee Song, my brothers Sangin and Sangho Ahn and their families, my parents-in-law, Jeongjung Kim and, and my brother- and sisters-in-law and their families also shared their financial resources and prayer with me as if this work were their own. To my wife, Juhyun Judy Kim, and my daughter, Grace Hyeyoen Ahn, I extend my sincere gratitude for persevering this “time of trial” with me and for being a source of smile. Finally, I deeply thank God for saving me from the perennial suffering. He has led me here, supplied the necessary resources, and sustained me to stay on course. It is to Him that I dedicate this humble piece of query into his unfailing love for humankind through His only Son, Jesus Christ. Soli deo Gloria.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PThSt</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>QD</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLEJL</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLSP</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBLSS</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>StudBibTh</strong></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TDOT</strong></td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The Two Testaments and "Biblical Theology" Movement

The bipartite nature of the Christian Bible has posed a perennial dilemma for biblical theologians. One of the reasons for such a quandary lies in the considerable measure of incongruity that the two Testaments display with one another (and within themselves) notwithstanding a certain degree of commonality. In the face of this observation, one group of scholars, especially some historical critics, has expressed skepticism toward the unity of the Old and New Testaments and further argued that "biblical theology" is possible only within certain confessional circles, reflecting reductionistic and positivistic methodology and a priori theological presuppositions. A greater number of biblical theologians, however, are more optimistic about the possibility of constructing a critically analytical "biblical theology." In this context, a large number

1 This question of disparity or diversity is at issue not only concerning the relation between the two Testaments but within the scope of the respective Testament. For the case of the New Testament, see James D. G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity, 3rd ed. (London: SCM, 2006). However, Dunn seems to have slightly shifted his stress from the diverse to the synthetic witness of the New Testament writings in his more recent work. Some of his observations are noteworthy: first, the impact the historical Jesus made upon his disciples was the formative force in shaping the present New Testament witnesses. Second, the oral communication environment facilitated a considerably conservative transmission process. Thus, he suggests the close connection between the first and third life settings. Idem, Jesus Remembered, CM 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 882-84. Dunn’s observation on the diversity (in the former book) indicates the difficulty inherent in the undertaking of "biblical theology."


of attempts have been undertaken along this line. Furthermore, contrary to the observation of a prominent biblical theologian ("biblical theology is a subject in decline"), the topic "biblical theology" continues to be a subject of much discussion as evidenced by the recent installment of journal series, monographs, and commentaries that are related to this topic. For the sake of space, only two of more popular approaches in this rubric of movement can be mentioned: canonical and tradition-historical approaches.

**Canonical Approach**

On the one hand, the enterprise of "biblical theology" has received, however, more criticism than welcome. For instance, the canonical approach, one of the more prominent approaches to "biblical theology" is most popularly represented by B. S. Childs, who points to the importance of the present form of the biblical canon as it was received and interpreted by the early church. His assumption and methodology, however, have been frequently criticized for the ambiguity of his hermeneutical program and general ignorance of the original historical contexts. Furthermore, the paucity of this peripheral "what it means" proposed by Krister Stendahl, "Biblical Theology, Contemporary," in *IDB* 1:418-32. For more scholars who stress the differences in terms of a balanced tension or unity between the two Testaments, see David L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of the Theological Relationship between the Old and New Testaments*, rev. ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991); Klaus Koch, "Two Testaments—One Bible: New Trends in Biblical Theology," *BTF* 28 (1996): 38-58; Stephen Motyer, "Two Testaments, One Biblical Theology," in *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies and Systematic Theology*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 143-64; Bernd Janowski, "The One God of the Two Testaments: Basic Questions of a Biblical Theology," *THTo* 57 (2000): 297-324; idem, "Biblical Theology," in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, ed. J. W. Rogerson and Judith M. Lieu (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 716-31.


6For critical responses to Child's approach, see James Barr, *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1983), 49-104; Dale A. Brueggemann, 'Brevard Childs' Canon...
type of study in New Testament scholarship obliquely bears testimony to the exegetical obstructions intrinsic to pursuing such a venture. Finally, the advocates of such an attempt often place emphasis on the principal hermeneutical role of the receptive community. This reader-oriented tendency renders the canonical approach less attractive to the practitioners of the traditional historical-grammatical approach.

**Tradition-Historical Approach**

A more positively received attempt than canonical criticism along the line of biblical theology, at least for the exegetes standing in the historical-critical tradition, is the tradition-historical approach, which seeks to find an overarching motif that weaves together the texts of the Old and New Testaments. Hartmut Gese and Peter Stuhlmacher
are usually associated with this systematic reading of the two Testaments through "Zion," or "Torah" leitmotifs. Gese argues, for instance, that successive Hebrew and Christian communities re-worked the previous generation's doctrine of the law in the face of the present life setting. Thus, he finds several phases of the Hebrew belief in the law differently understood throughout the history of Israel. This reinterpreted law is the final product for the community of the time, but is fully comprehensible in light of the ultimately re-read law, the New Testament. Some students of Gese and Stuhlmacher and other scholars have taken up this program, and put on a new dress, the "exile-and-restoration" theme. Of course, Gese and Stuhlmacher, on the one hand, and the proponents of the "exile-and-restoration" theme, on the other, do not overlap exactly in their theological presuppositions and exegetical conclusions, but they do share much in


common as far as their methodological presupposition is concerned. That is, a unifying theme visibly runs through the Old and New Testaments and exegetes can unpack it without inflicting violence to the texts.

Despite the considerable degree of enthusiasm with which a number of biblical students received these types of studies, these studies seem to possess both strengths and weaknesses. One of the positive contributions seems to be their recognition of the presence of a unifying theme woven together in the two Testaments. However, a negative upshot is that they undercut or misrepresent the insurmountable centrality of God. In other words, they lose sight of the principal thrust of the Christian Bible. That is, the main agent of the salvation history is differently put forth in the two Testaments. This peculiarity is, however, seldom or inadequately addressed in both canonical and tradition-historical approaches. What is fundamentally lacking in their studies is an aggressive engagement with the fact that the first Testament is deeply steeped in a scrupulous promotion of monotheism vis-à-vis Yahweh worship, whereas the second Testament is ditheistically oriented with a disproportional emphasis on the second person of the God-head, Jesus Christ. These two varying portraits of the two God-heads


14 In addition, in view of the significance of the supposed programic exile-and-restoration framework, explicit reference to such a theme, for instance, in John’s Gospel seems to be surprisingly sparse.

15 Similarly, Mark Seifrid points out the grave oversight of the New Perspective. That is, it misses the Christo-centric emphasis of the New Testament writings. Mark A. Seifrid, “Paul’s Use of Habakkuk 2:4 in Romans 1:17: Reflections on Israel’s Exile in Romans,” in History and Exegesis: New Testament Essays in Honor of Dr. E. Earle Ellis for His 80th Birthday, ed. Sang-Won Son (London: T & T Clark, 2006), 133-49. This criticism is also valid with reference to the exile and restoration motif studies.

16 The Bible is not one continuous tradition history, like a novel with a beginning, a middle and an end. Something stops, and a history of effects is set in motion that testifies to the form of the original canon and the differentiation of traditions, of various sorts, form it... The problem for the early church was not what to do with the OT. Rather, in the light of Scripture whose authority and privileged status were everywhere acknowledged, what was one to make of a crucified messiah and a parting of the
constitute one of the most vexing questions posed upon biblical theologians, and they call for serious consideration. One of the more oversimplistic responses to this question has been undertaken by a group of scholars who played down the testimonies of the Old Testament while stressing the uniquely elevated place of New Testament Christology.17 The history of the biblical theology movement, however, generally disagrees with the sharp wedge that this movement has driven between the two Testaments, especially their presentation of the God-head.18

**Christology within Jewish Conceptual Bounds**

A more considerate attempt to account for this disparity has traced back the origin of Christology from the conceptual strands attested in the Old Testament and the subsequent Jewish traditions. This approach can be further divided into two sub-groups. The first sub-group, more popularly represented by Richard Bauckham and William Horbury, maintains that New Testament Christology can be understood within the bounds of Jewish monotheism. Although in much different measure, they both postulate that Christian Christology is somewhat an organic outgrowth from Jewish monotheism.19

---


18Another significant attempt along the lines of the biblical theology movement can be mentioned here. Francis Watson notes the artificial gap present between Old Testament, New Testament, and systematic theological studies. These “three autonomous interpretive communities” are “ideologically motivated” and their academic products “systematically distort their subject matter,” which is the God of the gospel revealed in Jesus Christ as witnessed to by the Christian canonical Scriptures. Francis Watson, *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 6-7. Also, refer to his earlier study, idem, *Text, Church, and World: Biblical Interpretation in Theological Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994). Watson’s studies are full of sound judgments and a great number of scholars would heartily share his concerns. However, how practically his points can be applied in theological discussions seems uncertain. Another stream of thought in the line of “biblical theology” is the salvation historical perspective, most popularly associated with Oscar Cullmann. Once widely criticized, this approach has been revived recently by Robert W. Yarbrough, *The Salvation-Historical Fallacy?: Reassessing the History of New Testament Theology*, HBI 2 (Leiden: Deo, 2004).

19J. C. O’Neill, “The Trinity and the Incarnation as Jewish Doctrines,” in *Who did Jesus Think*
However, as Hurtado has pointed out, “the binitarian” theology of early Christians differs significantly from the conventional Jewish monotheism. Accordingly, the Jesus event (not the Jewish heritage of nascent Christianity) must have been the principal impetus for the early Christian worship of the second God-head.20

The other group has explored certain Jewish concepts (such as Son of Man or wisdom) and heroic protagonists, such as Moses, Elijah, or David, in an attempt to ascertain if they were seen as dormant messianic icons which were later translated into Christian Christology. This type of approach to New Testament Christology has found its way into the study of John’s Gospel, as well as into studies in other parts of the New Testament corpus. The present study aims primarily at assessing the value of the latter approach for understanding of the Gospel of John and its Christology in particular, by means of evaluating the Johannine texts that allegedly contain the traces of thought reflecting a Christology of Jewish heroes redivivus in view of the pertinent intertestamental Jewish writings that point to a redivivus eschatology.

**Centrality of Christology in the Fourth Gospel**

A student of the Fourth Gospel is immediately confronted with widely divided

---

Ein Hauptmerkmal des Johannesevangeliums ist die enorme Konzentration auf die Christologie. Ihr gegenüber treten andere theologische Felder, etwa die Ekklesiologie oder die Ethik, merklich zurück; sie werden von der Christologie sozusagen aufgesogen oder neu gepolt.24

He further goes on to spell out the centrality of Jesus in John on seven points: the Gospel’s concentration on Jesus, concentration on his words, Christological self-understanding of Jesus, Christological confessions, Christological titles, missionary Christology, and the I-am sayings.25

Even without entering into a meticulous discussion on such notions, however, this centrality of Christology simply makes a compelling case at least on two grounds. First, structurally speaking, the introductory prologue (1:1-18) and the concluding purpose statement (20:30-31) constitute an inclusio and stand out as pivotal points in John’s overall narrative schemes.26 Along with Martha’s confession in the middle (John 11:27), both sections speak of Christology in the highest terms possible in Jewish thought.

---


patterns, i.e., Jesus is portrayed as being equal to God (5:18; 10:33). Secondly, the content of the Fourth Gospel points to Jesus whose origin, divine and human nature, and works are constantly brought to the forefront throughout John. The recent insights

---


gained from the genre-critical analysis of the four Gospels also call for an urgent need for Gospel scholarship to refocus upon the main character (i.e., Jesus) rather than the developmental history of the communities which allegedly underlie the shaping of the canonical Gospels.29

**Johannine Christology from the Vantage Point of the Jewish Context**

If another consensus is to be designated, it would be the prominence of the Jewish religious/cultural milieu, with which a large number of Johannine exegetes associate the formation of the Fourth Gospel.30 The foremost reason for such a judgment is due to the recent conclusion of Gospel scholarship that the historical origin of the Jesus tradition is deeply rooted in Jewish contexts.31 Unless a sharp bifurcation is to be placed between the first and the third life-settings (that is, between Jesus and his disciples, on the

---


30 Thomas Söding, “Was kann aus Nazareth schon Gutes kommen?” (Joh 1.46): Die Bedeutung des Judenseins Jesu im Johannesevangelium,” NTS 46 (2000): 21-41. This judgment should be self-evident due to the plain fact that John speaks of Jesus' identity exclusively in Jewish terms such as “Christ” and “Messiah.” However, the dissensions of some scholars on this point require further discussion. See Appendix 2: “Religionsgeschichte and the Fourth Gospel.”

31 The picture of Jesus that has [recently] emerged is more finely nuanced, more obviously Jewish ... we read and read again the old Gospel stories and try to come to grips with the life of this remarkable Galilean Jew,” Craig A. Evans, “Assessing Progress in the Third Quest of the Historical Jesus,” JSHJ 4 (2006): 54.
one hand, and the theoretical writer/redactor responsible for the present form of John’s Gospel, on the other), one cannot fail to notice the pervasive Jewish elements of the Jesus tradition, which characteristic also has been frequently criticized as lacking in the previous quests for the historical Jesus.  

Another reason for approaching Johannine Christology from Jewish viewpoints owes to the way in which the fourth evangelist portrays the main character of his Gospel. That is, that Jesus is depicted primarily and exclusively in Jewish eschatological terms, i.e., “Messiah” (twice) and “Christ” (19 times). “Messiah” which is a Greek transliteration of the Aramaic word “Masiha (מָשִיחַ),” occurs within the entire New Testament corpus only in John (1:41; 4:25). The Greek translation (Χριστός) of this Semitic title does not connote any redeeming figure in the Hellenistic extra-biblical usages and it always refers to objects or abstract ideas. Therefore, not to mention the Semitic semantic provenance, the Greek epithet “Christ” was not intelligible to Gentiles in the Hellenistic cultural and/or religious contexts with reference to an eschatological overtone as denoted in the Gospel of John:  

As far as tradition-historical considerations are concerned, all NT texts with Χριστός are related to the OT and Jewish traditions. There is no secondary influence from secular Greek usage, which never applied Χριστός to persons;  

—The third failure of previous quests [the Old and New Quests] has been the mistake of looking for a distinctive Jesus, distinctive in the sense of a Jesus different from his environment. This failure also has a twin aspect: first, the determination to find a non-Jewish Jesus.” James D. G. Dunn, A New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 58 (italics original). An example of distancing these two Sitz-im-Lebens to a considerable extent is attested to in Eduard Lohse, Grundriß der neutestamentlichen Theologie, 5th ed., TW 5 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1998), 43-50. For a thorough critique of the New Quest and positive examination of the Third Quest, which locates the historical Jesus in the framework of Jewish apocalypticism, see N. T. Wright, Jesus and Victory of God, COQG 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 28-124.  


W. Radd, “Μεσσιάς, οὖ,” in EDNT, 2:412; BDAG, 634.  


Hahn, “Χριστός,” 485.
Basically the word [Xπιτώς] describes a thoroughly secular, everyday process, and has no sacral undertone at all.\textsuperscript{38}

Therefore, Craig Keener comments that

"Messiah" was a Jewish category, not Gentile, so it is hardly plausible that the title was invented by later Gentile Christians. "Christ" was a natural way to translate "Messiah" into Greek, and so it translates "anointed one" regularly in the LXX. . . . That John, writing in Greek, should explicitly translate "Messiah" as "Christ (1:41)," need not indicate Gentiles in his audience, as some have thought; quite the contrary, John is the only NT writer to include the Semitic term at all.\textsuperscript{39}

Finally, the Johannine narratives which inquire of Jesus’ identity manifest repeatedly a tenacious recourse to the exclusive Jewish messianic ideas and expectations as forecast, according to John, in the utmost Jewish authority, the Old Testament. In this respect, Klaus Scholtissek’s assessment is illuminating. He posits that the Johannine Christology is fundamentally biblical theology in the sense that the fourth evangelist reformulates the Old Testament view of God, and applies it to Jesus the Nazarene in terms of Messiah.

This aspect is most tangibly felt in the passion narratives in which the fourth evangelist depicts the suffering of Jesus as fulfilling the messianic qualifications as expected of the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{41}


\textsuperscript{41}See the section on the fulfillment themes of the Fourth Gospel in Appendix 3: The
As such, the aforementioned reasons lead one to conclude that Johannine Christology is dovetailed within the incipient Judaism, inclusive of the Old Testament. As a corollary, this judgment heuristically points to the ancient Jewish messianic antecedents as hermeneutically promising clues for a better understanding of Johannine Christology. Although this perspective does not promote the sheer exclusion of Hellenistic divine mediator types or traditions, it must, however, be acknowledged that the Jewish religious traditions require a substantially much closer scrutiny than other religious-cultural variables with reference to the formation of the Johannine Christology. In this respect, the comment made by Stephen Smalley is penetrating for the scope of this study.

Our consideration of the Jewish influence on the background to the Fourth Gospel leads us to the conclusion that John’s ethos is at root more in touch with Judaism than Hellenism . . . but if we accept the description of John’s background as ‘Jewish-Hellenistic’ . . . we must also recognize that the contact with Judaism is primary. The Hellenistic features of the Fourth Gospel tell us more about its final audience, that is to say, than about the background of its author or its tradition.

**Thesis**

In Judaism of the second temple period, Jewish messianic figures were often expected to play a redivivus role such as that of the king David, Moses, or the prophet

---


Elijah. Such language or metaphor, however, is strikingly absent in John. In view of this observation, therefore, this dissertation endeavors to make a case that the fourth evangelist presents the Old Testament characters primarily as witnesses to Jesus’ messianic identity in contradistinction to conventional Jewish messianic hopes prior to or contemporary with the writing of John’s Gospel. This conclusion, however, does not entail a sharp break between the Jewish Scriptures and the Fourth Gospel. One of the more conspicuous reasons lies in John’s belief that Jesus is the fulfillment of the Jewish Scriptures and that their testimony is valid as far as it concerns his messianic characteristics.44

History of Research

Theios Aner Theory

Before summarizing the contributions which sought to account for the Johannine Christology in light of the traditional Jewish messianic figures, it is worthwhile to comment on some previous attempts to resolve this question from the Hellenistic context. Hans-Jürgen Kuhn, for example, found no conclusive evidence that the evangelist spoke of Jesus in terms of a prophet.45 He further noted the absence of a miracle-working messiah in Jewish tradition. Thus, he postulated a theios aner Christology for the Signs Source in which Jesus is referred to as “Son of God.” Since the “Son of God” title is more akin to the Jewish context in his estimation, he dialectically came up with a merged conception of a Jewish “Son of God” and a Hellenistic miracle-working redeemer which he posited to be present in the Christology of the Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel.

Obwohl nicht nur Joh 1,35-42.44-50, sondern sogar das gesamte Neuen Testament den Terminus θειος ἀνήρ nicht kennt, die alttestamentlich-jüdische und auch die neutestamentlich-christlich beeinflußte Tradition das Adjektiv θειος kaum oder

44Labahn, “Jesus und die Autorität der Schrift im Johannesevangelium,” 203-06.
überhaupt nicht zur unmittelbaren Charakterisierung von Menschen gebraucht, neigt die vorliegende Arbeit dazu, Jesus in der befragten Texteinheit als sog. göttlichen Menschen dargestellt zu sehen, wenn auch diese Redeweise nach wie vor schillernd bleibt. . . . Die vorliegende Auseinandersetzung mit dem Abschnitt 1,35-51 zeigt deutlich, daß Literarkritik bei der Frage nach der Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums ihren legitimen Stellenwert besitzt, daß zugleich der Blick sich auf die alttestamentlich-jüdische Tradition in ihrer ganzen Breite richten muß, wenn es um die Frage nach den Wundern in NT, näherhin bei Joh geht, daß zugleich aber auch die rein hellenistische Darstellung unbedingt der Berücksichtigung bedarf. 46

Despite some measure of popularity since 1960's, the theios aner theory, however, is deemed to be fraught with intrinsic methodical flaws. 47 John Polhill, for instance, offers a three-tiered caution. 48 First, the major sources cited to advocate the theory date back to from as early as the early third century A.D. onward. Thus, the serious anachronistic nature of the comparative approach hampers the alleged influence of the Hellenistic divine myths on Johannine Christology. 49 The advocates of the theios-

46 His point is that although the term, "theios aner" is explicitly stated nowhere in the New Testament, his analysis of the Fourth Gospel, and John 1:35-51 in particular, leads him to conclude that the Gospel reflects a fused expression, that of the Old Testament and Hellenistic myths, of a divine man with reference to Jesus. Kuhn, Christologie und Wunder, 554-56.


aner theory usually claim the necessity of incipient oral traditions prior to their written stages. Granted that the existence of the extended period of an oral stage is certainly possible, however, a scientific query cannot be pursued on the basis of speculative oral traditions without any tangible evidence.

Second, the general characteristics of divine man myths are also problematic. In other words, the picture of a divine man is an artificially constructed one in that a number of recurring features are compiled from a number of sources so as to create a composite ideal figure. “The concept ‘theios aner’ is certainly freely used but seldom defined, and when it is defined, then so broadly that all figures rising out of antiquity might be subsumed under it.”

It is thus doubtful as to whether the divine man image of Kuhn was created at his fingertips or it was actually circulated among the first century Mediterranean folks.

Finally, the history of religions approach, which Polhill labels as reductionistic, appears to assume an immense logical leap with great ease. Differently put, even if there are some parallel imageries and symbols between the miracle accounts of the Fourth Gospel and certain Hellenistic literature, they do not automatically necessitate a literary or social-cultural dependence between them (unless of course one document claims such relationship as the Gospel of John evinces a direct dependence on the Old Testament which is attested obviously in the Johannine fulfillment formulae). These alleged parallels might simply suggest the universal nature of hope for a miraculous and gracious redemption from the common human ordeals experienced in the majority of cultures.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Gerd Petzke, *Die Traditionen über Apollonius von Tyana und das Neue Testament*, SCHNT 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1970), 161. The translation is Polhill’s. Polhill, “Perspectives on the Miracle Stories,” 391. Similarly, “In fact, many of the figures in Bieler’s exhaustive collection of ancient sources were never called θείος ἄνδρος by an ancient author. This recognition has given rise to questions about how much Bieler’s influential picture of a single, defined ‘archetype’ for divine men was in fact created by his indiscriminate use of a single (anachronistic and imposed) title. . . . Bieler himself compounds so many features of the ‘type,’ many of which are represented by only one or two (often anachronistic) members, that the very notion of a unified figure begins to seem forced.” Scott, “Is Philo’s Moses a Divine Man?,” 89-90.

Thus, Polhill writes that

"[t]here are parallels to nearly every detail of the Gospel miracles in the ancient literature—both as to form and content. This should come as no surprise. It is mere testimony to the fact that the miracle stories belong to the literary and social milieu of the first-century. One should expect an affinity with that milieu."  

For the reasons discussed above, the juxtaposition of Johannine Christology with non-Jewish Hellenistic literature does not seem hermeneutically promising. Rather, a more obvious provenance of Johannine messianism is observed in references to the Old Testament symbols and figures, with which the fourth evangelist plainly and repeatedly associates.

**Johannine Christology and the Jewish Messianic Figures**

A number of studies sought to address the correlation between the Johannine Christology and the major Old Testament protagonists in John’s Gospel. A brief chronological overview of selective studies on such topics will provide us with a glimpse into the development of the scholarly assessment of the issue.  

**T. F. Glasson.** Thomas F. Glasson published one of the first modern book-length treatments that located a thematic linkage of John’s Christology with an Old Testament messianic figure, Moses. He argued that Jesus is presented as a second (or

---

52 Polhill, “Perspectives on the Miracle Stories,” 392.


new) Moses based on the typological parallels found in the Gospel and in some Jewish literature (the Old Testament and rabbinic documents). His study, however, has drawn some criticism, especially for his excessive detection of typology. For example, A. J. B. Higgins, in a critique of Glasson’s association of the brazen serpent and Jesus, comments as follows: “The kind of exegesis offered here is in danger of becoming excessively typological. Not all the resemblances which Dr Glasson sees between Moses and Christ were necessarily or even probably present in the evangelist’s own mind.” Furthermore, his uncritical use of the rabbinic materials (especially without regards to their dating issues) clouds the value of this otherwise fine study on the role of Moses in the Gospel of John.

Wayne Meeks. Wayne Meeks’ doctoral dissertation accepted at Yale in 1965 was in many ways truly a ground-breaking attempt to account for Johannine Christology in terms of the Jewish expectation of the prophet like Moses, whom Meeks assesses to be regarded as the prophet-king _par excellence_ in Judaism of the Second Temple period. The fourth evangelist reveals a multi-layered understanding of Jesus. At first, he fulfills the functions expected of Moses (thus, Jesus being the true Moses). Then, the Christ does this in such a superior and exclusive way that Moses is stripped of those messianic functions and presented, not as a messianic type, but merely as a messianic witness to

---


Jesus (thus, discounting Glasson's thesis significantly). From this notion, he advances to postulate the *Sitz-im-Leben* of the alleged Johannine community as one standing in tension with a Moses-revered Jewish community.

Criticism of Meeks' study can be unfolded in three respects. First, his reconstruction of the Johannine community employs a mirror-reading based on oversimplistic deductions. It is not entirely clear as to why a certain Johannine interpretation should not have derived from the first *Sitz-im-Leben* (that of Jesus) instead of the third (that of the early church). Second, the broad scope and meticulous examination of relevant materials evident in his study is commendable. The latter aspect, offering a broad overview on the Mosaic estimation in the intertestamental Judaism on the one hand, however, shades his conclusion. The reason is because he bases his thesis (that Jesus is the prophet-king Moses) disproportionately upon the Jewish literary evidences outside the Gospel of John. He investigates primarily two Johannine pericopae, John 7:37-52 and 18:28-19:22, devoting about 70 pages, while the examination of the extra-canonical literature takes up 220 pages. As a result, a reader suspects that Meeks has superimposed the idea of the extra-canonical sources onto the Johannine text. The final criticism is his heavy dependence upon non-mainstream Jewish sources, for example, some later Samaritan, Mandaean, and late rabbinic texts. The late dates of these writings significantly diminish the value of the parallels that Meeks finds in their texts. The direction of influence seems to be from John onto those Jewish texts in view of the dating of the documents. Furthermore, Meeks does not carefully account for

---

57 This unparalleled or contrastive nature of Moses and Jesus is supported by a number of scholars, for instance, John Painter, *The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature, and Theology of the Johannine Community*, 2nd ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 253-86; Peder Borgen, "John 6: Tradition, Interpretation and Composition," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge*, ed. Martinus C. de Boer, JSNTSup 84 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 269-71.

58 Meeks examines an extensive range of materials for his research. Along with the Old Testament and the Fourth Gospel, both Jewish and non-Jewish literature of the intertestamental period, later rabbinic documents, and the Samaritan and Mandaean sources are carefully examined in order to locate possible Mosaic parallels with the Gospel. His proposals will be further evaluated in chap. 5.
the conceptual affinities between John and those literatures but takes them for granted. Especially problematic is John's connection with the Mandaean sources, which is largely refuted in recent Johannine scholarship (see Appendix 2: "Religionsgeschichte and the Fourth Gospel"). Nevertheless, this work of Meeks has exerted a lasting impact on the subsequent Johannine studies that bear relevance to the identity and historical setting of the so-called Johannine community.

**J. Louis Martyn.** Similar to Wayne Meeks and Raymond E. Brown, J. Louis Martyn marks a watershed point in the history of Johannine research. His contribution lies in the establishment of the Jewish hostility toward Jesus and his disciples as reflecting a historical reality of the later period. This insight stands in stark contrast to his predecessors, who approached the Gospel in an abstract manner, for example, the existential interpretation of Bultmann. Based on his historical reading, Martyn further argued that the tension portrayed in the Gospel reflects not only that of the first *Sitz-im-Leben* but that of the third, that is, the life setting of the alleged Johannine community. Thus, "two-level drama" has become a popular entry framework for a study of John. Since the dual reflection of the first and third life settings was important for the understanding of the Gospel, Martyn came up with the Gospel's progressive portrayal of Jesus concerning the Mosaic prophet image. Differently put, although the earlier layers contain a positive Mosaic image of Jesus, the later editorial hands accentuate the faith in

---


Jesus whose quality is far superior to that of Moses. Both Meeks and Martyn represent earlier form-critical attempts, which conveniently attributed the seemingly contradictory internal textual testimonies to different Sitzen-im-Leben. However, this deduction of the Johannine community has been rigorously criticized due to its artificial conjecture of the reality of writing (that, it is usually an individual who writes a book), underestimation of the competence of the final author (or redactor who is usually capable of resolving contradictory theologies in the final draft of writing), and the lack of concrete historical evidences for such an isolated and exclusive Christian community.\(^6^1\) The third point particularly deserves serious consideration. Since there is no explicit internal testimony to both early Christian and non-Christian records of the presence of such a community producing the Gospel of John, the burden of proof rests entirely on those who argue for the writing of the Gospel by a certain sectarian group. On the contrary, the early patristic witness, however, points to an individual author by the name of John.\(^6^2\)

Marinus de Jonge. Marinus de Jonge published a review article in which he considered the previously reviewed work of Meeks.\(^6^3\) Regardless of some agreements

---


\(^6^2\)Martin Hengel, Die johanneische Frage: Ein Lösungsversuch, WUNT 67 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 61-95.

\(^6^3\)Marinus de Jonge, “Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel,” ETL 47 (1973): 160-
with Meeks at a few points, he parts ways with Meeks at one important point. That is, the themes “king” and “prophet” (and even the epithet “Christ”) are not central to John. Rather, the expressions “Son of Man” and “Son of God” are keys to Johannine Christology.64

De Jonge’s notion might be correct that the Christological titles could possess higher hermeneutical priorities in John’s presentation of Jesus as Christ (his thesis is hypothetically accepted for argument’s sake at this point).65 Nonetheless, he does not adequately address some important historical questions related to John’s Christological presentation, namely, how the evangelist concretely used such ambiguous and fluid terms as those epithets and how he also anticipated without further explanation the immediate understanding on the part of his hearers or readers. For instance, the term “Son of Man” occurs only three times in the entire Jewish writings of the Second Temple Judaism: Daniel 7, 1 Enoch 37-71, and 4 Ezra 13. However, the evidence is comparatively clear that the Danielic text had a heavy influence on the latter two. It is generally accepted that there was no widespread “Son of Man” messianism in pre-Christian Judaism.66 Thus,


65Cf. “he is not simply a prophet like Moses as a second Moses, but the Son of God who came to do God’s will, that is: to give eternal life to all who believe.” de Jonge, “Jesus as Prophet and King in the Fourth Gospel,” 167-68.

Seyoon Kim writes

Now, the question is whether there was an apocalyptic Son of Man messianism at the time of Jesus. Against the older assumption that there was in the pre-Christian Judaism an expectation for the Son of Man as the messiah, it has been rightly made clear recently that before the New Testament there was no such messianic title as "the Son of Man."67

Similarly, Geza Vermes reaches a four-fold conclusion concerning the use of the "son of man" based on his observation of the pertinent Jewish writings: (1) bar nash [in Aramaic uses] is a regular expression for 'man' in general, (2) bar nash often serves as an indefinite pronoun, (3) the Aramaic speaker often referred to himself, not as 'I', but as 'the son of man,' and (4) in none of the passages, not even in the Jewish messianic exegesis of Daniel 7, does the expression bar nasha figure as a title.68 On the other hand,

---

67Seyoon Kim, *The Son of Man as the Son of God*, WUNT 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 19. Kim lists a number of scholars to support his statement: Moule, Schnackenburg, Leivestad, Marshall, Colpe, Lindars, Schweizer, and Fitzmyer. Kim, however, belongs to the group of scholars which maintains the Son of Man Christology was influenced by the Danielic tradition. Through a complicated linguistic analysis, R. Buth also postulates the Danielic background of Jesus' self-designation, "Son of Man," as a "quasi-title." However, his proposal fails to take note of the destination or the intended audience of the Gospels, especially that of Mark. From his repeated explanations of Jewish customs and idioms, it is evident that the intended audience was not familiar with Semitic backgrounds. That such a courteous explanation is lacking with regard to the son of man phrase must have been mystifying to the original Markan reader, if the phrase were a quasi-title. See Randall Buth, "A more Complete Semitic Background for ܡܫܚܒܐ ܫܡܥܐ, "Son of Man,"" in *The Function of Scripture in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, JSNTSup 154 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1998), 176-89. For a convenient survey on the son of man debate, see J. Howard Marshall, "The Son of Man in Contemporary Debate," in *Jesus the Saviour: Studies in New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1990), 100-20. Marshall takes the middle of the road position that both views are possible. Similarly, for those who argue that "Son of Man" refers to both divine and human natures of Jesus, see William O. Walker, "John 1:43-51 and 'The Son of Man' in the Fourth Gospel," *JSNT* 56 (1994): 31-42; Clay Ham, "The Title 'Son of Man' in the Gospel of John," *SCJ* 1 (1998): 67-84.

in intertestamental Judaism, the title “Son of God” referred to such a wide range of individuals that it is virtually impossible to speak of “Son of God” messianism (also, the link of “Son of God” with messianism is rather meager): “[S]on of God’ was always understood metaphorically in Jewish circles. In Jewish sources, its use never implies participation by the person so-named in the divine nature.”69 Furthermore, it seems that it is, not the title (“Son of Man”) that confers the Christological qualifications to Jesus, but the various conceptual images and the events which are closely associated with Jesus in the Johannine narrative contexts that constitute the Christological characteristics proposed by the advocates of “Son of Man” Christology theory.70

It is, therefore, logical to assume that the more concrete and definite messianic icons, such as David, Elijah, or Moses, would have more readily exhibited the messianic overtones of Jesus’ signs to the first century Jewish audiences than would the opaque conceptions, such as “Son of Man” or “Son of God” (this is especially true in view of the advocates of “Son of Man” Christology who cannot explicate why the evangelist does little to explain such an obscure Semitic phrase to the Hellenistic audience).71 De Jonge appears to overstate his case by downplaying the way in which the messianic identity of

69 Geza Vermes, “Jewish Studies and New Testament Interpretation,” in Jesus in His Jewish Context (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 66. The emphasis could have been on the function, not on the ontic aspect with regard to the epithet “Son of God.” In other words, the title could have referred to the kind of individuals who do works in service of God.

70 John Painter, for instance, concludes that “there is no Son or Son of Man Christology in John.” His judgment is based on his exegesis of the Johannine “Son of Man” texts, which demonstrate high Christology through various themes (i.e., “descent and ascent,” “king and judge,” “from giver to gift,” “exaltation and glorification,” and “Messiah”). Thus, it is these themes or traditions that constitute the Johannine Christology, not the epithet “Son of Man” in these texts. In short, the term contributes too little to the heavenly origin of Johannine Christology. John Painter, “The Enigmatic Johannine Son of Man,” in Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck, ed. F. van Segbroeck et al., BETL 100 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1887; idem, The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community, 2nd ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 319-42. Also for the negation of “Son of Man” Christology in John, see Margaret Pamment, “The Son of Man in the Fourth Gospel,” JTS 36 (1985): 56-66; Mogens Müller, “‘Have You Faith in the Son of Man?’ (John 9.35),” NTS 37 (1991): 291-94.

71 The most appropriate background of the term when applied to Jesus was the sense ‘Messiah.’” Keener, The Gospel of John, 1:295. Cf. “Figural representation is . . . the basic recognition that the biblical authors employ images or figures familiar to their readers . . . to present their eschatological messages.” M. Jay Wells, “Figural Representation and Canonical Unity,” in Biblical Theology: Retrospect and Prospect, ed. Scott J. Hafemann (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 113.
Jesus is carried over through, and often in contrast to, the terms of the traditional Jewish messianic figures, as found at many junctures in the Fourth Gospel.

**Georg Richter, Francis Grob, and Wolfgang Bittner.** Georg Richter and Francis Grob concurred with Glasson by expressing their understanding of Jesus’ identity as a miracle-working prophet-messiah like Moses. They based their arguments on their exegesis of the “signs” passages in John (contra Kuhn). Their thesis was broadened by Wolfgang Bittner, who included David in the scope of messianic precursors in the Gospel (as it seems to be the most predominant messianic paradigm in antique Judaism). He argued that although miraculous signs are repeatedly and decisively linked with Jesus, John’s Gospel refuses to associate Jesus with prophets. Rather, he is depicted as a prophet-messiah like Moses and David.

**Marie-Émile Boismard.** Marie-Émile Boismard also joined the interpretive tradition which explicates Johannine Christology in terms of ancient Jewish messianic figures. He based his thesis largely on his belief in John’s indebtedness to the Samaritan tradition on Deuteronomy 18:18-19, and argued that the Moses-like-messiah stands at the center of Johannine Christology. The majority and the most nascent redactional layers, according to him, speak of Jesus in terms of a new Moses or a prophet like Moses,

---


74“My interpretation of Johannine thought is at the opposite pole from that of Bultmann: the Johannine Christ is situated above all in the line of the prophets, and especially of Moses, who were sent by God to reveal his will to men.” Marie-Émile Boismard, *Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Leuven: Peeters, 1993); trans., *Moïse ou Jésus: essai de christologie Johannique*, BETL 84 (Leuven: Peeters: Leuven University Press, 1988), xiv-xv.
although a small portion of the final redaction added the superiority of Jesus over Moses.
The earlier redactional layers represent the attempt to evangelize the Samaritans while the latter the Jews, compelling the readers to choose between Moses and Jesus.\textsuperscript{75}

**Margaret Daly-Denton.** Margaret Daly-Denton has broken new ground in the study of Johannine Christology. She is the first one to recognize a large scale correspondence between David and Jesus in John.\textsuperscript{76} Her judgment is based on a structural comparison of John (it is commonly argued that John has a bipartite structure) with the first two books of the Psalms to find close parallels between them. She then goes on to say that the structural analysis and some intertextual echoes demand an understanding of the Fourth Gospel in which Jesus fulfills and replaces the Mosaic institutions as the Davidic messiah.\textsuperscript{77}

**Eric M. E. Wallace.** In contrast to the previous studies that sought to elucidate Moses in John as an arch-type of Jesus, Eric Wallace sets out his study in the

\textsuperscript{75}The work of Boismard will be further assessed more in detail in chap. 5.


jurisdiction setting, especially that of the Old Testament. Over against the court narratives of the Pentateuch, he maintains that the fourth evangelist depicts Moses as a witness on behalf of Jesus. Two conclusions of his dissertation are particularly pertinent for the present research. First, the Pentateuch is intimately woven throughout the Gospel of John. Thus, the knowledge of the foundational Jewish traditions is a crucial hermeneutical prerequisite on the part of the reader of John. The second observation especially marks a watershed point in the study of Moses in the Johannine Gospel because Wallace points out the narrative contribution of Moses in terms of a witness role (not his typological prefiguration as often argued in the previous studies) in defense of Jesus who is “Son of God” and is also equated with Yahweh.

This brief summary of the previous contributions manifests a mixed tendency toward identifying John’s Christology. Concerning the comparative figures, primarily Moses and/or David are often central to the discussions. In terms of the narrative role pertaining to Johannine Christology, views range between a typological prefiguration and a messianic witness. Regardless of the various opinions, they all seem to be unanimous in pointing out the important Jewish heroic figures as standing in close connection with the Christology of the fourth Gospel.

Recent German Contributions with a Particular Emphasis on Scripture as Christological Witness

The use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of John has recently drawn a great

---


79 Thus, Wallace construes that what Moses wrote about Jesus in the law and the prophets (John 1:45) refers to the Pentateuch.

80 Although Wallace does not seem to be cognizant of the recent German scholarship on this point as will be reviewed in the following section, his thesis stands in accordance with a number of Johannine scholars who understand the function of the scripture and the Old Testament characters primarily as witness in John.
deal of scholarly attention. Some of these studies, especially written by German exegetes, have focused on the contribution of “Scripture” to the messianic identity of Jesus. Their assessment of the role of “Scripture” more or less forms a consensus. That is, “Scripture” functions as Christological witness. As such, a review of these studies bears a direct relevance on the present discussion on the narrative role of the Old Testament characters as Christological witnesses. The following review will provide a point of departure for the present investigation as to the correlation between the functions of “Scripture” and the Old Testament characters.

**Martin Hengel.** In a lengthy essay on the role of the Scripture in the Fourth Gospel, Martin Hengel argues for a three-fold thesis. First, the role of the Scripture is so great that John’s Gospel must be seen as both anti-docetic and anti-gnostic. Second, the Gospel presupposes one salvation history, and the picture of Israel is overshadowed in the present Jesus event, which the Old Testament figures accepted. Furthermore, they were content to be witnesses of this salvation history. Finally, the evangelist is to be understood as an original exegete of the Jewish texts better understood in view of Philo.

---

Andreas Obermann. In a dissertation inquiring into the use of the Old Testament in John’s Gospel, Andreas Obermann reaches a six-fold conclusion. The Christological dimension is fundamental to John’s understanding of the Scriptures. The Old Testament is an authoritative witness to Jesus as the Christ. The Scriptures and Jesus mutually interpret each other in the working of Jesus in the Christological light. The glory of Jesus is indispensable for the Christological understanding of the Scriptures. This shift of understanding (from the conventional Jewish understanding of the Scriptures as the supreme authority and the source of life) is due to the evangelist’s memory and the guidance of the Paraclete. Finally, John was a scriptural theologian and the Old Testament was an important background in the formation of his theology.  

Christian Dietzfelbinger. Christian Dietzfelbinger is one of the first, in recent years, to perceptibly recognize the unique Johannine presentation of the Scriptures. The typological rendering of the Old Testament characters does not stand out. Rather, the Scriptures as a whole remain exclusively as a witness for the Christological identity of Jesus. In contrast to the testimonies of the Old Testament, the Old Testament characters do not provide a typological prefiguration as a recipient of the divine revelation, which becomes available only through Jesus. The reason is because only he “looked at God; only he climbed up the heaven and down from it (3:13). Therefore, only he can give authentic information of God (1:18); in the OT, however, such notion is not
to be found.\(^{84}\) According to Dietzfelbinger, the evangelist explains the justification of the Jewish rejection of Jesus on the basis of Scripture’s anticipation and pre-witness in John.

**Wolfgang Kraus.** On the other hand, Wolfgang Kraus explicates the Scriptures in the strongest antithetical terms of all the Johannine exegetes under review.\(^{85}\) With attention both to explicit citations of the Old Testament and to statements about “Scripture” in the Fourth Gospel, the author makes nine observations (summarized in pp. 18-19). First, in reference back to Genesis 1:1, John 1:1 equates the beginning of the Christ event (Christusgeschehens) with the beginning of the creation. Second, according to John 1:17, Moses and Christ (in John’s phrase, “law” and “grace and truth”) represent the old and the new order respectively, standing with each other in an antithetical relationship, or, at least, the latter replaces the former.\(^{86}\) Third, the earlier νόμος does not apply to the Johannine community any longer. The bywords (“your” or “their law”) indicate this aspect (cf. 8:5, 17, 10:34, 15:25, 18:31). Only the new order of stipulations, embodied in Jesus (13:34), are relevant to the Johannine community.\(^{87}\) Fourth, the Passion accounts of the Gospels altogether, particularly that of the Johannine Gospel, are to be understood as “arch-typical cult reports” in an anti-thesis to the Peshah Haggada. Fifth, the verb πληροῦν is used in 18:9 and 18:32 concerning the word of Jesus. Therefore, the word of Jesus and the “Scripture” stand in the same stage. Sixth, the outcry of Jesus in John 19:28 (“it is


\(^{86}\)Also, Obermann, *Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannevangelium*, 53-56.

finished”) indicates that the “Scripture” was completed (τὰ τελευταὶ γραφῆ). Seventh, the proper understanding for the “Scripture” is made possible only in view of the Jesus events, particularly the resurrection of Jesus (2:17, 12:15, 20:9). Eighth, after the resurrection, the “Scripture” and the words of Jesus were fused with one another to become a unit (2:22 in the context of 2:18-22; see also 12:16, 20:8). Finally, in the bread of life discourse (John 6), it is not the scriptural quotations but the word of Jesus in verse thirty-five that occupies the central meaning. The “Scripture” is subordinated to the words of Jesus thereby and possesses no independent relevance. Only in the light of the Jesus’ words and in reference to the Jesus event, the “Scripture” becomes comprehensible.

Based on these observations, Kraus reaches a four-fold conclusion (pp. 19-21). John understands the Scripture as a witness to Jesus; he also regards the Christ event to be the “fulfillment” of Scriptures; Jesus brings the imperfect Scripture to a “termination (Abschluß)”, and finally the Jesus event moves to the rank of “Scripture.” In addition to these four points, Kraus makes one more important notion along the same line in another article. That is, John sees the abandoning of the old redemptive program which was being carried out in Judaism, and the new salvific program is put into effect in Jesus.

In addition to his assessment of the role of “Scripture,” the brief mention of the

---


function of the Old Testament characters is of direct relevance for the present study (pp. 21-22). Kraus posits that John employs the Old Testament characters (Abraham, Isaiah, Moses, and John the Baptist) paradigmatically. In the accounts of these figures, the reception of the word of God is self-evident in the Old Testament. However, the Johannine depiction of these figures manifests some degree of ambivalence. For instance, Abraham is an ancestor, but not the father. He is jubilant, not over the birth of his son Isaac as Jews would have believed, but over his witness of “the day of Jesus (8:56).” Isaiah is a witness for Christ (12:41), both for the Jewish rejection of Jesus and the unbelief of Israelites in his time. Moses passed down the law, which cannot be broken (10:34). However, the community possesses a new commandment (13:34). Moses prefigures the giving up of the life of Jesus (3:16). The law was given through him, but Christ replaces it (1:17). The contrast exists, thus, between “law” on the one hand and “grace and truth” on the other side, not between Moses and Jesus, because Moses wrote about Christ (1:45, 5:39, 45). On the other hand, it is the law of the Moses, by which Jesus is delivered to death (18:31, 19:7). It is a misconception to believe that Moses would have given the heavenly bread (6:32), which sustained the Israelites, but it was not the bread of life. Finally John the Baptist stands within the rank of the Old Testament figures in John’s Gospel and plays an important witness role. However, he completely disappears as a person behind his witness for Christ (3:30). Kraus offers one of the more convenient overviews on John’s portrayal of the Scriptures and the Old Testament characters with much insight, although he seems to interpret the texts oversimplistically at times. His article is primarily focused on the role of Moses, and it will be closely reviewed in Chapter Five.

M. J. J. Menken. Marten Menken, a Catholic faculty member at the University of Utrecht, delivered a keynote address before the annual meeting of the New
Testament Society of South Africa in 1999. The kernel of his address is that the Scriptures and the Old Testament figures are employed as valid witnesses to the messianic identity of Jesus. In other words, their validity stands as far as they bear witness to the messianic identity of Jesus. However, they do not amount to the true revelation of God as revealed through Jesus, who according to the evangelist is the only true revelation (similar to Kraus’ third and fourth conclusions).

William Loader. Although not a German himself but in substantial engagement with German scholarship, William Loader concurs with a number of other German exegetes. His observation on the use of the Law in the Fourth Gospel enables him to posit several conclusions: first, “the Law [inclusive of more than the Pentateuch in the Fourth Gospel] matters because it points forward to Christ” (p. 73). The Scriptures [an equivalent of the Law in the Gospel] are not disparaged by any means because they were given by God with an implication that they bear divine authority. However,
generally there is replacement [theme]: of the temple and related laws not because of its destruction, but because . . . they have been taken up and replaced by Jesus” (p. 73). In view of this estimation, “The role of the Old must now be redefined. Its role as the basis for cultic and ritual practice ceases. . . . Its role now is to testify through its words, stories and rituals to Christ” (p. 73). That is to say that, “John affirms the Law only as testimony to Christ” (p. 74).95

Klaus Scholtissek. In response primarily to Menken and other German exegetes, Klaus Scholtissek, one of the most prolific German writers of this generation on the Fourth Gospel, reconsiders various viewpoints on the function of the Old Testament in John’s Gospel as proposed by Obermann, Menken, Kraus, Theobald, and Dietzfelbinger. He then goes on to classify them in three categories, namely, “the Christological fulfillment as abolition of the Scripture,” “cancellation of salvation history,” and “typological interpretation of Scripture.”96 Ultimately, Scholtissek is largely dissatisfied with these preceding views because they demonstrate a minimalistic appreciation of the Scriptures in view of the Johannine remark that “the law cannot be broken.”97

His article is, however, unpersuasive in two respects. On the one hand,

95Similarly, “There seems to be a broad consensus that John sees the primary role of the Law as bearing witness to Christ.” Loader, Jesus’ Attitude towards the Law, 446. “The exclusive Christology appears therefore to leave no room for a dual authority: the Son and the Law. What once was said of the Law now belongs exclusively to Christ. . . . the Law cannot be seen as anything more than supporting evidence, but at least this remains. The treatment of John the Baptist provides a helpful analogy. John is neither dismissed nor allowed to stand beside Jesus as a second authority. Idem, “Jesus and the Law in John,” 152.


Scholtissek’s interpretation of John 10:35 is misleading since the phrase (that “the law cannot be broken”) was quoted to undergird the validity of the Scripture’s testimony to Jesus’ identity as “Son of God” in the immediate literary context (as Menken’s perceptive essay addresses the validity of the Scripture, that is, the Scripture is valid as far as it bears testimony to Jesus being Christ).98 Second, he does not take into account the fourth evangelist’s different use of the terms, λόγος (“word”) and γραφή (“scripture”). The former refers to God incarnate while the latter points to the Mosaic writings.99 It is suspected that his judgment is largely driven by an external concern for Jewish-Christian dialogue rather than by the internal textual witness.

**Michael Labahn.** A recent Festschrift to Johannes Beutler is devoted entirely to the questions concerning the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel.100 Some of the essays from this volume are pertinent to the present discussion. Michael Labahn’s essay addresses how the authority of Jesus supersedes that of the Old Testament. For him, Jesus is the hermeneutical key to Scripture, and the only passage to the true understanding of God:

Die Schriften und der gesandte Sohn stehen in einer qualifizierten und keineswegs gleich gelagerten Relation. Jesus ist der hermeneutische Schlüssel der Schrift—ohne den Gesandten ist Gott, der selbst und dessen doxa in Jesus sichtbar sind (1,14; 2,11; 12,41)—ungesehen und ungehört.101

---


Labahn first recognizes that the recent German contributions to the theme of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel are set within the notion of the complex unity of the Father and the Son (p. 186). Within this unity, the Son is portrayed as the exclusive revelation of the Father. Thus, the Son possesses the revelatory superiority over Moses and the prophets chronologically, hermeneutically, and functionally. For Labahn, the hermeneutical key to Johannine Christology is, in this light, the concept of the pre-existent Logos, which legitimizes John’s presentation of Jesus as the ultimate revelation of God himself.

There are two more essays from the Festschrift to Beutler that are pertinent to the present discussion. Hans-Josef Klauck advances nine distinct criteria by which Old Testament materials in the Gospel are to be identified. Michael Theobald, on the other hand, explores the perplexing question of the function of the Jewish Patriarchs who seem to be downplayed in John. The first point in his three-fold conclusion is particularly germane to the present discussion. That is, for the evangelist, Abraham is exclusively a witness for Christ.

---


104 Michael Theobald, “Abraham—(Isaak—) Jacob: Israels Väter im Johannesevangelium,” in Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannesevangelium: Festgabe für Johannes Beutler SJ zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. Michael Labahn, Klauss Scholtissek, and Angelika Strotmann (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), 158-84. The other two conclusions are (1) this first observation does not imply the Johannine community being a “fatherless” society. Rather, the polemic is leveled against the synagogue of Jewish Christianity; and (2) a hermeneutical consideration pivotal for the Fourth Gospel is the past projection of the Johannine Christianity’s self-denial suffered by the contemporary synagogue. Theobald made an important observation relating to the present discussion. His examination of the “bread speech” in John 6
Justification for the Present Study

Scripture as Christological Witness

A cursory review of the previous contributions shows that much has been already inquired of the messianic role of the Old Testament figures in the Fourth Gospel. However, three observations call for further research on the issue. First, for the last fifteen years or so, important insights have emerged particularly among German scholarship concerning the role of the Scriptures and the ancient Jewish figures in the Fourth Gospel. In their discussions, it is frequently acknowledged that Christology is an important hermeneutical key to John's interpretation of the Old Testament. Moreover, the Scriptures and the Old Testament figures coherently play, as a whole (with some generalization), a witness function for the messianic identity of Jesus. Recent scholarly literature, especially dissertations on the Fourth Gospel written in the English language, however, has largely ignored these important contributions, with few exceptions.

reveals that Jesus is not the interpreter of the Scripture but is "the authoritative revealer" by which scripture can be properly understood. This understanding entails the radical paradigmatic hermeneutical shift in that the Old Testament loses the relevance for the history of Israel and has meaning only in relation to the Jesus event. Idem, "Schriftzitate im 'Lebensbrot'-Dialog Jesu (Joh 6)," 327-66.


The witness function of Scripture is beginning to be noted in English speaking scholarship. "But that Word is rightly understood only by those who see that it refers to the Logos who was manifested most completely in Jesus. In fact, Scripture is not really the direct self-disclosure of the Father, but testimony to the Son whom the Father has made known. The witness of Scripture, though true, cannot be anything but partial and provisional; and those who read it truthfully must realize that 'Moses and the prophets bear witness to Jesus.' . . . Scripture is the enduring record of those who saw the activity of the divine Logos prior to its appearance in Jesus and then testified to what they had seen." Paul Miller, "'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him': The Gospel of John and the Old Testament," in Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament, ed. Stanley E. Porter, MNTS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 127-51 (italics original). Also, John Painter, The Quest for the Messiah: The History, Literature and Theology of the Johannine Community, 2nd ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1993), 32. Miller also notes the coherent witness function of the Old Testament figures in the Gospel. Miller, "'They Saw His Glory and Spoke of Him,'" 137-48.

Lack of Study on the Role of the Old Testament Characters


instance, a discussion on the messianic contribution of the Jewish patriarchs in the Gospel is virtually absent in recent Johannine studies.

**Legitimacy of Tradition-Historical Approach**

As a corollary to those two inquiries, the propriety of the traditionsgeschichtlich approach for the Johannine Gospel should be reckoned, as it has become an almost accepted presupposition that there was a continuous tradition of thoughts in Jewish writings of the intertestamental period bridging the two Testaments. Thus, this approach adequately accounts for not only some particular expressions but the basic theological frameworks attested to in the canonical scope of the Christian Bible and other Jewish documents of the intertestamental period.\(^{109}\) A glimpse of this presupposition is observed in the following statement of a Tübingen exegete.

Die Methode, die der Einheit der Bibel am ehesten gerecht wird, möchte ich als traditionsgeschichtliche Auslegung bezeichnen: Es gilt, der Schrift des Alten Testaments und ihrer Auslegung zu folgen, zunächst im nachbiblischen Judentum, sei es palästinisch oder hellenistisch, dann im Neuen Testament selbst und schließlich im rabbinischen Schrifttum, das zwar erst nach der neutestamentlichen Zeit abgefaßt wurde, aber in seinem mündlichen Stadium teilweise in diese zurückreicht. Von daher ergeben sich auch Kriterien für Recht und Grenze der formgeschichtlichen Methode.\(^{110}\)

Therefore, it seems to be an opportune juncture to reconsider the methodical legitimacy of the approach, at least for the Gospel of John, vis-à-vis an examination of the Gospel’s self-claim on the messianic prefigurative and/or witness role of the Old Testament

\(^{109}\) For instance, “a heavenly, transcendent Messiah was not a unique invention of the Christian community but the outgrowth of reflection that had its roots in Judaism.” Neufeld, “And When That One Comes?” 140.

\(^{110}\) Otto Betz, “Das Johannesevangelium und das Alte Testament,” in *Wie verstehen wir das Neue Testament?* (Wuppertal: Aussaat, 1981), 14-20, especially 17 for this citation. Here it should be also noted that Betz uses the terminologies with different definitions. As for him, “the form-historical method” designates the extreme history of religions assumptions, such as maintained by Rudolf Bultmann. Similarly, another Tübingen bears testimony to such a view. “Denn daß das Neue Testament ohne die Kenntnis der zeitgenössischen jüdischen Geschichte und Religion historisch weithin unverständlich bleibt, wird heute kaum mehr bestritten. Daß es jedoch umgekehrt selbst eine wichtige Quelle für die Erforschung des Judentums seiner Zeit darstellt, wird erst allmählich erkannt.” Martin Hengel, “Das Johannesevangelium als Quelle für die Geschichte des antiken Judentums,” in *Judaica, Hellenistica, et Christiana: Kleine Schriften II*, ed. Martin Hengel with Jörg Frey and Dieter Betz, WUNT 109 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 294-95.
protagonists in view of their depictions in early Judaism.

**Methods and Terms**

**Diachronic and Synchronic Approaches**

There has been a tendency in biblical scholarship to bifurcate the approaches to New Testament studies into diachronic and synchronic studies, and to argue in favor of one at the expense of the other. For instance, Martin Hengel, in his inaugural address as the president of Society for New Testament Studies, expressed an outcry for the immediate need to return to a sound diachronic approach in the discipline of New Testament studies.¹¹¹ To give an example from the opposite pole, Larry Chouinard asserts that “the literary paradigm is logically prior to the historical analysis” in the inquiry of the Gospel Christology (although, in my opinion, he offers little justification as to why the opposite cannot be the case).¹¹²

The sharp schism between the two, however, has been lately recognized as artificial and unnecessary, and accordingly, some practitioners of historical criticism have adopted in some measure positive insights offered by literary critics.¹¹³ That is, the extremely fragmentizing tendency of the diachronic approach (i.e., identifying multiple redactional layers resulting from various historical situations) probably does not

---


¹¹³For an example of this tendency, see Robert H. Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 274-75.
accurately reflect the reality of writing.\textsuperscript{114} As such, an individual document within the entire New Testament corpus should be treated as a coherent literary unity in view of its literary context.\textsuperscript{115} This notion entails the importance of considering the narrative flow. Although an excessive preoccupation with complex structural analysis must be equally avoided (such as reconstructing a sophisticated chiastic structure), a considerable measure of exegetical benefit can be gained by paying attention, first, to the immediate context that precedes and follows a pericope under discussion and, second, to the overall literary schema of the entire document (i.e., the central message of the Fourth Gospel). Accordingly, recent biblical scholarship displays the increasing awareness of the exegetical benefits gained by combining the two approaches. This recognition results in the integration of these two methods, instead of their mutual exclusion, and seems to have provided a more productive venue for Gospel studies.\textsuperscript{116} This trend generated a new


\textsuperscript{115}Als Ergebnis ist festzuhalten: Die Frage nach der Kohärenz muß der Frage nach Brüchen und Spannungen vorgeordnet werden. Denn die Frage nach der Kohärenz zielt auf die Ermittlung der Form im Sinne eines sinnvollen Zusammenhanges. Diese vorordnung besagt für die traditionsgeschichtliche Arbeitsweise nur, daß sie stärker als bisher von der Einheit von Form und Inhalt ausgehen muß und daher vor allem auch den Zusammenhang des Ganzen erklären sollte." Klaus Berger, \textit{Exegese des Neuen Testaments: Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} ed., UTB 659 (Wiesbaden: Quelle und Meyer, 1991), 32. This point is reinforced in view of the growing awareness of the oral nature of the first century communication pattern. "Oral stories do not continue to circulate as isolated, independent units until they are drawn together in written texts, as form criticism has traditionally supposed. Rather, individual stories tend to aggregate into a larger, more or less coherent overall oral narrative focused on a hero or heroes, and such an oral narrative is likely to underlie the gospels. ... Knowledge of first-century media culture suggests that such a written source [signs source] is improbable. ... Furthermore ... the level of FG [the Fourth Gospel]'s Greek suggests reliance on oral memory rather than use of written source texts." Joanna Dewey, "The Gospel of John in Its Oral-Written Media World," in \textit{Jesus in Johannine Tradition}, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001), 248-49.

approach, namely, "composition criticism," which recognizes the competence of the final author (the contribution of redaction criticism) and the importance of the final form of the Gospels (the contribution of literary criticism). Accordingly, the once seen irreconcilable approaches (synchronic and diachronic) appear to have converged into a more productive method of research. With such a judgment in mind, this study utilizes an eclectic approach.

**Intertextuality**

**Category of intertextuality.** First of all, a recent notion of intertextual dynamics in the Fourth Gospel, which is primarily synchronic in its presupposition, will be taken into account. In order to meet this end, certain Old Testament materials contained in John need to be identified. Several scholars have suggested a certain set of criteria to detect the use of the Old Testament in the New. For instance, I. Howard Marshall identifies seven areas in which the New Testament writers made use of the Old Testament: (1) the influence of the language of the Old Testament; (2) the influence of the style of the Old Testament; (3) literal reference to events; (4) literal reference to commands; (5) literal reference to prophecies; (6) typological reference; and (7)
More specifically, Anthony T. Hanson suggests five ways in which the Old Testament is utilized in the Gospel of John: (1) the use of written scriptural sources without formal introductions, (2) citations with formal indications (i.e., the so-called fulfillment formulae), (3) quotations without formal introductions, (4) Christological use of the scriptural concepts, and (5) the Old Testament influence on narrative style. A third example is from Hans-Josef Klauck, who suggests nine criteria by which to define the presence of the Old Testament in John’s Gospel: (1) marked quotations, (2) unmarked quotations, (3) allusions, (4) echo, (5) Biblical language, (6) telling figures and telling sample (pattern), (7) general statements about the Scripture, (8) Jewish interpretation traditions and techniques, and (9) Christian reception.

The criteria of Marshall, however, seem more difficult (than that of Klauck’s formal criteria) to apply because his categories demand *a priori* hermeneutical judgments, whereas those of Hanson are not comprehensive enough (for instance, the use of the conceptual symbols and Old Testament figures is not accounted for). As such, this dissertation will employ the criteria suggested by Klauck. However, a primary consideration will be given only to the first four categories (citations with an introductory formula, citations without an introduction, allusions, and echoes) with reference to the Old Testament characters while due attention will be also paid to the rest of the five aspects as deemed necessary. In terms of Marshall’s categories, all but the first two.

---


121 Klauck, “Geschrieben, erfüllt, vollendet,” 143-44.

122 For the stylistic and linguistic influence of the Old Testament on the New, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1979). Another example of criteria to discern the Old Testament quotations in the New includes the following: (1) introduction of the quotation by an explicit quotation formula; (2) an interpretative gloss accompanying the quotation, and (3) syntactical tension between the quotation and its New Testament context. Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS 74 (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 1992), 65-82.
are directly related to this study.

A word of caution, however, is in order at this juncture concerning the definitions of "allusions" and "echoes." Although there is a general consensus that allusions encompass echoes, some scholars have sought to clearly demarcate between the two. For instance, Richard Hays put forward seven tests to discern echoes: availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation and satisfaction.\(^\text{123}\) However, some of these categories are quite difficult to define clearly. For instance, it is virtually impossible with a high degree of certainty to determine the availability (whether certain scriptural material was known to the reader) and history of interpretation (how a certain scriptural text was understood in the community to which the readers belonged) primarily because the business of identifying the so-called community of each New Testament writing is highly subjective.\(^\text{124}\) While Hays himself recognizes the elusive nature of establishing objective criteria for allusions and echoes, nonetheless, he is concerned more with being too loose with his criteria than with being too restrictive:

Although the foregoing texts are serviceable rules of thumb to guide our interpretive work, we must acknowledge that there will be exceptional occasions when the texts fail to account for the spontaneous power of particular intertextual conjunctions. Despite all the careful hedges that we plant around texts, meaning has a way of

---

\(^\text{123}\) Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 29-32. R. Hays notes that echo is a subtler allusion: "The concept of allusion depends both on the notion of authorial intention and on the assumption that the reader will share with the author the requisite 'popular library' to recognize the source of the allusion; the notion of echo, however, finesses such questions." Ibid., 29.

leaping over, like sparks.\footnote{125}

Hays' observation of the difficulty to identify the intertextual dynamics is probably valid, but the scientific aspect of our exegesis requires a particular nature of repeatability. That is, an exegete must be able to repeatedly demonstrate the intertextual dynamics in the crucible of exegesis by means of the available data, i.e., the Old Testament, the extant intertestamental Jewish documents, and the New Testament. Other exegetes, such as Greg Beale, point to the authorial intention as a valid criterion to demarcate allusions from echoes. Echoes, thus, differ from allusions in that they are the product of the author's sub-consciousness.\footnote{126} Although this notion seems to more closely reflect the reality of writing, it still does not completely avoid a sense of obscurity.\footnote{127} Once the relevant citations of and allusions (or references) to the Old Testament characters are

\footnote{125}Hays, Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul, 32-33. Richard Hays' application of his criteria is also somewhat obscure. "Echoes linger in the air and lure the reader of Paul's letters back into the symbolic world of Scripture. Paul's allusions gesture toward precursors whose words are already heavy with tacit implications." Ibid., 155. The arbitrary nature of Hays hermeneutical program is attested in Richard Hays, "Can the Gospels Teach Us How to Read the Old Testament?" ProEccl 11 (2002): 412-15. Here Hays is primarily concerned with the role of the original readers. However, in practice, his own theological agenda (or that of those who share his) overshadows his hermeneutics. In his interpretation of Psalm 69:9 alluded to in John 2:17, he colors his reading with the themes of vindication of Jesus and the restoration of Israel, both of which are not clearly indicated as the primary interest of the Gospel at least on the surface level in John 2 or in the rest of the Gospel. See "Thus, a reading of Psalm 69 after the passion and resurrection of Jesus would disclose that the Psalm is to be read as a poetic depiction of the suffering and vindication of Jesus the Messiah, whose voice 'David' had anticipated... One implication of such a reading is that the meaning of Jesus' resurrection is not to be understood apart from Israel's hope for deliverance and restoration." Ibid., 413-14. For a further critique of his reading, see page 136 of chap. 4 (footnote 52).


identified, an inquiry will proceed as to how such appropriation of the Old Testament materials (or traditions) contributes to the Johannean Christology.  

**Implication of orality.** The observation of different criteria as mentioned above, however, is in no way meant to disparage their contributions and insights, but rather to demonstrate the complexities inherent in this type of study. Thus, it seems best to limit this study to citations and strong allusions. Faint allusions or echoes could be merely a creation of a reader’s imagination, therefore, interfering with the results of this research. As such, overly subtle allusions and echoes will be excluded from serious consideration, although at times they will be briefly addressed when relevant. With this remark, it must be also said that this investigation is undertaken with certain exegetical predilections. That is, instead of a reader-oriented approach, this study is more interested in the authorial intention (which characterizes the diachronic orientation of this research) and the meaning inherent in the text.  

The reason lies in an opinion that the attempts to retrieve the meaning of the author or the text better account for the first century

---

128 Jean Zumstein identifies five areas of research related to this type of investigation in John: (1) the source of the Old Testament tradition (i.e., MT or LXX), (2) the exact nature of appropriation (i.e., citation, allusion, or echo), (3) the possibility of utilizing certain Jewish hermeneutical traditions (i.e., haggadah or targumic), (4) the social setting of the Old Testament appropriation (i.e., pre-Christian or Jewish theology), and finally (5) conservative or creative hermeneutical use of the Old Testament tradition. The present study is primarily concerned with none of the questions he raises. The main question asked is the Christological contribution of the Old Testament characters in John. Jean Zumstein, “Die Schriftrezeption in der Brotrede (Joh 6),” in *Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannesevangelium: Festgabe für Johannes Beutler SJ zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Michael Labahn, Klaus Scholtissek, and Angelika Strotmann (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2004), 123-24.

129 For an article that articulates the value of author-oriented hermeneutics, see Robert H. Stein, “The Benefits of an Author-Oriented Approach to Hermeneutics,” *JETS* 44 (2001): 451-66. Also see the value of the author-oriented intertextual studies: Harstine, “The Functions of Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel and Responses of Three Ancient Mediterranean Audiences,” 9-15. For a study that stresses the importance of readers who confer various meanings to the text, see Hieke Thomas, “Vom Verstehen biblischer Texte: Methodologisch-hermeneutische Erwägungen zum Programm einer ‘biblischen Auslegung,’” *BN* 119-120 (2003): 71-89. But, see Ashton’s bleak critique of reader-response reading: “Reader-response theorists do their best to guard their first-time readers from any knowledge that might sully the purity of their responses and prevent them from reacting to the text in the way that they (the theorists) have imagined. But ignorant as they are, they must know something, and what they know . . . will be prescribed by the theorists who are their only-begetters. It is hard to see this procedure as anything other than aleatory exegesis of the worst kind. . . . Why not face the fact that implied readers, as they are called, are simply doing the exegetes’ job for them, but with one hand tied behind their back? Undo the knot and they are transformed into real readers, free to use whatever tools are lying to hand. These are the tools of historical criticism.” John Ashton, “Studying John,” in *Studying John: Approaches to the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 199.
Mediterranean communication pattern, namely, orality as its default mode. The importance of orality is increasingly recognized in recent Gospel scholarship, and it entails two important exegetical corollaries in particular. First, unlike visual communication models, such as reading, the orality in human communication is much less conducive for meditations on some literary devices, such as, complicated typology, subtle symbolism, and extended chiastic structures. Second, orality and its concomitant eyewitness aspect reinforce the crucial role of individuals—especially those eyewitnesses of the original Jesus traditions—in the transmission and formulation of the Gospel traditions. As a consequence, they buttress the reliability of the Gospel traditions.


131 James Dunn also notes the corollary of this nature of orality. The fluidity and flexibility of the original oral tradition makes implausible the recent confidence of complicated form and source reconstructions with regards to the Gospel of John. James D. G. Dunn, “John and the Oral Gospel Tradition,” in Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition, ed. Henry Wansbrough, JSNTSup 64 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991), 351-79; idem, “Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition,” SBLSP 39 (2000): 287-326; idem, “Altering the Default Setting: Re-Envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition,” NTS 49 (2003): 139-75. However, it must be also noted that the prevalence of orality does not necessarily exclude the possibility of the use of written traditions in the writing of John’s Gospel as Paul Achtemeier seems to presume. Schuchard, Scripture within Scripture, xvi-xvii.

Religious Comparative Analysis

In addition to the attention given to intertextual dynamics, the religious comparative analysis of early Judaism and John's Gospel, which is diachronic in its orientation, will be undertaken so as to shed light on the alleged affinity between the Fourth Gospel and its most closely related religio-cultural backdrop, namely, early Judaism (see Appendix 2 for the necessity and relevance of religious-historical discussions). This inquiry, however, does not seek traces of direct dependence between them. Rather, it attempts to demonstrate the presence and/or degree of theological backgrounds and climate of thoughts that are common to both streams of religious expressions.133 In the process of this comparative investigation, furthermore, the provenance of the intertestamental Jewish materials will be carefully weighed. Although it is commonplace to acknowledge the presence of variegated soundings within early Judaism, it is totally another matter to claim that the early Judaism of the diaspora settings (for example, that of the Egyptian context) and Palestinian Judaism exerted an equal amount of influence on the formation of John's Gospel. Due to spatial restraints, it cannot be fully discussed here, but it is assumed that the train of Jewish thought stemming from a Palestinian origin was much more at work in the birth of the Fourth Gospel than its counterparts in the wider pan-Mediterranean world (for a detailed discussion of the importance of the Palestinian Jewish traditions, see appendix 2: Religionsgeschichte and the Fourth Gospel). The primary and secondary sources frequently consulted in the course of this research include the materials listed in Appendix 6.

Chronological boundaries of early Judaism. Finally, another

methodological caveat needs to be mentioned. This study takes into account the Jewish writings written in the period that ranges from 400 B.C. to A.D. 100. To indicate the Jewish conceptual currents of this period, three expressions will be used interchangeably without any significant distinction in meaning: early Judaism, intertestamental Judaism, and second temple Judaism. Some scholars have expressed reservation to restricting the scope of Jewish literature up to A.D. 100 because they believe that much later Jewish sources (usually early rabbinic literature) manifest coherent conceptual currents with the earlier documents (for the same reason, they disagree with the categorization of early Judaism or second temple Judaism).\textsuperscript{134} However, the scientific nature of this study requires concrete and tangible evidences. It is exegetically unwarranted to base an argument on speculative deduction. The exegetical danger of comparing the body of literature from this period (from A.D. 200 onward) with the New Testament writings has been noted, especially in view of the possible Christian influence on later Jewish documents (for example, see the discussions on the use of the rabbinic and Samaritan writings in chap. 5, pp. 194-200 and Appendix 7: “The Use of the Rabbinic Materials for New Testament Studies” in this dissertations).\textsuperscript{135} Therefore, whenever the intertestamental Jewish writings are referred to, thus, their date, reception in early Judaism, and possible Christian influence will be taken into consideration.

Terms

Typology and prefiguration. The importance of typology or prefiguration bears direct relevance upon the present study. In the wake of the rise of modern historical criticism, allegorical and typological studies encountered serious dismissal. On


the other hand, some evangelical scholars sought to salvage the New Testament figurative interpretations by carefully distinguishing between allegory and typology.\textsuperscript{136} The present investigation is not primarily concerned with the legitimacy of such a venture. Rather, typology or prefiguration is understood in a broad sense as the ancient would have.\textsuperscript{137} Thus, the definition of typology or prefiguration does not directly impinge upon the result of this study.\textsuperscript{138} What is primarily at issue is whether the fourth evangelist presents the Old Testament as messianic prefiguration and, if that is the case, how much he lays the emphasis on such depiction.

**Messiah and Christ.** Another clarification of terms is related to “Messiah” and “Christ.” As briefly discussed earlier and addressed more in depth in Appendix I (Messianism/Christology and the Gospel of John), these two nomenclatures do not overlap exactly in the domain of semantics. Probably, the epithet “Messiah” comprises a larger range of referents than “Christ” does, but “Christ” also possesses a unique connotation. That is, he is the exclusively supreme divine being.\textsuperscript{139} With this notion in


\textsuperscript{137}Moises Silva, “Has the Church Misread the Bible?” in _Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation: Six Volumes in One_, ed. Moises Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 44-57.

\textsuperscript{138}However, for the sake of advancing a study as this one, a working definition is worthy to mention: “A type is a biblical event, person, or institution which serves as an example or pattern for other events, persons, or institutions.” Hugenberger, “Introductory Notes on Typology,” 327.

\textsuperscript{139}Suffice it to point to the definition of Charlesworth for the present discussion. “This eschatological figure [the Messiah] will inaugurate the end of all normal time and history. I, therefore, use the term ‘Messiah’ in its etymological sense, to denote God’s eschatological Anointed One, the Messiah.” James H. Charlesworth, “From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects,” in _The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins_, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 4; idem, “Introduction: Messianic Ideas in Early Judaism,” in _Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls_, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Gerbern S. Oegema (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), I. G. Oegema’s definition covers a wider range: “a priestly, royal or otherwise characterized figure, who will play a liberating role at the end of time.” Gerbern S. Oegema, *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba*, JSPSup 27 (Sheffield, 1998), 26. For a Jewish perspective that points to the Christian claim to the divinity of Jesus as that which demarcates “Christ” from “Messiah,” see the following statement: “Where Christianity parts company from all other religions, including Judaism, signifies the systemic center of Christianity—all Christianities. That point, of course, is Jesus Christ. What, in particular, about Jesus Christ matters (from
mind, however, these two terms will be used interchangeably (as the fourth evangelist identifies “Christ” with “Messiah”) in the present study without a significant distinction in meaning, mainly for the sake of convenience.

Contributions

Old Testament Characters as Christological Witnesses

The main question this study seeks to answer is whether or not the Old Testament figures in the Fourth Gospel play a coherent role as Christological/messianic witnesses (as Scripture does), as some German exegetes have recently argued. Their thesis will be tested through conventional exegeses of the Johannine pericopae which either directly mention or allude to the traditional Jewish heroic figures. If the thesis stands intact, then it will be compared with the perception of the Old Testament figures pertaining to messianism in the Jewish literature of the second temple period. This comparison, however, will remain at a secondary level of investigation as the main focus of the research will be devoted to the role of the Old Testament characters within the canonical confines of the Johannine Gospel. The findings from this proposed research are hoped to illuminate some of the hermeneutical and theological insights crucial for an appropriate appreciation of the New Testament and the Gospel of John in particular.

First, this study is expected to articulate theological claims the evangelist makes to his first century readers/hearers over against its Jewish background in his presentation of the Old Testament Jewish figures with reference to the Christology of the Fourth Gospel.

the perspective of Judaism in particular) is not the claim that he was and is the Messiah, or that he was and is God incarnate, or that he taught and teaches Torah over and above the Torah of Sinai and in fulfillment of that first Torah. What matters is that Jesus Christ for Christianity uniquely is the Messiah, uniquely is God incarnate, uniquely reveals Torah against which all other Torah falls short... After all, everyone knows, when it comes to mere mortal sages, we of holy Israel have hundreds who compare in wisdom and piety and supernatural insight; and prophets, priests, and martyrs to compare as well. What we do not have is God incarnate in one person only, and what we have not known is the Messiah in any one person—at least, not yet." Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton. *Jewish-Christian Debates: God, Kingdom, Messiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 215-16.
Affinity between Early Judaism and John

Second, this proposed project will demonstrate the degree of affinity between the Gospel and the Jewish milieu of the Second Temple period. The conclusions adduced from this observation will point to somewhere other than the Old Testament or the Jewish intertestamental literature for the genesis of the Johannine Christology. Scholars have suggested the Jesus event \(^{140}\) as the provenance (or more specifically the post-Easter perspective) \(^{141}\) or the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. \(^{142}\) An implication of this second aspect will touch upon the legitimacy of *Traditionsgeschichte* as a proper interpretive method for the Gospel of John on the basis of the conclusions drawn from the first two inquiries. \(^{143}\) As a corollary, a hermeneutical doubt is cast over the typological and/or simplistic salvation-historical approach to the New Testament vis-à-vis the function of Old Testament characters with reference to the Johannine Christology. \(^{144}\) In this venue, some scholars have already expressed their skepticism over the history of traditions approach. For instance, Mogen Müller posits that the history of traditions approach undertaken by Stuhlmacher and Gese is in fact reading the Bible from the perspective of the Old Testament onto the New. That attempt, he believes, will naturally lead to where


\(^{141}\)Scholtissek, “Die unauflosbare Schrift’ (Joh 10,35),” 166-67.


\(^{143}\)For a convenient summary of Gese’s methodological presuppositions, see Seitz, “Two Testaments and the Failure of One Tradition History,” 195-211.

\(^{144}\)So does Reim ward off the typological interpretation of the Old Testament messianic texts in John. “Typologie ist bei Johannes also nicht Wiederkehr des Gleichen, was in der Urzeit geschah, in der Endzeit, sondern das, was in der Urzeit geschah, ist Hinweis auf das Geschehen des Eigentlichen in der Christuszeit.” Reim, *Jochanan*, 268.
it came from, “Judaism.” Similarly, Christopher Seitz perceptibly sets the issue under perspective when he writes,

The problem for the early church was not what to do with the OT. Rather, in the light of a Scripture . . ., what was one to make of a crucified messiah and a parting of the ways? It is this dimension of early Christian use of the OT that is attenuated in tradition-historical approaches of the Gese-Stuhlmacher variety.

Competency of Redactor/Author of John

Finally, if a coherent role of the Old Testament characters in the Gospel narratives is established, it will bolster, to some degree, the integrity of the final form of the Gospel text in contradistinction to those who assume various phases of a redactional process before the finalization of the present Gospel (and they are confident to identify beyond reasonable doubt the different layers of sources). For instance, some of the

145 Müller, “Neutestamentliche Theologie als Biblische Theologie,” 490.
146 Seitz, “Two Testaments and the Failure of One Tradition History,” 210-11.
recent linguistic investigations of the Fourth Gospel point out that the hypothetical
sources and layers cannot be exhibited linguistically and the language of the Gospel is
consistent throughout John. Therefore, contrary to the common view that the evangelist
was a clumsy editor who wittingly or unwittingly preserved various tensions between
Jesus and the Old Testament figures (either from a history of religions or socio-political
point of view), the consistent and coherent role of various ancient Jewish characters
concerning Christology will, if proven, bear witness to the competent editorial ability of
the final redactor, as Jeffrey Staley has observed.

If redaction critics are correct to conclude that FG [the Fourth Gospel] reflects to
fifty years of editing, it is remarkable that the current text also reflects an unusual
rhetorical unity on the themes of ‘authority’ and ‘witness’. . . . a two-tiered motif of
witnessing is reflected in the three major redactional stages in FG’s composition
history . . . . Throughout FG, no one comes to Jesus without the assistance of
another person . . . . the Signs Source exhibits a strategy remarkably similar to the
one isolated earlier in the three ‘formative redactional periods’ of the Johannine
Community.\(^\text{148}\)

Scope

Unless one is prepared to venture upon the writing of a *magnum opus* on the
historical Jesus (such as Dunn’s *Jesus Remembered*), he/she will have to, at some points,
assume and presuppose certain aspects instead of proving every statement with careful

\(^{148}\text{Jeffrey L. Staley, “What Can a Postmodern Approach to the Fourth Gospel Add to
Contemporary Debates about Its Historical Situation?” in *Jesus in Johannine Tradition*, ed. Robert T.
Fortna and Tom Thatcher (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001), 53-55. The proposed outcome of
this study is expected to yield a similar implication of Culpepper’s literary analysis of John that John
contains a high degree of literary integrity. R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in
Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983). One of the recent examinations of the Johannine characters
also shares the same judgment. “Eine dritte Richtung hat seit den Arbeiten von Schweizer (1939) und
Ruckstuhl (1951) aufgrund der Erarbeitung sprachlicher Besonderheiten, welche das Jeh von den
Synoptikern und den übrigen Schriften des NT abhebt, betont, daß sich die hypothetisch erschlossenen
Schichten und Quellen sprachlich nicht aufweisen lassen, die Sprache des Joh vielmehr durchgehend und in
allen seinen Teilen stark vom Endverfasser geprägt sei.” Peter Dschulnigg, *Jesus Begegnen: Personen und
ihre Bedeutung im Johannesevangelium* (Münster: Lit, 2002), 8.}
qualifications. This study proceeds in line with those who see Jesus as standing primarily in a Jewish messianic light. Generally speaking, Johannine Christology has been investigated in two ways: one in the form of Jewish messianic prefigurations (David, Elijah, or Moses), and the other through abstract titles and symbols (Son of God, Son of Man, wisdom, etc.). It is the former that seems to have had closer affinities with ancient Judaism. The conceptions of the latter category in the intertestamental period are known to be notoriously slippery and elusive, not to mention their meager reference in terms of messianology. Consequently, the comparison of the former category with its conception in the Fourth Gospel will reveal more evidently the points of contact between early Judaism and Johannine Christianity. There is certainly some degree of disparity between Christian Christology and Jewish messianism. This study intends to explore the possibility of early Christian appropriation of the early Jewish messianic hopes through heroic figures. The scope of this study includes Moses, David, Elijah (and John the Baptist), and two of the Jewish arch-patriarchs (Abraham and Jacob). Not only do these figures emerge prominently on the surface of the Jewish literary structures but they were held in high esteem in early Judaism as messianic prefigures. For the latter reason, the prophet Isaiah is excluded from the scope of this research regardless of his conspicuous Christological witness role in John. Although Jacob and Abraham do not usually occur

---


in the intertestamental Jewish eschatological contexts (as messianic prefigures), they are included for their symbolic status as the heads of Israel.

**Limitations**

In spite of several considerable merits, there are also some limitations to this proposed research. Although a comprehensive comparison of the perceptions of the Jewish heroic figures as a messianic prefiguration and/or witness in the Fourth Gospel and contemporary Judaism is highly desirable, the vast scope of such inquiry is hardly viable. Furthermore, an initial investigation has detected virtually no point of contact between the two distinct Jewish spheres of religious expressions (this is especially due to the lack of the motif of the Jewish antique figures as messianic witness not to mention the dearth of a systematized understanding of the messianic prefigures in early Judaism). Therefore, the present study limits its scope within the understanding of the Jewish antique figures as presented in the Fourth Gospel.

Another limit of the study involves the method of the present inquiry, that is, that an investigation of the messianic paradigms of the Old Testament figures in early Judaism will take its point of departure primarily from the secondary literature due to the enormous purview of the primary sources which contain the messianic ideas and figures in the Jewish writings of the Second Temple period. Some of the significant notions on the Old Testament figures concerning messianism referred to in the secondary literature will be examined in view of their original texts.\(^{151}\)

\(^{151}\)Although a first-hand investigation of the primary materials is highly desirable, the spatial limit of the present project precludes such an ambitious endeavor as the dissertations of Meeks and Behrens have amply proven. Meeks dealt with only the Mosaic messianic paradigm in 500 plus pages in his dissertation. Even the role of one Old Testament protagonist or the use of certain Old Testament texts in John deserves a dissertation-length study. Cf. Eugene Hotz, "L'Interpretation de l'Ancien Testament dans l'Evangile selon Saint-Jean" (Ph.D. Diss., Neuchatel, 1943); Wayne A. Meeks, "Jesus as King and Prophet in the Fourth Gospel" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1965); Gillian P. Bampfylde, "Old Testament Quotations and Imagery in the Gospel according to St. John" (Ph.D. diss., University of Hull, 1967); Phil G. Bowersox, "The Use of Isaiah 6:10 in John 12:40 and the Theology of Rejection" (Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1978); Mark William Woods, "The Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel. The Hermeneutical Method Employed in the Semeia and Its Significance for Contemporary Biblical Interpretation" (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980); Eugene W. Pond, "Theological Dependencies of John's Gospel on Isaiah" (Ph.D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1985);
Cherian Thomas, “Jesus the New Moses: A Christological Understanding of the Fourth Gospel” (Th.D. diss., Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, 1989); Stan Harstine, Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques, JSNTSup 229 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 2002); Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel; Andrew C. Brunson, Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study on the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John, WUNT 2/158 (Tübingen: Siebeck, 2003); Manning, Echoes of a Prophet; and Rainer K. W. Behrens, “The Use of Moses Traditions in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to John’s Use of the Old Testament” (Ph.D. diss., University of Gloucestershire, 2004); Wallace, “The Testimony of Moses.” Even a study of a seemingly insignificant character such as Jacob, who is explicitly mentioned only twice throughout the Gospel, can take up a lengthy inquiry. See David H. Johnson, “Our Father Jacob: The Role of the Jacob Narrative in the Fourth Gospel Compared to Its Role in the Jewish Bible and in the Writings of Early Judaism” (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1992).
CHAPTER 2
THE PATRIARCHS

Introduction
The Gospel of John makes no mention of Isaac. It is not too surprising in view of the rare occurrence of his name in the entire corpus of the New Testament. Furthermore, even in the Old Testament and early Judaism, Isaac and Jacob are already subsumed under the arch-forefather, Abraham: “Die schon im Alten Testament erkennbare und sich im frühen Judentum fortsetzende Tendenz, daß Abraham die beiden anderen Stammväter weit überflügelt, hat sich hier voll durchgesetzt.”¹ Not only the arch-patriarch occupied a crucial place for the matter of identity, he was also seen in a messianic prefigurative light in some early Jewish and Christian sources.² The portrayal of the Jewish patriarchs in John, however, differs slightly from these traditions in that the Samaritans seem to regard Jacob as their progenitor (4:12) and the Jews, Abraham (8:39, 53). More strikingly, Jesus appears not to acknowledge the significance of the typical Jewish perception of Abrahamic fatherhood (esp., “Abraham, your father,” 8:56). In


contrast to other New Testament writings and the assessment of some Johannine exegetes, the fourth evangelist does not eagerly claim the spiritual lineage of the patriarchs for Christ. Rather, the patriarchs serve as mere witnesses to Jesus' messianic/Christological identity, most remarkably of his pre-existence. The present chapter will discuss the portrayals of the forefathers in early Judaism and how they cast different pictures in John. In light of the exegetical examination of the Johannine narratives that mention and allude to Abraham or Jacob, the latter part of the chapter will probe into their narrative function with particular regards to the Christology of John.

**Jacob**

One of the three Jewish forefathers, Jacob, appears twice in the Gospel of John, alluded to in 1:51 and explicitly mentioned twice by name in 4:10-14. This study will delve into the former passage first.

**Allusion to the Bethel Theophany: John 1:51**

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, διὰ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεβοήτα καὶ τοὺς ἄγγελους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνουτας καὶ καταβαίνουτας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
(John 1:51, NA27)

And he said to him, “Very truly, I tell you, you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.” (John 1:51, NRSV)

---

3 Christian Dietzfelbinger, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, ZBKNT 4 (Zürich: Theologischer, 2001), 1:261-65. Cf. “He [God] has helped his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy, according to the promise he made to our ancestors, to Abraham and to his descendants forever” (Luke 1:54-55); “What then are we to say was gained by Abraham, our ancestor according to the flesh?” (Rom 4:1).

Narrative context. Jacob, son of Isaac, is alluded to in John 1:51, which echoes the Bethel account in Genesis 28. Structurally speaking, verse 51 concludes the first chapter of the Gospel which is marked by a recurrent witness theme. For example, John the Baptist carries out this “witness” motif in the first chapter. Verses 7 and 8 of the first chapter of John mark a pivotal point in the Baptist’s ministry of “witness”: “He came as a witness to testify to the light, so that all might believe through him. He himself was not the light, but he came to testify to the light.” The witness ministry of the Baptist for Christ is spelled out in the rest of the chapter. His testimony concerning Christ is first directed to “the Jews of Jerusalem” in verses 19-28, first indirectly (vv. 19-24) and then directly (vv. 25-28). He aims his next witness at “the people who came to hear him” in verses 29-34. The next day, the Baptist’s witness is extended to some of his own disciples in verses 35-37. The eye-witness nature of the latter two pericopae enhances the level of credibility of John’s witness. In addition, the force of his witness is further evidenced in some of his disciples’ (Philip and Nathanael) turning to Jesus upon departure from their first mentor in verses 38-50. These preceding occurrences of the “witness” theme culminate in the concluding statement of verse 51, which is presented in the form of an affirmative answer to the new disciple’s Christological confession, “you
are the Son of God, you are the King of Israel” (v. 49).8

The prediction of Jesus is disclosed to Nathanael, a true Israelite (possibly a proto-example of the New Testament Christians).9 Two analogous features call for this prophecy to be taken as an allusion to the Bethel account in Genesis 28:12.10 First, the beholders of the visions are called “Israel” and, second, the wordings of the vision in both accounts are identical (“you will see the heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending”). Therefore, exeges recognizes an analogy present in the text, identifying the son of man as the anti-type. However, opinions vary as to the type, i.e., Jacob, the stone, the ladder, and the place, of which the proponents of Jacob and the

---

8In this pericope (John 1:35-51, Jesus’ calling of disciples), Jesus’ identity is unfolded in four steps: rabbi (v. 38), son of God (v. 49), king of Israel (v. 49), and son of man (v. 51). C. Langner suggests that these four titles here proleptically function to summarize the mission and life of Jesus. That is, as a rabbi Jesus provides his teachings, as son of God he was condemned, as king crucified, and as son of man he was resurrected. As glaringly as it sounds, however, his interpretation seems to be without much textual support in this text or in view of the entire scope of the Gospel. In particular, it is doubtful whether Jesus was resurrected as “son of man.” Cf. Cordula Langner, “Was für ein König ist Jesus?” in Israels und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannesevangelium: Festgabe für Johannes Butler SJ zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. Michael Labahn, Klaus Scholtisess, and Angelika Strotmann (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2004), 250. In addition, the confession of Nathanael has been puzzling exegetes since it appears to be too mature at such an early stage of the Gospel. These interpretations have appealed to a number of exegetes. First, this confession is polemically directed at the unbelieving Jews. Therefore, it must be read retrospectively from the end to the beginning. Alternatively, others posit that Nathanael’s confessional statement is only provisional, that is, it merely reveals the amazed emotion of the new disciple. Finally, still some others point to the emphatic function of the confession in relation to the omnipotent supernatural divinity of Jesus. For the former view, see Ludger Schenke, Johannes: Kommentar (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1998), 50; Joachim Gnilla, Johannesevangelium, 5th ed., NEBNT 4 (Würzburg: Echter, 1999), 21-22; for the second, Wengst, Das Johannesevangelium, 1:94-97; for the last aspect, see Ekkehard W. Stegemann and Wolfgang Stegemann, “König Israels, nicht König der Juden?: Jesus als König im Johannesevangelium,” in Messiasvorstellungen bei Juden und Christen, ed. Eckehard Stegemann (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1993), 47, Stefan Schreiber, “Rätsel um den König: Zur religionsgeschichtlichen Herkunft des König-Titels im Johannesevangelium,” in Johannes aenigmaticus: Studien zum Johannesevangelium für Herbert Leroy, ed. Stefan Schreiber and Alois Stimpfle, BU 29 (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2000), 58-59.


ladder as an extension of the place represent two more popular views than others. The Hebrew Scripture is somewhat ambiguous as to the antecedent of the third person singular masculine pronominal suffix, "םא, since he/it could refer back to either Jacob or the ladder (םא) upon which the traffic of angels took place.

However, the Septuagint clarifies the antecedent of the demonstrative pronoun as it shifts the gender into feminine (אָוֹתָהּ). Thus, it is clearly upon the ladder where the angels were ascending and descending.

Jacob-Jesus typology. Taking the pronoun as referring to Jacob, however, some exegesis see a typology present between Jesus and Jacob. They typically detect John’s intentional opting for the Hebrew tradition over the Greek. This view is further argued for in view of some Jewish hermeneutical traditions, notably in Targum, Philo, and some of the early rabbinic interpretations of the present text.

---


12 Another change from MT is the shift of Hebrew participles to finite verbs in the imperfect tense. John W. Wevers, ed., Genesis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 271. In this respect, the Greek text of John follows more closely the Hebrew verb forms than those of the LXX. Both MT and John use participles for the traffic of the angels. Johnson, “Our Father Jacob,” 197.


aspects stand out in these Jewish traditions: first, the traffic of the angels is inferred or explicitly stated to have taken place on Jacob and, second, these texts present Jacob as the focal point of the vision, promoting him into a rank of the righteous.\textsuperscript{15}

For instance, midrashic \textit{Genesis Rabbah} (composed in the fourth through fifth centuries A.D.) on Genesis 28:12 recounts Jacob’s image engraved in heaven and the angels’ ascending and descending upon him in order to examine his facial features.

R. Hyya the Elder and R. Yannai: One of them said, “they were going up and coming down’ on the ladder.” The other said, “they were going up and coming down’ on Jacob.” The one who says, “they were going up and coming down’ on the ladder,” has no problems. As to the one who says, “they were going up and coming down’ on Jacob,” the meaning is that they were raising him up and dragging him down, dancing on him, leaping on him, abusing him. For it is said, “Israel, in whom I will be glorified” (Isa 49:3). \textit{[So said the angels,] “Are you the one whose visage is incised above?” They would then go up and look at his features and go down and examine him sleeping.}\textsuperscript{16}

\textit{Targum Neofiti} on Genesis (the tenth through eleventh centuries A.D.) also follows the interpretive tradition of Jacob’s image engraved in heaven.

And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth and its head reached to the height of the heavens; and behold, the angels that had accompanied him from the house of his father ascended to bear good tidings to the angels on high, saying: “Come and see the pious man whose image is engraved in the throne of Glory, whom you desired to see.” And behold, the angels from before the Lord ascended and descended and observed him.\textsuperscript{17}

\textit{Targum Pseudo-Jonathan} renders an analogous understanding of the Bethel account that the righteousness of Jacob and his image in heaven take the center stage in the discourse.

He had a dream, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the earth with its top reaching towards the heavens. And behold, the two angels who had gone to Sodom and who had been banished from their apartment because they had revealed the secrets of the

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{15}Cf. Philo \textit{De Somniis} 2.19 calls Jacob “the practiser [of virtue].”


\textsuperscript{17}Martin McNamara, \textit{Targum Neofiti I: Genesis}, ArBib 1A (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1992), 140.
\end{footnotesize}
Lord of the world, went about when they were banished until the time that Jacob went forth from his father’s house. Then, as an act of kindness, they accompanied him to Bethel, and on that day they ascended to the heavens on high, and said, “Come and see Jacob the pious, whose image is fixed in the Throne of Glory, and whom you have desired to see.” Then the rest of the holy angels of the Lord came down to look at him.18

In view of these rabbinic traditions, thus, there seems to be sufficient reason to posit a Jacob-Jesus typology.19

Ladder-Jesus typology. However, the interpretive judgment that sees a Jacob-Jesus typology in the present text under discussion poses a problem. The difficulty is two-fold. First, the advocates of such a view unfairly represent the rabbinic traditions which testify contradicting pictures, not to mention the anachronistic importation of the rabbinic materials onto the New Testament text (see Appendix 7: “The Use of the Rabbinic Materials in New Testament Studies”), and, second, they ignore the narrative context of the Johannine pericope (i.e., it is Nathanael and Jacob who behold the visions). For instance, Genesis Rabbah records the uncertainty among some rabbis concerning the place upon which the traffic of the angels took place. In addition, other Jewish texts, notably the Ladder of Jacob and Targum Onkelos, clearly state that it was upon the ladder where the angels traveled. These two texts also do not reveal the centrality of Jacob vis-à-vis his righteousness:20 “There were twelve steps leading to the top of the ladder . . . . And while I was still looking at it, behold, angels of God ascended and descended on it.”21


A greater number of more recent commentators, thus, correctly recognize a correspondence, not between Jacob and Jesus, but between the Son of Man and the ladder or Bethel, a place where God manifested himself to human beings. Then the anti-type of Jacob is Nathanael. Hence verse 15 can be rendered as follows: “Like Jacob, you [Nathanael] will witness the divine theopany bestowed upon the Son of Man.”

However, some commentators are still hesitant to accept the presence of a Jacob-Nathanael typology in the text. Schnackenburg, for instance, offers a three-fold skepticism. First, the vision is promised not only to Nathanael but also to the disciples since the number of the verb ὑποξεθε (“you will see”) in verse 51 is in the plural. Second, seeing Jesus being pierced and raised up (as some exegetes take the referent of this vision to be) is different from seeing the heaven opened. Third, John is taking only an element of Jacob’s vision, namely, the image of the ladder and the ascending and descending of angels. As for Schnackenburg, thus, to find a large scale correspondence between the Bethel account and John 1:51 is to press the symbolism beyond what the textual evidences permit. However, his dismissal of the typology calls for a more nuanced examination of the present text. Literary devices such as imagery, symbolism, and


typology should be interpreted on their own rights and not too literally, such as one would read historical writings. Schnackenburg is certainly correct in insisting on inclusion of other disciple(s) as the recipients of the vision and not limiting it exclusively to Nathanael. Nonetheless, it is hard to avoid the notion that Nathanael is depicted as an inclusive representative of the disciples and presented somewhat as a descendant and/or spiritual realization of Jacob (Israel) only without the fraudulent disposition characteristic of the forefather.\(^{24}\) In addition, an attempt to find detailed one-on-one correspondences in an analogy is to misunderstand such a literary genre. It is the context of John 1:51 (i.e., a [true] Israelite seeing a vision) and the resemblance (or the verbatim quotation in the case of this text) of the language that warrant the finding of an analogy.

**Contents of theophany.** Once the agents of the typology are established, the contents of the visions need to be clarified. From the Johannine text, on the one hand, it is clear that the Son of Man is the focus of the Johannine theophany. On the other hand, the exact nature of the theophany is uncertain. The cross event, Jesus’ baptism, the subsequent signs, and the second coming have been variously proposed but all seem to fall short of a firm conclusion.\(^{25}\) However, the most important aspect of this typology concerns the presence of a polemic over against the Old Testament and the contemporary Jewish traditions. In other words, in lieu of the well-known Johannine axiom that “no


one has seen God” (John 1:18; 5:37; 6:46), an interesting exegetical question can be posed as to whether John is making a counter-claim that Jacob, the Johannine proto-type of a genuine Israelite, was a witness to the pre-existent Christ instead of God.  

An affirmative answer to this question is possible since the Jewish traditions (OT, Targum, and Philo) on the Bethel account almost unanimously opt for Jacob’s witness of God on the ladder. Then, this intentional shift or clarification would have made quite an impression on the audience familiar with the current Jewish traditions.

This observation is intriguing and will certainly strengthen the thesis of the present dissertation since it infers Jacob’s eyewitness of the pre-existent Son of Man as interpreted by some early church commentators. Differently put, the confession of Nathanael can be read into Jacob’s vision so that Jacob bears witness to the Christological identity of Jesus in terms of his pre-existence, the divine sonship, and the headship of Israel (John 1:49). However, this construal remains in the realm of a


27“And behold there was a ladder firmly planted on the earth, and the Lord was standing steadily upon it; and he said, I am the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac, be not afraid.” Philo Somn 1.3. “And he dreamed, and behold, a ladder was fixed in the ground, while its top reached towards heaven; and behold, angels of the Lord were going up and down on it. And behold, the Glory of the Lord was standing over him, and He said, ‘I am the Lord, the God of your father Abraham and the God of Isaac.’” Aberbach and Grossfeld, Targum Onkelos to Genesis, 169-70. Also, this view that Jacob saw God at Bethel is commonly argued in recent Old Testament studies; for instance, see John Van Seters, “Divine Encounter at Bethel (Gen 28.10-22) in Recent Literary-Critical Study of Genesis,” ZAW 110 (1998): 503-13; and Michael Oblath, “To Sleep, Perchance to Dream . . .: What Jacob Saw at Bethel (Genesis 28.10-22),” JSOT 95 (2001): 117-26.


29For a study of Nathanael as a witness to a realization of the Old Testament messianic hopes, see Craig R. Koester, “Messianic Exegesis and the Call of Nathanael (John 1.45-51),” JSNT 39 (1990): 23-34.
reader-oriented hermeneutic, which often evades a reasonable exegetical control. Accordingly, it is without definite certainty that such reading can be claimed as being intended by the fourth evangelist.

A more natural reading of the present text, therefore, can be suggested here which bears, in our judgment, a more important bearing on the Johannine shift of the place of the angelic traffic, i.e., from on the ladder to on the Son of Man. In the Hebrew text of Genesis 28:12, Jacob is portrayed as a mere observer of the divine theophany. This passive aspect on the part of Jacob is further elaborated on by an extended divine promise in the following verses (Gen 28:13-15) since it is the divine providence that will enact the redemptive program through Jacob. On the other hand, in John 1:51, the focus of the vision motif is shifted onto Jesus (he even assumes the role preserved for God). The centrality of Jesus in this discourse is evidenced in the immediately preceding context, Nathanael’s Christological acknowledgment, which is positively affirmed by this prediction of the Jacob theophany motif. In addition, another noteworthy change is the announcer of the theophany. In the Genesis account, it is God who reveals the unfolding of his own salvation historical plan. However, it is Jesus himself in the Johannine account who discloses the theophany which captures a divine revelation of the Son of Man. These two apparent shifts set forth the centrality of Jesus in the present Johannine text.

Summary. In conclusion, therefore, the aforementioned observations suggest that John 1:51 speaks of the christological characteristics of Jesus in the backdrop of Jacob’s theophany motif which serves an affirmative function of Jesus’ messianic identity as reflected in the mouth of a genuine Israelite, Nathanael. Moreover, the present

---

30 The angels are often used to depict the delivery of the divine revelation in Jewish traditions. Reim, Jochanan, 103, 255-56. “In this piece of elaborate typology Jesus corresponds to ‘the Lord’ in the Bethel vision, the Lord who stood at the top of the ladder; but he also corresponds to the ladder itself, since the point of the midrash is to emphasise that Jesus is now the place where God is permanently to be found, both in heaven and on earth.” Hanson, The Prophetic Gospel, 37.
Johannine text illuminates Jesus as the focal point of the divine revelation (or the divine redemptive history) in view of the immediate narrative context and the Old Testament background and sets the stage for the unpacking of the replacement and/or contrast theme that follows in the subsequent chapters.  

**Jacob, the Provider of Water:** John 4:10-14

Jesus answered her, “If you knew the gift of God, and who it is that is saying to you, ‘Give me a drink,’ you would have asked him, and he would have given you living water.” The woman said to him, “Sir, you have no bucket, and the well is deep. Where do you get that living water? Are you greater than our ancestor Jacob, who gave us the well, and with his sons and his flocks drank from it?” Jesus said to her, “Everyone who drinks of this water will be thirsty again, but those who drink of the water that I will give them will never be thirsty. The water that I will give will become in them a spring of water gushing up to etemal life.” (John 4:10-14)

**Narrative context.** The fourth chapter of the Gospel of John should be seen in a natural narrative tie with the second chapter. Two observations in particular warrant such judgment. First, the recurrent keyword μαρτυρία (“witness”) and its cognate words weave together chapters 2 through 4 (John 2:25; 3:11, 26, 32; 4:39, 44). In those pericopae, the testimonies offered by the minor characters lead to the explicit manifestation of Jesus’ christological identity, i.e., Mary’s disclosing of Jesus’ divine

---

31Theobald, “Abraham—(Isaak—) Jacob,” 163.

32Cf. “Like much of the Fourth Gospel, its first four chapters are rather episodic, more a patchwork quilt than a seamless robe. It is recurrent themes rather than a continuous narrative that bind them together. To be sure, there is some narrative development. The prologue sets the stage for the Gospel story. The witness to the incarnate Word begins in 1:19-51. Two miracles, or ‘signs,’ both located at Cana (2:1ff. and 4:54ff.), bracket the following three chapters. Through these signs and the conversations with Nicodemus, John the Baptist, the Samaritan woman, and the disciples, the reader is led to an increasing understanding of Jesus as revealer and of the proper response to him.” Polhill, “John 1-4,” 445.
power, John the Baptist's verbal testimony of Jesus as Christ converting his disciples into Jesus', and the Samaritan woman's witness resulting in the Samaritans' confession of Jesus as the redeemer. In the present pericope, Jesus' discourse with the Samaritan woman leads her to escalating faith in Christ (a Jew v. 9 → greater than Jacob v. 12 → a prophet v. 19 → the Messiah v. 26 → her leading the villagers to Jesus v. 30 → the villagers' confession of Jesus as the savior of the world v. 42).33

Second, the replacement or contrast theme that permeates these texts requires these chapters to be seen as a narrative unit.34 As the plain water for Jewish purification practices was changed into better wine (John 2:1-11), so the water of Jacob's well that quenches the human thirst only temporarily will be replaced with the water of Jesus that enlivens the human soul perennially (John 4:1-15). Also, as the old temple is replaced with the spiritual temple of Jesus' body (John 2:13-22), so the true worship will supersede the superficial old cultic rituals in Jerusalem and in Gerazim when the new age is initiated (John 4:19-26).35 As the serpent of Moses was lifted, so "Jesus must be lifted so that everyone who believes in him may have eternal life" in contrast to the Israelites who did not live even to see the Promised Land (John 3:14-15).36 Furthermore, this new redemptive paradigm is marked by the breaking of the ethnic barrier, i.e., the exclusivity

35This contrast theme is noted in a number of commentaries on John, for example, Beasley-Murray, John, 58-59.
36Keener, The Gospel of John, 1:590. Wengst also notes that the present pericope is in continuation with the comparison of John the Baptist with Jesus. Wengst, Das Johannesevangelium, 1:160.
of Israel, as Jesus embraces these Samaritans in his ministry.\textsuperscript{37}

Some exegestes note possible parallels in this anecdote to other incidents at the well recorded in the Old Testament, i.e., the encounters of Abraham's servant, Jacob, and Moses, with their future wives (or the master's wife in the case of Abraham's steward) coupled with the unfaithful wife of Hosea 2.\textsuperscript{38} In view of some analogous elements such as meeting a woman by a well, these allusions are possible and probably the parallels will increase the force of the contrast theme in the narrative. However, it seems a special pleading to argue that the fourth evangelist had those allusions in mind as such because encountering of male and female at a well would not have been extremely sparse even in ancient times.\textsuperscript{39}

\textbf{Jacob's well.} The Old Testament does not mention Jacob's ever digging a well, nor that he gave it to his son(s). Genesis 33:19; 48:22 and Joshua 24:32 only comment on the purchase of Shechem for Joseph, which is the locale of Jacob's well in John 4:5 (as it is addressed as Sychar in the Gospel).\textsuperscript{40} Some Jewish traditions record

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textsuperscript{37}For the exclusive reception of the gift of God by Israel in Jewish literature, see Odeberg, \textit{The Fourth Gospel}, 150-52.
    \item \textsuperscript{39}Carson, \textit{The Gospel of John}, 232-33; Lindars, \textit{The Gospel of John}, 187. "There are no real parallels between the OT stories and the Samaritan narratives as it now stands .... A striking difference between the Johannine account and these OT stories lies in the centrality of marriage in the Patriarchal accounts. This is not clearly an issue in 4:1-42, even though Jesus is called 'the bridegroom' in 3:29, and even though some notion of wooing (in the sense of persuading the woman) is clearly present." Teresa Okure, \textit{The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1-42}, WUNT 2/31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 88.
interesting legends concerning Jacob and a well, such as, the traveling well and Jacob’s performing a miracle of water surging itself to the surface of the well. *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* attests that “Jacob was seventy-seven years old when he went forth from his father’s house, and the well went with him.”41 This well could have followed him to Shechem and it may well be the reason why the Samaritan woman associated the well with Jacob.

Some commentators often bring up another Jewish tradition about Jacob, which could have been contrasted with Jesus’ living water. In these legends, Jacob is said to have the water surge to the top of the well and overflow.

And the fourth miracle: the stone which all the pastors had come together to roll away from over the mouth of the well and could not, when our father Jacob came he raised it with one hand and gave to drink to the flock of Laban, his mother’s brother. And the fifth: when our father Jacob raised the stone from above the mouth of the well, the well overflowed and came up to its mouth, and was overflowing for twenty years—all the days that he dwelt in Haran.42

Therefore, some exegetes believe that this tradition sets the stage for Jesus’ reply about his living water, i.e., springing or gushing out water in contrast to the stagnant water in Jacob’s well.43 An echoing of this tradition may well have been intended in the text but the insufficiency of the internal textual evidence precludes a firm conclusion.

shift opens up a possibility that Isaac was sacrificed not in Jerusalem (“Moriah,” 2 Chr 3:1) but in Shechem. As a result, all three patriarchs are related to the Samaritan territory. Reinhard Pummer, *The Samaritans*, IR 23/5 (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 10. Because of the seeming congeniality to Samaritans, some exegetes posited some type of Samaritan influence on this pericope. For an overview of such scholarly judgments, see Margaret Pummet, “Is There Convincing Evidence of Samaritan Influence on the Fourth Gospel,” *ZNW* 73 (1982): 221-30. However, such a judgment suffers from the uncritical use of literature (see pp. 168-71). For an archaeological survey of the location in the time of Jesus, see Jurgen Zangenberg, “Between Jerusalem and Galilee: Samaria in the Time of Jesus,” in *Jesus and Archaeology*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 416-18.

41Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer 35 in Pirkē de Rabbi Eliezer (The Chapters of Rabbi Eliezer the Great) according to the Text of the Manuscript belonging to Abraham Epstein of Vienna, trans. Gerald Friedlander (New York: Bloch, 1916), 263.


43McNamara, “The Targums and Johannine Literature,” 145-46; Neyrey, “Jacob Traditions and the Interpretation of John 4:10-26,” 423. ἐκχύσασθαι in John 4:14 literally means “gushing out, flowing, or springing” water. “ἐκχύσασθαι,” *BDAG*, 810. However, these rabbinic witnesses are not earlier than second century C.E. Yet the contrast of the provisions of Jacob and Jesus still stands in the Johannine text.
The contrast of Jacob’s water with Jesus’. Although various elements in the discourse of Jesus and the Samaritan woman are subject to dispute, one aspect is certain, that is, the gift of Jesus (the gift of God in v. 10 is equivalent to the living water of Jesus in vv. 14-15) is greater than that of Jacob even in the face of the patriarch’s impressive ability to supply abundantly for himself, his sons, and their cattle. The Samaritan woman did not expect this to be true (because of her use of τῇ in front of her question in v. 12) but Jesus’ answer to her question articulates this point in three ways. First, Jacob’s well meets a temporary human need for a while whereas the water of Jesus quenches the human thirst perennially. Second, Jacob was able to offer an external provision which men had to visit over and over again, but the gift of Jesus is internalized in the heart of men so as to remain effective forever (also see Appendix 4). Lastly and most importantly, the gift of Jesus essentially supersedes that of Jacob in that the former leads to spiritual rejuvenation (this internalized well refers to the incoming of the Holy Spirit).

44Scholarly interpretations are divided over the meaning of “the gift” and the symbolic referent of “the water” in the discourse. It seems to refer to the living water and more specifically either the word of Jesus, the Logos (cf. Jer 2:13, Wengst, Das Johannesevangelium, 1:161-68, 170) and/or the Holy Spirit (Köstenberger, John, 150). The sacramental referent theory for the living water is ruled out due to its evident internalized characteristic in v. 14 (Polhill, “John 1-4,” 454-55). For the eschatological connotation of the Johannine “living water,” see Dale C. Allison, Jr., “The Living Water (John 4:10-14, 6:35c, 7:37-39),” SNTT 30 (1986): 143-57. In view of John 7:38 where “the indwelling of the well” clearly refers to the Holy Spirit, the gift in this pericope should involve some elements of the Spirit as well. For the religious background of “living water,” refer to Jeremiah (2:13, 17:13) and Ezekiel (chap. 47), Isaiah (12:3), Sirach (15:3, 24:21); 1 Enoch 48:1. Dietzfellbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 1:104-05; Köstenberger, John, 152. Noteworthy is a possible polemic of Jesus’ gift against the Torah, which is often depicted as “water” or “well” in the Second Temple Judaism (see Keener, The Gospel of John, 1:602-05). Then, the implication is that Jesus’ water supplants the Torah since it is internal, eternal, and spiritual over against the opposite characteristics of the Torah. Such symbolic reading is attractive but still is without definite textual proofs.


46Udo Wilckens, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, NTD 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 82.

47The internalized gift of Jesus is superior to the gift of Jacob since the latter is restricted by its locality. The same is true for the following comparison of the place for the true worship, which transcends the limitation of locality (whether Jerusalem or Samaria). Thielman, “Grace in Place of Grace,” 94-96.
Spirit later, see 7:38-39). This last aspect stands in stark contrast to the earthly oriented nature of the woman’s interest which is symbolically reflected in her history with six men. This manner in which the provision of Jesus surpasses that of Jacob rhetorically illustrates the overall superiority of Jesus, i.e., the unraveling of the salvation history is greater through Jesus than through the Jewish heroic figure. This theme occurs pervasively throughout the Gospel of John, for instance, with Jacob in chapter 4, Abraham in chapter 8, and Moses in 1:17, 6:32, 35.

Summary

Some conclusions can be induced from the observations noted above concerning the narrative function of Jacob for Jesus’ christological identity. In only a couple of pericopae in which the forefather is mentioned or alluded to (John 1:51; 4:10-14), he provides a point of comparison to connote the prominence of Jesus. Jesus and Jacob share a common ground in that they take part in the redemptive program. However, the points of contrast surpass the common denominator in these pericopae: Jesus is the focal point of the divine revelation and salvific program while Jacob remains at the fringe merely as a witness in the first pericope; in the latter, whereas Jacob provides an earthly and tentative means to sustain life, the gift of Jesus offers an efficient resource for eternal spiritual transformation.

Briefly put, these two texts portray the magnificent divine redemptive ministry unfolded through Jesus. In light of such insight, Jacob is presented as a witness who foreshadowed it. This inauguration of the new divine redemptive history takes on such a radically different level from that of Jacob that the theme of “replacement” is probably

---

48 Wengst, Das Johannesevangelium, 1:169; Dietzfellbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 1:103-05. O. Betz notes the theme of worship in spirit and truth and argues that this text echoes Joshua 24, in which Israelites are summoned to returned to true worship as well as the semantic synonyms of Jesus and Joshua. Otto Betz, “Das Johannesevangelium und das Alte Testament,” in Wie verstehen wir das Neue Testament? (Wuppertal: Aussaat, 1981), 103-05. The visibility of allusions, however, seems to be subject to question.

49 Dietzfellbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 1:103.
adequate to characterize this shift, especially in John 4. Yet a sense of contact-points still exists since Jacob’s involvement in the redemptive history echoes and, therefore, bears witness to this new progression of the centuries-old program first exclusively put forth in Israel and now expanded to embrace the broader ethnic groups with the incoming of Jesus into human history.50

Abraham as Christological Witness: John 8:51-58

Very truly, I tell you, whoever keeps my word will never see death.” The Jews said to him, “Now we know that you have a demon. Abraham died, and so did the prophets; yet you say, ‘Whoever keeps my word will never taste death.’ Are you greater than our father Abraham, who died? The prophets also died. Who do you claim to be?” Jesus answered, “If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing. It is my Father who glorifies me, he of whom you say, ‘He is our God,’ though you do not know him. But I know him; if I would say that I do not know him, I would be a liar like you. But I do know him and I keep his word. Your ancestor Abraham rejoiced that he would see my day; he saw it and was glad.” Then the Jews said to him, “You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham?” Jesus said to them, “Very truly, I tell you, before Abraham was, I am.” (John 8:51-58)

50The question asked in John 4:12, “Are you greater than our father Jacob?” formally resembles the one put to Jesus in 8:53, “Are you greater than our father Abraham?” Together the two questions belong to a theme in the Gospel which asserts Jesus’ superiority to the founding fathers of traditional Jewish religion. The thrust of the questions suggests that Jesus not only replaces Jacob, Abraham, and Moses vis-à-vis God’s revelation, but that an absolute claim is made on his behalf: he is greater than these, he supplants them with new revelation, a new cult and a new covenant.” Neyrey, “Jacob Traditions and the interpretation of John 4:10-26.” 420-21. Similarly, “Was die Grunderzählung mit ihrer Szenerie vom Jakobsbrunnen an leisen Tönen anklingen. Hisst, der Evangelist durch seinen Einschub Vv. 10-15 in Eindeutigkeit, allerdings ist diese von einer Art, dass sie jeglichen Gedanken an eine ‘heilsgeschichtliche’ Kontinuität ausschließt. Jesus ist kein neuer Jakob, er und seine Gabe sind von ganz anderer Qualität, in ihm bricht etwas auf, was Jakob nicht zu ‘geben’ vermochte” (italics original). Theobald, “Abraham—(Isaak—) Jacob,” 171.
Narrative Context

Commentators frequently note that the Gospel of John breaks into two parts: the book of Signs (1:19-12:50) and the book of Glory (13:1-20:31) with the prologue (1:1-18) and the epilogue (21:1-25) sandwiching them in between. Indeed, the first book is replete with miraculous signs: turning water into wine (2:1-12), the healing of royal official’s son (4:43-54) and of the lame man (5:1-47), the feeding of the multitude (6:1-71), the healing of the blind man (9:1-41), and the climactic raising of Lazarus from death (11:1-57). These signs serve to reinforce the messianic identity and divinity of Jesus as the crowd attests in John 7:31: “Yet many in the crowd believed in him and were saying, ‘When the Messiah comes, will he do more signs than this man has done?’”

In addition, lengthy speeches and controversies with Jews are interspersed between these signs materials. Just as the signs serve to expose the messianic identity of Jesus, these extended discourses also engender the messianic faith in Jesus on the part of the hearers of the dialogues: “When they heard these words, some in the crowd said, ‘This is really the prophet.’ Others said, ‘This is the Messiah’” (7:40-41a). In brief, the previous signs and discourses (chaps. 2-7) stir the prolonged argument with Jews (ch. 8), in which the identities of Jesus and his interlocutors are called into question. In the course of these debates, Abraham is brought into the fore as a vehicle by which the status of Jesus is measured.

With regard to Abraham, the eighth chapter of John contains three disputes (8:31-38; 39-47; 48-59) between Jesus and his opponents. The first two of the three

51 For instance, see Köstenberger, *John*, 10-11.


53 These interlocutors are consistently designated as Ιουδαίοι 4 times in this pericope (31, 48, 52, and 57). This ethnic description has generated a plethora of debates. For example, see the six representing essays in the following anthology, R. Bieringer, D. Pollefeyt, and F. Vandecasteele-Vanneuville, eds., *Anti-Judaism and the Fourth Gospel: Papers of the Leuven Colloquium, 2000*, JCHS 1 (Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, 2001): Johannes Beutler, “The Identity of the ‘Jews’ for the Readers of John,” 229-38; Henk Jan de Jonge, “‘The Jews’ in the Gospel of John,” 239-59; Martinus C. de Boer, “The
concern the status of Jesus’ interlocutors, namely, whether or not they are descendants of Abraham. It is the last debate (8:51-58) that leads explicitly to the revealing of Jesus’ identity in comparison with the quality of the patriarch. This pericope can be further broken down into two parts: (1) the immortality of Jesus and of Abraham (vv. 52-55); (2) and Abraham’s witness to the pre-existent Jesus (vv. 56-58).

**Immortality of Jesus and of Abraham**

Jesus’ emphatic exclusive claim (i.e., the immortality of the ones who keep Jesus’ words in v. 51) provokes the Jews’ comparison of Jesus with their identity figures, Abraham and the prophets (vv. 52-53). The expression “to taste death” does not occur either in the Hebrew or Greek Old Testament versions. However, some other ancient Jewish writings contain such an idiom, for example, *Pseudo-Jonathan Targum* on

---


Abraham stands out in three ways in the OT: the father of Jewish people, the original source of blessing for the Jewish people, and the identity figure of the Jewish people in his epithet, “the God of Abraham.” In early Jewish literature, four main themes are often related to the patriarch: a tenacious monotheist, a receiver of the divine covenant, possession of virtues, and finally his intercession and ascension to heaven. N. L. Calvert, “Abraham,” in *DJG*, 3-4. For a lengthy survey of the intertestamental Jewish literature on Abraham’s monotheistic faith as a Jewish model, see Nancy Calvert-Koyzis, *Paul, Monotheism and the People of God: The Significance of Abraham Traditions for Early Judaism and Christianity*, JSNTSUP 273 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 6-84.
Deuteronomy 32:1. Thus, the confused reaction of the Jewish listeners seems to be an attempt to set Jesus up in a trap since the immortality of souls was not an uncommon concept in the time of Jesus.

Nonetheless, the challenge of the Jews boils down to the order to which Jesus belongs. It can be paraphrased as following, “our heroic ancestors belong to the terrestrial order. Are you, Jesus, claiming otherwise?” Their question is exactly the same as the Samaritan woman’s inquiry with the same negative expectation indicated by a particle μη and these two verses demonstrate a typical example of Johannine ironies:

μη συ μελζων ει του πατρος ημων 'Αβρααμ (8:53)
μη συ μελζων ει του πατρος ημων 'Ιακωβ (4:12)

The comparison of Jesus’ status with that of the Jewish arch-forefather, however, is appropriate and effective since Abraham possessed a high status in ancient Judaism. Sirach, for instance, records that no one in ancient times had the glory equal to Abraham’s: “Abraham was the great father of a multitude of nations, and no one has been found like him in glory” (Sirach 44:19). Another important element pertinent to the present reference to the forefather is the ancient Jewish belief in the eternal duration of souls via resurrection. Although the state of soul after death in early Judaism is known to be multi-faceted and a systematic inquiry of such theme is notoriously elusive due to the Greek influence of the soul mortality belief, the expressions of the eternal duration of souls are commonly found in early Jewish literature. For example, Josephus indirectly

55Ernest G. Clarke, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Deuteronomy, ArBib 5B (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1997), 88. Further, Wengst (Das Johannesevangelium, 1:356) lists more sources that contain the idiom; 4 Esdra 6:26; BerR 9:5; WaR 18:1; Pesh Hosafa 1:1. Also the Wisdom of Solomon and 4 Maccabees are permeated with the concept of the enduring state of souls.

56Ludger Schenke, Johannes: Kommentar (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1998), 178.

57Theobald, “Abraham—(Isaak—) Jacob,” 181.


attests to the widespread belief in the eternal existence of souls in the first-century Palestine: "They [Sadducees] also take away the belief of the immortal duration of the soul, and the punishments and rewards in Hades" (Josephus Jewish War 2.165b); "But the doctrine of the Sadducees is this: That soul dies with the bodies. . . . but this doctrine is received but by a few" (Josephus Antiquities 18.16-17). Thus, the more recent generation of scholars tends to recognize the presence of a widespread belief in the eternal endurance of souls in Jewish culture and the soul immortality after death in Greek thoughts. For the former, one can refer to Mark 12:24-27, and for the latter Philo and 4 Maccabees clearly attest to such belief. In particular, the three patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, represent ideal figures who attained immortality by means of the overcoming of fleshly desires, practice of virtues, and martyrdom: "But as many as attend to religion with a whole heart, these alone are able to control the passions of the flesh, since they believe that they, like our patriarchs Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, do not die to God, but live to God" (4 Macc 7:18-19).

For the nature of mankind is mortal, but that of virtues is immortal; and it is more

---

Face of Death: The Resurrection Message of the New Testament, ed. Richard N. Longenecker, MNTS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 80-95. I have incurred a debt of gratitude to my supervisor, John B. Polhill, who advised me to adopt more refined terms on this point. The Jewish concept, "the eternal duration of soul," differs from the Greek soul immortality idea in that the former is enabled via resurrection.


reasonable that the name of the everlasting God should be conjoined with what is immortal than with what is mortal, since what is immortal is akin to what is imperishable, but death is hostile to it. (Philo *Abr.* 55)

Fourth Maccabees also notes the enduring life of Abraham through his martyrdom: “They knew also that those who die for the sake of God live to God, as do Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the patriarchs” (*4 Macc* 16:25). Accordingly, at first glance, Abraham and Jesus share a common ground that they are related to the eternal endurance of souls (that is, “the eternal life” in the Johannine language) and/or its analogous concept, the soul immortality. 62

However, on closer reading, a contrasting element between the two persons is observed in view of the Jewish belief in Abraham. 63 That is, for the forefather, the enjoying of eternal life was dependent upon his virtuous deeds, i.e., the obedience of Torah and martyrdom. On the other hand, the eternal life bestowed by Jesus hinges upon the condition of keeping his own word, i.e., the word of Jesus. This prerequisite indicates a self-divine claim on the part of Jesus, evoking “biblical language for obeying God’s law and word.” 64 This startling assertion is unmistakably further clarified in verses fifty-six through fifty-eight, which induced Jews’ attempt to hurl stones at Jesus in verse fifty-nine.

**Abraham’s Witness of the Pre-Existent Jesus**

In verses fifty-six and fifty-eight, Jesus makes a distinctive messianic 

---

62 The mode of the enduring existence of souls does not affect the comparative analysis of Abraham and Jesus since the present inquiry concerns on whom their eternal existence is dependent.

63 However, the incomplete nature of this comparison should be noted. The extant sources do not allow us to recover the comprehensive picture of the early Jewish beliefs (especially, in the time of Jesus within the Pharisaic circle) in the soul after life. The Pharisaic doctrine on the issue is only partially known primarily through the witness of Josephus. Thus, the result of this comparison could be a reflection of the difference between the Hellenistic and Semitic conceptual frameworks, rather than a broader category, “early Judaism,” and the Gospel of John. For a more detailed discussion on the Pharisaic beliefs on the resurrection of souls, see Claudia Setzer, *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 21-36.

64 Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1:765. It must be also noted that the Jews misunderstood Jesus in that they took him to mean that one will never die physically if he keeps the word of Jesus (as the Greek mythology envisages). This never-dying promise stands in stark contrast with Abraham, who enjoyed the eternal life upon resurrection at the *eschaton* in Jewish beliefs. However, it does not seem to be what Jesus meant by “not tasting death.”
statement, elucidating his pre-existence to which Abraham bears testimony. Especially, verse fifty-six has rendered a perennial riddle to Johannine exegetes. The word used to depict Abraham’s witness of Jesus is ἧγαλλιάσατο, an aorist tense and middle voice of ἀγαλλιάω in the present text. Some exegetes posit that this expression is reminiscent of Abraham’s laugh in Genesis 17:17 and 18:2-13 where the angels disclose the birth of Isaac. These commentators point to some ancient Jewish writings, such as, Jubiliees 15:17, Targum Onquelos on Genesis, and Philo (De Mutatione Nominum 154-75). In these texts, Abraham is presumed to have encountered God and received an eschatological revelation (cf., “τιν ἡμέραν τίν ξοιή, my day” in verse fifty-six echoes the eschatological language of the Old Testament). This group of writings tends to manifest a shift of emphasis which stresses the virtue of Abraham, especially his faith in the face of the divine promise concerning the birth of Isaac. Especially, for example, Targum Onquelos changes the verb of the original Hebrew text into one that renders a positive nuance with the result being an emphasis on Abraham’s faith.


68 Aberbach and Grossfield, Targum Onkelos to Genesis, 104.
that they reflect a misapprehension of the divine prophecy.\(^{69}\)

In addition to these texts, another group of ancient Jewish texts entertains the idea of Abraham taking a journey into the heavenly realm, including 4 Ezra, 2 Baruch, Liber antiquitatum biblicarum (Pseudo-Philo), and some rabbinic Midrashim.\(^{70}\) For instance, the Apocalypse of Abraham offers an elaborate account of Abrahamic visions.\(^{71}\) Chapters 1 through 8 report Abraham's rejection of idolatry and his request to know the living God. The rest of the book (chaps. 9-32) recounts his celestial expedition in which he receives visions concerning the end times.\(^{72}\)

The implications of these texts adduced in the Johannine commentaries are as follows. If the first group is taken into view as the conceptual background of the present text, either Abraham eye-witnessed the pre-existent Son in his previous earthly ministry prior to the incarnation or the forefather comprehended the implications of the unfolding of the redemptive history through his son, Isaac.\(^{73}\) When the second group of Jewish writings is taken into account, John suggests Abraham’s eye-witness of the pre-existent Son in his heavenly abode.\(^{74}\)

\(^{69}\) So is it in Philo Legum Allegoriae III.218.

\(^{70}\) And you [God] loved him [Abraham] and to him only you revealed the end of the times, secretly by night" (4 Ezra 3:14, OTP, 1:528); "After these things, I showed it [the new Jerusalem] to my servant Abraham in the night between the portions of the victims" (2 Bar 4:4, OTP, 1:622); "And he said to him, 'Is it not regarding this people that I spoke to Abraham in a vision, . . . when I lifted him above the firmament and showed him the arrangements of all the stars . . . and on account of his blood I chose them . . . I will reveal everything I am doing to Abraham' (L.A.B. [Pseudo-Philo] 18:5, OTP, 2:325); Gen. Rab. 44:12 (Freedman, Genesis, 367-68); and Ber. R. 44:21.

\(^{71}\) The document is considered to be originally written in Hebrew, but the extant manuscripts have survived only in Slavonic and date back to the first to second centuries C.E. R. Rubinkiewicz, "Apocalypse of Abraham," in OTP 1:681-82.

\(^{72}\) Apo. Ab. 9-32 (OTP, 693-705).

\(^{73}\) Labahn, "Jesus und die Autorität der Schrift im Johannesevangelium," 198.

Nonetheless, similar to the passages examined earlier in this study, the dearth of explicit textual evidence precludes any firm judgment on whether or to what extent the present text directly refers to certain contemporary and/or later Jewish traditions on Abraham’s reception of visions. No matter which view reflects better the original reading of the fourth evangelist, the concept of Abraham’s knowledge of the end time, or more specifically, his encounter with God was probably not too foreign to the first audience (who were presumably familiar with the common concurrent Jewish traditions about the patriarch) of this narrative, but it was his specific witness of the pre-existent Jesus that perplexed the hearers in verse 56.

Temporal Priority of Jesus over Abraham

Abraham’s witness of the pre-existent Christ in verse 56 leads to a more revealing christological statement in verse 58 in terms of the chronological priority of Jesus over Abraham.75 The Greek text of verse 58 has drawn a good deal of attention from commentators due to the presence of the so-called “ego eimi” construction: “before Abraham was I am (πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγώ εἰμι).” Although it is somewhat common to relate all the occurrences of Johannine “I-am” sayings with a deifying nomenclature, the present usage lacks sufficient analogous ancient parallels so that it makes a special pleading.76 However, its predicate clause (i.e., “before Abraham was”) warrants a theistic reading, namely, prolonging the current existence of Jesus at least by two millennia. In this respect, commentators detect an allusion to the Old Testament


divine descriptions, particularly, Exodus 3:14 and Isaiah 43:10. While one may not agree with the conceptual background and exact nature of this I-am saying, it is quite obvious from the reaction of Jews in verse 59 that the hearers of Jesus took it as an offense of blasphemy (in v. 59), which infringement in ancient Jewish culture was often dealt with stoning to death (Lev 24:16, 23; Jos Ant. 4.202). The hostile reaction of the Jews in verse fifty-nine disproves their self-claim of being “the children of Abraham” because, in stark contrast to their ill-reception, the forefather took delight in witnessing to Jesus.

Summary

In the present text (John 8:51-59), a clash between two groups of individuals is observed. The group of Jews brings forth Abraham as their ideal progenitor from whom their physical lineage originated and from whom they also inherited their status (as Abraham was free, the Jews conceived to have been free in v. 33). On the other hand, to Jesus, the forefather functions merely as a witness to the pre-existent divine characteristics of Jesus. In other words, the validity of Abraham stands as long as it verifies the divine nature of Jesus in terms of his pre-existence. Furthermore, it is not


78 One who blasphemes the name of the LORD shall be put to death; the whole congregation shall stone the blasphemer. Aliens as well as citizens, when they blaspheme the Name, shall be put to death” (Lev 24:16); “He that blasphemed God, let him be stoned, and let him hang upon a tree all that day, and then let him be buried in an ignominious and obscure manner” (Jos Ant. 4.202).

79 Dietzfelbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 1:269. “The Jews’ appeal to Abraham is rejected in two different ways: first, it is said that their relationship to Abraham is wrong, and then it is said that Abraham has only a subsidiary role to play in the divine drama as a witness of Jesus. What Jesus says of Abraham is close to what he has earlier said of Moses. Both Abraham and Moses are portrayed as witnesses of Jesus.” Raimo Hakola, Identity Matters: John, the Jews and Jewishness, NovTSup 118 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 194.

80 Die heiligen Schriften und Abraham werden durchaus als identitätsstiftende Autoritäten anerkannt. Allerdings werden sie in ein Gefüge eingeordnet, in dem der präexistent Sohn das
the Jewish arch-forefather but Jesus who is truly superior since his revelation comes
directly from the Father (8:16-19, 26, 29, 38, 42) and he can impart redemption from sin
(8:32-36, 51).

Conclusion

In this chapter, three passages in John (1:51; 4:10-14; 8:58-58) have been
investigated that contain explicit references to or allusions to the Jewish patriarchs,
namely, Abraham and Jacob. An exegetical examination of these passages reveals a
consistent characterization of the two personages and they serve the same function of
confirming the messianic identity of Jesus. Some conclusions can be drawn from the
preceding assessment of these texts in view of the surrounding literary contexts and
related questions raised earlier in the first chapter. First, the messianic witness function
of Abraham and Jacob fits nicely in the overall narrative flow of the chapters which
surround the texts under discussion. As the focus of chapters one through eight is
directed at Jesus with particular reference to his messianic identity, the two prominent
Jewish patriarchs consistently play the supportive role to corroborate the Johannine
Christology.

Second, although the Jewish forefathers were conceived as ideal and identity
figures in second temple Judaism, just as the Jews and Samaritans regard them with
admiration in John, they remain satisfied as witnesses for Christ in the present texts. On
the one hand, their introduction to the discourses provides a contact point, with which the
onset of the new redemptive history through Jesus stands in continuity, namely, with the
outworking of the Old redemptive history, most remarkably in their foreshadowing of the
divine characteristics of the Messiah. Just as the salvific outworking was unraveled
through Jacob in the Old Testament, so will it be through Jesus in John. On the other

entscheidende Kriterium ist.” Labahn, “Jesus und die Autorität der Schrift im Johannesevangelium,” 197;
“Zwar wird Abraham für die an Jesus Glaubenden nicht als Stamnäver und Identitätsfigur herangezogen,
hand, the patriarchs are presented as the point of comparison/contrast since they demonstrate the enormous magnitude of the radical unfolding of the new redemptive program. This surpassing and superseding nature of the new redemptive history is reflected upon the divine nature of Messiah and the gift that is bestowed through him.

Lastly, the observations inferred from the second point call into question the congruity of John’s Gospel with ancient Judaism.\(^{81}\) Dissimilar to the non-canonical Jewish writings of the intertestamental period, the fourth Gospel does not promote the virtuous characteristics of Jacob and Abraham (although it does not rigorously disavow them). The fourth evangelist also does not conceive the forefathers as the spiritual progenitors since they cannot offer what this new redemptive program avails to believers through the Messiah.

\(^{81}\) Much of the literature which sees the Fourth Gospel as being dependent on rabbinic traditions needs to be seriously questioned. The use of the Jacob traditions in the Fourth Gospel presupposes that the reader has some sort of access to the Jacob Narrative (either oral or written). But it does not presuppose a knowledge of the traditions of early Judaism and especially of the rabbinic traditions found in the targumim and midrashim. The intertextuality involved in interpreting the Jacob Narrative in the Fourth Gospel is quite restricted. It seems reasonable that any hints elsewhere in the Gospel to Jewish traditions may be more reflections of the historical situation being described than part of the intention of the Evangelist. In the passages studied in this dissertation it has been shown that there is no hint that rabbinic traditions are in view beyond what can be gathered from the biblical text itself.” Johnson, “Our Father Jacob,” 251-52.
CHAPTER 3
ELIJAH

He confessed and did not deny it, but confessed, “I am not the Messiah.” And they asked him, “What then? Are you Elijah?” He said, “I am not.” “Are you the prophet?” He answered, “No.” Then they said to him, “Who are you? Let us have an answer for those who sent us. What do you say about yourself?” He said, “I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, ‘Make straight the way of the Lord,’” as the prophet Isaiah said” (1:20-23).

Introduction

Unlike Abraham and Jacob, some Jewish documents portrayed Elijah, David, and Moses as eschatological redemptive figures. As such, it is necessary to treat their messianic images in the period in a separate section. As far as Elijah the Tishbite (1 Kgs 17:1) is concerned, he exerted a prominent influence in early Judaism and in the New Testament. The dimension of the eschatological prophet (i.e, Elijah redivivus), in particular, emerged as a more conspicuous one out of various characteristics and hopes related to Elijah such as a miracle worker or his translation into heaven.1 This aspect is arguably most tangibly addressed in the New Testament, especially, in the Gospels. Accordingly, it is worthwhile to probe into that particular expectation of Elijah redivivus in the second temple Judaism so as to understand the possible use of such portrayal in John within a broader conceptual milieu.2 Such an endeavor, however, entails a number

---

1“Elijah appears as the only figure whose personal eschatological return was expected in the Old Testament ... he is the only eschatological redivivus figure of the Old Testament.” Géza G. Xeravits, King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library, STDJ 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 184.

2Öhler disfavors the label, “Elijah redivivus,” since the prophet never died but was only translated into heaven alive. Markus Öhler, Elia im Neuen Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im frühen Christentum, BZNW 88 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 3. His point is valid because the term literally denotes the dead being brought back to life. Joynes, on the other hand, suggests “Elijah redivitus” instead, but her suggestion has not found a wide acceptance yet. Christian E. Joynes, “A Question of Identity: ‘Who Do People Say That I Am?’: Elijah, John the Baptist and Jesus in Mark’s Gospel,” in Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John...
of questions as following: How Elijah was perceived by Jews in the intertestamental period, especially with reference to messianic hopes; how the messianic expectations regarding the prophet were received in the New Testament and, particularly, the Gospel of John; and, finally, whether or not the Fourth Gospel presents Elijah as a messianic prefigure. In order to address these issues, this chapter begins with the perception of Elijah in the second temple period.

**Elijah in Second Temple Judaism**

The Jewish traditions related with Elijah *redivivus* can be classified into three broad categories: eschatological expectation primarily in terms of his reconciliation ministry (as described in the MT, LXX, and Sirach); the apocalyptic return of the prophet with the result of the militant subjugation of the unrighteous; and settling legal disputes. The witnesses of the third category are mostly attested in rabbinical writings, which variously date from the end of the first century A.D. onward. They represent late traditions that are least reflected in the New Testament, and thus, are hardly pertinent to the present investigation.

**Eschatological Reconciliation Ministry**

Malachi. It is commonplace to take the point of departure for an examination of the Jewish expectations of Elijah *redivivus* from the very last verses of Malachi, which also bear testimony to an impressive way to conclude the entire scheme of the Hebrew

---

3For examples of the third category, see "it is [families of] this sort that Elijah will come to declare unclean and to declare clean, to put out and to draw near (m. *Eduy.* 8:7); "let it lie there until Elijah comes" (m. *B. Mes.* 1:8); "Utensils of gold and of glass he should not touch them until Elijah comes" (m. *B. Mes.* 2:8); "but leave the whole sum until Elijah comes [and no one will be paid off]" (m. *B. Mes.* 3:4); "And the rest of the money [received for the sale of the larger one] is left until Elijah comes" (m. *B. Mes.* 3:5). For the use of the Elijah tradition in the rabbinic writings, see Gerd Hafner, *Der verheißeene Vorläufer: Redaktionskritische Untersuchung zur Darstellung Johannes des Täufers im Matthäusevangelium*, SBB 27 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1994), 337-38.
canon with the anticipation of the prophet’s return⁴: “Lo, I will send you the prophet Elijah before the great and terrible day of the LORD comes. He will turn the hearts of parents to their children and the hearts of children to their parents, so that I will not come and strike the land with a curse” (Mal 4: 5-6). Coupled with a previous prophecy concerning the messenger who will “prepare the way before God” in Malachi 3:1, this Elijah redivus theme of Malachi 4:5-6 constitutes an inclusio and expresses a tenacious hope of the prophet’s return. His return is hoped to reconcile the bond between the fathers and sons before the wrath of God strikes them.

Sirach. Further elaborations of the eschatological Elijah conception appear in some later Jewish traditions. For instance, the Septuagint broadens the scope of the prophet’s reconciliation ministry so as to encompass the relationship between the people with their neighbors, along with the fathers with their sons (καρδιὰν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πληρῶν αὐτοῦ).⁵ On the other hand, Sirach demonstrates a glimpse of the Jewish hope for the national restoration along with individual reconciliation vis-à-vis the return of Elijah: “At the appointed time, it is written, you [Elijah] are destined to calm the wrath of God before it breaks out in fury, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and to restore the tribes of Jacob” (Sir 48:10).⁶ These three passages voice more or less a


⁵Another change from the Hebrew to the Greek text is that the day of the Lord is “great and glorious (μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν),” not “great and dreadful (κρύπτην)’.”

⁶R. Horsley judges this text to be reflective of a popular rabbinic belief in the Persian and
unified hope of reconciliation in the aftermath of Elijah’s return, a hope of unity and restoration at the individual level and at the national level (with the latter being of lesser emphasis).\footnote{In addition to the Malachi texts, J. D. Martin detects an echo of Isa 49:6 which speaks of the restoration of the tribes of Jacob and the nation of Israel. James D. Martin, “Ben Sira’s Hymn to the Fathers: A Messianic Perspective,” in Crises and Perspectives: Studies in Ancient Near Eastern Polytheism, Biblical Theology, Palestinian Archaeology, and Intertestamental Literature, Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference, Held at Cambridge, U.K., 1985, ed. Johannes Cornelis de Moor, OtSt 24 (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 107-23.}

**Apocalyptic Militant Subjugation**

**Sibylline Oracles and the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah.** The second category of the Elijah redivivus anticipation often entailed the military subjugation of the unrighteousness. The *Sibylline Oracles*, for example, envisage the return of Elijah that will precipitate the apocalyptic judgment.

Then the Thesbite, driving a heavenly chariot at full stretch from heaven, will come on earth and then display three signs to the whole world, as life perishes. . . . And then a great river of blazing fire will flow from heaven, and will consume every place, land and great ocean and gleaming sea, lakes and rivers, springs and implacable Hades and the heavenly vault. But the heavenly luminaries will crash together, also into an utterly desolate form. For all the stars will fall together from heaven on the sea. All the souls of men will gnash their teeth, burning in a river, and brimstone and a rush of fire in a fiery plain, and ashes will cover all (*Sib. Or. 2:187-204*).\footnote{The origin of the *Sibylline Oracles* is presumed to be a mixture of Jewish and Christian with the strong imprints of the latter. John J. Collins, “The Sibylline Oracles,” in Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus, ed. Michael E. Stone, CRINT 2/2 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 377.}

Similarly, the Coptic *Apocalypse of Elijah* announces the return of Elijah and Enoch who will come to slay “the son of lawlessness.”

After these things, Elijah and Enoch will come down. They will lay down the flesh of the world, and they will receive their spiritual flesh. They will pursue the son of lawlessness and kill him since he is not able to speak. On that day, he [the antichrist] will dissolve in their presence like ice which was dissolved by a fire. He will perish like a serpent which has no breath in it. They [Elijah and Enoch] will say to him, “Your time has passed by for you. Now therefore you and those who believe you will perish.” They will be cast into the bottom of the abyss and it will be closed for Hellenistic periods. His reasoning is based on the fact that the entire book of Sirach is disinterested in eschatological matters. Horsley is right to say that this Elijah redivivus text stands out in Sirach, but he certainly overestimates the place of the text in contemporary Judaism based on one appearance. Richard A. Horsley, “Like One of the Prophets of Old: Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus,” *CBQ* 47 (1985): 440.
In this apocalyptic expectation of the prophet’s return, he is also sometimes associated with Phinehas the zealot (Tg. Yer. I Ex 6:18; Tg. Yer. I Num 25:12; L.A.B. 48; Liv. Pro. 21:1). Because of his connection with the Levites, Elijah was sometimes considered a priestly figure as early as the second-century B.C. However, some of the documents (esp. The Sibylline Oracles and the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah) that contain this strand of thought display traces of a Christian influence and most of them (the rabbinic writings) do not predate the Gospel of John.

Nag Hammadi and Qumran

The prominence of Elijah is not attested in the Nag Hammadi and the Qumran library. For the former, it could be envisaged that the strong miracle-working image of the prophet would have circumvented the sect’s rigorous penchant to emphasize gnosis, that is, saving knowledge (or revelation), which Beltz characterizes as “a mark of thorough Hellenization.” Nonetheless, the dearth of reference to Elijah in the Qumran library is surprising in light of its pervasive enthusiasm about the end times. Only one


13 “Elijah redivivus was not a distinctively [Qumran] sectarian figure, in the sense that the messiah of Aaron, or the Teacher at the end of days, was. The Elijah-like eschatological prophet had clear scriptural bases and did not require a sectarian perspective. He did not, however, figure as prominently as the Davidic messiah in the literature of the time, and presumably he was not as well established in popular
mention of Elijah by name appears in 4Q558, which is an Aramaic citation of Malachi 3:23.14

4Q521. 4Q521 consists of possible allusions to the accounts of Elijah in 1 Kings and Malachi 3:24.15

[For the heavens and the earth will listen to his anointed one . . . . For he will honour the pious upon the throne of an eternal kingdom, freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twisted . . . . And the Lord will perform marvelous acts such as have not existed, just as he said,] he will heal the badly wounded and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good news to the poor and . . . . he will lead the . . . . and enrich the hungry. . . . It is sure: The fathers will return towards the sons. (4Q521 2 ii 1, 7-8, 11-13; 2 iii 2)16

Three observations suggest that “the anointed one (אֲלֵיִהלֹהִי in the original Qumran script)” in the text should be taken as an allusion to the hope of Elijah redivivus (although a good portion of this passage is also cast over against Isa 61).17 First, the obeying of the heavens was recounted in the Old Testament only with reference to Elijah (1 Kgs 17:1-18:46).18 Second, only Elijah and Elisha are related to raising the dead in the Old Testament narratives (1 Kgs 17; 2 Kgs 4) and the subsequent Jewish traditions.19 Finally,
the phrase, “the turning of the fathers to their sons,” is a comparably clear echo of the 
language of Malachi 4:6.\(^{20}\)

\[\text{הָרָעַשְׁבׁי לָכְךָ אֲבֹהָו, יָכְנוּ אֶלֶּךָ בָּנוֹיֹ יָכְנוּ אֲבֹהָוֹי} \]

\[\text{בְּאֵם אָבוֹהַיָּא הָלָּכָּי} \quad (\text{4Q521 2 iii 2b, DSS})^{21}\]

However, what is questionable with this passage is that this series of thoughts is extremely thin in view of the entire corpus of the sect’s massive collection of documents, so much so that this particular document is believed not to have originated from within the community, but to have been imported from outside.\(^{22}\) No matter what the provenance of the belief was, however, the hope of the eschatological Elijah (that is, Elijah \textit{redivivus}) is not unattested, although not predominant either, in second temple Judaism prior to and contemporaneous with the shaping of John’s Gospel.\(^{23}\)

---


\(^{21}\)Martínez and Tigchelaar translate the phrase as following: “The Fathers will return towards the sons.” \textit{DSS}, 2:1045.


\(^{23}\)Horsley is generally skeptical about the widespread expectation of such an eschatological
Scribal Expectation of Elijah’s Return

One of the most intriguing questions, and also one pertinent for the present inquiry, has been debated as to whether there was an expectation of Elijah’s coming as a messianic forerunner in the intertestamental period. Morris Faierstein argued, in contrast to the scholarly consensus at the time of his writing, that all the Jewish texts previously alleged to conceive of Elijah’s return as a messianic forerunner postdate Jesus’ time (often under Christian influence) and that there are no clear literary examples which correlate Elijah with the Messiah in the Jewish eschatological texts. In opposition, Dale Allison called for a more nuanced reading of the Jewish eschatological texts that describe Elijah as the harbinger of the eschaton, because the day of the Lord in Jewish conceptual patterns, he contended, implies the return of Messiah (for his case, Allison refers to 1QS 9:1; T. Levi 18:1-9; T. Jud. 24:1-6). In defense of Faierstein, Joseph Fitzmyer responded that the Messianic texts adduced by Allison do not explicitly connect the Day of the Lord with the coming of the Messiah. Markus Öhler, who has conducted one of the most recent and comprehensive investigations on Elijah with reference to his conception in the second temple period, also sides with Faierstein and Fitzmyer. This brief review indicates that the synoptic accounts of certain scribes’ expectation of Elijah’s return as messianic forerunner probably reflect a marginal current of rabbinic interpretations or they could be indebted to the hands of the synoptic redactors.

---

24Morris M. Faierstein, “Why Do the Scribes Say That Elijah Must Come First,” JBL 100 (1981): 75-86. His examination covers a wide range of Jewish literature (such as the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, the Qumran scrolls, Philo, and the rabbinic literature).


27Öhler, Elia im Neuen Testament, 12-30; idem, “The Expectation of Elijah and the Presence of the Kingdom of God,” JBL 118 (1999): 461-76. Also, Horsley (“Like One of the Prophets of Old,” 443) and Xeravits (King, Priest, Prophet, 184-90) share this judgment.
The implication of Faierstein's, Fitzmyer's, and Öhler's studies is that we cannot cast the picture of Elijah depicted in the Synoptic Gospels onto that of the Fourth Gospel. Much confusion over the role of Elijah in John can be cleared up when we take the Johannine portrayal of Elijah on its own right, independent of the Synoptics. Another point that needs to be taken into consideration is that a great deal of Jewish tradition on Elijah does not have much congruity with John's Gospel. There are questions about whether the category of the apocalyptic prophet was influenced by the Christian apocalyptic traditions such as the revelation of John and whether the category of the legal judge represents later rabbinic developments. Thus, it would be exegetically safe to delimit the scope of the pertinent Jewish Elijah traditions to Malachi (the MT and LXX), Sirach, and 4Q521 for this present research into the eschatological prophet conception in the Gospel of John.28

Elijah in the Synoptic Gospels

The preceding survey on Elijah in the intertestamental period reveals his predominant influence in that period as expressed in three distinct hopes.29 The prophet continued to occupy an important place in the Pseudepigrapha, his distinction is carried more strongly over in the New Testament period.30 Among all the ancient Jewish heroic figures, he is most frequently mentioned in the New Testament (29-30 times) after Moses (80), Abraham (73), and David (59).31

In the Synoptic Gospels a somewhat unified picture emerges concerning the prophet. That is, the expectation of his return and his subsequent role is envisaged vis-à-

28Öhler, Elia im Neuen Testament, 12.
29"No biblical figure influenced later Judaism more than Elijah." Jeremias, "Hñ(ε)ιας," 928; Gese, "Zur Bedeutung Elias für die biblische Theologie," 127.
30Öhler, Elia im Neuen Testament, 12.
31Jeremias, "Hñ(ε)ιας," 934.
vis John the Baptist.\textsuperscript{32} Matthew and Mark concur on the identification of the Baptist as Elijah on the lips of Jesus.\textsuperscript{33} In Mark, it is recognized that John’s coming as Elijah \textit{redivivus} is in terms commensurate with the prediction of the Scripture: “But I tell you that Elijah has come, and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it is written about him” (Mark 9:13).\textsuperscript{34} The Matthean parallel (Matt 17:12a) appears to be attuned with this Markan tradition: “but I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not recognize him.” Earlier in the same Gospel (Matt 11:14), Jesus unmistakably identifies the Baptist with the prophet: “He is Elijah who is to come.”\textsuperscript{35} On the other hand, the Lukan rendering of the connection between the two figures is more oblique, characterizing John as only possessing the qualities attached to the prophet: “With the spirit and power of Elijah he will go before him, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord” (Luke 1:17).\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{32}D. L. Bock, “Elijah and Elisha,” in \textit{DJG}, 204-05. Michael Tilly surveyed the image of the prophet as perceived in Palestinian Judaism at the time of John the Baptist. According to his comparative analysis of the Synoptic portrayals and contemporary Jewish understanding, the fellow Jews would have understood John the Baptist as a prophet based on his appearance and the content of his preaching. Michael Tilly, \textit{Johannes der Taufer und die Biographie der Propheten: Die synoptische Täuferaiberlieferung und das jüdische Prophetenbild zur Zeit des Täufers}, BWANT 7 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994). For another comparative survey of John the Baptist in light of the contemporary prophetic tradition, see Joan E. Taylor, \textit{The Immerser: John the Baptist within Second Temple Judaism}, SHJ (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 261-316.


\textsuperscript{34}The misunderstanding of the bystanders seems to be a rhetorical device to prepare readers for the confession of the centurion on the messianic identity of Jesus. Mark F. Whitters, “Why Did the Bystanders Think Jesus Called upon Elijah before He Died (Mark 15:34-36)?: The Markan Position,” \textit{HTR} 95 (2002): 119-24.


Elijah in John’s Gospel

An examination of the role of Elijah in John, however, sets a Johannine exegete in a quandary. The reason is partly because the Gospel seems to lack any explicit references or allusions to the prophet; and no synoptic parallels that affirm the association of the prophet with the Baptist are found. Furthermore, more strikingly, John the Baptist, whom the Synoptic Gospels unanimously portray as Elijah redivivus, blatantly renounces his contemporaries’ inquiry on whether or not he is Elijah or the prophet, presumably an eschatological figure, in John 1:21. As such, Walter Wink’s statement appears to be warranted: “The [fourth] evangelist . . . sharply contradicts the earlier tradition [of the Synoptics] that John was Elijah. For him the idea of a forerunner is anathema.”37 Some explanations, therefore, have been offered to remedy the seeming inconsistency. Before turning our attention to such attempts, it is worthwhile to mention a group of scholars who maintain that it is Jesus, not John, who reflects the role of Elijah redivivus. 38

Jesus as Elijah

Cullmann, Schnackenburg, and Robinson. In a conclusion to a section which deals with the concept of the eschatological prophet in the New Testament, Oscar Cullmann defines the presence and use of the idea of Jesus as Elijah in John:

The synoptic writers did not express their personal faith in Jesus by means of this conception [the eschatological Elijah, or Elijah redivivus]. On the other hand, it does seem to have had a certain meaning for the writer of the Fourth Gospel. His particular emphasis of the fact that the Baptist rejected for himself the title of the Prophet, the returned Elijah, suggests that the writer of John wants to reserve this title for Jesus—along with other Christological designations and concepts . . . . 39

37Wink, John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition, 89.
39Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, 37. Cullmann also represents pre-critical scholarship on Jewish messianism via a prophetic figure. “Jesus appears not only as a prophet but as the
Cullmann’s conclusion is based on his observation of John the Baptist’s denial of being Elijah. Likewise, Schnackenburg also notes that “when John the Baptist denies that he is ‘the prophet’ or an eschatological figure of salvation like Elijah (1:21, 25), this indirectly reinforces the idea that Jesus is this ‘prophet’ or ‘Elijah.’” In support of this view, Cullmann further points to the early chapters of Acts (esp. 3:22; 7:37) which, he believes, preserve a tradition of Elijah redivivus Christology. Similarly, J. A. T. Robinson detects an element of Elijah-like Christology in Acts 3, where Peter calls for repentance on the basis of identifying Jesus with the one promised by a series of prophets. This prophet is expected to properly restore everything to God’s rule, and, to Robinson, this restoration theme evokes Elijah redivivus motif (Mal 3).

According to this very primitive Christology (Acts 3:12-26) [a earlier belief that understood Jesus as a prophetic figure], Jesus is quite explicitly the Prophet like Moses (as he is also in Stephen’s speech in Acts 7:37). It should hardly therefore come as a shock to find that he is equally evidently Elijah in all but name . . . Jesus was indeed to be the Christ. But he was Elijah first.

Prophet, the final Prophet who should ‘fulfill’ all prophecy at the end of time. We shall see that the expectation of such a prophet with a very definite task to perform at the end of time was widespread in Judaism at the time of Jesus.” Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament, 13 (italics original). However, R. Horsley simply refutes this view. “But there is very little evidence for any Jewish expectation of an eschatological prophet prior to the early Christian communities’ interpretation of Jesus (and John the Baptist) and the emergence of rabbinic Judaism following the crisis created by the Roman devastation of Jewish Palestine in A.D. 70.” Horsley, “Like One of the Prophets of Old,” 437.


See especially v. 21: “Who must remain in heaven until the time of universal restoration that God announced long ago through his holy prophets.”

Some skepticism, however, should be raised concerning the identification of Jesus with Elijah by Cullmann, Schnackenburg, and Robinson. That is, they commit the fallacy of superimposing the Elijah eschatology on the texts that display more the traits of the Mosaic eschatological prophet (cf. Deut 18:15).\textsuperscript{44} Their oversight is somewhat understandable in view of some early Jewish texts that fuse the two figures closely in their eschatological expressions. However, ill-defined criteria and their application in studies such as this create unnecessary confusion over the presence of certain personages in the texts.\textsuperscript{45} Moreover, it is particularly problematic when their judgments are largely based on arguments from silence. We cannot assume the Elijah \textit{redivivus} Christology because a text does not deny such to be the case. It is comparably obvious that the texts adduced to support their views infer a Mosaic eschatological prophetic picture rather than that of Elijah. Moreover, these scholars fail to prove that such Elijah Christological motif of Acts is imported into the Gospel of John.

\textbf{J. Louis Martyn.} In distinction to his predecessors, J. Louis Martyn put forward a more rigorous and complicated study of Elijah Christology in John.\textsuperscript{46} He traced the presence of the Elijah-like Christology in the pre-Johannine traditions through a convoluted source reconstruction. His contention is that the earlier “Signs Source” conceived of Christology in terms of Elijah \textit{redivivus} while such tradition was suppressed in the later redactional layers. An example of the latter is most explicitly attested in John 3:13 in the form of anti-Elijah polemic (“no one has ascended into heaven except the one


\textsuperscript{45}“In the few and scattered textual references [to Elijah \textit{redivivus} and a prophet like Moses] that are available, their particular forms or images do not appear to be mixed or conflated; hence they can be discussed separately.” Horsley, “Like One of the Prophets of Old,” 438.

\textsuperscript{46}Martyn, “We Have Found Elijah.” 9-54.
who descended from heaven, the Son of Man”). On the other hand, the traits of an Elijah-Christology are found in several allusions to Elijah’s miracles and references to his second coming: the former in the pericopae of the changing of water into wine (2:1-11), the healing of the official’s son (4:46-54), the feeding of the multitude (6:1-14), the healing of the blind (9:1-7), and raising of Lazarus (11:1-44). Therefore, his reconstruction of the Johannine sources leads him to postulate that the original source of John 1:43-49 (the testimony of Nathanael) actually contained a phrase, “we have found Elijah,” instead of “we have found the Messiah” (John 1:41).

A reader of Martyn’s essay, however, becomes skeptical of whether such a complex reconstruction of multiple source layers can be undertaken with as high a degree of certainty as Martyn asserts. Marinus de Jonge’s assessment of Martyn’s theory is illuminating: “It is one thing to say that the Fourth Gospel presupposes earlier written and oral traditions . . . , but it is quite another matter to claim that we are still able to determine beyond reasonable doubt what the source employed in 1:19-51 contained.”47 His view of Moses in John’s Gospel, however, seems to be contingent upon his hypothetical reconstruction of the history of the so-called Johannine community. If his theory of the community does not stand up to scrutiny, his view of Moses also breaks down.

Martyn proposes that, in its first phase, the Johannine community remained actively involved within orthodox Jewish synagogues with an outspoken conviction that Jesus is the long-awaited eschatological messiah (Martyn posits that the signs source reflects such a phase). Later on, the community had to detach itself from mainstream Judaism because of its theological differences. The problem with Martyn’s thesis, however, is that no extant literary evidence unambiguously supports his proposal (i.e.,

“signs source” or proto-Johannine Gospel with his contended phrase “we have found Elijah”). His reconstruction remains only a product of creative imagination, and the alleged background history of the Johannine community seems to be merely a mirror-reading. As such, his multi-redactional interpretation of the Mosaic portrayal in John is exegetically unsound.

From this brief sketch of three representative exegetes who perceive Jesus to be the eschatological Elijah in John, it becomes obvious that their interpretations invite much criticism. The vulnerability of their conclusions becomes visible especially when one takes into account the way in which the fourth evangelist presents the Jewish Scripture and the Old Testament characters consistently as messianic witnesses and not as messianic prefigures.

---


49 Probably it is John Meier who has advanced the most elaborate argument for Jesus as the eschatological Elijah-like prophet. He has so far published a series of three books on the very topic and is planning on writing two more books in the series. “And yet the massive amount of the Gospel record dedicated to Jesus’ miracle working, his itinerant prophetic ministry, his eschatological message, and even his narrative parables, which belong more to the prophetic than to the sapiential mode of speaking, argues that the Elijah-like eschatological prophet is probably the best single model for the historical Jesus, however much it must be supplemented by elements from the legal and sapiential traditions of Israel. The
John the Baptist as Elijah

Marinus de Jonge. In contrast to the scholars noted above, some explanations have been offered so as to make sense of the blatant denial of John the Baptist which runs directly counter to the testimonies of the Synoptic Gospels concerning his identity as Elijah redivivus. Marinus de Jonge, for instance, drew a clue from the testimonies of an early church father, Justin Martyr (Apology 35:1; Dialogue with Trypho 8:4) who reports that, in the time of Jesus, there was a popular belief of Elijah anointing the Messiah.

Until the anointing by the prophet, the messiah is unknown and powerless. But if the Messiah has been born and exists anywhere, He is not known, nor is He conscious of His own existence, nor has He any power until Elias comes to anoint Him and to make Him manifest to all. But you [Christians] have believed this foolish rumor, and you have invented for yourselves a Christ for whom you blindly give up your lives (Justin Dialogue with Trypho 8:4).

This tradition can certainly lead one to posit the dependence of the messiah on his forerunner and such tension could be exactly what the fourth evangelist was avoiding. John 2:26b-27a could be cited as a trace of reminiscence to such a tradition: “Among you stands one whom you do not know, the one who is coming after me [John].”

-----

Elijah-like prophet is not the total explanation of the historical Jesus, but it is, in my view, the dominant pattern.” John P. Meier, “From Elijah-like Prophet to Royal Davidic Messiah,” in Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land, ed. Doris Donnelly (London: Continuum, 2001), 46. Also, idem. “The Present State of the ‘Third Quest’ for the Historical Jesus: Loss and Gain,” Bib 80 (1999): 483. His thesis is generally valid in that Jesus is depicted as a prophetic figure but it manifests a grave exegetical oversight in two respects. First, he ignores the accounts of the Synoptic Gospels that explicitly identify John the Baptist, not Jesus, as the Elijah-like figure. Second, his reconstruction of the historical Jesus is largely dependent on the Synoptic Gospels. The Gospel of John, as will be demonstrated later in this chapter, does not care to employ the conventional Jewish expectations of the Elijah redivivus figure. Furthermore, since this Gospel was received as a part of the Christian canon it should be taken seriously into account in the reconstruction of the “historical Jesus.” By implication, it could be inferred that the image of Jesus as an Elijah figure was not a major concern for the disciples and early Christians. For his books on this topic, see idem, A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, 3 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1991-2001); but for his virtually exclusive dependence on the Synoptic Gospels, see especially John P. Meier, Mentor, Message, and Miracles, vol. 2 of A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 19-1038; idem, Companions and Competitors, vol. 3 of A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 19-285.

Marinus de Jonge, “Jewish Expectations about the ‘Messiah’ according to the Fourth Gospel,” NTS 19 (1973): 246-70; reprinted in Jesus, Stranger from Heaven and Son of God: Jesus Christ and the Christians in Johannine Perspective (Missoula, MT: SBL, 1977), 77-116; idem. “John the Baptist and Elijah in the Fourth Gospel,” 299-309. Also, “The Fourth Gospel’s refusal to depict John as Elijah, thus differing from Matthew and Mark, may be due to the view that Elijah would anoint the Messiah, a status which the fourth evangelist does not wish to grant the Baptist in his polemic directed at the disciples of John.” Polhill, “John 1-4,” 457 n. 10.

Another popular attempt explains the John-Elijah question with a later tension between the Johannine community and the so-called “party of the Baptist.” It is argued that some later church fathers hint at the posthumous sanctification of John the Baptist by his disciples. The advocates of this view usually substantiate their position on two grounds. First, Acts 18:24-19:7 speaks of Apollos and a group of Christian believers who were baptized only in the baptism of John. From this text, Trocmé, for instance, presumes a continuing presence of the Johannine followers in the Transjordan area. A more explicit reference to the remaining group of the Baptist sect is, however, found in a late second-century testimony of the Pseudo-Clementines, especially Recognitions 1.54.8; 1.60.1-11 and Homilies 2.23. The Latin version of Recognitions reveals that a group of John’s followers led by Simon believed the Baptist to be the Messiah (although the Syriac version of Recog. 1.54.8, the older tradition, does not record this belief). It has been argued that the early church fathers (i.e., Irenaeus and Justin) identified the founding father of Gnosticism, Simon Magus, as a follower of John the Baptist. As such, some exegetes believe that the fourth evangelist was refuting the...
budding Gnostic movement by his downplaying of John the Baptist at that particular point in the Gospel of John.

Table 1. Comparison of the Syriac and Latin versions of Ps.-Clem. Recog. on John the Baptist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Translations from the Syriac version</th>
<th>Translations from the Latin version</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Now the pure disciples of John separated themselves greatly from the people and spoke to their teacher as if he was concealed [or: said that their teacher was, as it were, concealed]” (Ps.-Clem. Recog. 1.54.8).</td>
<td>Some of the disciples of John who imagined they were great separated themselves from the people and proclaimed their master as the Christ (Ps.-Clem. Recog. 1.54.8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“One of the disciples of John approaches and boasted regarding John, ‘He is the Christ, and not Jesus, just as Jesus himself spoke concerning him, namely, that he is greater than any prophet who had ever been. If he is thus greater than Moses, it is clear that he is also greater than Jesus for Jesus arose just as did Moses. Therefore, it is right that John, who is greater than these, is the Christ’” (Ps.-Clem. Recog. 1.60.1-2).</td>
<td>“And behold, one of John’s disciples asserted that John was Christ, and not Jesus. ‘This is so much the case,’ he said, ‘that even Jesus himself proclaimed that John is greater than all humans and prophets. If therefore,’ he said, ‘he is greater than all, he should doubtless be considered greater than both Moses and Jesus himself. Now if he is greater than all, he is Christ’” (Ps.-Clem. Recog. 1.60.1-2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There appeared a certain John the Baptist, who according to the disposition of the syzygies was at the same time the forerunner of our Lord Jesus. And as the Lord had twelve apostles according to the number of the solar months, so also there gathered about John thirty eminent persons according to the reckoning of the lunar month . . . ” (Ps.-Clem. Hom. 2.23).55

It has been argued that the early church fathers (i.e., Irenaeus and Justin) identified the founding father of Gnosticism, Simon Magus, as a follower of John the Baptist.56

---


55NTA (1963), 2:547.

56First proposed by Ernst Haenchen, “Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis,” ZTK 49 (1952): 316-49; and further argued by Gerd Lüdemann, Untersuchungen zur simonianischen Gnosis, GTA 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1975); idem, “The Acts of the Apostles and the Beginnings of
such, some exegetes believe that the fourth evangelist was refuting the budding Gnostic movement by his downplaying of John the Baptist at that particular point in the Gospel of John.

**John the Baptist Not as Elijah**

**Markus Öhler.** In contrast to the views that articulate the Baptist as Elijah *redivivus*, Markus Öhler sets forth his reservations in a four-fold argument. First, in view of the magnitude of the trouble that the alleged tension would have caused to the early church, the Synoptic Gospels are surprisingly silent, and seek to remedy the alleged traditions. Second, contrary to the suggestion of Trocmé and others, the “hidden” language in John 1:26 represents a typical Johannine expression. Accordingly, it is difficult to attribute that verse to something other than a Johannine redactional trait as Trocmé posits it to belong to a pre-Johannine tradition. Third, Justin’s use of an independent Jewish tradition is unlikely in view of Justin’s verbatim quotation in 88.7. The citation resembles the wording of the Fourth Gospel so closely, so that the literary dependence should be reckoned from the Gospel onto Justin (although it could be an

---


Öhler, Elia im Neuen Testament, 94-97.

Also, Martin Stowasser, Johannes der Täufer im Vierten Evangelium: Eine Untersuchung zu seiner Bedeutung für die johanneische Gemeinde, ÖBS 12 (Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992), 93.
Finally, it is hard to imagine that the fourth evangelist decidedly went against the popular current of belief in John the Baptist as Elijah, the messianic forerunner, as witnessed in the Synoptic Gospels. It is rather easier to assume that the fourth evangelist was simply unaware of the pre-Markan tradition, in which the Baptist was seen as a harbinger of the messianic age. The researches of Faierstein and Öhler himself confirm that such pre-Markan tradition may well have been of only marginal influence if present at all. This notion makes a compelling case since the fourth evangelist does not manifest recourse to passages from Malachi and Sirach that represent arguably the closest examples of the so-called “Jewish hope of Elijah’s return as the messianic forerunner.”

**High view of John the Baptist.** In addition to the reservations of Öhler, some other aspects can be noted in contrast to the views articulated by Trocmé, de Jonge, and others. First, the high esteem reserved for John the Baptist in the Gospel does not tally

---


with their views. The divine origin of the Baptist is only matched by that of Jesus. The divine provenance of the Baptist as witnessed in John 1:6 and 3:28b depicts an analogous picture with the Johannine missionary Christology.62 The authority of John’s ministry as Christological witness amounts to that of the Scripture as the Baptist reveals Jesus to Israel (1:31; 3:29).63

We can fruitfully compare the functions of which the evangelist ascribes to the scriptural text and to John the Baptist. There is a striking similarity between these two functions; at the same time, the evangelist’s view of the Baptist is more elaborated at the textual level of his gospel than his view of the Scripture . . . the role of John the Baptist is almost completely reduced to that of a witness on behalf of Jesus . . . . In this respect, his [John the Baptist] role agrees with that of the OT: the positive, theological meaning of both John the Baptist and the OT within the Fourth Gospel is that they testify to Jesus.64

Moreover, the fourth evangelist’s high view of John is further illuminated in his references to the Baptist’s possession of the unique revelations that are not attested in the Synoptic Gospels, such concepts as, Jesus the Lamb of God, the preexistent Son, God’s chosen one, and the bridegroom of Israel (1:29-34; 3:39).

Anachronism and the textual testimony. The traditions that allegedly point to the tension between Jesus and John the Baptist (i.e., Justin and pseudo-Clement) are late and the number of such witnesses is quite sparse, especially in light of the extent of the crises it would have entailed. The extant literary evidences, therefore, preclude any firm conclusion that the fourth evangelist was portraying John the Baptist over against such traditions as Elijah’s anointing the Messiah or the Johannine community’s conflict with the full-blown Baptist party. Finally, if we assume the competent editorial and/or writing ability of the fourth evangelist (whoever was responsible for the final shape of the

62“There was a man sent from God, whose name was John (1:6)”); and “I am not the Messiah, but I have been sent ahead of him” (3:28b). The passive voice of the latter text probably demonstrates the divine initiative of his mission.

63Brown, An Introduction to the Gospel of John, 156.

present Gospel), the most important clue for the identity of John the Baptist should be his own self-revealing statement which the evangelist believed to be important enough to preserve in the present text and placed it in quotation marks: “What then? Are you Elijah?” He said, “I am not.”

**Function of John the Baptist in John**

Although John the Baptist is not related to Elijah in the Fourth Gospel, his role is quite interesting. His profile nicely fits with the characteristic that is reserved for the Old Testament characters in terms of the witness motif. John the Baptist appears in the four major sections of John’s Gospel: 1:6-8, 15, 19-36; 3:23-30; 5:33-36; 10:40-42. Each time he is mentioned, the length and importance of him are reduced. He is extensively addressed only in the first chapter, whereas, in chapters 3, 5, and 10, he is mentioned only in the passing references. Thus, it is worthwhile to focus an inquiry into his narrative function to the first chapter, especially John 1:19-34, due to the concentrated attention to the Baptist in the discourse. However, the fourth evangelist’s view of the Baptist as reflected in chapters three, five, and ten will be taken into account when deemed necessary.

**Witness**

Five major observations can be adduced from John 1:19-34, as well as from 3:23-30, 5:33-36, and 10:40-42. First, the formal analysis demonstrates a marked interest in the witness theme in three respects. The hina clause of John 1:7 indicates the sole purpose of John’s commission, that is, to bear witness to the light. 

---


In addition, the present pericope is structurally delimited with an *inclusio*, which is marked by the testimony of John the Baptist ("Καί ἄνθισεν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου": v. 19a; "καγώ ἐώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα": v. 34a), and which also accounts for the first two days or the inauguration of John the Baptist’s ministry.

The indirect witness of John concerning Jesus (1:19-28)
The direct witness of John concerning Jesus (1:29-34)

Finally, this section is replete with the recurrent keyword “μαρτυρία” and a conceptually related term “ὁμολογείν” (vv. 19, 20, 32, 34). Although some exegetes identify John the Baptist with Elijah in the present text, John’s solemn denial militates against such a view.

The reason for rejecting the association of the Baptist with Elijah, which is clearly indicated in the Synoptics, seems to be due to the evangelist’s intention to limit the role of John specifically and exclusively to that of witness (esp. 1:7, 15).

John’s explicit self-identification, “the voice crying in the wilderness,” is virtually a verbatim quotation from Isaiah 40:3:

\[ \text{ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ εὐθύμετε τὴν ὄδον κυρίου (John 1:23b, NA)} \]

\[ \text{φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτομᾶσατε τὴν ὄδον κυρίου (Isaiah 40:3a, LXX)} \]

\[ \text{ἡ λέγει ἐν ἡμῖν (Isaiah 40:3a, BHS)} \]

However, an interesting shift is observed in the Greek translation of the Hebrew predicate for the voice. The semantic force of the Hebrew participle (רְפָא, “proclaiming”) carries a strong prophetic overtone while its Greek counterpart (βοῶντος, “crying out”) does not.

---

68 This structural analysis is indebted to Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 111-28, and Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1:86-93.


70 The mode of John’s witness is via “crying out (ἐκραίνω).” Although formally it is in the perfect tense, the sense is in the present. *BDF*, 176 (§ 341); Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1:76.
bear such a connotation. This use of the identical verb probably points to the Johannine recourse to the Greek text of the Old Testament. Menken convincingly points out two reasons which show the dependence of John on the Septuagint rather than on the Hebrew text. First, the verb of the adjectival participle is βοῶ (to cry out), a Johannine hapax legomenon, which Menken construes to be an indication of John’s dependence on the Septuagint. Second, the Hebrew verb, לֶאַ (the piel form of מָלַ) means “to make clear” not “make straight” as described in the Johannine and the Greek Isiaian texts (εἶδονατε and ἐποιῇσατε). Furthermore, the use of Isaiah 40:3 in John reveals a degree of affinity with the Qumran community (perhaps indirectly) as it is quite frequently attested in the literary collection of the sect. Accordingly, a number of scholars postulate that the very text defined the identity of the community.

Divine Provenance

Second, the divine provenance of the Baptist is recognized in that he is sent from God (1:6). This divine commission also evokes the calling of the Old Testament prophets, and is matched only by those of Jesus (3:17, 34; 5:38) and of the Holy Spirit.

---

71 BDAG (p. 180) renders the meaning of βοῶ as to “use one’s voice at high volume, call, shout, cry out” or to “roar.” The qal participle of מָלַ means to “call someone, shout, proclaim, announce.” Especially, the latter connotation seems to be in mind. Louis Jonker, “ל,” in NIDOTTE, 3:972; HALOT, 2:1129.


73 BDAG (p. 406) renders εἶδονατε to mean “to straighten, make straight.” ἐποιῇσατε means to “prepare” (BDAG, 400; Liddell and Scott, 703).


75 A great number of Johannine exegetes posit that verses 6 and 15 are inserted into an original early Christian hymn. For a lengthy discussion on source criticism of the John the Baptist discourse in the prologue, see Thyen, Das Johannesevangelium, 76-79.
(14:26; 15:26) in John’s Gospel. However, this divine origin is not stated for self-interest, but rather functions to verify the legitimacy of his testimony. It is God who validates the witness of John (and his eyewitness testimony of the accompanying of the Holy Spirit on Jesus):77

And John testified, “I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it remained on him. I myself did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize with water said to me, ‘He on whom you see the Spirit descend and remain is the one who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.’” (1:32-33)78

### Analogy and Comparison to Jesus

Third, John provides a point of comparison with Jesus.79 Although he himself

---

76 “Verse six speaks of the Baptist as an envoy from God as the prophets of the Old Testament were sent by God.” Christian Dietzfelbinger, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, ZBNT 4 (Zürich: Theologischer, 2001), 1:27 (translation mine); Müller, *Johannes der Täufer*, 164.

77 Müller, *Johannes der Täufer*, 162; Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 75-76, 80.

78 On v. 33, Schnackenburg comments that “God himself is behind John’s testimony in two ways: he authorizes his office as witness, and he guarantees the content of his testimony.” Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel according to St John*, HTCNT (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 1:304.

79 Some scholars postulate an interpolation of a later historical tension (between the Johannine community and the Baptist circle) into the text. This reconstruction creates a suspicion of a mirror reading. Cf. Lichtenberger, “Täufergemeinden und frühchristliche Täuferpolemik im letzten Drittel des 1ten Jahrhunderts.” 36-57; Josef Ernst, *Johannes der Täufer: Interpretation, Geschichte, Wirkungsgeschichte*, BZNW 53 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1989), 210-11; Martin Stowasser, *Johannes der Täufer im Vierten Evangelium: Eine Untersuchung zu seiner Bedeutung für die johanneische Gemeinde*, ÖBS 12 (Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1992), 43; Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1:61. Three reasons, however, rule out such a construal. First, the anachronistic nature of their assessment renders fragile the high degree of certainty with which these exegetes reconstruct the specific communities of the Baptist and the evangelist. Knut Backhaus, *Die “Jüngerkreise” des Täufers Johannes: Eine Studie zu den religionsgeschichtlichen Ursprüngen des Christentums*, PThSt 19 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1991), 356, 439; Daniel S. Dapaah, *The Relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth: A Critical Study* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005), 133-34. Second, the extant data are insufficient to construe a coherent community related to the Baptist or to the Fourth Gospel. “The term ‘Baptist school’ is to be avoided because it suggests the system of the rabbinic training house. The same applies to the designations ‘Baptist sect’ or ‘Johannine sect’ because these suggest a community education with high inner-coherence and strong external isolation.” Müller, *Johannes der Täufer*, 187-88 (translation mine).

Finally, the textual testimonies of John’s Gospel that highly regard the Baptist contradict the historical reconstruction of the tension between the Johannine community and the Baptist sect. “It is methodologically illegitimate . . . to reconstruct the views of John’s disciples by reversing every denial and restriction placed on John in the Fourth Gospel. . . . By [this] line of reasoning, John was worshipped as Elijah, prophet, messiah, the Light and the Life of men, a wonderworker, the pre-existent Logos through whom all things were made, indeed, even as the Word made flesh! If such an advanced ‘John-cult’ had in fact antedated the fourth Gospel, John would never have been conferred such an exalted role by the Evangelist.” Wink, *John the Baptist*, 102. Here Wink refers to Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 17-18. Also it must be noted that the exponents of such a historical reconstruction depend too much on the extra-Johannine witnesses (especially those of Acts). Certainly, Acts 19:1-7 seems to reflect the presence of Christians who were influenced by John the Baptist. However, it is one thing to say that the Acts passage reflects such a tension within the early Christian groups (for the argument’s sake, it is assumed so) but it is an entirely different matter to say that the Fourth Gospel reflects the same historical situation as portrayed in Acts.
is of a divine origin just as Jesus is, the Baptist substantially differs from the one to whom he bears witness. This fundamental difference is expressed in various languages: he is not the light (1:8); nor is he Christ, Elijah, or even the prophet (1:20-21; 3:28). His water baptism is distinguished from the ministry of Jesus, for the latter is accompanied with the Holy Spirit (1:33). He is a friend of the bridegroom, at whose voice he takes joy. His existence is provisional: “He must increase, but I must decrease” (3:30); “He was a burning and shining lamp, and you were willing to rejoice for a while in his light” (5:35). He is a burning and shining lamp (5:35) in contrast to Jesus the true light (1:8-9). His testimony is not a prerequisite for Jesus’ messianic qualifications: “You sent messengers to John, and he testified to the truth. Not that I accept such human testimony” (5:34). He performed no sign whereas Jesus did many (10:41). His testimony of Jesus’ temporal precedence harkens back to John 1:1-2 where Jesus’ pre-existence is equated with that of God.

Mediator

Fourth, the witness ministry of John the Baptist mediates between Jesus and the unbelieving world, whom he leads to the light:

The next day John again was standing with two of his disciples, and as he watched Jesus walk by, he exclaimed, “Look, here is the Lamb of God!” The two disciples heard him say this, and they followed Jesus (1:35-37); Many came to him, and they were saying, “John performed no sign, but everything that John said about this man was true.” And many believed in him there. (10:41-42)

This mediating function could entitle him the “first Christian” as it is a common pattern of the Gospel that one person leads another to the faith in Jesus (Philip with Nathanael,

---

80 Müller, Johannes der Täufer, 173.

81 “This joy is the point of the comparison, as the final clause shows: the Baptist, who wishes to be no more than the friend of the bridegroom, sees his hopes fulfilled.” Schnackenburg, The Gospel according to St John, 1:416-17.

82 Müller, Johannes der Täufer, 177.

Recapitulation of the Old Testament

Finally, the witness function of the Baptist appears to be a recapitulation of the function of the Scripture and Old Testament characters as perceived by the fourth evangelist ("You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that testify on my behalf": John 5:39). Just as the Scriptures and Old Testament protagonists point to the messianic nature of Jesus, the content of John’s witness ministry indicates Jesus as the light and illuminates his pre-existence (1:7-15). This analysis of John’s narrative function locates him within the rank of the Old Testament figures notwithstanding his chronological place in the New Testament era.

Conclusion

If the observations stated above stand, it is quite plausible that the fourth evangelist did not fully take advantage of the Jewish eschatological expectations of Elijah redivivus, partly because they were of only marginal influence in view of the wide spectrum of Jewish messianic hopes (for instance, in comparison with the Davidic or Mosaic messianic hopes). More importantly, however, it is probably because the Jewish views of Elijah redivivus do not dovetail with the evangelist’s literary schema he reserved for the Scripture and the Old Testament characters, that is, the role of messianic

84Stowasser, Johannes der Täufer im Vierten Evangelium, 53; Müller, Johannes der Täufer, 162-63.

85"John appears to be ... the embodiment of the OT, ... It is as though, when the incarnation finally arrived, full of covenant love, the OT stood up and cheered." Thomas. L. Brodie, The Gospel according to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 143. "The Baptist serves as the prototypical OT prophetic witness to Jesus and his coming, which makes his testimony an integral part of the salvation history canvassed by the evangelist." Andreas Köstenberger, John, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 45.

86In contrast to Gese who positively evaluates the connection of the two Testaments in terms of Elijah. "Das Neue Testament steht einem im Alten Testament bis zu Sir 48 entwickelten Elibild gegenüber, dessen tiefe Wahrheit und große Bedeutung es so wiedergibt, daß Einheit von Altem und Neuem Testament auch in diesem Fall eindrücklich bezeugt wird." Gese, "Zur Bedeutung Elias für die biblische Theologie," 150.
witnesses. In other words, it is the Synoptic Gospels that re-read and redefined the eschatological texts of Elijah into Christian messianism (that is to assume that there were such early rabbinic beliefs from the statements of Mark 9:11 par).

Concerning the inquiry on the narrative role of Elijah, the answer must be given in the negative since the Johannine protagonists that most likely meet the expectations of Elijah redivivus, such as Jesus and John the Baptist, are not cast as such. On the contrary, John the Baptist, who is consistently portrayed as Elijah redivivus in the Synoptics, is characterized exclusively as a messianic witness throughout the Gospel of John, so that he is placed almost in the equal standing as that of the Old Testament characters. He does not baptize Jesus but only witnesses the Spirit descending as a dove and remaining on Jesus. He does not even compare himself with Jesus ("the one who is stronger than I," Mark 1:7 pars.) but only acknowledges the temporal priority of Christ (John 1:15). These observations enable us to conclude that the fourth evangelist Christianized the Baptist in his own way to suit his Christological emphasis (just as the Synoptics Christianized the Elijah redivivus traditions to their literary end) and stressed his witness function just as he brought forth the same function performed by the Scripture and the Old Testament protagonists. This characterization of John as messianic witness is quite impressive since the fourth evangelist did not take advantage of the

87 "The First Gospel offers an apologetic explanation of why Jesus was baptized by John. The Fourth Gospel avoids the difficulty by backgrounding baptism and foregrounding John’s role as witness to Jesus. . . . Indeed, his baptismal ministry serves the sole purpose of revealing Jesus to Israel, making explicit what the Synoptics imply. Since he is given this crucial but limited function, he is not identified with Elijah." Margaret Davies, Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel, JSNTSup 69 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 316. Contrary to Blomberg’s judgment, it seems fairly obvious in the subsequent context that the inquirers were concerned with the association of the Baptist with the prophet, especially of his authority, not of the prophet’s physical re-appearance. Cf. "But none of these texts (the synoptic accounts of John as Elijah) implies that John was the literal Elijah returned from heaven, which may be precisely what John is denying in the Fourth Gospel." Craig L. Blomberg, The Historical Reliability of John’s Gospel: Issues and Commentary (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2001), 76.

eschatological prophet traditions concerning Elijah (i.e., Malachi and Sirach) that were readily available, as much to John as to the Synoptic evangelists. Although it is to some degree an argument from silence that the evangelist did not opt for such traditions, it still speaks loudly of his tenacious penchant to describe John the Baptist solely as a messianic witness, and to neglect the role of Elijah for his Gospel.
CHAPTER 4

DAVID

Introduction

"A man after God's own heart," David, is one of the favorite Bible characters cherished by both Jews and Christians around the world. Rooted in the Old Testament, his popularity continued to play out a significant role in intertestamental Judaism and the New Testament. His role as a messianic prefiguration, in particular, has drawn a great deal of attention in biblical scholarship, and recently even in the field of Johannine studies. It is this question that the present chapter seeks to address. That is, it will examine whether the fourth evangelist presents David as a messianic type. In order to answer that question, this chapter will begin with an inquiry on the perceptions of David in the Old Testament and in early Judaism with special interest in his messianic image. Finally, the latter part of this chapter will be devoted to the question set forth in the beginning, namely, the messianic role of David in John.

David in the Old Testament and the Second Temple Period

The Old Testament writings and the subsequent Jewish traditions portray David the son of Jesse from a variety of angles.\(^1\) These various perceptions can be

---

classified under three headings: an ideal ruler, an exemplary Jew, and a messianic prefiguration.

**Ideal Ruler**

The earlier Jewish traditions, that is, historical narratives (i.e., the books of Chronicles and Samuel), generally present him in the first category. The second category of beliefs, in part, stems from the attribution of David as the author of the book of Psalms. Although only little more than half of the Psalms are explicitly attributed to David as the writer, some Jewish interpretive traditions (i.e., the Qumran and later rabbinic literature) embrace the Davidic authorship of the entire corpus of the Psalter (i.e., b. Pesah. 117a; m. Tehar. 1:6, 24:3; b. Ber. 3a). For example, the Babylonian Talmud speaks of him as the general editor of the Psalms (b. Bat. 14b-15a). A unique view, which may be remotely related to this current of thought, is the understanding of David as a prophet. Acts 2:30 bears witness to the recognition of him as such:

Since he [David] was a prophet, he knew that God has sworn with an oath to him that he would put one of his descendants on this throne. Foreseeing this, David spoke of the resurrection of the Messiah, saying, “He was not abandoned to Hades, nor did his flesh experience corruption.” (Acts 2:30-31)

Interestingly, among various strands of the intertestamental Jewish writings, only some of the Qumran writings demonstrate considerations analogous to the Acts passage in that David is seen as a spirit-inspired prophet.

---


And David, the son of Jesse, was wise, and a light like the light of the sun, and literate, and discerning and perfect in all his ways before God and men. And the Lord gave him a discerning spirit. And he wrote 3,600 psalms; and songs to sing before the altar over the whole-burnt perpetual offering every day, for all the days of the year, 364; and for the offering of the Sabbaths, 52 songs; and for the offering of the New Moons and for all the Solemn Assemblies and for the Days of Atonement, 30 songs. And all the songs that he composed were 446, and songs for making music over the stricken, 4. And the total was 4,050. All these he composed through prophecy which was given him from before the Most High. 5

Exemplary Jew

On the other hand, Psalms and some later rabbinic documents focus on his exemplary human characteristics such as his genuine repentance, prayer, and ardent study of Torah. 6 This category seems to have developed partly from the anecdotes surrounding David's affair with Bathsheba and the numerous prayers recorded in the Psalter to his credit. Although his sin and God's punishment demonstrate the nature of just world order, his repentance and the subsequent divine forgiveness epitomize an encouraging example of the genuine adherents to early Judaism (m. Tehar. 40:2; 51:1, 3). 7 In addition, other pseudepigraphic writings underscore his wholehearted devotion to God (Sir 47:3), his merciful character (1 Macc 2:57), and tenacious intercessory prayers (2 Esdr 7:108). 8 Some later rabbinic traditions also reveal examples of an elevated view on the origin of David: His maternal origin traces back to Miriam (it probably was to remedy his maternal lineage, Ruth, a foreigner (b. Ber. 7b; b. Sotah 11b); and the creation of the world and its

---


6 C. Thoma classifies the rabbinic traditions on David under two subheadings: the actualization of the rabbinic spirit and the exemplary expression of Jewish identity and Jewish confidence. The latter category is further divided into three sub-categories, the last of which concerns the messianic expectations. Clemens Thoma, “David II: Judentum,” in TRE 8:383-87.


well-being is dependent on him (b. Sanh. 98b; b. Sotah 49a; m. Tehar. 25:1).\(^9\)

**Davidic Messianic Expectations in the Old Testament**

However, more pertinent to the present investigation of his narrative role with reference to Johannine Christology is the last category, that is, the later developments of messianic hopes via a Davidic figure. It is generally accepted that the Synoptic Gospels relate Jesus to David but not John. In more congruous terms with the New Testament portrayals of David, especially those of the Synoptics, the last category of intertestamental Jewish beliefs, thus, projected him in the images of a royal Messiah.\(^10\)

The later prophets articulated more explicitly this anticipation of David *redivivus*.

Afterward the Israelites shall return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king; they shall come in awe to the Lord and to his goodness in the latter days (Hos 3:5); a Shoot shall come out from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots (Isa 11:1); but you, O Bethlehem of Ephrathah, who are one of the little clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to rule in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from ancient days. (Mic 5:2)

Copious examples of references and allusions to such Davidic messianic hopes are interspersed throughout the prophetic books of the Old Testament (Isa 55:3; Jer 33:15, 21-22, 25-26; Ezek 34:23-24, 37:24-25; Hos 1:11; Amos 9:11-15; Hag 2:23).

The provenance of these later Davidic messianic hopes, however, can be traced

\(^9\)Thoma, “David II,” 386-87. For a survey of rabbinic literature that defends David’s rightful Jewish status, see Bassler, “A Man for All Seasons,” 158-59.

back to the earlier historical narratives accounts. For instance, Daniel Block identifies four such passages in particular as the roots of the royal Davidic messianism for the later Old Testament writings: (1) Yahweh’s promise that “kings would come from Abraham” (Gen 17:6, 16; 35:11); (2) Jacob’s prediction that the scepter would not depart from the tribe of Judah (Gen 49:10); (3) Balaam’s oracle that a star and the scepter would rise from Jacob/Israel (Num 24:17); and (4) Moses’ charge for the Israelites to put Yahweh’s chosen one on the throne instead of a king (Deut 17:14-20). Upon these grounds, he finds later prophetic developments that evoke the idea of the Davidic Messiah (1 Sam 2:1-10; 2 Sam 5:1-3, 7:19; Pss 2:2, 6-8, 18:50-51, 89:20-21, 27-28; Isa 9:5-7, 11:1; Jer 23:5-6; Ezek 17:22, 34:23-24, 37:22-25; Dan 9:25-26; Hos 3:5; Mic 5:2-5; Zech 3:8, 6:12, 9:9-10, 12:10, 13:7-8).\(^{11}\)

As impressive as the number of references appear, however, the Davidic messianic idea does not seem to be as obvious as Block maintains in those texts.\(^ {12}\) Furthermore, the estimation of Block represents a considerable discrepancy with the depiction of the messianic David in the later intertestamental Jewish writings and in the Fourth Gospel. Even those intertestamental Jewish writings that entertain the idea of a Davidic Messiah date late and display a heavy Hellenistic influence.\(^ {13}\)


David Messianic Expectations in Second Temple Judaism

1 Maccabees and Sirach. In view of the relatively elevated interest in a Davidic Messiah in the Old Testament contended by some scholars, surprising is the paucity of references to such a figure in the intertestamental Jewish literature. There is no explicit mention of a Davidic Messiah in the Apocrypha, only twice in the Pseudepigrapha, and once in the Qumran library. For the first group of writings, First Maccabees 2:57 and Sirach 47:22 are sometimes cited to assert the presence of a Davidic messianic figure, but they do not display a clear eschatological overtone:

David, because he was merciful, inherited the throne of the kingdom forever (1 Macc 2:57). But the Lord will never give up his mercy, or cause any of his works to perish; he will never blot out the descendants of his chosen one, or destroy the family line of him who loved him. So he gave a remnant to Jacob, and to David a root from his own family. (Sir 47:22)

Psalms of Solomon. On the other hand, two documents in the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha make an explicit mention of David in reference to Messiah (i.e., Psalms of Solomon and 4 Ezra). The Psalms of Solomon, which dates from the mid first-century B.C., mentions “Messiah” in three different junctures:

14This assessment should be, however, qualified by the fact that there are a number of references to Davidic metaphors in this body of literature, such as root, branch, seed, horn, or shoot of David. Yet an explicit reference to David in terms of “Messiah” is lacking. The entire body of early rabbinic literature is also hesitant to speak of Davidic messianism. Thoma, “David II,” 384-85. However, Bassler (“A Man for All Seasons,” 159) points to several passages from rabbinic literature for the Davidic messianic hope (b. Sanh. 98b; Midr. Ps. 5.4, 18.27; b. Meg. 17b). However, the dating issue of the Talmudic literature poses difficulty for her comparison of the messianic passages in rabbinic literature and the New Testament. The composition of the Babylonian Talmud dates back to 6th century A.D. and the Midrashim on Psalms to third century A.D. respectively. Günter Steemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 2nd ed., trans. and ed. Markus Bockmuehl (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 322-23; Craig A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 228-29. For a more detailed discussion on the messianism in the Qumran library, see Appendix I: “Messianism/Christology in John’s Gospel.”


16The Psalms of Solomon preserve one of the most detailed messianic expectations in the immediate pre-Christian centuries. . . . There is more substance to the ideas concerning the Messiah in the Psalms of Solomon than in any other extant Jewish writings. The *Messiah* is here identified as a son of David who will come to establish an everlasting kingdom of God. Although not a supernatural being, both he and the devout over whom he reigns are without sin, and he rules with all the ancient virtues heightened to superlatives: wisdom, justice, mercy, power. He will restore the ancient tribal divisions and with them the ancient ways of righteousness and fidelity. He will bring back the Diaspora of Israel to a purified
And he will be a righteous king over them, taught by God. There will be no unrighteousness among them in his days, for all shall be holy, and their king shall be the Lord Messiah (Pss. Sol. 17:32); May God cleanse Israel for the day of mercy in blessing, for the appointed day when his Messiah will reign. . . . under the rod of discipline of the Lord Messiah, in the fear of his God, in wisdom of spirit, and of righteousness and of strength. (Pss. Sol. 18:5, 7)¹⁷

Michael Fuller draws four common characteristics from these texts with regards to messianism: (1) He will be a son of David; (2) the coming of the Messiah will usher the commencement of Israel’s restoration; (3) the primary task of the Messiah is the establishment and maintenance of righteousness and holiness; and (4) this Messiah is utterly reliant on God.¹⁸ Yet his evaluation neglects an important aspect common in the narrative contexts surrounding these texts, which is also a recurrent theme of the intertestamental messianism, that is, the militant subjugation of unrighteousness.¹⁹

4 Ezra. Dated to the late first century A.D. for the actual writing of the extant manuscript, Fourth Ezra also mentions an eschatological redeemer, a Davidic successor in the so-called Eagle Vision.²⁰

And as for the lion that you saw rousing up out of the forest and roaring and speaking to the eagle and reproving him for his unrighteousness, and as for all his words that you have heard. This is the Messiah whom the Most High has kept until the end of days, who will arise from the posterity of David, and will come and speak to them; he will denounce them for their ungodliness and for their wickedness, and will cast up before them their contemptuous dealings. For first he will set them before his judgment seat, and when he has reproved them, then he will destroy them. But he will deliver in mercy the remnant of my people, those who have been saved throughout my borders, and he will make them joyful until the end comes, the day of judgment, of which I spoke to you at the beginning.²¹

Over against the destruction of the Jerusalem temple (either of the sixth century B.C. or homeland. The nations likewise will come, to pay homage to Jerusalem and her king.” R. B. Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” in OTP, 2:643.

¹⁷Ibid., 668-69.

¹⁸Fuller, “The Davidic Messiah in Early Jewish Literature,” 71-73; also Wright, “Psalms of Solomon,” 643-46; Pomykala, The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism, 159-70.


of the first century A.D.), Fourth Ezra portrays the coming of Messiah with a (angelic) cohort to judge the nations and the gather the tribes of Israel.\(^{22}\) In this respect, the general tenor of this text overall seems to correspond to that of the Psalm of Solomon messianic text.

4Q252. A portion of the Qumran commentary on Genesis (4Q252) explicitly interprets the divine oracle in Genesis 49:10 in terms of a Davidic Messiah, which is absent in the original Genesis.\(^{23}\)

The scepter shall not depart from the tribe of Judah. While Israel has the dominion, there will not be cut off someone who sits on the throne of David. For “the staff” is the covenant of royalty, [and the thousands of Israel are “the standards”]... Until the messiah of righteousness comes, the branch of David. For to him and to his descendants has been given the covenant of the kingship of his people for everlasting generations, which he observed [...] the Law with the men of the Community, for [...] it is the assembly of the men of [...] He gives.\(^{24}\)

The compiled nature of the documents makes it difficult to designate the main theme of the entire document. Furthermore, the meticulous concern for the chronicles of Jewish historical events pervades in the greater portion of the document, so that it is probably unwarranted to read the entire document with messianic interest (only one out of the entire six fragments expresses an eschatological concern). On the other hand, in addition to the occurrence in 4Q252, an echo or allusions to a Davidic messiah appears


\(^{24}\) 4Q252 5.1-7 (DSS, 1:505). The Princeton version reads as following: “A ruler shall not depart from the tribe of Judah when there is dominion for Israel; [there will not] be cut off one sitting (on) the throne for David. For ‘staff’ is the covenant of the kingdom; [and the thousands of Israel are ‘the standards’ until the righteous Messiah comes, the Branch of everlasting generations, who kept [...] the Torah with the men of the Community, for [...] it is the congregation of the men of [...] he gave.” Joseph L. Trafton, “Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252=4QcommGenA=4QPBl),” in Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents, vol. 6B of The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, ed. James H. Charlesworth, PTS SSP (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 217.
elsewhere in three different Qumran documents (e.g., in terms of “the branch of David” or “the Prince of the Congregation”: 4QFlor; 4QpIsa; 4Q285). Thus, the Davidic messianic idea was probably indigenous in the community and seems to reflect that strand of thought.

**Summary.** However, three important elements common to these texts are often overlooked in scholarly discussions that contain a direct bearing on the examination of the relation between the Davidic Messiah and the Johannine Christology: first, the messianic activities in these texts involve militant conquest of the unrighteous, who are usually gentiles; second, the purpose of such messianic activities was in large measure to restore the nation of Israel; finally the presence of a Davidic Messiah is an ancillary aspect of the unfolding of the divine redemptive program. John Barton’s assessment of this aspect is particularly noteworthy: “Belief in the Messiah rests ultimately on the belief that God can be relied on to have the right people in place at the right time to save and deliver Israel, whether through the specific vehicle of a descendant of David or in some other way.”


27“The prime features are still military, the overthrowing of the great Roman Empire and the description of this activity in legal terms . . . .” Michael E. Stone, *Features of the Eschatology of IV Ezra*, HSS 35 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 118.

entire Jewish intertestamental writings, only three documents (Pss. Sol., 4Q252 from
Qumran, and 4 Ezra) make an explicit mention of the Messiah in relation to David. Thus,
the caveat expressed by K. Pomykala is appropriate for the present study:

The image of David as progenitor of the messiah is attested in only three
provenances... one of the least frequently attested images of David in early Jewish
texts... its status as a relatively minor image of David in early Jewish texts should caution us about seeing a latent allusion to messianism in every reference to
David.29

David in the Synoptic Gospels

In slight contrast to the meager projection of David as a messianic precursor in
the early Jewish writings, he frequently emerges in conjunction with Jesus the Messiah in
the New Testament, most conspicuously in the Synoptic Gospels, and a great deal of
scholarly attention has been drawn to this issue.30 Both Matthew and Luke trace the

29Kenneth Pomykala, “Images of David in Early Judaism,” in Ancient Versions and Traditions,
vol. 1 of Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture, ed. Craig A.
Evans, LSTS 50 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 34. Furthermore, Kaufmann notes that the Davidic
messianic hope is a later development in lieu of the disappointing failure of the Hasmonian dynasty, which

30Non-Gospel occurrences of a Davidic messianic picture include Acts 13:22-23, Rom 1:3-4,
Schweizer, “Concept of the Davidic ‘Son of God’ in Acts and Its Old Testament Background,” in Studies in
Near Eastern Studies: Essays in Honor of William Sanford La Sor, ed. Gary A. Tuggle (Grand Rapids:
Eerdmans, 1978), 7-17; Bruce D. Chilton, “Jesus Ben David: Reflections on the Davidissohnfrage,” JSNT
14 (1982): 88-112; Blasser, “A Man for All Seasons,” 163-69; Marinos de Jonge, “Jesus, Son of David and
Son of God,” in Inerrancy in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas van Iersel, ed. Sipke Draisma
(Kampen: Kok, 1989), 95-104; Terence Y. Mullins, “Jesus, the ‘Son of David,’” AJS 29 (1991): 117-26;
Dennis C. Duling, “Matthew’s Plurisignificant ‘Son of David’ in Social Science Perspective: Kinship,
BSac 151 (1994): 71-84; Donald J. Verheut, “The Davidic Messiah and Matthew’s Jewish Christianity,”
Fulfillment in Lukan Christology, JSNTSup 110 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995); Lidiya Novakovic, “Jesus as
the Davidic Messiah in Matthew,” HBT 19 (1997): 148-91; Jean-Marie van Cangh, “‘Fils de David’ dans
les évangiles synoptiques,” in Figures de David à travers la Bible: XVIF congrès de l’ACFEB (Lille, 1er-5
septembre 1997), ed. Louis Desrousseau and Jacques Vermeulen, LD 177 (Paris: Cerf, 1999), 345-96;
Daniëlle Roure, “La figure de David dans l’évangelie de Marc: Des traditions juives aux interprétations
évangéliques,” in Figures de David à travers la Bible: XVIF congrès de l’ACFEB (Lille, 1er-5 septembre
1997), ed. Louis Desrousseau and Jacques Vermeulen, LD 177 (Paris: Cerf, 1999), 397-412; Roland
Meynet, “Jesus, fils de David dans l’évangelie de Luc,” in Figures de David à travers la Bible: XVIF
congrès de l’ACFEB (Lille, 1er-5 septembre 1997), ed. Louis Desrousseau and Jacques Vermeulen, LD
177 (Paris: Cerf, 1999), 413-28; Christopher G. Whitsett, “Son of God, Seed of David: Paul’s Messianic
Exegesis in Romans 1:3-4,” JBL 119 (2000): 661-81; Margaret Daly-Denton, “David in the Gospels,” WW
genealogy of Jesus through David (Matt 1:6; Luke 3:31), which especially signifies the royal messianic qualification of Jesus.  

The connection is more conspicuously visible in the expression “son of David” in referring to Jesus.  

Three different groups of contexts could be recognized where that title carries messianic nuances: the healing accounts (Matt 9:27, 12:23, 15:22, 20:31-32; Mark 10:47-48; Luke 18:38-39); the praise of the crowd (Matt 21:9, 15; Mark 11:10); and the disputes with religious leaders (Matt 22:42-43, 45; Mark 12:35; Luke 20:41-44).  

Accordingly, it can be concluded that the image of a Davidic Messiah quite sporadically pervades the Synoptic Gospels. Upon turning to the Fourth Gospel, however, a reader becomes vexed to find very few, if any, corresponding examples (perhaps three passages could be arguably singled out as such: 2:17, 7:42, 12:13).  

**Messianic Role of David in John**  

The research history of John’s Gospel itself clearly indicates the difficulty of undertaking an inquiry into a Davidic messianic prefiguration in the Gospel of John. Until Daly-Denton’s study, which appeared in the year 2000, there was virtually no single study principally devoted to the issue, and exegetes hardly detected any significant presence of a Davidic messianic motif.  

Such facts place John in stark contrast to the

---


34On the contrary, M. Daly-Denton presumes extensive parallels to the Synoptic passion accounts in John. Her arguments will be addressed in detail in the following section. See especially, Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms*, AGAJU 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 289-92.  

35Minor exceptions to this current include the following: T. Francis Glasson, “Davidic Links
Synoptic Gospels, which have been the object of a myriad of studies that have addressed the Davidic messianic conceptions. Accordingly, Daly-Denton is justified in her comment that "the 'Davidlikeness' of Jesus is, perhaps, a neglected strand in the multi-hued texture of the Fourth Gospel." Daly-Denton's judgment was preceded by a host of Johannine exegetes. For example, Paul N. Anderson and Margaret Davies note the lack of David/Jesus analogy in John: "John is nearly devoid of Davidic messianic motifs," "Jesus' life is so unlike that of David... that the connexion which the Synoptics make could be misleading." Likewise, most recently, Andrew C. Brunson draws a conclusion concerning the titles usually attributed to the Davidic messianic nature of Jesus as follows:

Davidic ideology is not prominent throughout the Gospel, and Jesus is not programmatically compared to David. John can more easily re-direct the reader towards other backgrounds... However, he also does not identify Jesus explicitly with David. ... The Gospel's relative silence on David supports the suggestion that the title [king of Israel] is not intended primarily to evoke Davidic association.

Daly-Denton

In contrast to the assessment of the majority of Johannine exegetes, Daly-Denton, however, asserts that the Gospel of John is permeated with the portrayal of Jesus in a Davidic image. Her argument is supported by noting a number of parallels in the lives of Jesus and David. First, just as David (in the aftermath of Absalom's conspiracy in 1 Sam 15:23), Jesus begins his journey to the cross by crossing the Kidron valley (John

36 Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel, 7.


38 Margaret Davies, Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel, JSNTSup 69 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 212.


18:1), which is the only New Testament reference:

And all the people passed by over the Kidron valley, and the king passed over the Kidron valley, and all the people and the king passed on towards the way of the wilderness. (2 Sam 15:23)

When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his disciples across the Kidron valley, where there was a garden, which he and his disciples entered. (John 18:1)

Second, as a foreigner, Ittai the Gittite, pledged to follow David at any cost, “so must a servant of Jesus do” implies Jesus to Greek inquirers (John 12:20-26): “As the Lord lives, and as my lord the King lives, in whatever place my lord shall be, whether it be for death or life, there shall your servant be” (1 Sam 15:23); “Whoever serves me must follow me, and where I am there will my servant be also” (John 12:26). Third, just as Caiaphas advised that “one man (Jesus) should die for the people and the whole nation should not perish” (John 11:50), so Ahithophel urges Absalom that “you need only seek the life of one man and all the people shall have peace” (2 Sam 17:3). Finally, just as Samuel does not know whom to anoint (1 Sam 16:1-13), so also does John the Baptist not know who the Messiah will be (John 1:31). Therefore, although “taken individually, any of these similarities between David and Jesus . . . might seem insignificant or even tenuous . . ., the cumulative effect of these recollection of David is a strong impression of his latent presence in the Fourth Gospel.”

As convincing as the suggested analogies might sound, however, these

---

41A couple more parallels can be listed here (ibid., 299-301, 304-06). Jesus’ body was lavished with a royal burial as it would have befitted the Davidic king par excellence. In addition, Pseudo-Philo designates Samuel as “the light” proceeding before wisdom just as John was a provisional lamp shining until the coming of the true light (John 1:8-9; 5:35). “For when the light from which wisdom is to be born will go forth.” L.A.B. 51:4 (OTP, 2:365). However, the first parallel seems to read too much into the text, and the argumentative force of the latter one, on the other hand, is obscured by the late date of the source. Most scholars place the writing of Pseudo-Philo in the late first century A.D. Craig A. Evans, Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 49.

42Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel, 314-15. Also, “the whole point of placing the psalms (Pss 22, 69) on the lips of Jesus is that David is ancestor of the Messiah (the synoptic view) or a prophetic prefiguration of Jesus (the Johannine view). The psalms tell of how David experienced betrayal, torment, isolation, and eventually, the deliverance that gave rise to the praise that characteristically follows his laments. For the first Christians, David’s experience prefigures Jesus’ life, death, and resurrection.” Ibid., 315. “The literary persona of David, as it had evolved by the Second Temple period, as the protagonist of narrative traditions, as ‘author’ of the psalms, and as an idealized symbol of hope for the future, provided the Evangelist with a paradigm and a resource for such reinterpretation.” Ibid., 428.
allusions still loom too subtle, so that it is altogether questionable whether the originally intended audience would have detected those connections without difficulty. The possibility seems even less likely in view of the growing awareness of Gospel scholarship regarding the primary communication pattern of the first century Mediterranean world. The orality of the culture necessitates the intended messages be quite obvious, otherwise they stand a meager chance to be understood by the audience. Nevertheless, in addition to the four situational analogies, there are eight passages that explicitly refer to or allude to David that merit close scrutiny. These passages will be discussed with respect to the possibility of presenting Jesus as a Davidic figure, especially in a significant interaction with the arguments put forth by Daly-Denton.

Jesus as the Replacement of the Temple: John 2:17

His disciples remembered that it was written, “Zeal for your house will consume me.” (John 2:17, NRSV)

ο ζήλος τοῦ οἴκου σου καταφάγει με (John 2:17, UBS)

ο ζήλος τοῦ οἴκου σου κατέφαγεν με (Ps 68:10a, LXX)

(John 2:17, NRSV)

The so-called “temple cleansing” period in John 2:13-22 contains a virtually verbatim quotation from Psalm 69:9. There are two reasons in particular that might demand the presence of a Davidic prefiguration motif. First, Daly-Denton’s point is probably valid that the Psalter quotations would automatically remind the first-century readers of David, especially since Psalm 69 is already placed under the Davidic authorship in the Hebrew canon. This point is reinforced by the fact that this particular chapter of the Psalms is popularly quoted in other parts of the New Testament writings. On this basis, C. H. Dodd postulated the presence of “a testimony collection” that

---

43 For a fuller treatment of this issue, see pp. 47-48 of this dissertation.


45 Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel, 121.
circulated in the early churches: Matthew 27:34 (Ps 69:21); Luke 23:36 (Ps 69:21); John 15:25 (Ps 69:4); John 19:28 (Ps 69:21); Acts 1:20 (Ps 69:25); Romans 11:9-10 (Ps 69:22-23), 15:3 (Ps 69:9b).46 Second, it is relatively evident in the text that the suffering of David has a close correlation with that of Jesus. Just as David suffered because of his enemies’ misunderstanding of his zeal for the temple in Psalm 69, so also does Jesus in the remainder of the Gospel.47

However, upon a closer reading of its narrative context, this pericope calls for more than a Davidic prefiguration motif. First, the section ranging from the end of the first chapter to the pericope immediately preceding this text is replete with a recurrent replacement theme. Jacob’s encountering of Yahweh is replaced with the New Testament Christians’ meeting with Jesus (John 1:51). The old wine (τὸν ἐλάσσον, “inferior wine” John 2:10) is replaced with the new wine, which Jesus provides, and which the banquet master attests to be “the good wine” (John 2:10). Immediately after this sign in Cana is placed the present “temple cleansing” anecdote, which is followed by the “new birth speech” to Nicodemus (John 3:1-15), and John the Baptist’s notion that Jesus must increase and he himself decrease (John 3:30). As such, the present paragraph under discussion must be understood in light of the narrative flow of the surrounding texts that repeatedly underscore a replacement or contrast theme.48 In this light, Barnabas


Lindars' assessment of the Psalm quotation in John 2:17 is correct in that the verse is a parenthesis (i.e., a post-Easter interpolation), which interrupts the narrative flow. This point becomes more convincing when coupled with the statement about the disciples in verse 22: “After he was raised from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this; and they believed the scripture and the word that Jesus had spoken.”

Therefore, the main theme of this pericope is Jesus' replacement of the Jerusalem temple with his body, a spiritual temple. Accordingly, the key words are “temple” (vv. 17, 19, 20, 21) and its cognates “house” (v. 16), not “consume” or “zeal” in the psalm citation. That is precisely why the evangelist placed the Psalm quotation at

reasons. First, the surrounding contexts are replete with the replacement theme. Second, the first half of the pericope and the latter one are woven together with a keyword “sign” that the cleansing act is best understood as a symbolic referent to the sign of Jesus' resurrection which replaces the physical Jerusalem temple. Third, it is difficult not to take into account the catastrophic fall of the Jerusalem temple for the background of this passage. Cf. Jarl H. Ulrichsen, “Jesus—der neue Tempel?: Ein kritischer Blick auf die Auslegung von Joh 2,13-22,” in Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen, ed. David E. Aune, Torrey Seland, and Jarl H. Ulrichsen, NovTSup 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 202-14. For an example of the understanding that sees the temple cleansing pericope as an integral part of a larger narrative unit, see Mark A. Matson, “The Temple Incident: An Integral Element in the Fourth Gospel's Narrative,” in Jesus in Johannine Tradition, ed. Robert T. Fortna and Tom Thatcher (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2001), 145-53.


50Similarly, "his disciples did not understand these things at first; but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things had been written of him and had been done to him" (John 12:16).


52The text does not dwell on elaborating Jesus' suffering as a consequence of this temple-cleansing act as Matthew (26:61) and Mark (11:18; 14:58) point out it as a cause of Jesus' arrest. This proportional aspect militates against the reading of this text as a righteous suffering prefigured in David's Psalm 69. In this respect, the exegetical value of Richard Hays' reading is diminished as he recognizes the replacement theme in the text then quickly moves onto the righteous suffering and vindication of the nation of Israel. Hays, “Can the Gospels Teach us How to Read the Old Testament?” 412-15.
this point instead of leaving it after the resurrection. This narrative plot also explains why John does not here refer to Isaiah 56:7 and Jeremiah 7:11, as Matthew 21:13 and Mark 11:17 do. The evangelist probably intended to focus on the new temple, Jesus, and not divert the attention of his readers to ancillary elements. Furthermore, this replacement of the temple theme fits nicely with the replacement of the place of God as articulated in John 1:51. Finally, this citation from Psalms (as well as the following catena) serves to manifest that Jesus’ replacement of the Jerusalem temple is accorded with the testimony of the Scriptures. All these observations, however, do not preclude the possibility that one might find a Davidic motif (or the judgment theme that is more popularly claimed for the synoptic parallel accounts). What they suggest is that such a motif, if present at all, is kept at the secondary level, probably even on the level of a prophet motif, as some commentators have noted.

**Jesus as a Davidic Posterity?: John 7:42**

"Has not the scripture said that the Messiah is descended from David and comes

---


54 To some extent, this argument runs in danger of postulating a literary relationship between the Synoptics and John. However, at least some degree of indirect influence should be reckoned, because the three Gospel strands share the same tradition of the temple cleansing incident.


56 “I finally suggest that the transition from 1.51 to 2.17 is the transition from Christ as the place of God’s presence to Christ as the house of God.” Hanson, *The Prophetic Gospel*, 44.

57 Umoh, “The Temple in the Fourth Gospel,” 323. Thus, the assessment of Evans is rather a little off the track. He thinks that the function of the citation is analogical but it seems to be more prophetic. See Craig A. Evans, “Old Testament in the Gospels,” in *DJK*, 588.


from Bethlehem, the village where David lived?” (Jn 7:42)

This passage seems to share a common tradition with Matthew 2:5-6 where Jewish scholars were easily able to locate the birthplace of the anticipated Messiah based on Micah 5:2. A couple of questions have been raised concerning this passage. First, it is peculiar that the question is left unanswered. Accordingly, Bultmann concludes that “the evangelist knows nothing or wants to know nothing of the birth in Bethlehem.” His judgment, however, ignores the level of civilization in the first century Mediterranean world. Recent assessment of archaeological and literary discoveries of that period render unlikely Bultmann’s presupposition that the alleged Johannine community or the fourth evangelist was extremely isolated from the rest of early Christendom.

Another problem is that there is no clear indication in early rabbinic literature for Bethlehem as Messiah’s birth place, although the town was often closely associated with David. Consequently, it may be the case that the Matthean Gospel reflects a minor rabbinic tradition. On the basis of a messianic anticipation, which is couched in terms of a Davidic posterity, however, some have argued for a Davidic messianic motif widely held by the Johannine crowd. At first glance, it seems well-grounded; but, a closer examination that takes account of the narrative flow requires a different reading.

The section which contains the inquiry of a Davidic ancestry is preceded by a

---


repeated theme of unbelief. In chapter 5, the Jews do not understand the healing authority of Jesus, as witnessed on the Sabbath. The entirety of chapter six is marked by the Jews’ misunderstanding, and even Jesus’ own disciples with reference to eating and drinking Jesus’ flesh and blood. In the seventh chapter, during the feast of Tabernacles, this misunderstanding or, probably more precisely, unbelief motif is also the overarching theme of this section. In chapter eight through twelve, one of the main recurrent themes is also the stubborn unbelief of the Jews. Thus, the questioning (or accusing) of Jesus’ Davidic origin in verse 42 should be seen in line with this persistent misunderstanding or unbelief leitmotif. That is why the Jews rhetorically assert that a prophet or Christ cannot come from Galilee:

When they heard these words, some in the crowd said, “This is really the prophet.” Others said, “This is the Messiah.” But some asked, “Surely the Messiah does not come from Galilee, does he?” (Jn 7:40-41); They replied, “Surely you are not also from Galilee, are you? Search and you will see that no prophet is to arise from Galilee.” (John 7:52)

While the unbelief motif permeates chapters five through twelve, another prominent theme emerges in these sections, namely, that of Jesus’ heavenly origin. This concept is often expressed in the language of father/son (5:19-29; 6:32-40), flesh/spirit (6:63), light/darkness (8:12), above/below (8:23), and God/Satan (8:44-47). What this heavenly origin entails is that Jesus does not need a human witness (John 2:24-25; 5:34, 36-37, 39, 41; 8:14-20) because it is God who bears witness to him. This is why the question concerning Jesus’ Davidic origin is left without an answer in verse 42. The lack of an answer is not to dismiss the Davidic lineage of Jesus, but it is to indicate that Jesus’ messianic identity does not rest on human qualifications. In other words, the royal lineage does not buttress his status as Messiah.

What did the evangelist himself think about Jesus’ ancestry and origin? His theology is not concerned with the human antecedents or earthly homeland of Jesus, but only with his heavenly origin. In this respect, he has no desire to establish the legitimacy of his Christ by the criteria of Jewish messianic expectation. . . . [John] is suggesting the same answer as Jesus gave in v. 28: you know Jesus, yet you do not

---

really know him; to be Son of David and born in Bethlehem is not what matters.  

Jesus as Davidic King of Israel?: John 12:13

So they took branches of palm trees and went out to meet him, shouting, “Hosanna! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord—the King of Israel!” Jesus found a young donkey and sat on it; as it is written: “Do not be afraid, daughter of Zion. Look, your king is coming, sitting on a donkey’s colt!” His disciples did not understand these things at first; but when Jesus was glorified, then they remembered that these things had been written of him and had been done to him. (John 12:13-16)

In John, the epithet “King” is mentioned in four different contexts with reference to Jesus: Nathanael’s confession (John 1:49); the crowd’s attempt to crown Jesus following the miraculous feeding (6:15); the triumphant entry (12:13-16) and in the passion narratives (chaps. 18-19). In three of these instances, the Davidic association is too subtle or Jesus refuses to accept such a designation. However, the pilgrim’s hail of Jesus in John 12:13-16 seems to evoke fairly obviously the Davidic royal messianic image. In addition, Jesus and the evangelist appear to sanction such praise.65


65Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel, 45-46, 176-87. However, John Ashton notes the absence of the title “Son of David” in the Fourth Gospel as a negative factor to be taken into consideration before assuming that “King of Israel” is a messianic title in John. John Ashton, Understanding the Fourth Gospel (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 262.
Although various questions arise from this text, the main question pertinent to the present investigation is the exact nature of the crowd’s acclamation. Some preliminary inquiries, however, need to be discussed. First, H. Koester asserted that this acclamation (i.e., “Hosanna”), being a popular early Christian liturgical phrase, is a later interpolation.66 Given the dominant scholarly acceptance of the independence between the Synoptic Gospels and John, it is difficult to explain the coincidental insertion by later redactors. Matthew, Mark, and John (Matt 21:9, 15; Mark 11:9, 10; John 12:13) equally contain the idiosyncratic Greek transliteration (ωσάννα) of the Hebrew word (יְהֹשֻׁעַ, Ps 118:25 BHS).67 Phonetically, the Greek pronunciation (hosanna) departs slightly from that of the Hebrew word (hosia-na). The Septuagint does not use this Greek word and the only later attestation is found in Didache 10:6. Thus, the insertion of the word is presumed to have originated from an earlier tradition(s).

The second question has to do with a claim that the hail of the crowd was a normal expression of welcome for any festal pilgrim.68 This contention seems justified in view of the Roman authority’s seemingly tacit allowance of the commotion. If the acclamation had a political or royal messianic overtone, it is hard to believe that it went unnoticed on the part of the Roman authority. Nonetheless, what concerns our investigation the most is how the evangelist colors the historical event recorded in the present text. It is relatively clear from the surrounding contexts that the acclamation of the crowd has a direct bearing on the passion of Jesus as a qualification of the Johannine Messiah, which is indicated by two subsequent quotations from Scripture (Ps 118:25-26; 


Zech 9:9). The significance of the so-called “triumphant entry” as a messianic qualification is marked by the surrounding narratives. The present pericope of John 12:12-16 is placed between the paragraphs that address the resurrection of Lazarus (one of the main causes for Jesus’ crucifixion and perhaps a proto-type of Jesus’ resurrection). These “Lazarus” passages are further surrounded by texts that allude to the sacrificial death of Jesus.

The preparation of Jesus’ death: 12:1-8
Lazarus: 12:9-11
Welcoming Jesus: 12:12-19
Lazarus: 12:17-19
A kernel of wheat: 12:20-33

In this respect, the messianic image of Jesus in the present text does not correspond to the conventional hopes expected of the Davidic Messiah, who would display the working of Yahweh in his militant subjugation of the ungodly. This sacrificial aspect of the messianic qualification, thus, militates against the view that sees a presence of Davidic royal messianic prefiguration in the text.

Another view connects the raising of Lazarus with an act of the king of Israel and does not take into account the misunderstanding of the crowd. However, it is

---

Footnotes:

69 In this respect, Coakley’s assessment misses the target. Although the scriptural fulfillment formulae in John 12:13-15 (Ps 18:25-26; Zech 9:9) probably did not ring a bell to the crowd as Coakley rightly notes, they had a significant import to the intended reader of John against Coakley. This significance is recognized via the disciples’ post-Easter reminiscence (John 12:16).


exactly that which the fourth evangelist refutes. Against the hope of Jews, Jesus entered the great city, not to assume a nationalistic leader as a Davidic figure, but to offer himself as a sacrifice (see the kernel of wheat speech in John 12:24-27), as an humble servant (the foot-washing in John 13). Moreover, it is difficult to see the miracle-working nature as a constituent of a Davidic Messiah.

Passion as a Messianic Qualification

Towards the latter half of the fourth Gospel, the Old Testament is closely tied with the fulfillment motif in the suffering of Jesus. Only Matthew, among the Synoptics, follows a similar pattern. Like Matthew, John introduces the Old Testament material with the fulfillment formulae (i.e., with an introductory remark, παλεξερωθώ); but unlike the first evangelist, he does not hesitate to put the formula on the mouth of Jesus (13:18; 15:25; 19:28; 20:9; cf. 5:45-6).


76 Moreover, John uses the formula to introduce reflections based on words of Jesus spoken earlier: "This was to fulfill the word that he had spoken, 'I did not lose a single one of those whom you gave me'" (18:9). (This was to fulfill what Jesus had said when he indicated the kind of death he was to die) (18:32). The hermeneutical dynamics of these fulfillment formulae are the object of scholarly debates. For a broad range of typological interpretation, see Richard N. Longenecker, "Who is the Prophet Talking
It is clear that the evangelist explains Jesus' passion in terms of "fulfillment." This fulfillment theme is set forth in chapter twelve and onward. A number of scholars see the fourth Gospel as comprising two main divisions (chaps 1-11: the book of signs; and 13-20: the book of the passion). If such a division is accepted, chapter twelve is a transitional section that commences a new phase. On this ground, it can be argued that the first half of John spells out the greatness of Jesus as confirmed by prominent Old Testament figures, while the latter part justifies how the greatness of Jesus is consistent with the Jews' rejection of him as Messiah, which is already prophesied in the Old Testament. Thus, John 12:37-41, which quotes Isaiah 6:10, could be understood as a
high point of John’s apologetic on behalf of Jesus’ passion.\textsuperscript{80}

Although he had performed so many signs in their presence, they did not believe in him. This was to fulfill the word spoken by the prophet Isaiah: “Lord, who has believed our message, and to whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?” And so they could not believe, because Isaiah also said, “He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that they might not look with their eyes, and understand with their heart and turn—and I would heal them.” Isaiah said this because he saw his glory and spoke about him. (John 12:37-41)

From 12:39-41 on, John forcefully explicates that the rejection of the Messiah accords with God’s redemptive program as it is prophesied in the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{81}

Interesting is the high concentration of the citations from the Psalms in the Passion narratives that contain five out of the eighteen quotations which include a fulfillment formulae (see Appendix 6: “Explicit Old Testament Materials in John”). On these grounds, thus, some scholars posit that the fourth evangelist portrays the Passion of Jesus in terms of the Davidic trials image.\textsuperscript{82}

\textbf{Judas’ betrayal as foreshadowed in David: John 13:18.} In the end of the foot-washing story in John 13, Jesus covertly reveals his betrayer as foreshadowed in the life of David:

\begin{verbatim}
Οδ περὶ πάντων ημῶν ἔγω οἶδα τίνας ἐξέλεξάμην ἄλλο τίνα ἡ γραφὴ
\end{verbatim}


\textsuperscript{81} Hamid-Khani, \textit{Revelation and Concealment of Christ}, 258-330. This is not, however, to say that the Passion was to comply with the prophecies, since Jesus existed before the Old Testament figures. “These passages [i.e., the Matthean fulfillment texts] are not saying that the Law and the Prophets are just predictions of future events, nor is it saying that Jesus simply fulfills the parts of the Law and the Prophets which happen to be predictions. It means Jesus is the true purpose and goal of the OT.” Dan McCartney and Peter Enns, “Matthew and Hosea: A Response to John Sailhamer,” \textit{WTJ} 63 (2001): 104.

\textsuperscript{82} Daly-Denton, \textit{David in the Fourth Gospel}, 189-242.
I am not speaking of all of you; I know whom I have chosen. But it is to fulfill the scripture, “The one who ate my bread has lifted his heel against me.” (John 13:18)

Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, who ate of my bread, has lifted the heel against me. (Ps 41:9)

A late rabbinic document identifies the origin of Psalm 41:9, which is quoted in the text under discussion, to the incidents related with Ahithophel’s betrayal against David. At first glance, therefore, it seems that the quotation serves to establish a David-Jesus typology.

However, a contextual reading points to another direction. The immediately preceding paragraph recounts the servant-hood of Jesus in a foot-washing account (Jn 13:1-17). The following section narrates Jesus’ charge to love one another (John 13:34-35). Furthermore, the introduction to the fulfillment formula states that the quotation is to assist the disciples to believe in Jesus when the betrayal takes place (John 13:19): “I tell you this now, before it occurs, so that when it does occur, you may believe that I am he” (v. 19). That is, the betrayal did not take Jesus by surprise but, even in his omniscience, he willingly obeyed the course of action prescribed by God. The omniscience and willingness on the part of Jesus qualify the glory language and offset the shocking betrayal by a close pupil: “When he had gone out, Jesus said, ‘Now the Son of Man has been glorified, and God has been glorified in him. If God has been glorified in him, God will also glorify him in himself and will glorify him at once’” (John 13:31-32). Therefore, the point of citing Psalm 41:9 seems to underscore the divine characteristics of Jesus. If the Davidic analogy is intended at all, it is certainly kept on a

---


84 Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel, 191-201.

85 Wengst, Das Johannesevangelium, 2:99; Dietzfelbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 2:15.
Irony of Jewish persecution: John 15:18. In the midst of the so-called "farewell discourse," Jesus warns his disciples of impending persecution. It is in this context that Jesus brings forth the groundlessness of Jewish persecution, which "fulfills" Scripture: "It was to fulfill the word that is written in their law, 'They hated me without a cause.'" It can be argued that this citation reinforces the alleged recurrent theme of David as a proto-type of Jesus.\(^\text{87}\) Just as the world hated David without reason, so will the disciples of Jesus be persecuted groundlessly ("'If the world hates you, be aware that it hated me before it hated you,'" John 15:18).\(^\text{88}\)

However, a closer reading of the narrative flow requires us to focus on a more prominent theme of the pericope. In verses one through seventeen of John 15, Jesus speaks of bearing the fruit of love in the imagery of grapevine and friend. This special relationship with Jesus and the ensuing bearing of fruit entail the reception of persecution from the world (or Jews). It is in this context that a quotation from the Psalter is inserted in the present text. This citation serves two functions in particular. First the excerpt from the Psalm underscores the irony that the law, to which Jews adhere so staunchly, condemns their rebellion against the law in persecuting Jesus and his followers. As a consequence, they unwittingly fulfill their own scriptures.\(^\text{89}\) At the same time, they have no excuse for their misbehavior since they witnessed the signs and heard the words of Jesus:

\[^{86}\text{Contra Carson, The Gospel according to John, 470-71.}\]
\[^{87}\text{This citation is either from Ps 35:19 ("Do not let my treacherous enemies rejoice over me, or those who hate me without cause wink the eye.") or Ps 69:4 ("More in number than the hairs of my head are those who hate me without cause; many are those who would destroy me, my enemies who accuse me falsely. What I did not steal must I now restore?"). Menken posits that the present quotation is inserted from LXX. M. J. J. Menken, "'They Hated Me without Reason' (John 15:25)," in Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form, CBET 15 (Kampen: Kok, 1996), 139-46.}\]
\[^{88}\text{Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel, 201-08.}\]
\[^{89}\text{Carson, The Gospel according to John, 527.}\]
If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin. . . . If I had not done among them the works that no one else did, they would not have sin. But now they have seen and hated both me and my Father. (John 15:22, 24)

Second, the quotation serves as a forewarning, in order for the hearers to be prepared for upcoming persecution ("I have said these things to you to keep you from stumbling," John 16:1). Just as in John 13:18, the quotation from the Psalter in John 15:25 does not provide a clue pointing to a palpable David-Jesus typology but reveals a divine characteristic of Jesus, namely, his foreknowledge in preparing his followers for the coming trials.

**Allocation of Jesus’ clothes: John 19:24.** Like the Synoptic Gospels (Matt 27:35; Mark 15:24; Luke 23:34), John records the division of Jesus’ clothes by the Roman soldiers. Yet it is only John who brings out the Scripture to depict this scene in terms of “fulfillment.” In addition, it should be noted that the quote from the Psalm is unmistakable because of the introductory formula, although the wording is slightly different.90

So they said to one another, “Let us not tear it, but cast lots for it to see who will get it.” This was to fulfill what the scripture says, “They divided my clothes among themselves, and for my clothing they cast lots.” (John 19:24)

They divide my clothes among themselves, and for my clothing they cast lots.” (Ps 22:18)

εἰπαν οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ λάχωμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ τίνος ἔσται· ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ [ἡ λέγουσα]· διεμερίσαστο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἑτί τῶν ἱματισμῶν μου ἑβαλὼν κλήρον. Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιώται ταῦτα ἐποίησαν, (In 19:24, UBS)

(וְהָלְכוּ בְנֵי לְוֵיתִי לְעַל-לְבָנָתָם בְּבֵית אָבִם) (Ps 22:19, BHS)

Two observations stand out with regards to the interest of this study. First, some have argued that the un-torn inner garment symbolizes the unity of and the

---

90Menken posits that the quotation is the verse is a direct excerpt from the LXX. M. J. J. Menken, “The Use of the Septuagint in Three Quotations in John: Jn 10,34; 12,38; 19,24,” in Scriptures in the Gospels, ed. Christopher M. Tuckett, BETL 131 (Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1997), 367-93.
everlasting promise given to the Davidic kingdom, a precedent of the Johannine community or the early church. 91 Second, the quotation from Psalm 22:18 is cited to bring forth the aspect of Jesus’ death as a righteous sufferer foreshadowed in David’s life. 92 The first interpretation runs into difficulty not only for its allegorical hermeneutics but also for its ignorance of the fact that the garment was taken from Jesus. Schnackenburg’s interpretation seems more natural to the narrative context that the giving up of his garments implicates his total sacrifice. 93 The second point is feasible in view of the recurrent quotations from the book of Psalms, which were closely associated with David in early Judaism. However, such a connection is heavily overshadowed by the theme of the divine sovereignty. 94 The psalmic citation is probably better understood in terms of the consistence of Jesus’ crucifixion with the divine redemptive program, rather than Jesus’ fulfilling the qualification expected of a Davidic Messiah. In this respect, Keener’s comment is illuminating. John’s most central implication at this point, however, is the fulfillment of Scripture. His ouv at the end of v. 24 (“this is why the soldiers did these things”) reinforces the point: the soldiers may have acted according to custom and may have acted according to evil desires, but they ultimately were unwittingly fulfilling God’s

91 For example, R. Alan Culpepper, “The Theology of the Johannine Passion Narrative: John 19:16b-30,” Neot 31 (1997): 27-28; Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel, 208-19. For example, “In biblical lore, prophetic garment-tearing symbolizes the loss of the kingship (Saul) or the division of the kingdom with concomitant diminishment of the king’s sovereignty (Ahijah). Set against this background, the Johannine insistence that Jesus’ tunic was not torn is a declaration that, in spite of the utter despoliation that he willingly suffered, Jesus’ royal status remained intact and undiminished. ‘The hour’ thus emerges as the definitive moment when the 2 Sam 7 promise to David of everlasting kingship is realized.” Ibid., 218. Some early exegetes based on some Talmudic literature and Josephus also posited that the unity of the undergarment signified the priesthood of Jesus. This view is protested by Ignace de la Potterie, “La tunique ‘non divisee’ de Jesus, symbole de l’unite messianique,” in New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke, ed. William C. Weinrich (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984), 1:133. For a discussion on the research history of the views, see Wengst, Das Johannesevangelium, 2:255-56. Dietzfelbinger discards both theories in view of the narrative context. Dietzfelbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 2:300.

92 Carson, The Gospel according to John, 612-13; Andreas Köstenberger, John, BECNT (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 547.


94 Carson, The Gospel according to John, 612. For the lack of a better term, the word “sovereignty” is used here but without the connotation that later reformed theology attributes to the expression, especially with reference to soteriology.
unbreakable word. 95

Jesus' thirst: John 19:28. Some suggest that the last word of Jesus in John 19:28 indicates his thirst to be in union with God, as the Psalms often portray David to be. 96 On the contrary, however, the fourth evangelist forcefully and meticulously endeavors to bring forth the point that every turn of events involved in Jesus' passion complies with the will of God as recorded in the Old Testament Scripture. A common phenomenon, which can happen to an average man hanged on a tree, even serves to fulfill the Scripture prophesied of the Messiah: "After this, when Jesus knew that all was now finished, he said (in order to fulfill the scripture), 'I am thirsty'" (John 19:28). 97 This declaration of thirst and the subsequent drinking of vinegar could refer to the cup of sacrifice alluded earlier in John 18:11, or to the flowing of the living water promised in John 7:28. 98 Yet the focus of attention should still be given to the motif of the fulfillment of Scripture. 99

In addition, the same hermeneutical weight should be equally given to the aspect of Jesus' active realization of the divine salvific program. Even to the very last


97 The attestation of "in order to fulfill" phrase is early: N, D', Θ, f1,13 and others. NA, 313. For a discussion of possible scriptural passages in view of this fulfillment passage, see Garland, "Fulfillment Quotations in John's Account of the Crucifixion," 237-43.

98 When Jesus says, 'I thirst,' therefore, he not only points to the fulfillment of scripture and the fulfillment of his offer of living water to those who would come to him; he also figuratively announces his own death." Culpepper, "The Theology of the Johannine Passion Narratives," 32. Also Barrett sees the implication for the promise of the living water in the flowing of Jesus' water and blood. C. K. Barrett, The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text, 2nd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 534.

99 Dietzfelbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 2:304.
moment, it is Jesus who advances through the path of sacrifice incumbent upon him as the Messiah, that is, he is not a passive participant of the ultimate sacrifice, the culmination of the redemptive historic event.\(^{100}\) That point squares well with the following remark: "When Jesus had received the wine, he said, 'it is finished.' Then, he bowed his head and gave up his spirit" (John 19:30). The fulfillment formulae observed so far, including the one found in John 19:28, indicate that Jesus, in his suffering and death, willingly accomplished the qualifications required of the Messiah from the start to the end and in minute details as expected in Scripture.

**Not breaking the legs and piercing the side: John 19:36.** The last reference to the book of Psalms appears in John 19:36 where the failure to break Jesus' legs is referred to as "fulfilling the Scripture." John, then, goes on to mention Zechariah 12:10, in order to show how the death of Jesus tallies with the picture of the Messiah as prescribed in the Old Testament. These two citations or allusions to the Old Testament are tied with one another by the introductory formula, "these things occurred so that the Scripture might be fulfilled (ἐγένετο γὰρ ταύτα ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ):"

But when they came to Jesus and saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. Instead, one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear, and at once blood and water came out. (He who saw this has testified so that you also may believe. His testimony is true, and he knows that he tells the truth.) These things occurred so that the scripture might be fulfilled, "None of his bones shall be broken." And again another passage of scripture says, "They will look on the one whom they have pierced." (John 19:33-37)

However, the exact provenance of the allusion for the first reference is difficult to ascertain because the wording differs slightly from the alleged Old Testament texts. Usually, Exodus 12:46, Numbers 9:12, and Psalm 34:20 are suggested. Two passages

---

\(^{100}\)Ibid., 2:305. Cf. "We may suppose that Jesus really is thirsty; but he is thirsty only by his own volition, because of his own awareness that there is a prophecy to be realized." Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 2:928. Also, "The thirst of Jesus represents his complete obedience to the Father's will, drinking to the dregs the cup of death; and by it, salvation, living water, is poured out for human kind. To use another Johannine image, from the bitter wine vinegar comes the good wine that has been kept until now." Garland, "Fulfillment Quotations in John's Account of the Crucifixion," 244.
from the Pentateuch refer to a commandment not to break a Paschal lamb's leg bones. The first example is found in Exodus 12:46: "It shall be eaten in one house; you shall not take any of the animal outside the house, and you shall not break any of its bones." The second example is mentioned in Numbers 9:12: "They shall leave none of it until morning, nor break a bone of it; according to all the statute for the passover they shall keep it." The last passage appears in Psalm 34:20: "He keeps all their bones; not one of them will be broken." There are three possibilities. If the first two passages are assumed to be the origin, then, the fourth evangelist associates Jesus with the Paschal lamb, whose bones should be kept intact according to the Levitical regulations. On the other hand, if the Psalm text is opted for, the picture is of Jesus cast as a righteous sufferer, as was David when Yahweh protected him from Abimelech. Finally, a growing number of exegetes mediate the tension between the two options by positing a confluence of the two traditions on the present Johannine text. Some from this group argue that the Psalm quotation attributes a characteristic of David to Jesus, that is, he is a royal Messiah because of the Psalm's association with David. Daly-Denton unfolds her logic for this contention as follows:

It is the contention of this study that the exegetical warrant for regarding a psalm quotation such as ὤν σωτρήφηται as spoken about Jesus the Messiah is to

---


be found in the supposed Davidic authorship of the Psalter. According to the midrashic logic which this warrant permits, Jesus is to be recognized by his Davidic-likeness (not, John would say, by linear descent from David) as the king in whose name King David prophetically composed this psalm. Thus John’s psalm citation portrays Jesus not as “righteous,” but as royal.\footnote{Daly-Denton, \textit{David in the Fourth Gospel}, 239. Also, “as cited in John 19:36, it underlines the Johannine conception of Jesus’ death as his triumphant royal enthronement.” Ibid., 241.}

However, her argument and those of other exegetes along this line misses the point of the citation in lieu of the narrative contexts both of John and the Psalm (let alone it seems unlikely that the original hearers immediately captured “the midrashic logic” of John). In Psalm 34, one verse of which is alluded to in the text, the psalmist speaks of God’s redemption of a righteous sufferer (i.e., David) in the midst of trials. The gory portrayal of John 19:33-37, which recounts the piercing of Jesus’ side that leads to the depletion of the inner body fluid, precludes, thus, a royal enthronement interpretation of the Psalm citation. The primary sense in which Psalm 34 is quoted is probably, as John plainly states, to show that the death of Jesus, even the manner in which he died, does not contradict the will of God but fulfills it.\footnote{Cf. Garland, “Fulfillment Quotations in John’s Account of the Crucifixion,” 247-48.}


And again another passage of scripture says, “They will look on the one whom they have pierced.” (John 19:37)

And I will pour out a spirit of compassion and supplication on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that, when they look on the one whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him, as one mourns for an only child, and weep bitterly over him, as one weeps over a firstborn. (Zech 12:10)

Because of the phrase, “house of David,” in Zechariah, some argue for the presence of the kingly characteristics in relation to the piercing of Jesus’ side. A closer examination
of the original context and John, however, speaks against such a construal. The interpretation of Zechariah 12:10 is decisively divided on a number of issues (such as whether or not the subject of the violent act is the house of David) but one element is certain, that is, David (or the house of David) is not identified with the one who is pierced, as it is related to Jesus in John.\textsuperscript{108} Furthermore, the general message of Zechariah 12 is that Yahweh will transform the hearts of people of Israel, and the house of David will be a recipient of this blessing. In view of the narrative contexts of both passages, thus, the following assessment of Daly-Denton concerning the implication of the Zechariah quotation does not stand under close scrutiny:

The two sources complement each other: the paschal lamb reference points to the sacrificial efficacy of Jesus’ death, the testimony of David pointing to the vindication of Jesus, not merely as “righteous,” but as royal. . . . This royal portrayal of Jesus facilitates the recognition of the pierced one (Zech 12:10) as the one in \textsuperscript{109} whom κύριος εἰς βασιλέα ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν (Zech 14:9).

Contrary to Daly-Denton, the one pierced in Zechariah is someone other than David, probably Yahweh or a prophetic figure. In addition, the Lord, who will become Lord over the earth in Zechariah 14:9, is also, not David as Daly-Denton maintains, but Yahweh. Thus, John seems to correlate Jesus with Yahweh (or a prophetic figure) and David (i.e., his house) with the New Testament believers (with particular emphasis on the eye-witness theme) in his use of the Zechariah texts.\textsuperscript{110} If the fourth evangelist wished to speak of a certain nature of Jesus by means of the citations from the Psalm and Zechariah, it is of his divinity, not his relation to David as some consider him to be a messianic precursor. However, even such divinization of Jesus is not brought to the fore of the


\textsuperscript{109}Daly-Denton, David in the Fourth Gospel, 240.

\textsuperscript{110}The house of David is a typological thesis to the New Testament believers. Menken, “‘They Shall Look on Him Whom They Have Pierced’ (John 19:37),” 178-85. For a prominent witness function of the citation, see Dietzfelbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 2:310-11. For an apologetical charge to believe in Jesus by the vivid description of his death, see Ludger Schenke, Johannes: Kommentar (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1998), 363; Wengst, Das Johannesevangelium, 2:285.
narratives in the passion accounts.

**Conclusion**

The Jewish writings in the second temple period envisaged David as an ideal figure such as a capable ruler, a genuine Jew, and even a messianic figure. Some new Testament writings such as the Synoptic Gospels and the Revelation display affinity with the motif of his image as a royal messianic prefiguration. In contrast to such prefiguration motifs, however, the fourth evanglist does not present Jesus in that angle, but rather seems to be in terms more congruous with the perception of him as a righteous sufferer.

The frequency of quotations from the book of Psalms should be noted at least on the sub-conscious level, if not on the surface as indicating this aspect. The reason is because the texts explicitly cited from the Psalter serve to expose that Jesus possesses messianic qualifications, especially his divine characteristics, such as omniscience and an unremitting willingness to comply with the Father’s will. This aspect points to the authenticity of Jesus as Messiah as it is prescribed in the supreme authority of Judaism. Second, the texts cited from Scripture function to indicate that his death conforms to the divine redemptive program as recorded in Scripture, and it was not a precarious venture that inadvertently happens.

Finally, concerning the question put forth at the beginning of this chapter, as to whether or not there is a messianic correspondence between David and Jesus, these observations answer in the negative. The royal messianic image of David, which was most often envisaged in the contexts of the intertestamental Jewish eschatological hopes, does not fit the messianic picture of the Fourth Gospel. If the correlation must be pressed hard, it is found in the witness function of David for the messianic qualification of Jesus. In his numerous trials, the ideal Jewish figure offered analogies to the righteous suffering of Jesus, and in doing so he, perhaps unconsciously, foreshadowed the characteristics of
Messiah. Moreover, the house of David bears witness to the prefiguration of Jesus, i.e., the pierced Yahweh, just as the disciples of Jesus eye-witness the death of Jesus (as the citation from Zech 12:10 points out). This aspect is what most straightforwardly comes into the fore of John’s narratives in his use of the Old Testament passages that are related to David.
CHAPTER 5

MOSES

Introduction

Of all the important Old Testament characters, Moses, "the man of God" (Deut 33:1; Josh 14:6; 1 Chr 23:14; Ezra 3:2; Ps 90:1; 1 Esdr 5:49; 4Q378 26 2; 4Q381 24 4), is most frequently addressed in the study of John's Gospel. Therein, not only his importance is often noted, but it is contended with much vigor that he is portrayed as a messianic prefiguration. That is, Jesus is a new Moses.¹ In the same vein, a group of scholars draws attention to some early strands of Jewish eschatological conceptions (particularly to the early rabbinic and Samaritan traditions) that allegedly exerted influence on Johannine Christology. On the opposite side stands another group of

scholars which does not find a typological reading of the Moses texts to be pervasive in John.²

With such a divergence of scholarly assessments in view, this chapter seeks to explore the narrative function of Moses with regards to the Johannine Christology and in light of his messianic prefigurative references in the Old Testament and the intertestamental Jewish literature. The space allowed for this study precludes a comprehensive examination of the Mosaic references in early Judaism. Nonetheless, the first half of this chapter will address a sufficient number of selected passages from the Old Testament and early Jewish writings (especially those of the Palestinian provenance) that are particularly relevant to the present research, in order to fairly represent the common Jewish understanding of Moses in that period. The second half will deal with John’s depiction of Moses and his function with special reference to the Christology of his Gospel. In conclusion, the possible link between early Judaism and Johannine Christology via Moses and his Christological contribution in John will be assessed.

Mosaic Images in the Old Testament and Early Judaism

The Old Testament and Early Judaism mention a large number of persons. Yet none is more prominent than Moses. For example, Philo describes Moses as the “greatest and most perfect man” (Mos. 1:1).³ As such, his standing and multi-hued character have far reaching implications for understanding of the Christian Bible. He is variously portrayed as the cult founder, a prophet, a priestly and a kingly figure, the law giver, and

²As an example, Dieter Sänger finds no explicit trait of thought concerning Moses in terms of correspondence or typology not only in John but in the entire purview of the New Testament writings. Rather, the concepts of “intensification” and a “qualitative improvement” best depict the images of Moses in the New Testament. Dieter Sänger, “‘Von mir hat er geschrieben’ (Joh 5,46): Zur Funktion und Bedeutung Mose im Neuen Testament,” KD 41 (1995): 112-35.

an example of Jewish royalty. Of these images, four characteristics stand out, and they are particularly pertinent to the present discussion as it concerns Johannine Christology.

Accordingly, the following preliminary survey will focus on his images in early Judaism as a figure of authority, a prophet, and a king. It is also noteworthy that some scholars contend that some of the early Jewish ascension and enthronement narratives confer a certain degree of divinity to Moses. Since such deification bears a direct bearing on this study, a close scrutiny of such texts will be included. Finally, an examination will be undertaken concerning some early Jewish texts that depict Moses as an eschatological redeemer figure, which could have easily developed into a Johannine Mosaic Christology.

Moses as Authority Figure with Particular Emphasis on Law-Giving and Legitimatizing

The Old Testament. This category of perception largely stems from Moses' reception and transmission of the Sinai revelation as recorded in Exodus 24 and the

---

4 Lierman, The New Testament Moses, 32-257. Lierman even detects a strand of Jewish thought that associates Moses with baptism (ibid., 175-208). For more convenient surveys on the issues related to the perceptions of Moses in the Old Testament, see Erich Zenger, "Mose/Moselied/Mosesegen/Moseschriften I: Altes Testament," in TRE, 23:330-41; Marion Ann Taylor and John E. Harvey, "Moses," in NIDOTTE, 4:949-60; Carl S. Ehrlich, "Moses, Torah, and Judaism," in Rivers of Paradise: Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus, and Muhammad as Religious Founders, ed. David N. Freedman and Michael J. McClymond (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 11-119; Eckart Otto, "Mose I: Altes Testament," in RGG, 5:1534-38; Rolf Rendtorff, Canonical Hebrew Bible: A Theology of the Old Testament, TBS 7 (Leiden: Deo, 2005), 545-59; for those of early Jewish literature, see Joachim Jeremias, "Mωυσῆς," in TDNT, 4:849-64; Gabrielle Oberhansli-Widmer, "Mose/Moselied/Mosesegen/Moseschriften III: Apokalyptische und jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur," in TRE, 23:347-57; Stan Harstine, Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques, JSNTSup 229 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 2002), 96-129; for the Mosaic portrait in early Greco-Egyptian and early rabbinic traditions, see Maren Niehoff, "Mose III, 1: Antike Judentum," in RGG, 5:1539-42. Some scholars have traced the various Jewish key figures traditions (such as, prophetic, priestly, and scribal) to Moses. That is, Moses is the first in the prophet tradition. For example, the suffering prophetic image of Elijah is in line with the suffering of Moses in the wilderness. On the other hand, the priestly succession also stems from Moses through his spiritual subordinate Aaron. Finally, the book of Deuteronomy is considered as the Mosaic interpretation of the Sinai Torah. As such, Moses stands as the first in the line of the scribal tradition. Otto, "Mose I," 1537-38.

5 A considerable number of investigations into the historic Moses were advanced categorically (such as a cult founder, legislator, prophet, charismatic leader, priest, etc.), rather than biographically, due to the skeptical form critical influence of Wellhausen. Rudolf Smend, "Methoden der Moseforschung," in Gesammelte Studien, vol. 2 of Zur altesten Geschichte Israels, BEvT 100 (Munich: Kaiser, 1987), 90; Zenger, "Mose/Moselied/Mosesegen/Moseschriften I," 23:331. Zenger notes the danger of overgeneralization inherent in this type of systematic categorization. For the convenience of presentation, however, the present study proceeds in line with this type of survey with such a caution in mind (ibid.).
concomitant reinforcement of the Sinaitic covenant in the lives of Israelites as witnessed in Deuteronomy. His role in the process of imparting the Law granted him an enduring status of authority. However, one reason why his authority stands out is due to the unparalleled degree of directness with which he received the divine revelation. The books of Exodus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy testify to the intimacy Moses enjoyed in his encounter with Yahweh. That is, unlike any of the other prophets to whom God reveals himself in visions and dreams, God conversed with Moses “face to face.”

Thus the LORD used to speak to Moses face to face, as one speaks to a friend (Ex 33:11a); And he said, “Hear my words: When there are prophets among you, I the LORD make myself known to them in visions; I speak to them in dreams. Not so with my servant Moses; he is entrusted with all my house. With him I speak face to face—clearly, not in riddles; and he beholds the form of the LORD (Num 12:6-7); Never since has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses, whom the LORD knew face to face. (Deut 34:10)7

However, an important qualification should be made concerning the expression “face to face.” In light of the surrounding literary contexts, the phrase does not imply that Moses directly beheld God, but it signifies his intimate relation or the directness of his encounter with Yahweh (i.e., without mediation). In other places, the Pentateuch clearly indicates that the prophet could not observe the face of Yahweh (Exod 33:20-23) and he only beheld the “form or likeness (הַחוֹלֵיתָא בְּעַדָּיו)” of Yahweh (Num 12:7). Jeffrey Tigay’s summation on this idiom is helpful in this respect: “The point of the text is that Moses had the most direct contact with God of any prophet, and hence had the clearest knowledge of Him and His will.”8

---

6The reception of oracles is a particular mark of a prophet, in Moses’ case, most conspicuously evidenced in the Sinai event. As such, the issues related to the Sinai event should be treated under the category of a prophet. However, the enormous magnitude of the Torah reception merits a separate treatment. The messenger function, that is the delivery of a divine oracle, is the dominating aspect of the Old Testament prophets. James F. Ross, “The Prophet as Yahweh’s Messenger (1962),” in Prophecy in Israel: Search for an Identity, ed. David L. Peterson, IRT 10 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 112-21.

7The expression in the Numbers passage literally means “mouth to mouth” (לְפָנַי יְהוָה) but NRSV idiomatically translates “face to face.” See J. A. Thompson and Elmer A. Martens, “‘פָלַח,’” in NIDOTTE, 3:583. The Exodus and Deuteronomy passages literally read “face to face” (לְפָנַי יהוָה).

8Jeffrey H. Tigay, Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation, JPSTC (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 340. Some other reasonable suggestions better to understand the phrase are “one on one,” Richard D. Nelson, Deuteronomy: A Commentary, OTL
Furthermore, not only the directness of his reception, but the content of his oracle distinctly sets apart the authority of Moses. The commanding nature of the Sinai covenant and its lasting impact on every aspect of the life and thought of Israelites (with which he is frequently associated) equally confer to him a superlatively authoritative standing. McBride summarizes this tradition as follows:

Significantly this [Ex 24:12 where Moses receives the Torah] is the first occurrence of the term “the Torah” in its general sense in the Mosaic portrait. What was first spoken through Moses to the people is now given a permanent existence and conveyed to Moses in a form called “the Torah and commandment,” so that through his service it would guide the covenant people throughout their future history. The use of the singular forms means the text refers to more than a series of particular stipulations. Rather, “the Torah” refers to a very comprehensive authority of guidance that was given to Moses. “The commandment” is the mandate found in and derived from the Torah in a continuing fashion. The substance of the Torah is not only content but authority and function intended to preserve the covenanted people in the covenant.9

The frequent reference to Moses in conjunction with the Torah further testifies to his prominent place occupied in the minds of Israelites. Although his name does not appear as frequently in the rest of the Old Testament as in the Pentateuch, the historical narratives often recognize the integral part Moses played at the Sinai event.10

---

9S. Dean McBride, Jr., “Transcendent Authority: The Role of Moses in Old Testament Traditions,” Int 44 (1990): 238. Thomas Dozeman, however, detects the transitional nature of the Mosaic role in Exodus 34:29-35. He posits that the masking and unveiling indicate the theocentric idealization of Moses at the expense of his personality, so that it is not Moses but Yahweh who is present in Moses’ presence. Thomas B. Dozeman, “Masking Moses and Mosaic Authority in Torah,” JBL 119 (2000): 21-45. However interesting, his suggestion appears to hang too much weight on a few passages, and his psychosociological reading does not take into account properly the preeminent emphasis on Moses unfolded in the following pericope.

10In the light of his vast importance in that literature and time, it is quite surprising that Moses as topic and name is mentioned so infrequently in the rest of the Old Testament. If it appears from this that the Mosaic presence is absent from the record in the other books, then appearances are deceiving. The
Josiah, for instance, charges his people to comply with the Levitical regulations that were given through Moses. The Hebrew text renders a vivid illustration of Moses’ role by means of the expression that the law was given into the hands of Moses (גָּדַע־כָּאָשָׁה, "act according to the word of Yahweh [given] in the hand of Moses," 2 Chr 35:6). Similarly, Ezra also records that a group of priests rebuilt the altar of God “as prescribed in the law of Moses” and identifies him as the man of God (אֶשְּרָה הַנֶּלֶכָּה, Ezr 3:2; similarly, Jos 14:6; 1 Chr 23:14; Ps 90:1; 1 Esd 5:49).  

**Sirach, the Assumption of Moses, and 1 Esdras.** The Hebrew scriptures’ emphasis on Moses as the mediator of the Torah is also found in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Tob 1:8; Bar 2:2, 28; Sus 1:3, 62; 2 Macc 7:30; 1 Esdr 1:6, 11; 5:49; 7:9; 8:3; 9:39). In addition, the privileged nature of his reception of the divine revelation is also recognized in this group of Jewish writings vis-à-vis the “face-to-face” phrase (Sir 45:5) and the pre-appointment language (As. Mos. 1:14):

> By his words he performed swift miracles; the Lord glorified him in the presence of kings. He gave him commandments for his people, and revealed to him his glory. For his faithfulness and meekness he consecrated him, choosing him out of all humankind. He allowed him to hear his voice, and led him into the dark cloud, and gave him the commandments face to face, the law of life and knowledge, so that he might teach Jacob the covenant, and Israel his decrees. (Sir 45:3-5)

Therefore, he has devised and invented me, I who have been prepared from the beginning of the world to be the mediator of his covenant. (As. Mos. 1:14)

And having testified, he also called on heaven and earth to be witneses, lest we should transgress his commandments, which he had mediated to us. (As. Mos.

above illustrations insist that by the charisms and tradition transmitted through him, he is present wherever spirit and Torah work together to bring Israel to God and God to Israel.” McBride, “Transcendent Authority,” 239.

11Some other examples of identifying the Torah with Moses include the following passages: 1 Kgs 2:3; 8:9; 14:6; 18:6, 12; 2 Kgs 21:8; 23:25; 1 Chr 6:49; 15:15; 22:13; 2 Chr 8:13; 23:18; 25:4; 30:16; 33:8; 34:14; 35:6, 12; Ezr 6:18; 7:6; Neh 1:7, 8; 8:1, 14; 9:14; 10:29; Dan 9:11, 13; Mal 4:4.

12On the other hand, the depiction of the Hellenistic apologists conforms to the Greek ideals that Moses is a great civilizer, philosopher, inventor, ideal king embodying the offices of legislator, high priest, prophet, and a “divine man.” Daniel K. Falk, “Moses,” in EDSS, 1:576-77.
Related to this emphasis on the authority of Moses is an interesting note from Scott Hafemann who writes that 1 Esdras shifts the emphasis from Moses' instrumental function in the transmission of the Torah in 2 Chronicles to his being the object (or the final destination) of the impartation.\(^{14}\)

Slaughter the passover lamb, sanctify yourselves, and on behalf of your kindred make preparations, acting according to the word of the LORD by (literally, "in the hand of") Moses. (2 Chr 35:6)

and kill the passover lamb and prepare the sacrifices for your kindred, and keep the passover according to the commandment of the Lord that was given to Moses. (1 Esdr 1:6)

The Hebrew idiom, "in the hand of (תְּנַח) Moses," as found in 2 Chronicles is replaced with "to Moses (תְּנַח מֹהָה") in 1 Esdras.\(^{15}\) Hafemann's observation could be tenable in two respects. First, the similarity in wording in both texts is so close that the Esdras passage is likely to have reread the Chronicles with the intention as suggested by Hafemann. Second, the expression, the Torah given to Moses, is surely a peculiar form since it does not appear anywhere else in the Old Testament. Common expressions for the law in relation to Moses are "the law of Moses" (1 Kgs 2:3; 2 Kgs 14:6; 2 Chr 23:18; 30:16; Ezra 3:2; 7:6; Neh 8:1; Dan 9:11, 13) and "the law given through (or by) Moses" (2 Chr 33:8; 34:14; Neh 8:14; 10:29).\(^{16}\)


\(^{15}\)For יא as an indication of "the agency or instrument," see *BDB*, 391. The dating of 1 Esdras is difficult to ascertain but it can be placed around 150 BCE. Jacob M. Myers, *I and II Esdras: Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, AB 42 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1974), 8-15.

\(^{16}\)Such expressions also abound in the Apocrypha: "the law of Moses" (Tob 1:8; 7:13; Bar 2:2; Sus 1:3, 62; 1 Esdr 8:1, 9:39); "the law given through Moses" (2 Macc 7:30). Similarly, 1QS 1:2-3 (James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls:*)
However, the two texts under discussion cannot be examined in isolation from the rest of the Hebrew canon and intertestamental Jewish writings, which reflect the Jewish interpretive currents of the period. The expressions, “the law of Moses” and “the law given through Moses” mentioned above logically presuppose that Yahweh gave the Torah to Moses in the first place. Another important factor is that some texts structure the language in such a way that Moses is identified as the one who gave the Torah to the Israelites.

This is the law that Moses set before the Israelites. These are the decrees and the statutes and ordinances that Moses spoke to the Israelites when they had come out of Egypt (Deut 4:44-45); All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law that Moses commanded us as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob. (Sir 24:23)

These texts, thus, demand the idea that Yahweh first gave the Torah to Moses, and he in turn delivered it to the nation of Israel. To put it another way, it is highly unfeasible to construe that Moses initially created and imparted the Torah. Contrary to Hafemann’s confident assertion, therefore, the logical inference of the passing on of the Torah, as discussed above, suggests that the Esdras passage may be a reflection of the common understanding among Jews in the time of its writing, instead of an intentional shift from the preposition of instrument to that of locative, in order to superimpose a “relecture” of the Chronicles passage. 17

4 Maccabees. Two other passages that refer to the authoritative position of Moses are also worthy of inquiry. Although Fourth Maccabees displays heavy Hellenization in its overall expression, as is especially evident in its emphasis on the possession of philosophical virtues, a verse in this book appears to equate the authority of

the Torah with that of Moses: “We are obviously putting our forebears to shame unless we should practice ready obedience to the law and to Moses our counselor” (4 Macc 9:2). However, the issues of geographic provenance (Asia Manor; whereas the provenance of the fourth evangelist is considered to be of Palestine) and dating (from the mid first century to early second centuries C.E.) considerably reduce the relevance of the document for the present discussion.18

2 Maccabees. Another example of early Jewish testimony to the Mosaic authority is attested to in 2 Maccabees 7.

The Lord God is watching over us and in truth has compassion on us, as Moses declared in his song that bore witness against the people to their faces, when he said, “And he will have compassion on his servants.” (2 Macc 7:6)

While she was still speaking, the young man said, “what are you waiting for? I will not obey the king’s command, but I obey the command of the law that was given to our ancestors through Moses.” (2 Macc 7:30)

Second Maccabees contains the narratives of Jewish persecutions wreaked by Antiochus IV and the ensuing Jewish revolt.19 Until chapters 6 and 7, Antiochus IV is depicted as an agent to carry out the divine wrath poured upon Israel for her unfaithfulness. It is, however, this very persecution that turned the wrath of God into the divine redemptive intervention on behalf of Jews as narrated on chapter seven onwards. In the course of

---

18H. Anderson, “4 Maccabees,” in OTP, 2:533-37; Jan Willem van Henten, The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees, JSJSup 57 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 73-91. For another example of the elevation of Moses in terms of his virtues as the grounds for the divine selection, see Sir 45:3-5: “By his words he performed swift miracles; the Lord glorified him in the presence of kings. He gave him commandments for his people, and revealed to him his glory. For his faithfulness and meekness he consecrated him, choosing him out of all humankind. He allowed him to hear his voice, and led him into the dark cloud, and gave him the commandments face to face, the law of life and knowledge, so that he might teach Jacob the covenant, and Israel his decrees.”

this turmoil, Moses is remembered as one who encourages others to be faithful to the Torah even to the point of martyrdom. The phrase, “Moses declared in his song,” in 2 Maccabees 7:6 harkens back to Deuteronomy 32:36 in the form of verbatim citation from the Greek Deuteronomy.20

Indeed the LORD will vindicate his people, have compassion on his servants, when he sees that their power is gone, neither bond nor free remaining.” (Deut 32:36)

In a series of persecutions geared to cause a forsaking of Jewish religious practices, a number of Jews went through awful tortures. It is in the midst of this tribulation that the present narrative recounts a mother with seven sons (2 Macc 7:1-6). This family is forced to eat swine flesh. Upon their defiance, the first son’s tongue and his four limbs are cut off. Ultimately, he was scalped and was fried to death. While watching this torture, the mother and the six brothers remember the divine promise promulgated in the lips of Moses that Yahweh will comfort his faithful and take vengeance upon the heathens.21 What the explicit reference to Moses seems to hint at is

---


21By this citation, they also recognize themselves to be the ones in whom the divine promise of Deut 32:36 has been fulfilled. Jonathan A. Goldstein, II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB 41A (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983), 304; Dommershausen Werner, 1 Makkabäer, 2 Makkabäer, 2nd ed., NEchtB 12 (Würzburg: Echter, 1995), 138. R. Doran takes this account to be a literary interpolation so as to increase the dramatic effect of the document. Robert Doran, “The Second Book of Maccabees,” in 1 & 2 Maccabees, Introduction to Hebrew Poetry, Job, Psalms, vol. 4 of NIB, ed. Leander E. Keck (Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 240. His reason is based only on the presence of the parallel folktales in other Jewish writings that speak of a mother with seven sons who bravely encounter
that Moses is recognized not only as the transmitter (2 Macc 7:30) but as the defender of the Torah at all costs (2 Macc 7:6).22

Qumran. In contrast to the various portrayals in other Jewish writings of the intertestamental period (both the Palestinian and Diaspora settings), the Qumran library demonstrates more or less a consistent view of Moses in three distinct terms: as an authoritative figure, a prophetic intercessor, and possibly an eschatological figure23 (virtually no reference is made concerning Moses as king regardless of some counter-arguments, and his priestly role of atonement is mentioned only briefly in passing in 4Q504 2 ix-x24). This section will concern only the first category, that of authority.25

That his authority is evidently acknowledged in the community of Qumran is observed in the juxtaposition of Moses with the Torah, which implics several ideas. First, Moses plays an identity marker role for the divine stipulations. In other words, when such an association is mentioned, it is the particular divine revelation given through Moses that is being referred to in the discourse. Such association is expressed in the following phrases: “the Torah of Moses,” “the laws commanded to Moses,” or “God spoke to Moses” (4Q174 2 ii 3, 4Q175 1 i, 4Q252 1 iv 2, 4Q270 11 i 20, 4Q377 2 ii 2), “by the hand of Moses” (which echoes 2 Chr 35:6; 1QS i 3, 4Q504 1 v 14), “God spoke through/by Moses” (1Q22 1 i, 1QM 10 vi, 1QHa 17 xii, 4Q255 1 iii, 4Q259 1 iii 6, a trial.

22For further elaborations of Moses as the authority figure in early Judaism, see Hafemann, “Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,” 80-88; Lierman, The New Testament Moses, 128-39.


24Falk, “Moses,” 576-77. It is not that the Qumran conceptual current is far removed from those reflected in other writings of early Judaism. Rather, the Dead Sea Scrolls constitute so important a part of early Judaism that they deserve a separate treatment.

25For a detailed discussion on Qumran’s view of Moses as the authoritative figure, see James E. Bowley, “Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Living in the Shadow of God’s Anointed,” in The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation, ed. Peter W. Flint, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 159-70.
4Q266 18 v 1-2, 4Q267 2 v-vi), "Moses said" (4Q266 3 ii 19, 4Q267 2 9), and "as it is written in the book of Moses" (4Q398 1 v, 4Q397 4 x, 4Q174).

Second, stemming from this first point is the conception that the authority of the Torah is in turn transferred to Moses. The identification of Moses' authority with that of the Torah is attested in several respects. For example, in addition to the first five books of the Hebrew Scriptures, the Qumran community attributed Mosaic authorship to a dozen more books.

The sheer number of these writings testifies to the overwhelming importance of Moses as the legitimator of religious ideas in Second Temple times. If the Bible did not say what you thought it should, what you were convinced God would have said through Moses but somehow neglected to say, then you took reed in hand and, as it were, wrote for Moses.²⁶

Moreover, towards the end of the rule section of the Damascus Document, the one who wishes to join the sect is repeatedly instructed to take an oath to "return to the Torah of Moses;"²⁷ Not only is the means of entering the community predicated upon Moses, but the identity of the members is defined by the tenacious determination to observe the rules set forth through and/or by him.²⁸ Finally, the Damascus Document also spells out the benefit of joining the band, that is, the departing of an evil angel, Mastema (lit.,

²⁶ Michael O. Wise, Martin G. Abegg, and Edward M. Cook, The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation, rev. ed. (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005), 427. The writings the Qumran community attribute to Moses as the author are Jubilees, the Words of Moses, rewritten Bible texts, the Test of a True Prophet, the Temple Scroll, the Apocryphon of Moses, and possibly the Discourse on the Exodus and Conquest.

²⁷ "But when he has imposed upon himself to return to the law of Moses with all his heart and all his soul." 4Q266 17 i 3 (CD 15:12); "with Israel, the covenant to revert to the law of Moses with the whole heart and [with] the who[le]." CD 15:9; "the law of Moses, for in it all is defined . . . . And the exact interpretation of their ages about the blindness . . . to the law of Moses, the angel Mastema will turn aside from following him, should he keep his words." 16:2. 5 (4Q271 2 ii 3-4). "This statement indicates that formally the Yahad viewed the Torah of Moses as the ultimate source of all Qumranic halakah and indeed of all things necessary for proper living," Bowley, "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 161. The Damascus Document appears to have originated from the Qumran community from around 100 B.C.E. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah, 122-23. For a comprehensive introduction to the Damascus Document, see Charlotte Hempel, The Damascus Texts, CQS I (Sheffield: Sheffield, 2000). Also, the members are called "the returnees to the Torah" and "the doers of Torah" (4Q171 2 ii-iii, xiv, xxii). John M. Allegro, Qumran Cave 4: 4 Q158-4 Q186, DJD 5 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 43-44. For the ultimate authority of the Mosaic law in the Qumran community, see Geza Vermes, "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in Its Historical Setting," LUOSA 6 (1966-68): 87.

²⁸ 1QS 5 vii-x (CD 15 viii-ix); DSS, 1:80-81.
"obstruction"), from new members. Conversely, however, any deliberate or negligent breach of the Torah of Moses is punishable by expulsion from the community.

Third, some scholars posit that the Qumran community understood themselves as preserving the authoritative interpretation of Moses as it is reflected in 4Q266 3 ii (=CD V 17-VI 7).

[For formerly] stood Moses and Aaron by the hand of the Prince of Lights, and Belial raised up Jannes and his [brother in his] plotting when he wrought evil [against Israel] in the beginning vacat. [And at the time of the destruction] of the [and], trespassers [arose] and led Israel astray [and the land became desolate], for they spoke defiantly against the commandments of God (given) through Moses, vacat and also against the anointed holy ones. And they prophesied falsely so as to cause Israel to turn away from God. And God recalled the covenant with the first ones, and he raised up men of understanding [from Aaron] and wise men from Israel, and [he] caused them to hear. And [they dug] the well of which Moses said, "the well was dug by the princes and excavated by the nobles of [the people], with a ruler" vacat. The "well" is the Law, [and those who "dug" it] are the penitent of Israel who departed from the land of Judah and sojourned in the dwellings [of Damascus], God [called them] all "princes" for they all [sought him, and their glory was not rejected] by anyone's mouth. vacat [And the "ruler" is the Interpreter of the Law, [of whom Isaiah said, "He takes out,"].

In this allegorically interpretive account, "the interpreter of the Law," which some

29"They shall muster him with the oath of the covenant which Moses made with Israel, the covenant to return to the Torah of Moses with all (his) heart and with all (his) soul. But when he takes upon himself to return to the Torah of Moses ... a man shall take upon himself (an oath) to return to the Torah of Moses ... and on the day when a man takes upon himself (an oath) to return to the Torah of Moses, the angel of Mastema shall turn aside from after him, if he fulfills his words." CD 15 viii-16 v (=4Q271 2 ii 6; James H. Charlesworth, ed., Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents, vol. 2 of The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, PTSDSSP [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1995], 39; 4Q270 6 ii 6, Joseph M. Baumgarten, ed., Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273), DJD 18 [Oxford: Clarendon, 1996], 179).


31"Dans ce contexte palestinien ... il apparaît que le Mohoqqeq, Interprète de la Torah, docteur suprême de la Communauté et chef de son exode ... est vraiment représenté comme un "nouveau Moïse."" Geza Vermes, "La Figure de Moïse au tournant des deux Testaments," in Moïse: L'homme de l'alliance, ed. Henri Cazelles (Paris: Descée, 1955), 81-82. Also, Naftali Wieder, "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," JJS 4 (1953): 172. Coupled with the witness of 4QMMT, Bowley suggests that the authoritative interpretation of the Qumran community is equated with the status of Moses. Bowley, "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 165-66.

32For the similar text that is missing the explicit reference to Moses, see CD V 17-VI 7 (= 4Q266 3 ii 1-15), Baumgarten, Qumran Cave 4. XIII, 97-98; Charlesworth, Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents, 22-23.
exegetes identify with Moses, is said to have retained the binding authority until the appearance of the "one who shall teach righteousness at the End of Days." (CD 6 xi) Three cautions, however, are in order concerning the "Interpreter of the Law" text. First, it could be an important indication that the explicit reference to Moses is missing in another version of the similar account (4Q266 3 ii 1-15), with the implication being that he is mentioned only peripherally in this text. Second, the equation of Moses with the Interpreter of the Law appears to distort the natural reading of the text concerning the role of Moses. Moses appears only as the medium by which the law was transmitted to the community, and the text does not seem to explicitly identify him with "the Interpreter of the Law." Finally, the "Interpreter of the Law" is mentioned three other times in the Qumran library. These three other references seem to refer to three different characters (one in 4Q174 3 x-xii in terms of David and another in terms of a priest or a prophet). These differing characterizations signify that the epithet was meaningful in terms of his function (e.g., an end-time redeemer) and not so much in his analogy to a specific historical figure. In view of these three observations, therefore, discernment should be exercised so as not to overestimate the authoritative place of Moses as based on the "Interpreter of the Law" texts.

34 Another point can be noted along this line of argument although it is an indirect one. Other Qumran documents, 4Q Patriarchal Blessings and 4Q Florilegium, juxtapose "the Interpreter of the Law" with a Davidic figure, not with that of Moses. Daniel R. Schwartz, "The Messianic Departure from Judah (4Q Patriarchal Blessings)," TZ 37 (1981): 257-66.
35 4Q174 3 x-xii seems to clearly indicate a Davidic figure in reference to the "Interpreter of the Law." The two other occurrences are from 4Q177 2 v (the text of which is too fragmentary to be certain about the identity of the figure) and CD 7 ix-8 ii. Scholars are divided over the identity of the figure in the latter text. For an argument for the prophetic figure, see Florentino Garcia Martinez, "Messianic Hopes in the Qumran Writings," in The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices, ed. Florentino Garcia Martinez and Julio Trebolle Barrera (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 182-84. For an argument for the priestly figure, see Michael A. Knibb, "Interpreter of the Law," in EDSS, 1:384. For an overview of the debate surrounding this title, see Hempel, The Damascus Texts, 75-77.
36 In this respect, one-sided is Hafemann's assessment concerning the place of Moses in the letter of Aristeas. "The incredible authority is vested in Moses. Moses does not derive his status from the law; the law derives its status from Moses!" Hafemann, "Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," in The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices, ed. Florentino Garcia Martinez and Julio Trebolle Barrera (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 182-84. For an argument for the priestly figure, see Michael A. Knibb, "Interpreter of the Law," in EDSS, 1:384. For an overview of the debate surrounding this title, see Hempel, The Damascus Texts, 75-77.
Lastly, a stunning instruction illuminates the status of Moses, in that the community forbids pronouncing the Torah of Moses, just as the divine names, because the law contains the spelled out names of Yahweh.

[He will not sw]ear by Aleph and Lamed (‘el = God) nor by Aleph and Daleth (‘adonai = the Lord), but by the oath of the youths, by the curses of the covenant. (blank) Neither should one mention the law of Moses, for in it is the full enunciation of the name. (CD-A XV 1-2 [4Q266 8 1-2])

As briefly discussed so far, Moses enjoyed an incomparable status as an authority figure in various strands of the Old Testament and the intertestamental Jewish writings. However, there seems to have been a tendency to elevate his status as he was remembered in the later post-biblical traditions.

**Moses as Prophet with Particular Emphasis on Intercession and Miracle-Working**

**The Old Testament.** Without a doubt, Moses is depicted as the prophet *par excellence* in the Hebrew Scriptures. The reason is, not because he is so frequently dubbed as such, but because the series of events surrounding his calling and subsequent sovereign nature in the transmission of the Torah, the document still holds, to a considerable degree, a belief in the providence of God in granting the wisdom to Moses. Cf. “In his [Moses’] wisdom the legislator ... endowed by God for the knowledge of universal truths surrounded us with unbroken palisades and iron walls to prevent our mixing with any of the other people in any matter, being thus kept pure in body and soul, preserved from false beliefs, and worshiping the only God omnipotent over all creation . . . . [The king] commanded this man, and said to the next, ‘How can one avoid doing anything contrary to the Law?’ To this he replied, ‘By realizing that God has given to legislators the purpose of saving men’s lives, you would follow them.” *Let. Aris.* v. 139, 240 (in *OTP*, 2:22, 28). Moreover, the designation, “the legislators,” in the plural form does not always refer to Moses in the document as Hafemann suggests. Starting with Victor Tcherikover, the majority of scholars maintain that the document reflects the Jewish contentment with the Hellenistic elements that were compatible with Palestinian Judaism. Although often described in positive terms, however, such adaptation reveals the compromised nature of the letter, most starkly observed in its identification of Yahweh with Zeus (see *Let. Aris.* v. 16 [in *OTP*, 2:13]). For the positive acceptance of Hellenism in the letter, see Victor Tcherikover, “Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas,” *HTR* 2 (1958): 59-86; Naomi Janowitz, “Translating Cult: The Letter of Aristeas and Hellenistic Judaism,” *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 347-57; Jonathan Goldstein, “Jewish Acceptance and Rejection of Hellenism,” in *Semitics, Iranians, Greeks, and Romans: Studies in Their Interactions*, BJS 217 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1990), 27; John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*, 2nd ed., BRS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 97-102, 191-94.


ministry set forth the pattern of a prophet’s life followed by other Hebrew prophets.\textsuperscript{39}

Some qualities corollary to his life and ministry as a prophet can be discussed in two subcategories: his performing of miracles and his intercessory role.\textsuperscript{40}

First, the signs and wonders that Moses performed entitle him to be called the greatest prophet. Some later Old Testament traditions remember the miracles wrought against Egypt as the grandiose manifestation of the divine power, and, thus, he is symbolically portrayed as the protector of the nation of Israel: “By a prophet the LORD brought Israel up from Egypt, and by a prophet he was guarded” (Hos 12:13).

Furthermore, the Deuteronomist defies comparison of the number and magnitude of his miracles with those of other prophets:

He was unequaled for all the signs and wonders that the LORD sent him to perform in the land of Egypt, against Pharaoh and all his servants and his entire land, and for all the mighty deeds and all the terrifying displays of power that Moses performed in the sight of all Israel. (Deut 34:11-12)

As such, J. McConville even detects the analogy of Moses with Yahweh in this text (i.e., it is Moses who performed the miracles): “And remarkably, the language typically used of Yahweh himself in Deuteronomy to describe the defeat of Pharaoh and the powerful feats of the exodus from Egypt (4:34) is now used of Moses.”\textsuperscript{41} However, this notion


\textsuperscript{40}Although the reception and transmission of divine oracles often mark the outset of prophetic commission (as discussed in the previous section), the enormous magnitude of the Sinai covenant for the life and thought of Israelites merits a separate treatment as it is a common pattern of procedure for studies on Moses.

\textsuperscript{41}J. Gordon McConville, \textit{Deuteronomy}, AOTC 5 (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2002), 478.
gravely overlooks the explicit reference to God as the source of Moses’ miracles in verse eleven and his reluctance to follow the divine initiative especially at the inauguration of his mission to Pharaoh (Exod 4:1-17).

Turning now to the intercessory function of a prophet’s ministry, Moses exceeds other intercessory prophets as well. His intercession begins with calling upon Yahweh for the deliverance of Pharaoh and Egyptian officials, and his prayer, on behalf of the fellow Israelites, continues to appear in a large part of the Pentateuch (Exod 32, Num 11, 14, 21, 32, Deut 9). Although he failed to have his request answered, his intercessory ministry reaches its climax in Exodus 32:30-32 where he risks his own existence on behalf of the rebellious Israelites.

Sirach, 2 Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon. In early Jewish writings, Moses is also remembered for the signs and wonders wrought through him:

“By his words he performed swift miracles; the Lord glorified him in the presence of kings.” (Sir 45:3a)

Just as Moses prayed to the Lord, and fire came down from heaven and consumed the sacrifices, so also Solomon prayed, and the fire came down and consumed the

---

42 It is debated whether this particular ministry was a constitutive quality for a prophet. Contrary to the assessment of the previous scholarship (F. Hesse, A. S. Herbert, H. G. Reventlow, J. Jeremias, and A. B. Rhodes), Samuel Balentine argued that the intercessory ministry is not a mark of Jewish prophets. Only four figures manifest a considerable degree of intercessory ministry: Abraham, Moses, Samuel, and Jeremiah. Samuel E. Balentine, “The Prophet as Intercessor: A Reassessment,” JBL 103 (1984): 161-73. On the contrary, however, Widmer notes frequent references to the intercessory ministry of the Hebrew prophets and non prophetic figures. Widmer, Moses, God, and the Dynamics of Intercessory Prayer, 80-85.

43 “Moses said to Pharaoh, ‘Kindly tell me when I am to pray for you and for your officials and for your people, that the frogs may be removed from you and your houses and be left only in the Nile’” (Ex 8:9); “The people came to Moses and said, ‘We have sinned by speaking against the LORD and against you; pray to the LORD to take away the serpents from us.’ So Moses prayed for the people” (Num 21:7); “The LORD was so angry with Aaron that he was ready to destroy him, but I interceded also on behalf of Aaron at that same time” (Deut 9:20).

44 “On the next day Moses said to the people, ‘You have sinned a great sin. But now I will go up to the LORD; perhaps I can make atonement for your sin.’ So Moses returned to the LORD and said, ‘Alas, this people has sinned a great sin; they have made for themselves gods of gold. But now, if you will only forgive their sin—but if not, blot me out of the book that you have written’” (Ex 32:30-32). For a detailed treatment of Moses as an intercessor as depicted in the Pentateuch, see Robert Martin-Achard, “Moïse, figure du médiateur selon l'Ancien Testament,” CRTP 11 (1984): 107-28; Wesley J. Fuerst, “Moses as Intercessor,” in Scripture and Prayer: A Celebration for Carroll Stuhlmueller, ed. Carolyn Osiek and Donald Senior (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1988), 5-19; Widmer, Moses, God, and the Dynamics of Intercessory Prayer, 89-349.
whole burnt offerings. (2 Macc 2:10)\(^{45}\)

The Wisdom of Solomon also relates the miraculous Exodus events in chapters 11 through 19, which are preceded by the title of Moses, the "holy prophet."\(^ {46}\)

**The Assumption of Moses.** Furthermore, his intercession is recounted frequently in the *Assumption of Moses*. The book records the intense intercessory ministry of Moses, to which God has appointed him.

Or who will pray for them, not omitting one single day, so that I can lead them into the land of the Amorites? ... For their (number) was a hundred thousand, but now they have grown into this multitude here, only because of your prayers, lord Moses. ... If the enemies will sin against their Lord once more, there is no longer an advocate for them, who will supplicate to the Lord for them, as Moses was, the great messenger, who bent his knees on earth every hour of the day and of the night, praying; and who could look at him who rules the entire world with mercy and justice, reminding him of the covenant with the fathers, and placating the Lord. ... The Lord has appointed me for them and for their sins that I should pray and supplicate for them. (*As. Mos.* 11:11, 14, 17, 12:6)\(^ {47}\)

An interesting note about Moses in the *Assumption of Moses*, however, deserves a separate treatment.\(^ {48}\)

And then his kingdom will appear in his entire creation. And then the devil will come to an end, and sadness will be carried away together with him. Then the hands of the messenger, when he will be in heaven, will be filled, and he will then avenge them against their enemies. (*As. Mos.* 10:1-2)\(^ {49}\)

In an eschatological context, the messenger is depicted as a divine agent/mediator who executes the divine wrath upon the ungodly. The key question is the identity of the

---

\(^{45}\)Coogan, *The New Oxford Annotated Apocrypha*, 249. Second Maccabees 2:10, which Hafemann deals with under the category of "authority" ("Moses in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha," 82-84), seems to better fit the intercession category.


\(^{48}\)Although the earliest extant manuscript is in Latin, the original text is considered to be of Semitic origin written in first century Palestine. J. Priest, "Testament of Moses," in *OTP*, 1:920-21.

“messenger (nuntius)” in verse 2. Since the word seems to have been translated from the Greek synonym ἀγγέλος, some scholars suggested that it refers to an angelic being. However, three observations strongly suggest the referent of the word as being Moses. First, the lack of any reference to an angelic figure as an eschatological divine agent elsewhere in the document precludes such a conclusion. In addition, the word “nuntius” usually refers to a human agent in other Latin writings similar to the Assumption of Moses. Second, in the same book, Moses is denoted as arbiter (μεσίτης, “mediator”) in 1:14 and magnus nuntius in 11:17. Finally, the literary context of this document, i.e., a testament of Moses to Joshua, suggests that Moses could be the object of this narrative. As such, the messenger in the pericope seems to connote a Moses redivivus figure, an agent of divine judgment. The composite picture of Moses from this book (particularly 10:2, 11:16-17, and 12:6) is that he is a chief intercessor and mediator for Israel.

Qumran. Much as in the Hebrew scriptures and early Jewish literature, Moses is also considered as the prophet par excellence in the Qumran documents. The Jewish traditions on Moses can be broken down into two broad categories: first, as he is seen in the images as depicted in the Hebrew scriptures as the law-giver, an intercessor, a receiver of revelations concerning the end-times, and, second, as an ideal human figure so portrayed in Greek apologetical writings (Atistobulus, Artapanus, Philo, and Josephus) in terms of the great civilizer, philosopher, inventor, the ideal king, and a divine man. This section will concern Moses’ role as the miracle-worker and intercessor seen in the

Qumran library.

It is, however, somewhat perplexing to observe that virtually no Qumran document elaborates on or explicitly mentions Moses as a miracle-worker. Charlesworth’s concordance lists no juxtaposition of Moses with the noun, “signs (תְּמִיץ),” which, however, occurs about a hundred times in the Qumran library without reference to him.\(^5^4\) The complete lack of a general entry to semantic synonyms to תְּמִיץ, such as, miracle, sign, or wonders, in Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls is also highly indicative of the community’s disinterest in the miracle-working aspect of the prophet.\(^5^5\) In the Qumran literature, the word, “sign,” is generally mentioned as an indicator of true prophets or divine prophecy.\(^5^6\) However, this lack of interest in Moses in terms of a miracle-worker may well explain the similar indifference in the prophet Elijah who is above all recalled as the miracle worker in the biblical tradition but not in the Qumran texts (see pp. 96-98 in this dissertation). Hence it is possible to postulate on the basis of the two observations mentioned above that the Qumran community was not preoccupied with the miracle-working aspect of the prophets. This orientation may be due to the community’s belief that, although the eschaton is expected to arrive soon, it had not come to pass yet. Therefore, the signs were not as important as the inspired interpretation. Despite the minor interest, however, in the miracle-working aspect, he is still portrayed as the yardstick by which a true prophet is determined. Such a notion is expressed particularly in three documents: the Temple Scroll, 4Q175 (4QTestimonia), and the Apocryphon of Moses (4Q375-76; 1Q22; 1Q29). These writings will be further


examined in detail later under the subheading of "Moses as the eschatological prophet."

Turning to the image of Moses as an intercessor, a number of passages can be mentioned. In an allusion to the golden calf episode of Exodus, 4Q504 mentions that, on account of Moses’ atonement, God took pity on Israelites: “You [God] became angry with them to destroy them; but you took pity on them in your love for them, and on account of your covenant—for Moses atoned for their sin—and so that they would know your great power and your abundant kindness for everlasting generations.”

4Q374, in passing, mentions Moses as “a mediator for your people” (לְאֵלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, 4Q374 7 ii):

“[. . .] your . . . blank [. . .] [. . .] a mediator for your people [. . .] [. . .] clouds, and above [. . .] [. . .] [. . .].”

2Q21 also recounts the intercession of Moses:

[. . . Nadab and Ab[i]hu, Elca[zar and Ithamar . . . [. . . in order to do] you justice in truth, and in order to reprove with faith[ful]ness [. . .] blank [. . .] [And Moses went outsid]e the camp and pleaded with YHWH and bowed do[w]n before [. . .] [And he said: YHWH Go[d], how can I look at you, and how can I li[ft] my face [towards you . . .] [. . .] one nation by your d[e]eds [. . .]. (2Q21 =2QApocryphon of Moses)

In analogous terms with the Old Testament, 4Q368 also documents the effectiveness of Moses’ intercession, resulting from his direct encounter with Yahweh (e.g., face to face):

[. . .] [. . .] [. . .] [. . . and he spoke wi[th] Moses [these] words [. . . Exod 33:11-13 and YHWH spoke to Moses face to face] to face as [one man speaks to another. And Moses said to YHWH: “Se]e [y]ou are telling [me: Lead up this people. But you have not made known to me] whom you will send with me. [You have said: I know you by name. And also: You have found favour] in [my] ey[es]. But now, if [I have really found favour in your eyes, make then your way known to me] so [that]. (4Q368 1)

However, one of the more interesting accounts is the notion of Moses’ heavenly intercession as recorded in several ascension narratives. With a series of

---

57 4Q504 1 ii 8-11 (DSS, 2:12-13); Maurice Baillet, Qumrán Grotte 4 III (4Q482-4Q520), DJD 7 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 139-41. The Deuteronomy text is not crystal-clear, but seems to speak of the unabated divine wrath even in the face of Moses’ intercession.


59 DSS, 1:214-17.

60 Ibid, 2:726-27.
catenae from Deuteronomy (1:3, 9-18; 6:10-11; 11:17; 15; 27:9-19; 28:15), 1Q22

(1QWords of Moses) 1-3 depicts Moses as one who establishes a covenant between God and Israel and charges the obedience to the decrees. The first half of the fourth (which is the last) column presents an account of a heavenly council:

In the congregation of the gods [and in the council of the holy ones, and in their [ ... , in favour of the sons of Israel and on behalf of the land. And] take from [its blood and] pour (it) on the earth [ ... ] ... [and atonement shall be made] for them by it [ ... And] Moses [spoke saying:] Observe. (1Q22 4 1-3)

The extensive presence of lacunae, however, only allows one to posit some type of connection between Moses and the atonement.

On the other hand, the ambiguous role of Moses in 1Q22 receives illumination in view of 4Q378 (4QApocryphon of Joshua) 26 which contains a similar heavenly council account.

... and who knows the knowledge of the Most High and m[ ... ]
... h man of God made known to us according to o[ ... ]
... and the congregation of the Most High gave ear to the voice of M[oses ... ]
... his m[ ... ] and b[ ... ] God Most Hi[g ... ]
... great signs and he restrained his wrath
... acts of [kindness and until its ages remember
... o[ ... ] unto l[n ... ]
... vacat
... ]o[ ... ]oo[h[ ... ]

It is clear from the text that Moses appealed to the celestial assembly and his intercession placated the divine wrath. In this respect, some scholars juxtapose this text with 4Q427 7

61Ibid., 1:58-63.
62Ibid., 1:62-63. The composition of the heavenly council consists of divine beings (םנ). For a survey on the meaning of this word, see S. B. Parker, “Sons of (the) God(s),” in DDD, 794-800.
63Van Henten’s assessment that this pericope presents Moses as an intercessor seems to be merely a conjecture. van Henten, “Moses as Heavenly Messenger in Assumptio Mosis 10:2 and Qumran Passages,” 224.
64Carol A. Newsom, “4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua,” in Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25-26. Juli 1993, ed. Heinz-Josef Fabry, Armin Lange, and Hermann Lichtenberger, SIJD 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 56-57. The translation of Martínez and Tigchelaar is as follows: “[ ... ] having the knowledge of the Most High and [seeing] the vision [of Shaddai ... ] the man of God an[nounced us, according [ ... ] and the assembly of Elyon; they paid attention to the voice of Moses ... ] ... [ ... ] God Most High ... ] great signs; and in anger he restrained ... ] ... man of the [pi]ous ones and until its ages remember ... eternal, to [ ... ]” DSS, 2:748-49.
and 4Q491 11-12, in order to further identify the deified nature of the enthroned Moses:

"[My] office is among the gods!" (4Q427 7 i 11); “For I have sat on a [throne] in the heavens.” (4Q491 11 i 13) Nevertheless, the identification of the character in 4Q491 is under severe debate (i.e., “the Teacher of Righteousness,” Moses, and Melchizedek). Furthermore, the figurative genre of the text must be taken into consideration making it uncertain whether the person is related to the historical figure or if the text is simply intended to justify the existence of the community via symbolic language. What the foregoing observations point out is that Moses was held in high regard, and some post-biblical Jewish sources entertain the elevated status of Moses via ascension narratives. Therefore, open to dispute is the extent to which these writings intend to promote the super-human or quasi-divine characteristics of Moses.

---

65The entire text of 4Q491 11 is as follows: "[...] has done awesome things marvelously [...] [... in the strength] of his power the just exult, and the holy ones rejoice in [...] in justice [...] he established [Israel] from eternity; his truth and the mysteries of his wisdom in all generations [...] might [...] [...] [... the perfect ones of [...] eternal; a mighty throne in the congregation of the gods above which none of the kings of the East shall sit, and their nobles not [...] silence (?) [... my glory is in {comparable} and besides me no-one is exalted, nor comes to me, for I reside in [...], in the heavens, and there is no [...]. I am counted among the gods and my dwelling is in the holy congregation; [my] desire is not according to the flesh, [but] all that is precious to me is in (the) glory of [...] the holy [dwell]ing. Who has been considered despicable on my account? And who is comparable to me in my glory? Who, like the sailors, will come back and tell? [...] Who bears all] sorrows like me? And who (suffer) evil like me? There is no-one. I have been instructed, and there is no teaching comparable [to my teaching [...] And who will attack me when [I] open my mouth? And who can endure the flood of my lips? And who will confront me and retain comparison with my judgment? [...] friend of the king, companion of the holy ones [incomparable, f]or among the gods is [my] position, and my glory is with the sons of the king. To me (belongs) [pure] gold, and to me, the gold of Ophir [...] [... exult,] just ones, in the God of [...] in eternal happiness; and there is no [...] to establish the horn of [his] Messiah[...] [...] to make known his power with strength [...]” DSS, 2:980-81.


Moses as Royal Figure

The Old Testament. In the ancient world, royal and priestly roles are often closely interrelated. In this respect, some scholars propose that the Pentateuchal depiction of Moses as the mediator confers on him a royal office based on adjacent Ancient Near-Eastern traditions.⁶⁸ Although the connection between kingship and priesthood in early Jewish tradition is beyond the scope of this research, a close examination of a selective number of passages related to the kingship of Moses is hoped to substantiate such a suggestion.

Two Old Testament passages are usually referred to with reference to the royal office of Moses. The first passage is from Exodus 4:20 in which Moses is said to carry with him “the staff (תּוּרְפָּא) of God” as he embarked on the journey back to Egypt: “So Moses took his wife and his sons, put them on a donkey and went back to the land of Egypt; and Moses carried the staff of God in his hand” (Exod 4:20). Some exegetes suggest that “the staff of God” connotes Moses’ royal standing.⁶⁹ Their judgment is based on two observations. The word refers to the scepter of a ruler mentioned elsewhere in the Old Testament (Ezek 19:11, 14; Ps 110:2) and a later rabbinic interpretation understood the staff as a royal scepter.⁷⁰ For instance, a Midrash on Psalm 21:2 reads as following: “Yet Moses was allowed to take the scepter of the Holy One, blessed be He, for it is said Moses took the scepter of God in his hand” (Exod 4:20).

However, their view appears to be problematic. The royal usage of תּוּרְפָּא and its cognate words in the Old Testament is extremely rare. Only three out of two hundred fifty-three occurrences of this word and its cognates refer to an explicit royal connotation. Those three royal usages appear only in Ezekiel 19 and Psalm 110. In those fifty-plus instances, originally referring to parts of a tree, the word, תּוּרְפָּא, and its synonym, בַּעַל, 

---

are most often translated as “tribe.” In contrast to another synonym, פְּלִיוֹן (which usually involved an authority figure such as a father, a king, or God), פְּלִיוֹן is usually associated with a shepherd’s staff or lower authoritative figures such as a priest, prince, or tribal leader rather than with God or king. Furthermore, not only is it anachronistic to read the midrashic passage back into the Exodus (for the same reason, that of Ezekiel and Psalm into the Exodus), but the Exodus passage in its literary context does not require a royal reading of Moses’ undertaking of the journey or his staff. Although some scholars point to the reading of the Greek Old Testament, which qualifies the staff as “from God (τὴν ράβδον τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ),” the divine provenance of the rod does not necessarily suggest the kingship of the recipient, as much as it does the divine instrumentality of the carrier.

Deuteronomy 33:4-5 is the other passage that is often adduced to promote the royal standing of Moses:

Moses charged us with the law, as a possession for the assembly of Jacob. There arose a king in Jeshurun, when the leaders of the people assembled—the united tribes of Israel. (Deut 33:4-5)

The thirty-third chapter of Deuteronomy, which is often called the “blessing of Moses,” contains Moses’ last testament to the Israelites. Structurally, verses one through five and twenty-six through twenty-nine bracket the chapter. The former recounts the blessings of

71 TDOT, an older dictionary, finds a relatively wide use of the word in the royal sense, but Newer dictionaries, such as NIDOTTE and HALOT, find minimal instances (for HALOT none). Cf. H. Simian-Yoffe, "פְּלִיוֹן" in TDOT, 8:241-49; David Fouts, "פְּלִיוֹן," in NIDOTTE, 2:924; idem, "פלים," in NIDOTTE, 4:27; HALOT, 1:573, 2:1990.


74 G. Schneider also takes ράβδος of Moses in Exod 20:4 as a mere rod. G. Schneider, “ράβδος,” in TDNT, 6:967.
Yahweh granted upon Israel and the latter reminds Israelites of their privileged status as God's chosen ones. Verses 6 through 25 speak of prophecies concerning the twelve tribes. The first three Hebrew words in verse 5 can be literally translated as “there arose a king in Jeshurun” or “he became a king in Jeshurun” (ךלאר ב "יושבון ב "יושבון). Because the referent of the waw consecutive is not clearly designated, Moses, the subject of the previous sentence, is often pointed out as the implied subject in verse five.76

However, this reading encounters exegetical problems in two respects. First, the immediately proceeding context manifests a progression of thought with the emphasis on the kingship of Yahweh.

He said: The LORD came from Sinai, and dawned from Seir upon us; he shone forth from Mount Paran. With him were myriads of holy ones; at his right, a host of his own. Indeed, O favorite among peoples, all his holy ones were in your charge; they marched at your heels, accepted direction from you. (Deut 33:2-3)

Coupled with verses 26 through 29 which also praise Yahweh for his majesty, therefore, the royal language of verses two and three suggests the subject of king in verse five to be Yahweh as well.77 In particular, verse five can be seen as standing in parallel with verse

75ךלאר" occurs only four times in the Old Testament and it is usually considered as a euphemism for Israel and/or Jacob. M. J. Mulder, "ךלאר" in TDOT, 6:472-77.

76J. R. Porter, Moses and Monarchy: A Study in the Biblical Tradition of Moses (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), 14 n. 35; Lierman, The New Testament Moses, 80-81. Lierman also brings forward some later rabbinic interpretation of the text in terms of Mosaic kingship (ibid., 81-82). These traditions, however, do not constitute definitive evidence due to their late date of composition. In addition, some exegetes point to the change of the waw-consecutive into the future tense in LXX as a hint at an expectation of Moses redivivus' arrival as a kingly figure. Odo Camponovo, Königstum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjudischen Schriften, QBO 58 (Freiburg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995), 387; John W. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy, SBLSCS 39 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 541; Lierman, The New Testament Moses, 82-83. However, it is equally important to note that LXX changesךלאר into ἄρχων. In using a much diminished expression, LXX seems to have sought to convey a coming of a leader rather than a royal figure. Revised Standard Version clarifies the subject of verse 5 to be Yahweh but New Revised Standard Version changed it to an improper pronoun: “there arose a king.” Thus, NRSV leaves open the possibility of the referent to be Moses.

26:

There arose a king in Jeshurun, when the leaders of the people assembled—the united tribes of Israel. (Deut 33:5)

There is none like God, O Jeshurun, who rides through the heavens to your help, majestic through the skies. (Deut 33:26)

The presence of God side by side with Jeshurun in verse twenty-six renders it highly reasonable to take “king” in verse five as Yahweh.

Furthermore, although Moses can be said to have played a partial role of king, the general tenor of Deuteronomy prevents conferring him a full title as such. In his comment on the text under discussion, D. L. Christensen precisely sums up the Ancient Israelites’ attitude towards the kingship idea.

In giving the Torah, Moses functions as a prophet; but he also takes on much of the functions of “a king” in his capacity as leader in ancient Israel. At the same time, it is important to note that Moses never takes upon himself the name or the position of royalty... They [Israelites] made God their king. At least that is what it was at the outset, in the teaching of Moses... The principle that God alone is in reality king in Israel means that God’s official spokesperson, the prophet like Moses, must share political authority alongside the designated king, who was originally known as a "ןָּבֶל", "leader" in the sense of being a permanent warlord, rather than a "אָבְל", "king."78

At the least, it could be said that some Deuteronomy texts seem to allow room for the establishment of kingship in Israel.79 Nonetheless, the power of king in ancient Israel is substantially limited in comparison with those of the surrounding Near Eastern empires. The restrictions of the Deuteronomistic circumscription include the following: the source of power being Yahweh; no power to grant land; no inherent right to make an executive decision; appointed by people, and no military figure.80 As such, the royal office of

Abingdon, 1998), 534.


Moses constitutes an extremely thin conceptual trajectory in the Hebrew Bible:

Deuteronomy evidently intends somehow to circumscribe or restrict the powers of the king. The king as presented here differs enormously from that of the usual ancient Near Eastern concept of the king as the chief executive in all aspects of the nation's life.\footnote{McConville, “King and Messiah in Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic History,” 276-78.}

James Watts also notes the fundamental incongruity between the Ancient Near Eastern kings and those of Israel. That is, the Jewish kings never gave a law, whereas the former group was often marked by the proclamation of laws. In addition, a stark contrast is observed between the image of Moses and that of David, the ideal king figure. Thus, “Deuteronomy characterizes Moses less in royal terms than as prophet and teacher/scribe, characterizations that the book’s position in the larger Pentateuch both amplifies and restricts.”\footnote{James W. Watts, “The Legal Characterization of Moses in the Rhetoric of the Pentateuch,” \textit{JBL} 117 (1998): 416-18.}

Finally, remarks are in order concerning the methodology employed by Lierman and others. Caution can be expressed in two respects. First, they impose foreign materials onto the Old Testament texts so as to corroborate the presence of the “prophet-king” motif. A great deal of Near Eastern literature and extra-biblical sources have been adduced to make a case on their behalf. However, they draw too little attention to the exegesis of the actual Old Testament passages. Too often, the aforementioned extra-biblical (virtually always much later) sources are brought forth to support their thesis. For example, Lierman spends about four pages (pp. 79-81 and 84-86) in a discussion of the Old Testament passages which allegedly speak of Moses as a royal figure. Then, he goes on to the examination of the extra-biblical sources for the rest of the chapter (pp. 79-123).\footnote{Lierman, \textit{The New Testament Moses}, 79-123. Even worse, Wayne Meeks reserves no section for a discussion of the “prophet-king” concept found in the Old Testament, for Moses or any other prophets. Meeks, \textit{The Prophet-King}.} This disproportion leaves a reader wondering whether
there really is a strand of thought in terms of Mosaic king-prophet in the Old Testament or it is simply a product of later embellishments. Furthermore, Lierman and others refer to only three verses (Exod 4:20; Deut 18:15; 33:5) out of the entire books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, which they believe speak of Moses' kingship. Such a dearth of references is surprising as one would expect that such an important theme as the kingship of Moses (especially in view of his prominence in the Pentateuch) would appear more often.

Another exegetical fallacy of Lierman and others is their employment of ill-defined terms. For instance, Lierman brings up David and Saul to propose that the prophetic office and that of a king were conceived as overlapping in the Old Testament traditions. As true as they are in the cases of David and Saul, it is a totally different matter to claim that the same holds true of Moses, who lived in the pre-Monarchy period. Lierman quotes K. Berger who states that prophets can play a royal function. However, it is fallacious to generalize some particular instances. Saul, in particular, was mockingly dubbed as a prophet (1 Sam 10:10-11; 19:23-24). In addition, although David and Saul may have played both kingly and prophetic functions at times, it would be more accurate to admit that the overlapping of the roles took place on only a few occasions and that they were seen primarily as kings. Certainly, only the two examples from a long line of the Israelite monarchy tradition seem rather meager as conclusive evidence.

God language of Moses in Exodus, Sirach, and Philo. In analogical language, Exodus 4:16 seems to depict Yahweh as conferring a divine status to Moses.

84 Although Lierman finds a kingship motif in Deut 18:15 (Lierman, The New Testament Moses, 82-89), McConville detects an important demarcation between king and prophet from the text. Yahweh chooses king and priest through public ceremony performed by people. On the other hand, prophet is chosen privately as need arises. Thus, it is necessary to have means to confirm the true prophethood. That is explicated in vv. 16-17. That is whenever prophecy comes true then a prophet could be regarded as a true messenger of God. McConville, Deuteronomy, 302.


(also Exod 7:1, which literally reads, "I give you, a god, to Pharaoh"):87 “The LORD said to Moses, ‘See, I have made you like God to Pharaoh, and your brother Aaron shall be your prophet.’” Although the language of the text is intriguing, it does not seem to be intended to focus on the ontic transformation of Moses. The point of such a stark simile (note also that it is a simile not a metaphor) is to indicate God’s sovereignty over a series of ensuing events. In the course of time, Moses was to play as a divine instrument so as to facilitate the outworking of the divine redemptive plan. John Durham articulates so well the functionality of the “god-language” with reference to Moses in terms of divine sovereignty.

Thus a question of Moses is once again an opening for an assertion of Yahweh that makes clear that Moses (and this time, Aaron as well) is but an instrument of God’s activity . . . That Moses is to be a god to Pharaoh will be Yahweh’s doing, not his . . . The assertion that Moses is to be made a god (יְהֹוָה) to Pharaoh, and that Aaron will function as his prophet (אָנָב, “spokesman”) is to be understood as a credit to Yahweh and not to Moses or to Aaron . . . Yahweh makes it clear that both Moses (and in this passage also Aaron) and Pharaoh are to be instruments in the proof of his Presence.88

Three observations in particular reinforce this judgment. First, the linguistic inability of Moses does not add up to his alleged divine status.89 Second, that Yahweh is the subject of conferring the supposed divine quality to Moses is as significant as his hardening of Pharaoh. In other words, Moses is no more special, especially in view of his hesitation to carry out the divine commission, than Pharaoh in what would unfold as divine instruments. Finally, the following context repeatedly highlights the role of

87 Durham, Exodus, 85. Some scholars speculate the divinization of Moses in the text as a result of the tension between the priestly source and prophetic source which were incorporated into the Pentateuch. For a summary of scholarly debates on the issue, see Brevard S. Childs, The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary, OTL (Louisville: Westminster, 1973), 113-14; William H. C. Propp, Exodus 1-18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 284-86.

88 Durham, Exodus, 86-87. Childs also notes the function, not the ontological statement, by means of the “god language,” Childs, The Book of Exodus, 118. Terence Fretheim takes this god-language as divine self-effacement. However, the subsequent divine miracles in the literary context speak against such an assessment because the subject of the signs is expressively designated as Yahweh. Cf. Terence E. Fretheim, Exodus, Int (Louisville: John Knox, 1991), 90-91.

89 Propp, Exodus 1-18, 282.
Yahweh as the sole conductor who is responsible for orchestrating the subsequent divine miracles. Accordingly, the aforementioned observations foster the conclusion that the god-language in Exodus 4:16 and 7:1 does not promote the idea of a deified Moses.

In addition, a later interpretive tradition consolidates the non-deification reading of the text. For instance, an interesting allusion to Exodus 4:16 and 7:1 is attested to in Sirach 45:1-5 in which Moses was said to have been made “equal in glory to the holy ones”:

And was beloved by God and people, Moses, whose memory is blessed. He made him equal in glory to the holy ones, and made him great, to the terror of his enemies. By his words he performed swift miracles; the Lord glorified him in the presence of kings. He gave him commandments for his people, and revealed to him his glory. (Sir 45:1-3)

Instead of Yahweh, Sirach explicitly compares the status of Moses with that of angels in his reference to “holy ones (ἄγιοι).” The deification of Moses in this Sirach passage has been asserted on the basis of its connection with 4Q374, which, some exegetes argue, contains a reference to Moses’s deification upon ascension into heaven. However, the texts of Deuteronomy, Sirach, and the Qumran library only speak in an analogical sense. That is, Moses is likened to Yahweh or angels with reference to some shared nature between them. It is evident that the prophet shares some divine qualifications or attributes, but the exact nature of the shared attributes is uncertain. Philo’s comment on the deification of Moses (in Exod 7:1) probably is an important indicator, for highly Hellenized Jewish thinkers, such as Philo himself, understood the divine entitlement of Moses not as ontological (i.e., “not in reality”) but as functional and representational (i.e.,

---


Wayne Meeks points to Mos. 1:158-59 where Moses is “named god and king of the whole nation” and is taken into the divine realm. His analysis, however, ignores the context that the providence of God is the cause of Moses’ exaltation:

For, since God judged him worthy to appear as a partner of His own possessions, He gave into his hands the whole world as a portion well fitted for His heir. . . . Perhaps, too, since he was destined to be a legislator, the providence of God which afterwards appointed him without his knowledge to that work, caused him long before that day to be the reasonable and living impersonation of law. (Mos. 1:155c, 162a)

Due to the highly symbolic or figurative conception of the text, a more explicit and literal description mentioned above should be taken more seriously into account. The foregoing observation of these intertestamental Jewish texts suggests that the “divine language” in these texts seems to point to Moses’ exalted and privileged status as an agent of Yahweh.

The Exagoge of Ezekiel. The Exagoge of Ezekiel the Tragedian, usually dated back to the second century B.C., is a composition of Greek drama centered on Moses in parallel accounts with Exodus 1-15. In lines sixty-eight through eighty-nine, Ezekiel the tragedian relates the enthronement vision of Moses, in which a “man (φῶς)” hands over to Moses the crown, scepter, and throne:


96 φῶς is a Homeric poetic form of ἄνω, and represents God in the context. The emphasis, however, should be placed on his keeping authority as emblematic of royal power, rather than on anthropomorphic theology. Erich S. Gruen, Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition, HCS 30 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 132, n. 91.
On Sinai's peak I saw what seemed a throne so great in size it touched the clouds of heaven. Upon it sat a man of noble mien, becrowned, and with a scepter in one hand while with the other he did beckon me. I made approach and stood before the throne. He handed o'er the scepter and he bade me mount the throne, and gave to me the crown; then he himself withdrew from off the throne. I gazed upon the whole earth round about; things under it, and high above the skies. Then at my feet a multitude of stars fell down, and I their number reckoned up. They passed by me like armed ranks of men. Then I in terror wakened from the dream. (Ezek. Trag. 68-82) 97

A scholarly debate has arisen concerning the implication of Moses' enthronement. This controversy can be divided into three categories: the deification of Moses, the appointment of Moses as divine agent, and the polemic against the elevated Moses traditions. 98 The advocates of the first view often point to three observations as indicators of Moses' deification. First, the divine man not only hands over the scepter and crown but yields his throne to Moses. Thus, Moses seems to assume the standing of the divine man. Second, the ability of Moses to count the stars (in line seventy-nine) finds the only parallel with that of God in Psalm 147:4 and Isaiah 40:26:

"He determines the number of the stars; he gives to all of them their names." (Ps 147:4)

"Lift up your eyes on high and see: Who created these? He who brings out their host and numbers them, calling them all by name; because he is great in strength, mighty in power, not one is missing." (Isa 40:26)

Likewise, the Metatron, probably an angel in this text, names all the stars: "This teaches us that the Holy One [Metatron], blessed be he, has given to every single star a name" (3


Enoch 46:12; OPT, 1:299). Finally, in the same verse (line seventy-nine), the stars, which are common symbols of angels, are depicted to worship Moses. However, as Bauckham elucidates, the point of the vision must not be placed on the deification of Moses but on his role as ruler and prophet over Israel. The dream appears to have been employed as an illustration for the divine instrumental function of Moses. In the process, he undoubtedly manifests a degree of divine quality. Nonetheless, the focus is not to be on his ontological transformation, as the dream of Joseph is not interpreted as such (Gen 37:9-10).

The Sibylline Oracle. A text from the Sibylline Oracle, written in Alexandria dated to the turn of the Common Era, is commonly cited to indicate the royal standing of
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99 Hurtado, One God, One Lord, 59.


Moses as believed in the intertestamental period.¹⁰²

Then when the people of twelve tribes, bidden by the Immortal, leave the fruitful plain of destruction and God himself, the prince, gives a law to men, then a great, great-spirited king will rule the Hebrews, one who has a name from sandy Egypt, a man falsely thought to have Thebes as his homeland. (Sib. Or. 11:35-40)¹⁰³

Contrary to Lierman’s contention that the anonymity of Moses in the text is an indication of the popular belief of his kingship over Israel, however, the point seems to be on his leadership in the Exodus event, not so much on his royal standing in the context.¹⁰⁴

**Philo.** Philo, one of more important Jewish writers who were roughly contemporary of the New Testament writers, manifests his understanding of Moses as a king. Frequently, Philo refers to Moses as king and elaborates on his royal calling as uniquely appointed by God.

For he did not become king in the ordinary way by the aid of troops and weapons or of the might of ships and infantry and cavalry. It was God who appointed him by the free judgment of his subjects, God who created in them the willingness to choose him as their sovereign. Of him alone we read that without the gifts of speech or possessions or money he was made a king, he who eschewed the blind wealth and embraced that which has eyes to see, and, as we may say without reserve, held that all he owned was to have God for his heritage. (Praem. 54)¹⁰⁵

In the last verse of the first book of *De vita Mosis*, Philo identifies the purpose of his writing in its entirety, that is, to portray Moses as king:¹⁰⁶

We have now told the story of Moses’ actions in his capacity of king (τα κατὰ τὴν βασιλείαν . . . περαγμένα). We must next deal with all that he achieved by his powers as high priest and legislator, powers which he possessed as the most fitting accompaniments of kingship (βασιλειά). (Mos. 1:334; *Philo VI*, 448-49)
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In the immediately following verses (Mos. 2:1-2), Philo further clarifies that the various virtues of Moses, i.e., a chief priest, law-giver, and philosopher, are integral characteristics of his royal status:

The former treatise dealt with the birth and nurture of Moses; also with his education and career as a ruler, in which capacity his conduct was not merely blameless but highly praiseworthy . . . For it has been said, not without good reason, that states can only make progress in well-being if either kings are philosophers or philosophers are kings. But Moses will be found to have displayed, and more than displayed, combined in his single person, not only these two faculties—the kingly and the philosophical—but also three others, one of which is concerned with law-giving, the second with the high priest’s office, and the last with prophecy. (Mos. 2:1-2; Philo VI, 450-51)

Furthermore, Philo calls Moses “the truly perfect ruler (τῷ τελειωτάτῳ Ἑγεμόνι),” “archetype (ἀρχετύπῳ),” and “model (παράδειγμα)” of all future rulers:

We said above that there are four adjuncts to the truly perfect ruler. He must have kingship, the faculty of legislation, priesthood and prophecy (Mos. 2:187a; Philo VI, 540-41); Thus all future rulers would find a law to guide them right by looking to Moses as their archetype and model, and one would grudge to give good advice to their successors, but all would train and school their souls with admonitions and exhortations.” (Virt. 70b; Philo VIII, 204-07)

From the aforementioned texts, it becomes evident that Philo painted Moses almost as a super-human who occupied a royal office. Despite Philo’s description of Moses in terms of king, his concrete denial of Moses being a divine being even in the face of the Hellenistic tendency of deifying the emperors is still remarkable (cf. pp. 176-77 on Philo’s description of Moses).

**Josephus and Qumran.** Josephus and the Qumran library stand in contrast to the Philonic picture of Moses as a royal figure. Both literary collections are generally reticent about Moses’ kingship. In the case of Josephus, Lierman supposes that the theocracy might explain the lack of royal portrayal of Moses:

Our lawgiver, however, was attracted by none of these forms of polity, but gave to his constitution the form of what—if a forced expression be permitted—may be termed a “theocracy,” placing all sovereignty and authority in the hands of God. (Ag. Ap. 2:165)\(^{107}\)

---

\(^{107}\) *Josephus I*, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, LCL (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,
In the case of Qumran, the same reason is also understood to have occurred.\textsuperscript{108}

**Moses as Eschatological Prophet**

**Deuteronomy 18:15.** Some exegetes have pointed out that early Jewish belief in Moses \textit{redivivus} is an important clue to understanding the New Testament Christology. This trajectory of thought derives from Deuteronomy 18:15, in which a prophet-like Moses is alleged to return:\textsuperscript{109}

\begin{quote}
The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet (NRSV);

השכמתווכניא מקרבעת אתאיה, כולם יוכ칩 על יהוה אלהינו, אלהי (MT);

προφήτην εκ τῶν ἄγγελων σου ώς εμὴ ἀναστήσει σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου αὐτού ἀκούσθε. (LXX)
\end{quote}

Such expectation, however, is surprisingly scant in intertestamental Jewish writings. Almost the only Pseudepigraphic reference adduced for this hope is 1 Macc 14:41, which vaguely speaks of some type of an end-time prophet: “The Jews and their priests have resolved that Simon should be their leader and high priest forever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise” (1 Macc 14:41). A small number of scholars, such as Marc Philonenko, take this statement to be reflective of the hope of the Mosaic eschatological prophet.\textsuperscript{110} However, the meager presence of this type of thought elsewhere in the early Jewish literature justifies J. J. Collins, who does reserve a section on the eschatological Moses in his comprehensive treatment of Jewish messianism in the second temple period (cf. Collins, \textit{The Scepter and the Star}).

\textsuperscript{108}Meeks, \textit{The Prophet-King}, 175.

\textsuperscript{109}Also, similarly, “I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their own people; I will put my words in the mouth of the prophet, who shall speak to them everything that I command” (Deut 18:18).

This dearth of the hope in Moses redivivus is justified also in the Old Testament context itself, in which Deuteronomy 18:15 was originally addressed. That is, the verse is located in the midst of a series of divine stipulations on how to choose public offices such as, kings, judges, priests (Deut 16:18-18:22). At the end of these instructions comes the declaration of Yahweh that he would send to Israel a Moses-like prophet to whom they need to heed and by whom they should be able to discern false prophets. Accordingly, the crux of this narrative appears to be the envisioning of legitimate prophets, not bringing back of the historical Moses or anyone in his spirit:

The “prophet” contemplated is not a simple individual, belonging to a distant future, but Moses’ representative for the time being, whose office it would be to supply Israel, whenever in its history occasion should arise, with needful guidance and advice; in other words . . . the reference is not to an individual but to a prophetical order.\(^{111}\)

Similarly, “the ‘raising up’ of the prophet need not mean a single act, or a single individual, therefore. It rather envisages a succession of prophets, as and when the Lord deems it right.”\(^{112}\) This contextual reading of a succession of prophets is further strengthened in view of the emphasis of the context, not on the appointment of the prophet, but on the human obeisance to the divine oracle which would be delivered through the prophet.\(^{113}\)

For Moses to say that the prophet to come will be “like me” refers to the role of Moses played as God’s messenger, not to his person; for 34:10 makes clear that “there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom YHWH knew face to face.”\(^{114}\)

\(^{111}\)Driver, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy, 229.

\(^{112}\)McConville, Deuteronomy, 303. Also, Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy, 262; Christensen, Deuteronomy 1:1-21:9, Revised, 405.

\(^{113}\)Nelson, Deuteronomy, 235.

Finally, the fact that the later Jewish traditions (Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and early rabbinic literature) did not interpret Deuteronomy 18:15 eschatologically speaks in favor of the true prophet-hood reading. It is highly instructive that the entire corpus of the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha does not take up Deuteronomy 18:15 in reference to an eschatological figure. A host of scholars (such as, Howard Teeple, W. D. Davies, and Joachim Jeremias) confirm this judgment. Richard Horsley, for instance, perceptively articulates the textual testimony on the issue.

We find very little evidence that the expectation of a prophet like Moses (whether linked with or separate from Deut 18:15-18) played an important role during the time of Jesus. The text on which such an expectation might have been based, Deut 18:15-18, originally did not have an eschatological orientation, but referred to the regular succession, or perhaps rather the periodic appearance, of prophets as spokespersons for God. Moreover, it is difficult to find textual references to an eschatological prophet like Moses in biblical or post-biblical Jewish literature whether before or after the time of Jesus, except in the Qumran scrolls.

Rabbinic tradition. In distinction to the apparent Hebrew scriptural context and the silence of Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha on the Mosaic eschatological prophetic expectations, however, some exegetes, such as, Jeremias, Teeple, Meeks, and Lierman, point to certain rabbinic sources as an indicator for the presence of such belief.
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117 Jeremias, “Mωσεις,” 857-64; Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*, 43-68; Meeks,
Nonetheless, their analysis of the rabbinic view of Moses, especially, in conjunction with the Gospel of John should be called into question. Recent New Testament scholarship generally encourages one to take into account early rabbinic literature so as to illuminate the possible correlation between Jewish religious/cultural elements and early Christianity. No serious student denies that the New Testament writings and the Gospel of John in particular would probably have come into contact with Pharisaism or emerging rabbinic traditions.

However, a responsible inquiry into the influence of rabbinic literature on the New Testament is susceptible to serious suspicion at least for two reasons. First, the late date of the composition of the rabbinic literature evinces that the parallelism cited in New Testament studies reflects circular reasoning, and those parallels seem to demonstrate rather Christian influence on the rabbinic writings or, at best, some common Jewish traditions rooted in the Old Testament tradition. For instance, Meeks cites extensively from Midrash Rabbah (of the Soncino collection), which dates to A.D. 450-1100 for its composition. Most writings in this collection attribute the authors to the rabbis from as early as the Amoraic period which ranges from A.D. 220-500. These alleged authors, however, still postdate the final composition of John, at least, by a century. In addition, although Epstein points to the ancient records of early midrashic activities, we do not have a concrete piece of textual evidence for "midrash" in the form analogous to the Soncino collection. An earlier rabbinic body of literature, Mishnah, is not helpful for
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120 Cf. I. Epstein, “Foreword,” in Genesis, vol. 1 of Midrash Rabbah, trans. H. Greedman and
the analogical investigation, since it is primarily concerned with the legal system.\textsuperscript{121} Second, the compiled nature of the body of rabbinic literature also hinders comparison because it is impossible to discern which part traces back to the earlier oral traditions which were hypothetically current in the time of the early church.\textsuperscript{122} Therefore, the extant early rabbinic materials should only serve as an aid to illustrate the common Jewish cultural/religious matrix of the first century Palestine which intertestamental Judaism and nascent Christianity shared (cf. "Appendix 7: The Use of the Rabbinic Materials for the New Testament").\textsuperscript{123}

**Samaritan tradition.** In addition to rabbinic literature, some scholars have attempted to find early Jewish conceptual traits of the Mosaic eschatological prophet tied to Deuteronomy 18:15 within early Samaritan traditions.\textsuperscript{124} The specific Samaritan

Maurice Simon (London: Soncino, 1951), x-xiii.


\textsuperscript{124}Convenient recent overviews on the Samaritan religion and literature can be found in the
literature cited to indicate such an interpretive tradition is Memar Marqah. This composite body of documents claims its author to be Marqah (=Marcus), a renowned Samaritan religious leader who lived in the third to fourth centuries. Regardless of its alleged authorship, the writing of the extant manuscripts is variously located in the fourteenth through nineteenth centuries.\textsuperscript{125}

Despite the late date of the extant manuscripts, however, some scholars argue that early Samaritan eschatological hope, which was recorded later in the Samaritan writing, became reflected on the Gospel of John with particular reference to Christology.\textsuperscript{126} For example, Ferdinand Dexinger, one of the more vocal advocates of this view, has extensively put forward his case that Memar Marqah reflects Jewish understanding of the Mosaic eschatological prophet prior to and current in the time of early Christianity.\textsuperscript{127} He points to Memar Marqah's interpretation of Deuteronomy 18:18

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{125}Zeev Ben-Hayyim detects two major phases of the writing of the Memar Marqah: the first to the fourteenth to sixteenth and the second to the eighteenth to nineteenth centuries. Abraham Tal, "Samaritan Literature," in \textit{The Samaritans}, ed. Alan D. Crown (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 463. Ben-Hayyim is the editor/translator of the most recent critical edition of Memar Marqah.
  \item \textsuperscript{127}For his arguments, see Ferdinand Dexinger, "Die frühesten samaritanischen Belege der Taheb-Vorstellung," \textit{Kairos} 26 (1984): 224-52; idem, "Der 'Prophet wie Mose' in Qumran und bei den Samaritanern," in \textit{Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M Mathias Delcor}, ed. André Caquot,
in terms of the Mosaic eschatological prophet (whom some medieval Samaritans call בֵּיתוּו, "Taheb," lit. meaning "restorer" or "one who returns"), and argues that "this expectation traces back to Judaism from the second century B.C. on."128

In order to substantiate his case, Dexinger advances two prerequisite theses: First, the traditionally held Jewish-Samaritan hostility was marginal and was developed in a large scale only after the third century A.D.129 The implication is that Samaritanism was an integral part of early Judaism, as some Samaritan interpretive traits seem to be at play in some Qumran writings. Second, although the extant manuscripts of Memar Marqah originate from the medieval period, the eschatological conceptions, especially with reference to the Mosaic prophet, reflect the beliefs of the intertestamental period.


128 "Die Taheb-Vorstellung wurzelt in der spezifischen Interpretation von Dtn 18,18, die ab dem 2.Jh.v.Chr. im Judentum belegbar ist." Dexinger, "Der Taheb," 25. For a further definition of Taheb, see Dexinger, "Der Taheb," 37.

129 Alan D. Crown also asserts that the hostility between Judeans and Samaritans fully developed not before the third century A.D. Crown's judgment is based on his analysis of the so-called proto-Samaritan texts of Qumran. Alan D. Crown, "Redating the Schism between the Judeans and the Samaritans," JQR 82 (1991): 17-50; Ingrid Hjelm, The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis, JSOTS 303 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 2000), 52-102. Thus, the statements of Josephus (J.W. 2.232-33; Ant. 20.118-38) and the New Testament (John 4:3-4; Luke 9:52) that record the hostility between the two ethnic groups reflect only a trace of minor regional sentiment of the time. Crown calls attention to J. E. Sanderson who finds that the Exodus scroll of Qumran is strikingly similar to the Samaritan Pentateuch but not identical. Thus, Samaritanism and the Qumran community shared some common traditions. Judith E. Sanderson, An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExodum and the Samaritan Tradition, HSS 30 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1986), 317-20. The works of E. Nodet also in some measure contribute to the integral nature of Samaritanism within early Judaism. However, both of these views are called into question by the recent monograph of Hjelm, The Samaritans and Early Judaism, 52-75. For Nodet's view on the importance of the Samaritan tradition within the intertestamental and early Judaism, see Etienne Nodet, A Search for the Origins of Judaism: From Joshua to the Mishnah, JSOTS 248 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1997), 122-201.

130 The relation between Jews and Samaritans was ambivalent. Although the adherence to the
MacDonald maintains, the direction of influence is to be construed from John onto Memar Marqah. Since there are remarkably analogous parallels present between these two bodies of literature (not only some eschatological expressions, but especially the likening of Moses to "Christ" in wordings similar to those of John), it is difficult to deny some type of literary and/or oral dependence. However, a fair assessment of the correlation would be the Samaritan reception of the Johannine tradition in view of the dates of the extant manuscripts of both bodies of documents and the obscure characterization of "Christ" in Jewish literature prior to the Christian era. Second, even if the early dating (i.e., the third century A.D. onward) of some parts of the documents may be supposed for a moment, the recent philological examinations of the Aramaic language used in Memar Marqah usually detect much later (i.e., medieval period) editorial hands. Coupled with this presence of much later linguistic traits as well as the lack of a systematic understanding of the first century Palestinian Aramaic linguistic framework, thus, the composite nature severely hampers the value of this literature for the present discussion.

Mosaic writings was shared by Samaritans and Jews, the two groups were divided over important issues, such as, the acceptance of the Prophets and Writings, the centrality of the Jerusalem temple, and the idea of the resurrection of the body. Pieter W. van der Horst, "Anti-Samaritan Propaganda in Early Judaism," in Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context: Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity, WUNT 196 (Tbingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 134-50.


133 These skeptical assessments are expressed in the following: Pamment, "Is There Convincing Evidence of Samaritan Influence on the Fourth Gospel," 221-30; Horsley, "Like One of the Prophets of Old," 442; Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects," 14; Oegema, The Anointed and His People, 246-47; Maier, "Schriftrezeption im jüdischen Umfeld des Johannesevangeliums," 81. John MacDonald also conceived of the Samaritan influence on the Johannine
Qumran tradition. As mentioned before, the hope of the eschatological prophet like Moses based on Deuteronomy 18:18 appears sparse in early Judaism. The same goes true with the Qumran community. Such judgment probably should be qualified with an observation that the Deuteronomy text is often cited but not often with eschatological overtones. For the most part, Moses stands as an identity figure for a true prophet, and is frequently brought up in order to contrast him with the false prophets. Accordingly, the emphasis often lies in the recognition of false prophets and not so much on the hope of the coming prophet like Moses. Discouraged by such a state of fact, Boismard sums up the virtual absence of Mosaic expectation in Qumran, writing that

We know that the Qumran sectarians awaited two messiahs, one a warrior, the other a priest, and that their coming would be preceded by a prophet; but nothing indicates that this indeterminate prophet should be identified with the prophet like Moses of Deut 18:18-19.\footnote{Ibid., 3.}

There are only three documents that are usually cited as referring to the eschatological prophet of Deuteronomy 18:15. These writings as well as 11Q13 (which has recently been brought up as containing a Mosaic eschatological hope) will be evaluated. An examination of these writings will manifest the lack of an eschatological concern via Moses.

Of the three Qumran passages often referred to in conjunction with Deuteronomy 18 (the Temple Scroll=11Q19 54:8-18 and 60:21-61:1-5; 4Q175=4QTestimonia; and the so-called Apocryphon of Moses=4Q375-76; 1Q22; 1Q29), the Temple Scroll and the Apocryphon of Moses display virtually no concern for the end

\footnote{Mosaic Christology but later changed his position to the opposite side, that is, the Johannine influence on the Samaritan literature. For the former view, see John MacDonald, "Samaritan Doctrine of Moses," \textit{SJT} 13 (1960): 149-62, esp. 150-61. For the latter expression, see idem, \textit{The Text}, xx; idem, \textit{The Theology of the Samaritans}, 150-61, 429-46. Also, although Boismard finds the two expressions, "the king of Israel" and "son of Joseph" to be particular marks of Samaritanism, the former epithet is too generic a term to be of the exclusive Samaritan influence and the latter seems to point to Jesus' immediate father in the literary context. The presence of his hometown (Nazareth) renders it unlikely that his association with Joseph refers to one of the arch-patriarchs. In John 1:45, Jesus is referred to as Ἰησοῦν ἦν ὁ Ἰωανής τοῦ Ἰωάννην ἐκ Ναζαρέτ, literally translated as "Jesus, who is son of Joseph and is from Nazareth." For Boismard's argument on this reading, see Boismard, \textit{Moses or Jesus}, 30-36, 66-67.}
time. Although they extensively quote from Deuteronomy 18 where the rising of a Moses-like prophet is promised, the context of the entire corpus or the immediate context militates against an eschatological reading of the text. Rather, in view of the primary purpose of the documents (the Deuteronomic legal codes), the catenae should be seen as the provision for discerning future false prophets.

In contrast to the first two documents discussed above, 4Q175 is more controversial as to whether or not it speaks of the Mosaic eschatological prophet. This document is comprised of three blocks of catenae from the Old Testament and ends with an application of these texts with view to either the present or a future situation. The fragment begins with a quotation of two passages from Deuteronomy (5:28-29, 18:18-19) virtually word-for-word from the Masoretic text and the Samaritan Pentateuch. This section records the prediction of the new Moses.

And Yahweh spoke to Moses, saying “I have heard the sound of the words of this people which they spoke to you. They have well (said) all that they have spoken. Would that they were of such heart to fear me and to keep all of my ordinances always that it may be well with them and with their children forever. I will raise up a prophet for them from among their own kindred like you and I will put my words in his mouth, and he will speak to them all that I command him. If there is someone

---


136 No significant study so far has been produced that reads the catenae or these texts in terms of eschatology.

137 The primary concern of the entire Temple scroll is to readdress the Deuteronomic law codes, including the provisions for the building of the Temple. Johann Maier, The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary, JSOTSup 34 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 3-7; Sidnie White Crawford, The Temple Scroll and Related Texts, CQS 2 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 2000), 17-19.

138 The judgment of Xeravits on this text is slightly off the mark. He says that “the Testimonia connects Moses to an eschatological personage, the future prophet, as in several currents of early Judaism. It must, however, be mentioned that this prophet in the Testimonia is not identified with Moses, who only serves as a type for the figure to come.” Xeravits, King, Priest, Prophet, 176. His assessment is correct as far as Moses in the text plays as a type of the future prophet. However, he does not seem to grasp the point of the citation that such a concept is meant in the original Deuteronomic context as well. In other words, both Deut 18:15 and the first section of 4Q175 conceive of the same eschatological prophet who is “like” Moses in some measure.
who does not heed my words which the prophet speaks in my name, I myself will call him to account.” (4Q175 1-8)\textsuperscript{139}

In the form of a citation from Numbers 24:15-17, the second section reinterprets the Old Testament text to indicate the coming of eschatological figures, such as, the Star of Jacob (a Davidic messiah) and the Scepter of Israel (a priestly messiah, elsewhere dubbed as messiah of Aaron).\textsuperscript{140}

And he uttered his verse and said, “Oracle of Balaam, son of Beor, and oracle of the man whose eye is true; oracle of one who hears the words of God, and knows (the) knowledge of the Most High; who beholds (the) vision of Shaddai, in a trance but with eye unveiled; what I see (is) not yet; what I behold (is) not soon. A star comes forth from Jacob, and a scepter arises from Israel; and it smashes through the brows of Moab, and it demolishes all the sons of Seth.” (4Q175 9-13)\textsuperscript{141}

Afterwards, the last citation follows from Deuteronomy 33:8-11, which is originally Moses’ blessing of Levi. In this section, the tribe of Levi is praised for their steadfast adherence to the covenant of Yahweh. Then, this section probably envisages the Teacher of Righteousness by its emphasis on the teaching aspect of the Levites as well as the priestly function.\textsuperscript{142}

And of Levi he said, “Give to Levi your Thummim, and your Urim to your faithful one whom you tried at Massah, and (with whom) you contested at the Waters of Meribah; who said to his father and to his mother, ‘I do not know you’; and his brothers he disregards, and his children he does not know. For he has kept your command and guards your covenant. And they will teach your judgments to Jacob, your law to Israel. They shall place incense in your nostril(s), and the whole offering on you altar. Bless, O Yahweh, his substance, and favor the work of his hands. Smite the loins of his foes, and as for his enemies, let them not rise again. (4Q175 14-20)\textsuperscript{143}

Finally, the document addresses “the cursed man” and his two sons, “the


\textsuperscript{140}These figures often occur together (1QS 9.11; CD 12.23) or apart (4QPsalmsa 3.15) in the Qumran library. John J. Collins, “The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context, ed. Timothy H. Lim (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 208-17; Craig A. Evans, “Messiahs,” in EDSS, 537-42.

\textsuperscript{141}Cross, “Testimonia,” 314-15.

\textsuperscript{142}Cross, “Testimonia,” 309.

\textsuperscript{143}Ibid., 126-17.
weapons of violence." These antagonists are portrayed as fulfilling the curse of Joshua (i.e., premature death on their parts) with reference to rebuilding of Jericho (Joshua 6:26) following their building program of Jerusalem in line 30 of this text.

When Joshua finished praising and giving thanks with his praises, then he said, "Cursed be the man who will rebuild this city. With his firstborn he shall lay its foundation, and with his younger son he shall set up its gates. Behold a cursed man, (a man of) Belial shall arise, to become a [fo]wler's sna[re] to his people, and terror to all his neighbors; and he shall arise [and . . . shall a]ris[e . . . to be]come, the two of them, weapons of violence. And they shall again build [this city and cons]truct its wall and towers to make a wicked fortress [and great wickedness] in Israel, and its horrors in Ephraim and in Judah. [. . . And they] shall produce pollution in the land and great strife among the children of [Jacob; and they shall pour out blo]od like water on the rampart of Daughter Zion, and in the district of [. . .] (vacat) Jerusalem. 144

The antagonists in the final section have sparked debate over their identities and the characteristic of the document, namely, whether it reflects eschatology or past events. 145 The detailed description of the antagonists, however, has led some to conclude that the main concern of the document was to address the contemporary problem, that is, the apostasy or deviant practice of the Torah, rather than eschatology. 146

### Table 2. Contents of 4Q175

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

144Ibid., 318-19. This text is often called the "Psalms of Joshua," which is partially preserved in 4Q379 (4QPsalms of Joshua).


Notwithstanding the possibility of expressing present or past concerns, taken at
face value, all three catenae seem to relate to future events vis-à-vis the popular
eschatological figures. Relevant to the present study is the degree in which the Mosaic
eschatological prophet is invoked. As is the case in its original Deuteronomic context
here too, the focus seems to lie on the model function of Moses by which one can discern
false prophets. That is, the primary function of the citation is to provide criteria for
recognizing the present or future antagonists, rather than to predict a coming of an
eschatological redeemer figure like Moses. The reason that the Deuteronomy text is cited,
therefore, seems incidental. That is, it is not because the cited text contains a reference to
the prophet, but because it was one of the more popular eschatological texts at the time.

As briefly discussed thus far, the Qumran community did not pervasively and
enthusiastically look for a Mosaic eschatological prophet. Géza Xeravits, however,
recently suggested that 11Q13 (=11QMelchizedek) is an exception to this current of
thought.

Based on Deut. 18:15, the Community expected the arrival of an eschatological
prophet like Moses. The figure of Moses only occurs once as an eschatological,
redivivus figure, as the anointed prophet of 11QMelch. He will emerge as herald of
the heavenly Melchizedek, as one who will comfort God’s afflicted people in the
time of the eschatological battle.

An intense eschatological document, 11QMelchizedek speaks of two end-time

---

on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London: G. Chapman, 1971), 83-84; Xeravits, King,
Priest, Prophet, 57-58.

148 Xeravits, King, Priest, Prophet, 183; idem, “Moses Redivivus in Qumran?” QC 11 (2003):
103-05.

What calls for special attention is that not only these actions usually reserved for God, but the divine names, such as, \textit{el, elohim,} and \textit{Yahweh} are applied to Melchizedek. However, relevant to the present discussion is the description of “the messenger” of Melchizedek, dubbed also as “the anointed of the spirit” whose message people should heed.\footnote{Of direct relevance for this discussion are lines 18 and 19: “And ‘the messenger’ [is] the anointed of the spirit about whom Dan[iel] said, ‘Until (the coming) of an anointed one, a leader, (there shall be) seven weeks.’ And ‘the messenger of good (news) who announces salvation’ is the one concerning whom it is wri[ten] that [ . . .].” Roberts, “Melchizedek,” 268-69.} Xeravits argues that the descriptions of this second figure fit the profile of the Mosaic eschatological prophet at several points. First, the “messenger” is clearly depicted as a prophetic figure in the text. Second, in the Qumran writings, it is only Moses who bears the title \textit{מֵדֶחא (“messenger”) and is described as a prophet at the same time as evidenced in 4Q377.\footnote{4Q377 portrays Moses as the messenger \textit{par excellence} and God’s anointed. Xeravits, \textit{King, Priest, Prophet}, 177-81.} In addition, the presence of the name of Moses, which is the only legible word in the first fragment, further convinces him.

Notwithstanding that his conjecture is somewhat intriguing, however, his
argument calls for some reservation. For one, the presence of the word “Moses” in fragment one is too fragmentary to be of any use. Second, the non-sectarian provenance of 4Q377 clouds the argumentative force of its comparison with 11Q13 which is of sectarian origin. Furthermore, the instances of Moses’ identification with “messenger” and “anointed” are too infrequent within the entire corpus of the Qumran library. Finally, even if the presence of the Mosaic eschatological prophet is acknowledged in 11Q13, it is strikingly meager in view of its potential importance within the Qumran community and the wider Jewish thought world of the Palestinian origin.\footnote{At the end of his preliminary research into the role of Moses in early Judaism, Dale Allison states that “the outcome of this discussion is that the expectation of an eschatological prophet like Moses, founded upon Deut. 18:15 and 18, was not little known, or just the esoteric property of the Qumran community and Jewish-Christian churches. It was instead very much in the air in first-century Palestine and helped to instigate several short-lived revolutionary movements.” However, most of the evidence he adduces postdates the time of Jesus. Furthermore, his analysis is too brief or plagued by heavy dependence on the secondary literature. Cf. Allison, \textit{The New Moses}, 75-84.}

Summary

Some summarizing remarks can be made from the foregoing observations that are pertinent to the following discussion. First, of all the Old Testament protagonists surveyed (i.e., Jacob, Abraham, Elijah, and David), Moses enjoyed a high estimation, which derived from his involvement in the Sinai event and his life and ministry in the subsequent events. His prominent status is readily observed in the large number of Jewish writings that take on his pseudonym. Second, the post-biblical Jewish traditions tend to elevate the status of Moses in various terms. The early Jewish ascension narratives, for instance, portray Moses as a semi-deified being especially in the ascension narratives of the Diaspora settings. Josephus, on the other hand, painted a royal image out of the Pentateuch narratives. Finally, in view of the preeminence of Moses, the expectation of the eschatological prophet like Moses (or an end-time redeemer figure vis-à-vis Moses) is surprisingly sparse in early Judaism. With the possible exception of a few instances (i.e., 11Q13), the Old Testament and intertestamental Jewish literature that
are chronologically prior to or contemporary of the time of Jesus chronologically and of
the Palestinian provenance geographically are extremely reticent about the coming of
Moses redivivus.

Moses in the New Testament

The insurmountable importance of Moses in the New Testament is readily
observed by the fact that he is mentioned more frequently in the New Testament than any
other Old Testament figure (80 times in total, cf. 40 of Elijah and 59 of David). On the
one hand, these frequent references seem understandable in view of his importance in the
Jewish history. On the other hand, however, it is surprising that scholars have paid
attention only sporadically to the role of Moses in the New Testament. This relatively
sparse interest is partially justified by the significance the New Testament writers
attribute to him. For the sake of the brevity, the role of Moses in the New Testament
can be broken down into functional categories. Hubert Frankemölle, for example,
divides the functions of Moses in terms of the mediator of the Torah, a prophet, and a
type of Jesus. However, the scope of his analysis encompasses passages from only
Matthew and 2 Corinthians. In contrast, the purview of Hays’ examination is more
comprehensive. According to Hays, Moses functions in various ways to clarify the
writers’ Christology, cast light onto the Mosaic Scripture, and advance the church’s self-
understanding within the entirety of the New Testament writings.


155 Stefan Schapdick, “Autorität ohne Inhalt: Zum Mosebild des Johannesevangeliums,” ZNW 97 (2006): 177. Schapdick mentions only two major substantial contributions on this topic, one by Kastner and the other by Saito (ibid.).

156 Hubert Frankemölle, “Mose in Deutungen des Neuen Testaments,” Kuf 9 (1994): 70-86

addition to these roles, Fitzer detects distancing of Moses in John and the Pauline epistles. Fitzer,
“Μωσής,” 452. For further introductions to the role of Moses in the New Testament, see Tadashi Saito,
Die Mosevorstellungen im Neuen Testament, EHS 23/100 (Bern: P. Lang, 1977); Sänger,
Moses in the Gospel of John

In the past, some scholars have inquired into the role of Moses in the Gospel of John with an eye primarily to the historical situation of the so-called Johannine community. This historical reconstruction was undertaken by means of form critical analyses which sought to identify different layers of editorial hands. Influenced largely by J. L. Martyn’s theory, these scholars attempted to explain how the discourses concerning Moses reveal an ambivalent attitude within the alleged community. For instance, some have proposed that the Johannine sect tried to break away from mainstream Judaism and, at the same time, had to maintain their loyalty to Moses in an effort to demonstrate the authenticity of its belief in Jesus as the Christ as forshadowed in the writings of Moses. Others maintained that an earlier layer reflects the Samaritan-oriented mission of the Johannine community, while a later layer reveals the distancing of the community from the Jews. These types of studies represent an attempt to account for the seemingly stereo-typical depiction of Moses in John, where Moses seems to be portrayed at some points as a messianic prefiguration, while at other times Jesus supersedes and replaces the prophet par excellence.

In the face of increased emphasis on the integrity of the present literary form, however, more recent studies tend to focus on the consistent depiction of Moses, more...
pertinently to this research, the typological correspondence between Moses and Jesus. While interacting with these scholarly contributions, the following section will closely examine the narrative function of the four Moses pericopae with a special reference to the Johannine Christology. Of course, one can arguably find more passages that supposedly evoke a Mosaic Christology. However, these texts represent some of the more explicit depictions of Moses (and a number of exegetes argue in the typological prefigurative sense), so that a contextual examination of these texts will provide a sufficient sketch for the evangelist’s presentation of him in relation to Christology.

**Law through Moses, Grace through Jesus: John 1:16-17**

οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἴμαις πάντες ἐλάβομεν καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος; οὗτος διὰ Ἰωάννης ἔδωκεν, ἠ χάρις καὶ ἠ λεησυάκι διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο;

From his fullness we have all received, grace upon grace. The law indeed was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ. (John 1:16-17)

The first explicit mention of Moses appears in the latter part of the Johannine prologue, which articulates divine revelation through Jesus. The reference to Moses in this text does not directly speak to his narrative function other than his integral part in the reception of the Torah, which is repeatedly acknowledged in early Jewish writings.

---


(including OT) and in this Gospel (John 7:18-24, 8:5). A close reading, however, reveals the evangelist’s general attitude towards the arch-prophet and provides a glimpse into his role in relation to Johannine Christology.163

The broader context of the prologue delineates the incarnation of Jesus as the climactic manifestation of the glory of Yahweh (i.e., “full of grace and truth”) which is explicitly illustrated in verse 14. Particularly interesting are the linguistic similarities of verse fourteen with Exodus 33-34. In addition to the tabernacle language (σκηνόω, lit. “to tabernacle”), the expression, “full of grace and truth (πληρωθεὶς χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας),” bears a resemblance to the Hebrew idiom, “full of love and faithfulness (רַּבָּבוּ לְכָּל לְיָחֵד, Exod 34:6).”164 It is within this context that the new divine revelation is further compared with or contrasted to that of Moses, who is referred to as a metonym for the old covenant, especially the Pentateuch (1:17).165

Scholarship is evenly divided over the relation between the Mosaic economy and that of Jesus. A group of Johannine exegetes maintains that the present text signifies the supplementary or accumulating nature of the new salvific revelation through Jesus:


hence the “grace and truth” of Jesus came in addition to the law of Moses. Another group favors the supercessionistic reading of the text: the “grace and truth” of Jesus came in replacement of the Mosaic law. The following structural, syntactical, and lexical analysis of the text is hoped to shed light into the exact nature of this relation of the economies of Moses and Jesus.

**Structure of the prologue.** A number of proposed structural analyses of the prologue can be delimited into two categories: logical progression and chiasmus models (the latter was popularized to a large degree by R. Alan Culpepper, cf. footnote 170).
The former model is observed in the studies of C. Dietzfellbinger, K. Wengst, A. T. Lincoln, G. Beasely-Murray, R. Brown, and the latter in S. Voorewinde, J. Stalley, W. Dumbrell, and A. Köstenberger.

Table 3. Various Structural Analyses of the Prologue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dietzfellbinger¹⁶⁸</th>
<th>1. The relationship of the Logos to God and to the world (vv. 1-5)</th>
<th>2. Of the witness of the Baptist to the reception of the divine childhood (vv. 6-13)</th>
<th>3. The witness of the believers (vv. 14-18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wengst¹⁶⁹</td>
<td>I. Description of working of the Word, its refusal and reception (vv. 1-13)</td>
<td>1. The creation and working of the Word at the beginning (v. 1-4)</td>
<td>2. The refusal of the historically working Word (vv. 5, 9-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. The reception of the historically working Word (v. 12-13)</td>
<td>Excursus: John the Baptist as witness of the Logos (vv. 6-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln¹⁷⁰</td>
<td>I. The Word in relation to God and creation (vv. 1-5)</td>
<td>The witness of John the Baptist to the Word as Light (vv. 6-8)</td>
<td>The word in the world and the two types of responses (vv. 9-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The community’s confession about the word (vv. 14-18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beasley-Murray¹⁷¹</td>
<td>1. The Word of God and creation (1-5)</td>
<td>2. The witness to the Word of God by John the Baptist (6-8)</td>
<td>3. The reactions to the Word of God in the World (9-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. The confession of the Word of God by the church (14-18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁶⁸ Dietzfelbinger, Das Evangelium nach Johannes, 1:22-34.

¹⁶⁹ Wengst, Das Johannevangelium, 1:47.

¹⁷⁰ Lincoln, A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John, 94-109.

¹⁷¹ Beasley-Murray, John, 10-16.
Brown
The Word with God (vv. 1-2)
The Word and creation (vv. 3-5)
  Parenthesis: John the Baptist's witness to the Light (vv. 6-9)
The Word in the world (vv. 10-12b)
The community's share in the Word-become-flesh (vv. 14-16)
  Parenthesis: John the Baptist testifies to the pre-existence of Jesus (v. 15)
  Editorial expansion of v. 16 (vv. 17-18)

Voorwinde
A. The Word (v. 1)
B. "With God" (vv. 1-2)
C. Creation: "Life and light" (vv. 3-5)
D. The testimony of John (vv. 6-8)
  E. The incarnation: "Light" (vv. 9-10)
    F. Human response: Negative (vv. 10-11)
    F'. Human response: Positive (vv. 12-13)
  E'. The incarnation: "Glory" (v. 14)
D'. The testimony of John (v. 15)
C'. New Creation: "Grace and truth" (vv. 14-17)
B'. "In the bosom of the Father" (v. 18)
A'. "The One and Only God" (v. 18)

Stalley
The relationship of the Logos to God/creation/humankind vv. 1-5
  The witness of John (negative) vv. 6-8
  The journey of the Light/Logos (negative) vv. 9-11
  The gift of empowerment (positive) vv. 12-13
  The journey of the Logos (positive) v. 14
  The witness of John (positive) v. 15
The relationship of the Logos to humankind/re-creation/God vv. 16-18

Two observations stand out in light of these structural analyses. First, the prologue centers on Jesus, who played an integral role in the creation and through whom the new divine revelation became manifest. More importantly, if the presence of a chiastic structure is accepted, verses sixteen through seventeen recapitulate the preexistent Logos idea spelled out in verses one through two, and further accentuate the culmination of the redemptive plan as unfolded in Jesus. That is, the chiastic structure elucidates the superiority of the new economy over the Mosaic covenant. However, it should also be noted that the logical progression models do not rule out this notion. Nevertheless, the chiasmus more clearly demonstrates the escalating progression of emphasis on Jesus.

---


176Köstengerer, John, 21.
Syntax. Some earlier Johannine commentators understood the parallel between Moses and Jesus in verse seventeen as an antithesis. 177 Ruth Edwards and Klaus Wengst, for instance, cite Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Origen, Theophylact, Augustine and Jerome as patristic evidence that opted for this interpretation. 178 Some contemporary exegetes also hold to this view as well. 179 For example, Matthias Gawlick understands John 1:17 as a simple antithetical term and applies it to a hypothetical historical setting of the Johannine community:

Somit ist die Beziehung Mose zu Jesus antithetisch, mit der die Rezipienten über das unbestreitbare Vorrecht Jesu informiert werden. Zu der spannungsreichen Beziehung zwischen Gemeinde und ‘den Juden’ paßt es kaum, wolle man behaupten, hier werde Mose in eine Linie mit Jesus gesetzt, so daß sich dann etwa ein heilsgeschichtliches Kontinuum ergebe. Noch problematischer erscheint der Versuch, Jesus mit der bekannten Kategorie der Tora zu identifizieren, denn diese darf als zu eng gelten, zumal sie im Gesamttext im wesentlichen negativ geschildert wird. Der gebildete Gegensatz ist für die weitere Lektüre wichtig, darf aber nicht verabsolutiert werden - ein diskreditierter Mose wäre für die joh Intentionen gleichfalls unbrauchbar. In Kap 1,17 ist die Erwähnung Mose also ein hermeneutisches Signal dafür, wie sich die Christusanhänger von ihren jüdischen Geschwistern unterscheiden: Polemisiert wird gar nicht gegen Mose, sondern gegen diejenigen Juden, die als seine Jünger ihm im Vergleich zu Jesus eine zu hohe Bedeutung zusprechen. 180

Syntactical observations, however, militate against such a view and lend weight to either the accumulation or replacement sense. The lack of conjunction or particle between the first and the second halves of verse seventeen make it difficult to

177 Becker, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 1:101; Rudolf Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 21st ed., KEK 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 53; Dietzfelbinger, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 1:32; Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 42-43; Wilekens, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 35. Some scholars posit the interpolation of verses 16-18 based on the idiosyncratic nature of grace/law antithesis in John. For example, Painter, *The Quest for the Messiah*, 147-49. However, the structural and syntactical examination of the text displays a cohesive place of vv. 16-18 in the context.


determine the relationship between the two clauses. A clue, however, is found in the conjunction ὅτι plus the indicative construction (v. 17), which usually functions as a causal subordinate clause in biblical Greek. Therefore, the literal rendition of the verses sixteen and seventeen could be as following: “From his fullness we have all received grace upon/instead of grace (χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος) because the law was given through Moses and/but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.” As such, the two occurrences of χάρις in verse sixteen correspond to the Mosaic law and the new economy of Jesus respectively in verse seventeen. This syntactical observation avails an important hermeneutical point. The Mosaic economy and that of Jesus are equally extensions of the divine grace. The common divine provenance is also attested to in the passive voice (“the law was given [ἐδόθη] through Moses”), which probably signifies the divine initiative.

One caveat, however, is in order regarding an implication of the parallelism, as Wengst asserts, namely, that the two clauses seem to focus on the intermediary role of Moses and Jesus in passing on of the divine grace:

Dieser Vers begründet die Aussage, Gnade empfangen zu haben: “Denn die Tora wurde durch Mose gegeben, die Gnade und Treue kam durch Jesus Christus.” Beide

---


Vershälften sind ganz parallel formuliert: Am Beginn steht das jeweilige Subjekt: die Tora sowie Gnade und Treue. Es folgt die Angabe des jeweiligen Mittlers: Mose und Jesus Christus. Den Schluss bildet das jeweilige Prädikat in einer grammatisch passiven Form, die auf Gott als logisches Subjekt weist. Er ist der Geber der Tora durch die Vermittlung des Mose. Und er ist es auch, der durch Jesus Christus in seiner Gnade und Treue gekommen ist. Gott ist gnädig Gebender durch Mose und durch Jesus Christus. Das Bekenntnis von V.16, überreich Gnade empfangen zu haben, wird also doppelt begründet: zunächst durch die Gabe der durch Mose vermittelten Tora und dann durch die Präsenz des gnädigen und treuen Gottes in Jesus Christus.184

His notion, however, does not adequately take into account the point of the pericope comprising verses sixteen through eighteen in the wider context. First, the entire scope of the prologue disproportionately underscores Jesus as being tantamount to God and being the first divine exposure to men in human form (esp. vv. 1, 14, and 18):

In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father's only son, full of grace and truth; No one has ever seen God. It is God the only Son, who is close to the Father's heart, who has made him known.

Second, Wengst's observation does not pay sufficient attention to the message of the immediate context. The tenor of verse 18 could be seen as a polemic against the popular Jewish traditions about Moses who was believed to behold Yahweh, however partially.185 Accordingly, Jesus is the incarnate self-revelation of God in human history. Unfolded in this logical progression, thus, verses 16 through 18 can be paraphrased as following: “In his divine kindness, God has granted one grace on top of/in place of another. The first grace came through Moses and/but the second is revealed in Jesus Christ who is the first palpable manifestation of God himself.” Seen in this context, therefore, the parallelism of Moses and Jesus highlights the progression of the divine redemptive plan rather than the mediatory role of the two figures.

**Semantics.** The causal understanding of ὥτο at the beginning of verse

---

184 Wengst, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1:79.

seventeen clarifies the divine provenance of both economies. In addition, the causal interpretation of the conjunction further hints at the double reference to χάριτος in verse sixteen corresponding to the two following clauses in verse seventeen. Then, the meaning of the preposition ἀντί which connects the double reference to χάριτος becomes a crucial hermeneutical clue to the relation between the Mosaic and the new salvific plan.

As briefly reviewed above, the meaning of the preposition also sharply divides scholarship: one group takes it to mean "upon, in addition to, or on top of" whereas the other favors "in place of." Lexical observations, nonetheless, support the latter view.

First, standard Greek lexicons do not refer to a single instance of the word ἀντί meaning "upon" in ancient Greek literature. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (BDAG)* renders the original meaning of this word to be locally "opposite," from which developed "various types of correspondence ranging from replacement to equivalence."186 The five uses of the word are to indicate (1) that "one person or thing is, or is to be, replaced by another," hence "instead of, in place of" (2) that one thing is equivalent to another, such as "for, as, in place of" (3) a process of intervention, "in behalf of, for" (4) the reason for something, "because of, for the purpose of" and (5) result with implication of being a replacement for something, "therefore, so then."187 With the lack of a semantic precedence, therefore, it is natural to translate the preposition ἀντί in its most common usage, "instead of."

Second, the examples of ἀντί usually cited in favor of the sense of accumulation do not stand up to a scrutiny. Some commentators point to Sirach 26:15 where a meek or humble woman is described as χάρις επι χάριτι ("charm upon charm,")

---

186 *BDAG*, 87.

187 Ibid., 87-88. *EDNT* and *TDNT* also do not list a single occurrence or usage of the word meaning "upon" or "after." The range of meaning in these lexicons overlaps with the definition of *BDAG*. Friedrich Büchsel, "ἀντί," in *TDNT*, 1:372-73; H. Frankemölle, "ἀντί," in *EDNT*, 1:108-09. Cf. "in John 1:16 charin anti charitos denotes a perpetual and rapid succession of blessings, as though there were no interval between the arrival of one blessing and the receipt of the next. Alternatively, the idea of constant renewal may be less prominent than the notion of the replacement of 'old' grace by 'new' grace." M. J. Harris, "Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament," in *NIDNTT*, 3:1179-80.
i.e., a double blessing). The example is hardly relevant for the present discussion since the preposition is ἐπὶ not ἀντί. Keener comments that “the preposition differs . . . but LXX readers might have suspected an allusion; prepositions were losing some force by the Koine period.” Keener’s statement, however, is a special pleading. Another ancient Greek passage often referred to is from Philo’s De Posteritate Caini 145a:

Διὸ τὰς πρῶτας αἰεὶ χάριτας, πρὶν κορεσθέντας ἔξυβρίασα τοὺς λαχῶντας, ἐπισαχὼν καὶ ταμιευσάμενος εἰσαύθις ἐτέρας ἀντ’ ἐκείνων καὶ τρίτας ἀντὶ τῶν δευτέρων καὶ αἰεὶ νέας ἀντὶ παλαιότερων, τοτε μὲν διαφεροῦσας, τοτε δ’ αὐτ’ καὶ τὰς αὐτάς ἐπιδίδωσι.

Wherefore God ever causes His earliest gifts to cease before their recipients are glutted and wax insolent; and storing them up for the future gives others in their stead, and a third supply to replace (ἀντι) the second, and ever new in place of (ἀντι) earlier boons, sometimes different in kind, sometimes the same.

As is evident in the text, this usage of the preposition adds up to the replacement view since the idea is not “accumulation” but clearly “replacement.” That is, God dispenses one gift (or blessing) in place of another so as not to spoil men.

At this point, it is worthwhile to consider two points, which scholars bring up in favor of the superabundance of the grace view. Despite the apparent indicators, for instance, some commentators point to the general tenor of the entire Gospel and the immediately preceding verses as an important hermeneutical indicator. Yet, the replacement interpretation of verses sixteen and seventeen does not exclude such an


189 Ibid., n. 546.


191 Ibid., 6.

insight. The textual exegesis of verses sixteen through eighteen reveals, however, that these texts principally highlight the difference of dispensations. The profusion of the divine grace is logically deduced from the shift of these dispensations and particularly from the superlatively rich provision of the new covenant.

In addition to the semantic argument for the accumulation view, some scholars draw attention to the possible Old Testament imagery in the first clause of verse eighteen: “No one has seen God (Θεὸν οὐδείς ἐβρακεν πώτερ).” A. T. Hanson maintains that since Exodus 33:12-34:8 clearly indicates that Moses beheld Yahweh, it is difficult to postulate that the fourth evangelist is negating such a popular Jewish tradition.193 Furthermore, John 12:41 also notes the vision of the prophet Isaiah, in which he witnessed the “glory” of Jesus. Hanson does not mention Abraham’s witness which also makes this conjecture more plausible (John 8:56-58).194 Thus, the idea of witnessing God or more precisely the pre-existent Logos is not foreign to John. Consequently, it follows that it was the pre-existent Logos, not Yahweh, that Moses witnessed in the theology of John.195 In this logic, the latter part of verse 18 explains the first half. Likewise, verses 16 through 17 expound on the continuity and abundance of the divine redemptive plan under the Mosaic and the new economies, both through the Logos.

Hanson’s interpretation, however, ignores the wording of John 1:18, which stresses the contrastive nature of God’s invisibility and the Son’s premier disclosure to


194Hanson, “John 1.14-18 and Exodus 34,” 86-88.

human history in the new covenant (this recurring theme of God coming into the world for the first time in this manner is reiterated in vv. 10-11, 14-15), not on Moses’ witness of the pre-existent Jesus, which could be secondarily inferred. This text neither directly excludes the possibility of Moses’ witnessing the pre-existent Logos in view of the theophanies of Isaiah and Abraham in the Gospel, nor does it positively promote such a view. Differently put, the point of verse eighteen is that, in contrast to the Mosaic dispensation (in which “no one has seen God”), the new salvific economy has made God accessible like never before, thus upholding the close unity between God and the Son and the unique theophany through the latter at the same time. Likewise, John 6:46 reiterates the superiority of the new revelation that is based on the direct encounter with Yahweh: “Not that anyone has seen the Father except the one who is from God; he has seen the Father.” In this respect, even the possible polemic against Moses (or the Gnostic redeemer figure for the same reason) is relegated onto an ancillary level. The summary statement of William Loader is helpful:

[John] 1,18 discredits all alternative claims to see God. This includes claims made about Moses. But while this may seem to be disparaging of Moses, it stands beside the more positive claim that the Law was given, ἐδόθη, through Moses. . . . Something positive is being said [about the Mosaic covenant] but it is set in contrast with something much greater for which the vocabulary of fullness is used. . . . This gift [given to Moses] from God is now surpassed by a great gift from God.

Summary. In summary, the observations noted so far spell out the positive role of Moses on the one hand. As a representative of the old covenant, he foreshadows the gracious nature of the new salvific plan as unfolded through Jesus. For this reason, the oversimplistic antithetical understanding of John 1:16-17 fails to take into account

196 It is probably not the intention of the evangelist that this text communicates Moses’ witness of the pre-existent Logos. Michael Theobald, Die Fleischwerdung des Logos: Studien zum Verhältnis des Johannesprologs zum Corpus des Evangeliums und zu 1 Joh, NTANT 20 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1988), 259-62.

this continuity. On the other hand, as its superseded status indicates, the common
denominator between the two economies recedes to the background as the superiority of
the new Heilsgeschichte is brought to the fore of the narrative. Standing in the
background, Moses still points to the gracious nature and the preeminence of the new
divine disclosure. The analogy of John 6:32 could be helpful. As God gave bread to the
Israelite ancestors through Moses, he also imparts the living bread, Jesus, to believers. In
this analogy, Moses' role in the distribution of Manna bears witness to the gracious
nature and continuity of the old and new redemptive plans rather than providing a
typology for the messiah:

Joh 1,17 ist in seiner Kürze enigmatisch, weist aber in seiner Terminologie auf
Vorstellungen und Konzeptionen hin, die wir in anderen Stellen des Evangeliums
finden. Joh 6,32 ist eine wichtige Analogie: Mose hat das Manna an die Väter
gegben, Gott das Brot des Lebens Jesus. Wie Moses Mannagabe ein Vorzeichen,
ein Schatten der Lebensgabe ist, so ist Moses Gabe des Gesetzes ein Vorverweis auf
die Gabe von Gnade und Wahrheit durch Jesus. Wird die Gabe des Mose, das
Gesetz, auf Jesus hin gelesen, so entspricht dies seiner eigentlichen Zeugnisfunktion.
Die Mosegabe gewinnt ihre Autorität dadurch, dass sie Zeugnis für Jesus ist.198

Although only an indirect allusion, the witness function of Moses via the law in John
1:16-18 initiates a recurring witness motif followed by that of John the Baptist (v. 15) in
the Johannine prologue.199 To represent Moses in witness terms means a redefinition of
the conventional belief in him, i.e., an authority figure.200

198 Michael Labahn, “Jesus und die Autorität der Schrift im Johannesevangelium:
Überlegungen zu einem spannungsreichen Verhältnis,” in Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im
Johannesevangelium: Festgabe für Johannes Beutler SJ zum 70. Geburtstag, ed. Michael Labahn, Klaus
Scholtissek, and Angelika Strotmann (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), 193.

199 Martin Hengel, “The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” in The Gospels and the
Scriptures of Israel, ed. Craig A. Evans and W. Richard Stegner, JSNTSup 104 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1994),
387-88. In this light, it makes sense that the Peshitta version supplies the adversative conjunction \( \text{dn} \)
between grace and truth in verse 17. Cf. Tjitze Baarda, “John 1,17b: The Origin of a Peshitta Reading,”

200 Schapdick describes this redefinition as “the switching of content.” “Der Nomos ist nicht als
die göttliche Offenbarung selbst zu verstehen, sondern als Wegweiser zu dieser Offenbarung. Das Gesetz wurde
Mose gegeben, um Zeugnis abzulegen von der eschatologischen Gottesoffenbarung Jesu. Von daher ist es
richtig anzumerken, dass die göttliche Gnadengabe des Gesetzes durch die Wahrheit Jesu Christi nicht
aufgehoben wird . . . . Seine soteriologische Relevanz wird jedoch neu bestimmt. Es dient als Zeuge für das
Heil in Jesus Christus. Ein Lesen des Nomos ohne Christusbezug entlässt jedoch keinerlei Heil aus sich.”
Schapdick, “Autorität ohne Inhalt,” 186 n. 35.
Serpent of Moses: John 3:14

And just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of Man be lifted up. (John 3:14)

Context. The present text is located within the pericope of Jesus’ conversation with Nicodemus (John 3:1-21). This occasion provides an entry for the first extended discourse about the crucifixion on the part of Jesus. The narrative was prompted by Nicodemus’ acknowledgement of Jesus’ divinely commissioned nature (v. 2), then it moves onto the “born-again” speech, “the earthly things” (τὰ ἐπίγεια, vv. 3-12).

Scholars have debated over the referents of the “earthly” and “heavenly” things. D. A. Carson convincingly puts out a case for this distinction. Because the new birth takes place on earth, it is the earthly things while the glorification of Jesus occurs in the heavenly realm. In addition, it is natural to take “the earthly things” mentioned in v. 12 as referring back to the previous context (vv. 3-9) which speaks of the new birth (being born again).  

At the disbelief of the Jewish teacher Jesus laments because, unless one is born again and/or from above, he has no part in the kingdom of God (v. 3). Furthermore, because of the disbelief or inability to understand “the earthly things,” Jesus is somewhat hesitant to divulge his knowledge about “the heavenly things (τὰ ἐπουράνια, v. 12)” so much so that the revelation is given only briefly in two respects. First, he is the only qualified revealer of the heavenly realm because he is the only one who has descended from and ascended to the heaven (v. 13). This fact also implies that he is the only one who has really seen and heard about the “heavenly things” (v. 11). The qualification of Jesus’ being the only valid witness (vv. 11, 13-14) leads to a glimpse into the “heavenly...”
things.” That is, God’s intention is to save the world by lifting up his only Son. This “lifting up” relates not only to the crucifixion of Jesus but also to his enthronement in heaven. Even more, this exaltation also involves the judgment of the world:

Those who believe in him are not condemned; but those who do not believe are condemned already, because they have not believed in the name of the only Son of God. And this is the judgment, that the light has come into the world, and people loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. (John 3:18-19)

In John 12:31-32, this aspect of “lifting up” (i.e., crucifixion) is set forth in terms of the judgment of the prince of the world. Therefore, the analogy of Jesus’ crucifixion to Moses’ lifting of a bronze serpent in verse 14 serves two purposes: the qualification of Jesus’ witness for “the heavenly things” and his mission to realize the divine redemptive plan, “the heavenly things” (vv. 15-21) in the saving and judgment of the world.

T. F. Glasson. Of the four major typological studies on Moses in John, only T. F. Glasson addresses this text at length in a typological sense (Moses in the Fourth Gospel, 33-39). He takes notice of some interesting parallels between John 3:14 and the Sinai theophany event in Numbers 21. He does not explicitly maintain that these parallels manifest the Mosaic typology in the section in which the text is discussed.

However, in view of his remark in the introduction that seeing Jesus as a second Moses is

---


203 The ascension of “Son of Man” is described in the perfect tense in v. 12 (ἀνεβασμένος). This tense may indicate a theological reflection of the early church into the first life setting.

204 The three other studies are Meeks, the Prophet-King; Boismard, Moses or Jesus; and J. Louis Martyn, History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel, 3rd ed., NTL (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2003). In addition, Duncan Derrett offers also somewhat typological observations related to this text. J. Duncan M. Derrett, “The Bronze Serpent,” Expository Times 91 (1996): 322-27.
an important hermeneutical key, it seems to be fair to presume that he argues for the presence of a Mosaic messianic typology in the text:

In recent years increasing attention has been paid to the importance (for the understanding of the New Testament generally) of seeing the Messianic hope in terms of a new Exodus and of recognizing the Messiah as a second Moses. In the following pages it is hoped to show that this approach is one of the keys to the understanding of the Fourth Gospel. 205

As such, his study will be taken into account in the present discussion as a dialogue partner.

Glasson observes a four-fold parallelism that underscores the analogy between Moses and Jesus. First, "looking" is an important theme both in Numbers and John. Although the actual phrase "seeing" or "looking" is lacking in John 3:14 and in its immediate context, the motif emerges in connection with Jesus' crucifixion in John 6:40 and 19:37. 206 Second, "lifting up" is applied both to the brazen serpent and to Jesus. In addition, the fourth evangelist uses the verb for "lifting" as a double entendre in reference both to the crucifixion and glorification (i.e., the ascension). 207 Third, the term "lift up (עָטַלְתָּה)" in John 3: 14 can be associated with the word "standard (שֵׁית)" in Numbers 21:8:

\[
\text{Then the LORD said to Moses, "Make a fiery serpent, and set it on a standard (שֵׁית)."}
\]  
(Num 21:8 NASB)

This conjunction is also attested to in some passages from Isaiah, in which the expression "lifted up (ûšôw)" is repeatedly linked with a standard (šêt)" (cf. Isa 5:26, 13:2, 11:12, 18:3, 62:10). 208 Therefore, although the Hebrew text of Numbers does not contain the word "lift up (ûšôw)," the readers of John familiar with the Hebrew tradition must have been reminded of the close connection between the word "lift up (ûšôw)" and the "standard or

205 Glasson, Moses in the Fourth Gospel, 10 (parentheses original).
208 Glasson, Moses in the Fourth Gospel, 36.
Finally, the Greek text of Numbers 21:8 refers to the bronze serpent as "σημεῖον," a "banner." However, Glasson suggests that σημεῖον in the Greek Old Testament could have evoked the Johannine miracle language. That is, that Jesus hung upon the cross is both a banner under which all believers should rally around, and a sign, in the sense of miracle or wonder, by which a believer reaches a saving knowledge.

**Critique of Glasson.** In response to Glasson, a rejection of a Mosaic typology in the present text is necessary for several reasons. First, the connection between John and Numbers via the “seeing” motif is not as explicit as Glasson suggests. Although the following “belief” language (vv. 15-18) might logically require “looking at” Jesus as a prerequisite step of faith, the emphasis of the present Johannine context is on God and Jesus, and not on a believer’s regeneration or the necessary procedure for securing salvation. As briefly discussed above, the point of John 3:1-21, and especially verses 12-21, is about “the heavenly things.” The heavenly affairs, i.e., salvation history, are revealed in human history through the “lifting up” (the crucifixion and the exaltation) of the Son of man. The “seeing” motif is only a peripheral point in this *Heilsgeschichte.*

Second, the association of “lifting up” with “banner” and “sign” is an unnecessary deduction. Not only are these two Hebrew words not semantically related, but the context of John 3:14 does not require a sense of the cross being a banner, under which all believers will be gathered together. The connection can be adduced theologically but not from a natural exegesis of the text.

Third, the mention of Jesus’ being the only one to journey back from and forth to heaven excludes a Mosaic typology. In contrast to somewhat widespread Jewish beliefs (this tradition was discussed above on the Assumption of Moses, the Exagoge of

---

210 Ibid., 38.
Ezekiel, and Philo), John unmistakably denies the possibility of Moses’ ascension to heaven. Thus, he is counted out from the rank analogous to Jesus; Moses is no peer of Jesus.\textsuperscript{212}

Finally and most importantly, the role of Moses played out in the texts of John and Numbers does not demand a typological reading. In both John and Numbers, Moses participates in the divine redemptive program as a mere facilitator (with God being the active agent), whereas Jesus is the object or the content of the salvation history:\textsuperscript{213}

In 3, 14 f. liegt keine Mosetypologie vor.... Christus wird in 3,14 f. demnach nicht als ein zweiter Mose charakterisiert, zumal dies mit 3,13 kollidierte. Denn dort wird mit einem unüberhörbar polemischen Unterton bestritten, außer dem Menschensohn sei jemals einer in den Himmel hinaufgestiegen. Genau dies ist aber, vor allem auf Mose bezogen, eine weit verbreitete Überzeugung im antiken Judentum. Geht es also nicht um eine typologische Entsprechung Mose-Christus, präfiguriert Mose \textit{Tun}, das er im göttlichen Auftrag vollzieht, typologisch das christologischc Heilsgeschehen.... Vielmehr setzt er Jesus durch die Aufnahme weisheitlicher Sophia- und Logostheologie, mit deren Hilfe er seine soteriologisch orientierte Christologie füllt, von Mose deutlich ab.\textsuperscript{214}

Furthermore, the redemption brought forth through Moses was only provisional, while that of Jesus takes an eternal consequence (John 3:15-16). The active agent of the salvation history remains the same, but the gift is drastically changed.\textsuperscript{215} Such a stark contrast and the different roles played out by Jesus and Moses in the analogy exclude the possibility of Moses’ becoming a messianic prefiguration.


\textsuperscript{214}Sanger, “‘Von mir hat er geschrieben’ (Joh 5,46),” 126-27.

\textsuperscript{215}Dietzfelbinger, \textit{Das Evangelium nach Johannes}, 1:290; Schapdick, “Autorität ohne Inhalt,” 188-89.
Summary. The foregoing observations reveal the fourth evangelist’s unique understanding of Moses not in terms of a messianic prefiguration but as a mere facilitator and spectator of the divine redemptive program. The salvation history of which he was part bears witness to the gracious and supernatural nature of “the heavenly things.” However, the contrast is so stark between the old and new Heilsgeschichten that a typology between the two is hardly appropriate.

The most striking aspect of the Johannine description of Jesus’ ascension, however, is paralleled neither in the Gnostic myths nor in the Moses legends. This is the central paradox that Jesus’ “being lifted up,” his ‘glorification,’ takes place in and through his death on the cross. The Johannine paradox is the exclusive product of Christian interpretation of the passion tradition. Comparison of the legends of Moses’ ascension with the Johannine theme of the exaltation of the Son of Man thus leads to negative results. The notion of Jesus’ paradoxical enthronement is not dependent on the Moses traditions for its fundamental structure.

Witness and Accusation of Moses:
John 1:45, 5:37-39, 46

A number of Johannine exegetes recognize the key role of the present text

---


217 Meeks, The Prophet-King, 297.
(John 5:39-46) for John’s hermeneutics of the Scripture. They variously call this text a “Schlüsselftext” or “Kompendium.” Furthermore, a small number of scholars recognize even the prominence of “correspondence between Moses and Jesus” in this text. For instance, the systematic defiance of Israelites and the Jews and the redemptive acts of Moses and Jesus are noted as providing points of contact. In contrast, a greater number of exegetes find the witness function as more prominent for “scripture” and Moses. With these divergent opinions in view, this section will seek to ascertain the narrative function of Moses in relation to Christology.

**Controversial context.** John 5:31-47 is located after the account of the healing of the lame man (5:1-9). Since the healing ministry took place on Sabbath, certain Jews leveled criticism against Jesus in the temple (5:10-18). In response to their antagonism, Jesus states the grounds for the legitimacy of his working on Sabbath. That is, Jesus is equal to God, as most conspicuously attested to in his authority over life and death (5:19-29). Therefore, he stands above the Sabbath rule:

> But Jesus answered them, “my Father is still working, and I also am working.” For this reason the Jews were seeking all the more to kill him, because he was not only breaking the sabbath, but was also calling God his own Father, thereby making himself equal to God. Jesus said to them, “very truly, I tell you, the Son can do nothing on his own, but only what he sees the Father doing; for whatever the Father does, the Son does likewise” (5:17-19); “Indeed, just as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whomever he wishes” (5:21); “So that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father. Anyone who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent him.” (5:23)

Moreover, Jesus appeals to a series of four witnesses in defense of his mission,

---
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which includes his healing ministry (5:31-38). The first witness is John the Baptist, but his witness is partial and incomplete. The second witness, God the Father, provides the ultimate witness. Jesus does not need a witness from such men as John the Baptist, but his witness was given in order for the benefit of Jesus’ audience: “Not that I accept such human testimony, but I say these things so that you may be saved” (5:34); “I do not accept glory from human beings” (5:41). The witness of these third party individuals justify the identity and mission of Jesus. In contrast to the common belief of the Jews who held Moses to be authoritative and the source of information for life, he functions only to bear witness in favor of Jesus.222 Ironically, this witness function of Moses, in turn, indicts the Jews for their unwillingness to accept this God-designated purpose of his writings (5:39-47).

**A series of witnesses.** Contrary to the belief of the Jews, they do not enjoy an intimate relationship with God. The Jews repeatedly claim their lineage from Abraham and Moses, implying their privileged position to possess the divine revelation and the close association with Yahweh through these ancestors of faith: “Then they reviled him, saying, ‘you are his disciple, but we are disciples of Moses. We know that God has spoken to Moses, but as for this man, we do not know where he comes from’” (John 9:28-29; for Abraham, see 8:33, 39, 53). On the contrary, John articulates the outworking of the salvific event (which is variously described as possessing eternal life, and the indwelling of or believing in the Word incarnate) exclusively in terms of Jesus. This unique and definitive standing of Jesus is further corroborated through a series of four witnesses: John the Baptist (vv. 33-35), Jesus (v. 36, 10:25), God the Father (vv. 37-39a), and “the scripture and Moses” (vv. 39b-47).223 Particularly pertinent to the present chapter is

---
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verse forty-six, where Moses is recognized as the author of “scripture” and is also called in as a witness for Jesus. Structurally, the witnesses of Jesus and God are bracketed by the witnesses of the Baptist and Moses. However, the witnesses of God and Jesus are greater than those of John the Baptist and Moses (vv. 36, 39).

Figure 1. Four witnesses on behalf of Jesus' mission and identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John the Baptist (vv. 33-35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus (v. 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God (vv. 37-39a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scripture and Moses (vv. 39b-47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An allusion to the Sinai account. A large number of scholars recognize the presence of an allusion to Moses in verses 37-38, especially in his encounter with Yahweh on Mount Sinai (i.e., Exod 19:9, 33:12-34:35, Num 7:89, 23:6-8, Deut 5): “And the Father who sent me has himself testified on my behalf. You have never heard his voice or seen his form, and you do not have his word abiding in you, because you do not believe him whom he has sent.” This allusion implies a typology between Moses and Jesus. Just like the Israelites in the wilderness, the Jews do not experience God due to their disregard for the divine messenger, Jesus. As such, John 5:37-38 insists readers must accept Jesus just as the Israelites should have received Moses wholeheartedly. Some of the scholars sympathetic to this typological reading refer to the Pentateuchal accounts of Moses and Deuteronomy 18:15-18, in particular, as the conceptual background, which set the stage for the Johannine readers (who were familiar with the Mosaic prophet expectations). Under this circumstance, the reader of John would have

---

immediately perceived Jesus as an eschatological figure like Moses.

**Klaus Scholtissek and the majority view.** Scholtissek is one of the scholars who explain the present text in accordance with this line of logic. Unless the reception of the divine messenger accompanies, the searching of the scripture does not bear the fruit it promises, “life.” Belief in Jesus is crucial because it leads to the immanence of the word of God. This view takes the conjunction ὅτι in verse 38 as causal: “ὅτι δὲν ἀπέστειλεν ἡκέως, τοῦτω υμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε.” (5:38b) Thus, verses 37-38 can be paraphrased as following:

Because you do not believe in me (Jesus), as a result, you have not seen or heard God and his word is not abiding in you just like the Israelites in the wilderness had not experienced Yahweh.

An alternative interpretation (the majority view) of this passage in light of the Sinai allusion understands John 5:38b as an explanation for John 5:37b-38a. That is, not experiencing God (which is basically the miscomprehension of the Scripture) explains the Jewish rejection of the divine messenger. This view takes the ὅτι clause as explanatory:

In the last clause of v. 38, for you do not believe the one he sent, the conjunction “for” should therefore be taken as introducing the conclusive evidence in support of the triple indictment, rather than as the cause of the spiritual and moral failure of Jesus’ interlocutors.
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Thus, the witness of God in scriptures explains the Jews’ rejection of Jesus.

Nevertheless, both views do not adequately take into account the important semantic difference of the terminologies, “word (λόγος, v. 38)” and “scripture (γραφή, v. 39).” In the prologue, λόγος means “the presence of God in the person of Jesus, not the divine activity in the words of Jesus.” In the immediate contexts, the λόγος of Jesus is also closely juxtaposed with “life.” The “hearing of λόγος” is life in 5:24. Its semantic cognate, ἐνέργειά of Jesus are the spirit and life in 6:63. Λόγος and ἐνέργεια are usually reserved for the word of Jesus (or God), and not once in reference to the writings of Moses (the prologue, 4:41, 50, 6:59-61, 7:40, 10:19). In addition, an important Johannine motif, the internalization of Jesus being equal to the direct encounter with God or the divine immanence, pervades in the prologue and the rest of the Gospel (John 1:1-18, 7:37-39, 10:38, 14:9-11, 20, 17:21-23). These two observations suggest that “word (λόγος)” in verse 38 should be understood differently from “scripture (γραφή)” in verse 39. Λόγος and γραφή are two totally different entities. Therein lie the exegetical mistakes of most Johannine commentators and Scholtiseek, as they uncritically equate the two phrases. Jesus, the Word incarnate, is more than the passage to “life.” In effect, he is the life (5:26, 6:35, 63, 11:25, 14:6).

In addition to this semantic observation, the Gospel’s recurrent emphasis on the divine exposure through Jesus weakens the Sinai allusion view (in addition to the prologue 1:18, also 6:46, “no one has seen the Father except the one who is from God; only he has seen the Father”). The point of verses thirty-seven through thirty-eight relates to the witness of God, that which becomes evident in the life of contemporary Christian believers through the unprecedented indwelling of the “word (λόγος)” of God, not the witness of the scripture or an allusion to Moses’ encounter of Yahweh (this notion

---


also stands in accordance with the tenor of the bread of life discourse in ch. 6 [see the following discussion in the next section]).

One who rejects Jesus does not enjoy this union with God. That imminence is God’s witness. This “greater witness” theme continues on in verse thirty-nine forward. God’s immanent presence is not to be found in “scripture,” which only functions to direct as to that end (5:39, 6:45). In this way, the scripture and Moses bear witness to the coming messiah (John 1:45, 5:46). This way of understanding the role of Moses through his writings is the only valid interpretation of scripture. Differently put, non-Christological hermeneutics of scripture is also deficient. It is not in certain passages, but collectively, that the Mosaic writings point forward to the incomparable messiah, the only true way through which God reveals himself completely. In this regard, just like that of John the Baptist, the witness of Moses through his writings (γραφή, “scripture”) is inferior to the immanent witness of God the Father through the indwelling of the Word incarnate in the hearts of believers. As such, the authority of Moses stands as far as it bears witness to Jesus.

Bertold Klappert. B. Klappert also offers an elaborate exegesis of the present text under discussion along the same lines as Scholtissek’s. First, the point of departure for his investigation is the miracles and signs of Jesus that invoke the “signs and wonders” performed by Moses, as recorded in the exodus accounts. For the Gospel of John, it is a significant indicator that the healing of the lame man narrative precedes the testimony of Moses as recorded in John 5:46-47. The importance of the healing narrative is due to the fact that the account evokes the wonder-working image of Moses. In addition, the feeding of the five-thousand and the bread of life discourses following John 5:46-47 (“the testimony of Moses”) reinforces the allusion to Moses, especially the

---


Manna accounts of Exodus. These parallels constitute a Moses-Jesus typology, which is anticipated in Deuteronomy 18:15-18 and confirmed in John 5 and 6.234

Second, the miracle accounts of Exodus invite Israelites to believe in Yahweh and in his servant, Moses. Likewise, the Johannine counterparts of the Mosaic miracle accounts (i.e., the signs of Jesus) are reminiscent of the Yahweh experience in the wilderness, and they promote faith in the Johannine divine messenger, Jesus. The faith in Jesus corresponds to the faith in Moses, who is Jesus’ eschatological counterpart. As a corollary, not seeing the correspondence between Moses and Jesus is to misunderstand the point of Deuteronomy 18:15-18, the transgression with which Jesus charges the Jews in John 5:46:  “if you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote about me.”235

However, this interpretation results from a gross oversight of the point of the entire Gospel, that is, to proclaim the exclusive revelatory value of Jesus, the only way through whom the redemption that Jews hoped for has been made possible. The reason for Moses’ indictment of the Jews is because they set their hope in a wrong person who metonymically represents the Old Testament and who merely pointed forward to the messiah. This indictment of Moses stands in stark contrast to the common Jewish belief; namely, he is their defender.236 In other words, the guilt of the Jews was more

234Klappert, “‘Mose hat von mir geschrieben,’” 633-35.

235Ibid., 633-37. Also, Scholtissek faults the Jews with their lack of the correct understanding of the Scripture. “5,39 spricht von der ‘Meinung,’ ‘ewiges Leben in den Schriften zu haben.’ Jesus überführt diese Überzeugung durch den Hinweis auf das Zeugnis ebendieser Schriften für ihn und auf den Unwilling seiner Hörer, zu ihm zu kommen (5:39-40): ‘Levern zu haben,’ ist nur christologisch möglich. Die Lebens-Suche der Menschen (vgl. 5:39, 44; 6:24-26), die sich zu Recht auf die Schriften richtet, findet ihre Erfüllung erst im Glauben an Jesus, von dem die unauflosbare Schrift (10,35) Zeugnis ablegt. Damit vollzieht sich ein für die joh Schriftttheologie entscheidender Überstieg: Das Ziel des Studiums der Schriften, ‘in ihnen ewiges Leben zu finden’ (5,39; vgl. 1,45.48), erfüllt sich nur, wenn erkannt wird, daß diese für den Sohn Zeugnis ablegen, denn allein der Vater und durch ihn der Sohn ‘hat (ewiges) Leben in sich’ (5:26; vgl. 1:4; 5:24, 42). Ort und Mittler des ‘Lebens in Fülle’ (10,10) ist allein Jesus, auf den das Zeugnis der Schrift weist (vgl. 5:45-47).” Klaus Scholtissek, “Die Brotrede Jesu in Joh 6,1-71: Exegetische Beobachtungen zu ihrem johanneischen Profil,” ZKT 123 (2001): 39. However, Scholtissek commits the fallacy of superimposing the distant contexts. First and foremost, the immediate context articulates that the scripture only bears witness to Jesus who is the only one to make the eternal life available (Jn 5:39-40). The goal of the Scripture is not to provide the eternal life but to point to Jesus.

236Meeks, The Prophet-King, 118, 137, 159-61, 174, 200-04. He refers to Philo, Josephus, As. Mos., Pseudo-Philo, Qumran, and rabbinic midrash. Kotila wishes to separate Moses from this text arguing that the reference to Moses is not to him in person but to the Scripture in its judgment over the Old
fundamental, that is, they were headed in a wrong direction for “life,” not that they were miscomprehending the correspondence between Moses and his anti-type. John 5:39 implies that the “life” is not to be found in “scriptures”: “You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that testify on my behalf.”

Furthermore, the general tenor of John toward Jesus is that he is far superior to Moses. He is above the Sabbath rule, which was passed down to Jews through Moses (5:1-19, 7:18-24). Moses was not able to provide Manna even for provisional satisfaction, but Jesus is himself the life of bread that sustains believers forever (6:1-59). This superiority pushes the possible typology to a secondary level. In the studies of Scholtissek and Klappert, the motive for inter-religious dialogue, rather than careful exegesis, seems to be at work with the result of seriously distorting the plain reading of the texts.

**Marie-Émile Boismard.** Finally, another noteworthy study that presents the Johannine Jesus in terms of a Mosaic typology is that of Boismard. He detects such a typology from the conversation between Philip and Nathanael. His view is unfolded in four steps. First, the phrase, “Moses … and the prophets,” in John 1:45 is an idiosyncratic expression, nowhere else to be found but here in the entire scope of the New Testament writings. As such, the expression should not be taken as a conventional euphemism for the whole of the Old Testament, but as a reference to the specific scope of the Mosaic writings, namely, the Pentateuch. Second, various reasons suggest that the particular text in mind is Deuteronomy 18:18. Third, and more specifically, one can detect the evangelist’s strong recourse to the Samaritan tradition in the two disciples’ recognition of Jesus as a descendant of Joseph the patriarch (not Jesus’ legal father) and

the King of Israel (i.e., Moses). These two figures were supposed to have enjoyed the highest esteem among the Samaritans in the time of Jesus. From these three steps, Boismard reaches his final conclusion that Jesus is king in imitation of the patriarch Joseph. 237

Regardless of the painstaking exegetical labor, however, Boismard’s study raises a number of questions. First, it is unclear whether Jesus is associated with Joseph the son of Jacob. The text articulates the provenance of Jesus as “Son of Joseph who is from Nazareth (Ἰσαοῦν γενὸς τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τόν ἁπέναξ ᾿Αναρέτ, 1:45).” The juxtaposition of Joseph with Nazareth probably indicates his family and hometown. Elsewhere in the Gospel (6:42), the phrase “son of Joseph” clearly refers to his father, not the patriarch. In the next verse, Nathanael does not take note of Jesus’ supposed connection with the patriarch but only of his geographic origin (Nazareth). Both biographical and local provenances do not appear to impress Nathanael.

Highly puzzling, however, is Nathanael’s confession in verse 49, in which Jesus is called “Son of God (ὁ γενός τοῦ Θεοῦ)” and “King of Israel (βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ).” In the pericope of John 1:35-51 (Jesus’ calling of disciples), Jesus’ identity is revealed with four different epithets: “rabbi” (v. 38), “Son of God (ὁ γενός τοῦ Θεοῦ) and King of Israel (βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ)” in the mouth of Nathanael (v. 49), and Son of Man (v. 51). C. Langner suggests that these four titles here proleptically function to summarize the upcoming mission and life of Jesus. That is, as a rabbi Jesus provides his teachings; as “Son of God” he was condemned; as King crucified; and as “Son of Man” he was resurrected. 238 As neatly as it sounds, however, his interpretation seems to be without much textual support. In particular, it is uncertain whether Jesus was resurrected

237Boismard, Moses or Jesus, 23-41.

as "Son of Man."

More puzzling than the four-fold progression of Jesus’ identity is the location of Nathanael’s confession, since it appears to be too mature a confession to be placed at such an early stage of the Gospel. Three interpretations, in particular, have been proposed to solve this issue. First, this confession is polemically directed at the unbelieving Jews. Therefore, it must be read retrospectively from the end to the beginning of the Gospel (as such, the confession is a redactional insertion).\footnote{Schenke, Johannes, 50; Gnilka, Johannesevangelium, 21-22.}

Alternatively, others posit that Nathanael’s confessional statement is only provisional in nature, namely, it merely reveals the amazement of the new disciple at Jesus’ supernatural knowledge.\footnote{Wengst, Das Johannesevangelium, 1:94-97.} In this direction, D. A. Carson, for example, partially solves this dilemma by suggesting that the epithet “Son of God” is a functional category, not an ontological one.\footnote{Carson, The Gospel according to John, 161-62.} That is, Jesus shares in the nature of God and he acts as God would (in the sense that we call some fellow Christians “godly men”). Thus, the epithet does not reflect a full-blown messianic confession. This notion sounds plausible, especially in view of Jesus’ supernatural knowledge about Nathanael.\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{242}} However, the study of J. J. Collins suggests that the term already took on a messianic significance in Palestine at the time of Jesus. John J. Collins, “The Son of God Text from Qumran,” in From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge, ed. Martinus C. de Boer, JSNTSup 84 (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1993), 65-82. See 1QSa 2:11-12; 2 Esd 7:28-29.} Additionally, the disciple could have expressed his hope for a mere political liberator by means of the title, “King of Israel.” Finally, still some others point to the emphatic function of the confession in relation to the omnipotent supernatural divinity of Jesus (the implication being also the result of a redactional coloring).\footnote{\text{\textsuperscript{243}} E kkehard W. Stegemann and Wolfgang Stegemann, “König Israels, nicht König der Juden?: Jesus als König im Johannesevangelium,” in Messias-vorstellungen bei Juden und Christen, ed. Ekkehard Stegemann (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1993), 47; Stefan Schreiber, “Rätsel um den König: Zur religionsgeschichtlichen Herkunft des König-Titels im Johannesevangelium,” in Johannes enigmaticus: Studien zum Johannesevangelium für Herbert Leray, ed. Stefan Schreiber and Alois Stimpfle, BU 29}
wording of this short pericope requires a certain degree of messianic understanding (in contrast to Wengst and Carson). The titles “Son of God” and “King of Israel” may not be used as technical terms on their own in the present text and in the time of Jesus. Yet coupled with Philip’s introduction based on the scriptural witness (i.e., the one whom Moses and the prophets promised in v. 45), however, the double designation seems to be intended to carry some measure of a messianic overtone. Furthermore, “Son of God” is referred to in association with Messiah in John 11:27 and 20:31:

“She said to him, ‘Yes, Lord, I believe that you are the Messiah, the Son of God, the one coming into the world’” (John 11:27); “But these are written so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name.” (John 20:31)

Messianic or not, the question directly relevant to the present study is whether “King of Israel” bears a Mosaic overtone. The idiom is not a common expression, mentioned only three times, apart from this passage, in the entire New Testament corpus. Both in Matthew 27:42 and Mark 15:32, the crowd mocks Jesus with this title at his crucifixion. In the Johannine triumphal entry account (12:32), Jesus is hailed as “King of Israel.” In all these occurrences, if an association with an Old Testament character is to be found, it is David, not Moses. Thus, the extent of Boismard’s argument (19 pages) probably (and ironically) speaks against his view. If John intended a Mosaic messianic overtone with the expression, one wonders why it takes such a lengthy investigation of extra-canonical sources to prove a supposedly important Johannine theme? The extra-biblical materials (later rabbinic and Samaritan sources) to which Boismard has recourse might reveal the kingship of Moses in association with Joseph the patriarch, but the Gospel of John does not (neither Matthew nor Mark) espouse such an
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Summary. In John 1:45 and 5:36-47, Moses is mentioned and alluded to. Contrary to the arguments of some exegetes, these texts do not paint Moses as a messianic type. His narrative function in these texts is exclusively restricted to that of witness and not a provider of "life" or a facilitator of the divine immanence. The latter function is strictly reserved for Jesus. The witness function of Moses develops in two ways through his writings (γραφή, "scripture"). On the one hand, his witness is extended in the service of recognizing the identity of Jesus. That is, his writings do not merely promise an eschatological figure in an abstract manner (especially as Deut 18:15-18 was sometimes understood in the intertestamental literature), but they unambiguously point to Jesus as the promised messiah (1:45, 5:39, 46-47). His role does not proceed beyond this point. His witness does not include "life" itself (the divine immanence) nor become internalized in the believers of Jesus. This aspect of internalization and being the source of eternal life separates Jesus drastically from Moses. This distinction, thus, rules out the messianic typological role of Moses. On the other hand, however, his other witness function is also peculiar in contradistinction to the conventional Jewish beliefs that upheld him as their advocate. That is, Moses prosecutes those who distort the purpose of his writings, which is to direct his readers to Jesus the messiah. The two primary roles of Moses, as messianic witness and as prosecutor of Jews, markedly distinguish the Fourth Gospel from his preceding and concurrent currents of Jewish thoughts.

---

Allusions to the Exodus Events:
John 6:14-15, 32-33

When the people saw the sign that he had done, they began to say, „This is indeed the prophet who is to come into the world.“ When Jesus realized that they were about to come and take him by force to make him king, he withdrew again to the mountain by himself. (John 6:14-15)

Then Jesus said to them, „Very truly, I tell you, it was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven, but it is my Father who gives you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven and gives life to the world.“ (John 6:32-33)

The sixth chapter of the Gospel of John has drawn a great deal of scholarly attention. In large measure, the reason lies in the rich allusions to and echoes of the Old Testament anecdotes related to Moses. Usually, the crossing of the Red Sea, the reception of Manna, and the ingathering of the twelve tribes are mentioned as that which evoke the exodus traditions. The following discussion will engage in a dialogue with exegetes who see this chapter as containing a Mosaic typology with reference to the

---

aforementioned Old Testament traditions. Afterwards, the narrative contribution of Moses to the Johannine Christology will be reviewed.

**Narrative unity.** In the aftermath of the rise of canonical and literary criticisms (commonly associated with B. S. Childs and R. A. Culpepper), Johannine exegetes agree upon the importance of the context. In this concurrence, what is also assumed and affirmed simultaneously is the importance of literary unity, in the case of the present discussion, that of chapter 6 within the surrounding narrative units. Based upon this scholarly agreement, this section proceeds with a contextual examination of the preceding and subsequent chapters. Some recent commentators detect a slight transposition of the narrative units. For instance, Udo Wilckens rearranges the chapters four through nine as following 4; 6:1-71; 5:1-47; 7:15-24, 1-14, 25-53. Ismo Dunderberg, on the other hand, postulates that chapter six is a later interpolation in between chapters 5 and 7. Not only are such reconstructions without textual attestation, they are suggestive at best and arbitrary from one study to another. A great number of scholars do not embrace the disarrayment and they respect the fourth evangelist’s compositional intention.

**Thematic link between John 5 and 6.** In his recent essay, Klaus Scholtissek perceptively notes the narrative cohesion of chapter 6 within the context of chapters 5

---
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through 7. The following contextual analysis is largely indebted to his study and, accordingly, follows his outline with some modifications. First, the witness theme is at work in both chapters. In John 5:36-47, four witnesses are called in on behalf of the authenticity of Jesus: John the Baptist (34-35), the works of Jesus (5:36), the witness of the Father (5:36-38), the witness of the scriptures (5:39-40, 46-47). Three of these four are invoked again: the “works” of Jesus (6:27-28, 30); the Father’s “sealing (ἐυαγγελίζω)” of the Son (6:27) and his sending of the true bread, which is reminiscent of the logos in John 5:38 (6:27, 32); and the Jews’ misunderstanding of the scripture and Jesus’ corrective interpretation (6:31-32).

Second, the inaccessibility of God and the unique intermediary function of Jesus are reiterated in 5:37 and 6:46. Third, the controversy over the reception in the name of the Father pervades (1:11-13, 5:43; 6:41, 52, 60-71). Fourth, related to this “reception motif” is the concomitant immanent presence of God in the believers’ heart (5:37-38, ). The reception of the divine messenger sharply separates the believers from the unbelievers (5:43-44, 6:41, 52). In addition, the themes, “searching” and “finding,” permeate chapters five and six (5:39-40; 6:24-26).

Fifth, after enlisting his disciples in John 1:19-51, two “feast cycles” run through the first half of the Gospel: the first from Cana to Cana (2:1-4:54) and the second from Jerusalem to Jerusalem (5:1-10:39). These two pericopae are replete with reference to the Jewish calendars and feasts, such as, the Sabbath, the Passover, and the Feast of Tabernacles.

---


common to these narratives is that only Jesus can fulfill human needs. Finally, the elusiveness of Jesus is deeply woven into the fabric of the narratives of John 6 through 7 (6:1, 14-15, 19, 21, 24-26, 7:1-13, 9:1-41, 11:7-16, 54-57). The bread of life speech, which is centered upon chapter six, is precipitated by the two “signs” discourses (the feeding of the multitude in 6:1-15 and the crossing of the sea in 6:16-21).

"The bread discourse [which occupies the center stage of John 6 in its entirety] is aimed at the faith decision. It exposes unbelief and leads to a crisis, provoking the confession as Peter speaks in verses sixty-eight through sixty-nine on behalf of the twelve disciples."

In conclusion, chapter six continues to spell out the missionary Christology of chapter five.

Wayne Meeks. Wayne Meeks has, in various ways, blazed a new trail in Johannine scholarship with his contribution, The Prophet-King. First, despite some previous attempts, he has presented one of the most elaborate cases for the influence of the Samaritan and early rabbinic sources upon the shaping of John’s Gospel. Second, the studies subsequent to his have had to respond, at least in some degree, to his thesis; namely, that the fourth evangelist redefined Jesus’ messiahship radically in terms of

---


"prophet-king": "The following investigation undertakes to clarify the way in which the motifs represented by the two terms ‘prophet’ and ‘king’ in the Fourth Gospel not only are interrelated, but interpret each other." Finally, based upon the allegedly divergent views on this Mosaic Christology (positive at some points but negative at others), he confirmed the then-popular two level drama hypothesis: that is, the tension toward Moses reflects the shift of the Johannine community’s historical settings. That the first and third points are subject to serious dispute need not be repeated here (see Appendix 7: “Use of the Rabbinic Materials for the New Testament Studies” for the first point; see pp. 106 n 48 in chapter three for the third point). Directly relevant to this study, however, is the question whether John portrays Jesus as a Mosaic prophet-king.

The concept of Mosaic prophet-king which Meeks constructed is largely dependent upon his interrelated exegesis of John 6:14-15 (people coercing Jesus to be a king), 10:1-39 (the good shepherd discourse), 18:33-38a (the crucifixion trial scene before Pilate). After noting several texts (1:49, 7:37-52, 12:12-19, 18:28-19:22) that associate Jesus with king, Meeks goes on to argue that John 6:14-15 reflects a common Jewish hope at the time for a Mosaic prophet-king derived from Deuteronomy 18:15-22:

When the people saw the sign that he had done, they began to say, “This is indeed the prophet who is to come into the world.” When Jesus realized that they were about to come and take him by force to make him king, he withdrew again to the mountain by himself. (John 6:14-15)

Such a notion, he maintains, is further confirmed by recurrent allusions to the Exodus events related to Moses in the following discourses in John 6, especially in terms of “signs":

In any case it is sufficiently evident that the discourse [John 6] sets Jesus’ σημεία parallel with God’s miraculous care of Israel under Moses’ leadership. This adds

262 Meeks, The Prophet-King, 1.
263 Ibid., 32-87.
264 Ibid., 87-96.
very strong support to the supposition that “the prophet” of verse 14 is the Mosaic eschatological prophet.\textsuperscript{265}

Related to this allusion to the Manna event is the theme of “gathering.” As gathering of fragments is mentioned in 6:13, John 11:50-52 also mentions the death of Jesus so as to gather the scattered children of God:\textsuperscript{266}

“You do not understand that it is better for you to have one man die for the people than to have the whole nation destroyed.” He did not say this on his own, but being high priest that year he prophesied that Jesus was about to die for the nation, and not for the nation only, but to gather into one the dispersed children of God. (John 11:50-52)

In addition, Jesus died a death of a good shepherd as he described one would do (John 10:1-39). Since David was not primarily considered to be a prophet, therefore, the recurrent description of Jesus as a prophet fits with the profile of the eschatological prophet like Moses but in the redefined royal-prophetic terms.\textsuperscript{267}

\textbf{Critique of Meeks.} Notwithstanding some interesting parallels that Meeks draws, his observations fail to be persuasive at a number of points. Most significantly, the sixth chapter of John as a whole does not appear to put a great emphasis on a Mosaic typology. Although some allusions are employed, they set a stage to clarify the surpassing nature of the new gift, namely, the bread of life. In other words, the value of the Mosaic references is only in providing the contrasting and exceeding aspect of the new redemptive history. When the people requested a sign by which they identified Jesus with Moses, Jesus’ reply was in the emphatic negative:\textsuperscript{268} “ἐμὴν ἐμὴν λέγω ἵμιν, οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ἴμιν τὸν ἐαρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; truly truly I say to you, it was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven” (6:32a). It is highly telling that the verse begins with the double amen idiom, and the repudiation of Moses’ giving bread is

\textsuperscript{265}Meeks, The Prophet-King, 92-93.
\textsuperscript{266}Ibid., 96-98.
\textsuperscript{267}Ibid., 97-99.
followed by the negative adverb où. It was inappropriate for people to look for a sign analogous to that which was brought about through Moses (6:32b). Not only is it God (not Moses) who supplies the bread, but the new bread, in stark contrast to its old counterpart, is unperishing and enlivening forever (6:48-58). The references to Moses are mentioned only in passing remarks, and Jesus emphatically rejects the people’s expectation of such an earthly hope. In light of the proportion of the passages allusive of the Mosaic accounts, the bread of life pericope should take hermeneutical priority over the previous allusions (feeding of the multitude and the crossing of the sea) to the exodus events as recorded in the first half of chapter 6. The latter accounts mainly serve to stimulate the main discourse about Jesus’ being the source of everlasting life.

Furthermore, another question that can be raised against the argument of Meeks is whether the good shepherd discourse and the trial scene necessarily demand a Mosaic typology. The mistake of Meeks lies in his presupposition that the evangelist must have presented Jesus exclusively in terms of personal figures, instead of abstract images, such as, the Passover lamb, water, and bread. In accordance with John’s more explicit analogy to these abstract Jewish symbols, the good shepherd may have to be viewed from a non-personal messianic prefigurative perspective. In addition, Meeks’ reason for excluding David from being a good shepherd is arbitrary. He allows a “radical redefinition” for Moses to become a royal-prophet. Yet, David does not enjoy such flexibility. It is unclear why John should not have employed the radical redefining of David as a royal prophet in the inverse way Meeks constructs the Mosaic prophet-king image from various extra-canonical sources.

John Dennis. Another noteworthy study that detects a wide range of exodus typology in John six is the one by John Dennis, “The Presence and Function of Second Exodus-Restoration Imagery in John 6.” Having surveyed the contemporaneous...
Jewish expectations of the Mosaic eschatological prophet, he delineates the Johannine depiction of Jesus as a prophet like Moses in three aspects. As Moses parted and crossed the Red Sea, Jesus also provides safe passage for his disciples. As Moses supplied Manna, Jesus makes the bread of life available. Finally, as Moses gathers and leads the twelve tribes of Israel, Jesus draws together the twelve disciples, a symbol of the new Israel. This eschatological ingathering is also signaled in the collecting of the leftover fragments that filled the twelve baskets in John 6:13. With these Mosaic echoes in the background, therefore, Jesus is presented as “the prophet like Moses par excellence who is . . . leading a second exodus restoration.”

Critique of Dennis. A number of Johannine exegetes have noted the rich echoes of the Exodus events alluded to in John 6. The question at stake for this study, however, is not whether the text uses such intertextuality, but whether the allusions and echoes invoke the Mosaic messianic prefiguration motif. More specifically, the question to be addressed is not whether people viewed Jesus as such but whether the evangelist presents him in such a manner. In this respect, it is significant that Jesus refused the desire of the people to appoint him as their alleged “prophet-king” (the kingship of Jesus is no doubt assumed in John, but it is salvation-historically redefined) because his kingship is not tantamount to their interpretation of the Pentateuchal images of Moses,
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especially that of Deuteronomy 18.274 The exegetical pitfall of Dennis (and that of Meeks as well as others) is that he uncritically takes for granted the Mosaic Christological typology from these exodus imageries. The exegetical disadvantage of this superficial reading can be further spelled out in three ways.

First, he ignores the principal function of the exodus allusions; that is, to invite Jesus to reveal his identity as the source of eternal life. As reviewed above (in critique of Meeks), the three allusions to the exodus events serve as vivid illustrations, over which the unique and superlative nature of the new redemptive history through Jesus can be better comprehended in comparison. In the same vein, the request of the people, who could have found the similarity of Jesus with Moses upon experiencing the feeding of the multitude, prompts an occasion to specifically articulate the identity of Jesus' mission and his relation to God.275 It is surprising that the feeding of the five thousand people with a few pieces of staples did not convince the people (“crowd” in 6:2, 5, 22, 24, “Jews” in 41, 52) of the divinely commissioned nature of Jesus, because they had to ask for another sign (John 6:30). Some scholars posit that the crowd was asking for a continuous feeding as Moses supplied for forty years.276 No matter what the exact nature is, the kind of sign people requested probably had something to do with satisfying their physical hunger. Yet, Jesus (and God) intends to meet the spiritual needs with the true “heavenly bread.”277 As such, those Mosaic allusions serve only to set a stage for

274 There is no doubt that Jesus is associated sometimes with kingly and prophetic images. However, it is open to question whether the converged concept of the two images is applied to Jesus in John. The Johannine portrayal of Jesus as a king is closely related to the divine salvation history. Reimund Bieringer, “‘My Kingship Is Not of This World’ (Jn 18:36): The Kingship of Jesus and Politics,” in Myriad Christ: Plurality and the Quest for Unity in Contemporary Christology, ed. Terrence Merrigan and Jacques Haers, BETL 152 (Leuven: Louvain University Press, 2000), 159-75; Hans Kvalbein, “The Kingdom of God and the Kingship of Christ in the Fourth Gospel,” in Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen, ed. David E. Aune, Torrey Seland, and Jarl H. Ulrichsen, NovTSup 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 227-32.

275 Note that Jesus calls the source of Manna as “father” in v. 32.


Christological discourses (i.e., the bread speech).

The signs in the Fourth Gospel find their most natural background in the events of the exodus, and are most often associated by scholars with the signs of Moses. However, although Moses does figure prominently in John and was inseparably linked to the exodus and events in the wilderness, it is of interest that the great majority of “sign(s)” references from Exodus through Deuteronomy point specifically not to Moses but to God. Thus when Jesus takes the first exodus as a model for much of his ministry, he may be intent not so much on reproducing the signs and works of Moses as on associating his work with that of Yahweh. Consequently, although it is appropriate to speak of Jesus as a second Moses, this is only in a secondary sense. In fact, he surpasses Moses in every sense, not only in signs and works, but also in primacy of identity and the role he plays in the new exodus—and Moses himself is called as a witness to this.278

Second, and more importantly, the analogy is set up not between Moses and Jesus but between God and Jesus. It was God, not Moses, who provided the Manna and, so does Jesus. This analogy is contrasting to the belief of the Johannine Jews that Moses provided the Manna.279 Jesus fulfills the Heilsgeschichte which Yahweh inaugurated in the book of Exodus and he is the Heilsgeschichte itself. On the other hand, Jesus denies the significance of the part Moses played in the previous salvation history: “It is not Moses who has given you the bread from heaven” (John 6:32a).280 Some scholars contend that this denial is a direct polemic against the contemporary Jewish belief in both the eschatological Moses who will provide daily staples and his deified status.281


279Thyen, Das Johannesevangelium, 351. For the possible source of the alleged citation with an introductory formula in John 6:31, “as it is written, ‘He gave them bread from heaven to eat,” see Menken, “‘He Gave Them Bread from Heaven to Eat’ (John 6:31),” 49-54; Thyen, Das Johannesevangelium, 351.


problem with these proposals is that the evidence adduced in favor of the former view is meager and postdates early Christianity.282 Furthermore, Moses does not occupy the centerstage of this discourse. The attention devoted to Moses appears to be too slim to establish a typology. The only explicit reference and possible allusion to Moses are found in three verses (14-15, 32) out of the seventy-one verses of John 6! As such, the main thrust of this pericope is that Jesus’ mission originated from God, and Moses is located only on the periphery (as clearly seen in John 6:32 where Jesus sets Moses aside from the focus).283 On the other hand, John, in view of the contemporary Jewish traditions, should be credited as the first interpreter to detect the cause of the wilderness generation’s demise from eating Manna.284

Finally, the disparity between the exodus events and the bread speech is so great that one wonders whether a messianic typology is an appropriate framework. As for the two kinds of bread, the first bread was perishable and it satisfied only temporarily, whereas the second one secures eternal satisfaction (John 6:31-35).285 The bread given through Moses was not able to keep the fathers of Israel alive but the bread of Jesus sustains life forever (John 6:46-51).286 Furthermore, another stark contrast is the disparity between old Israel and its counterpart in John’s Gospel. In addition, it is open to question whether the gathering of the twelve disciples is an authorially intended symbolic fulfillment of the hope for the restoration of Israel (immediately after the

282Menken, “‘He Gave Them Bread from Heaven to Eat’ (John 6:31),” 56.

283Brunson, Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John, 162.


"gathering of the twelve baskets" Jesus leaves the crowd behind to cross the sea of Galilee!287 The scope of the new redemptive history is drastically expanded to include the gentiles, as evident in the Samaritan mission of John 4 and John 12:20 ff. In addition, the unflinching nature of the "new Israel" clouds the Mosaic typology since this new family of God remains faithful in contrast to the repeatedly rebellious Israelites of Moses.288 The confession of Peter who representatively speaks for this new group demonstrates the loyalty of a new kind.

Because of this [the difficulty of Jesus' sayings] many of his disciples turned back and no longer went about with him. So Jesus asked the twelve, "Do you also wish to go away?" Simon Peter answered him, "Lord, to whom can we go? You have the words of eternal life. We have come to believe and know that you are the Holy One of God." (John 6:66-69)289

One can argue for the presence of recurrent exodus themes in John 6, but those imageries scarcely constitute a Mosaic Christological typology.

Summary. The sixth chapter of John's Gospel is replete with rich echoes of the exodus events. In contrast to some exegesis who argue for the Mosaic Christology based on these allusions, a more careful reading reveals that the typology is between Jesus and God. The role of Moses provides a background, against which the new redemption is better understood. This narrative function of Moses is in accordance with the similar role played out in John 1:16-17, 45, 3:14, 5:37-39, 56.290 On the one hand, he


288 For the "murmuring" theme coalesced in John, see Marianne Meye Thompson, "Thinking about God: Wisdom and Theology in John 6," in Critical Readings of John 6, ed. R. Alan Culpepper, BIS 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 234-36; Brunson, Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John, 166.

289 Although one of the twelve betrays, the group of disciples is still called "the twelve," which displays the unflinching status of this group. "The Jews' cry that they have no king but Caesar reveals their true identity and seals their exclusion from the true Israel, in contrast to those who in accepting Jesus affirm that Yahweh is their king. As for the disciples, they are still called the twelve (20:24) even though only eleven are left, underlining their significance as a symbol of the restoration of Israel." Brunson, Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John, 166.

290 Joh 6,30-33 rekurriert gleich Joh 3,14 auf zwei Taten Gottes, einerseits die Versorgungstat durch Mose, andererseits die Lebensgabe durch Jesus. Die Differenz findet sich erneut in der Qualität der soteriologischen Gabe, auf der einen Seite das Manna, das Israel in einer spezifischen Situation am Leben erhält, auf der anderen Seite die ζωή αἰώνιος, die ohne jede Einschränkung oder Begrenzung allen gegeben
provides a point of comparison for the gracious nature and the divine initiative of the two redemptive programs, one by Moses and the other by Jesus. Moses foreshadows the salvific plan inaugurated through Jesus. On the other hand, however, the fundamental difference of quality between the two salvation histories pushes Moses to the background, and it highlights the unprecedented eminence of the new Heilsgeschichte. Nonetheless, his Christological witness function is not as prominent in this text as in other texts mentioned above.

John’s Jesus is not a ‘second Moses’ in the sense of merely recapitulating or building on the mission of his predecessor. John states quite clearly that Jesus supersedes and replaces Moses as the decisive bearer of revelation. . . . The relation of Moses to Jesus is that of forerunner to fulfiller. Jesus is the full flowering of the truth to which Moses, for all his greatness, merely hinted. . . . Moses, like John the Baptist, recedes into the background with the coming of Christ. . . . It is in his use of Moses tradition that the boldness of John’s approach becomes evident. He does not depict Jesus as a ‘new Moses’ in the same way as does Matthew, for whom the relationship between Moses and Jesus is that of type to antitype. John’s Logos Christology leads to this startling exegetical phenomenon: Moses is not the pattern for Jesus; rather, Jesus is the pattern for Moses.


In his recent article on John’s view of Moses, S. Schapdick reaches a five-fold conclusion. First, the reason for a recurrent recourse to the Mosaic authority is due to the Gospel’s Jewish context. The God of Moses is none other than the God of Jesus. Second, in the perspective of John, the function of Moses is essentially a witness to the divine revelation through Jesus. Third, the mention of the salvific events associated with Moses undergirds the sovereignty of God who is the Lord over life and death. Fourth, the Torah and its author, Moses, emerge in the conflict settings with the Jewish adversaries of Jesus. The Jewish misunderstanding of the Mosaic writings signifies that the only valid hermeneutics of the Torah comes about through a Christological perspective. Finally, Moses is presented as an authority figure, behind which God stands. However, due to the Christo-centric perspective, the content of the Mosaic writings is not a valid criterion to judge the divine revelation through Jesus. Rather, the revelation through Jesus is the valid criterion to measure out the revelatory value of the Mosaic writings. Schapdick, “Autorität ohne Inhalt,” 202-06. Schapdick goes so far as to say that Moses is an “empty religious authority figure.” “Das Mosebild des Johannesevangeliums zeigt sich daher relativ inhaltleer. Letztlich wird Mose als bloße Chiffre religiöser Autorität im Rahmen jüdisch/judenchristlichen Denkens präsentiert. Diese Autorität wird freilich betont und exklusiv in Anspruch genommen. Sie ist allerdings Autorität ohne Inhalt, denn dieser Inhalt, konkret das Heil, wird ausschließlich in christologischer Konzentration vermittelt.” Ibid., 206.

Conclusion

Moses emerges frequently throughout the Gospel of John in the context of controversy with Jesus’ antagonists. In contrast to their constant appeal to the Jewish authority figure, the Johannine presentation of Moses is more or less in a uniform fashion. Namely, he is a witness for the Christological identity of Jesus, not a messianic prefiguration. Moses is often mentioned because the new salvation history through Jesus stands in continuity with the old one (of which Moses was a part as a divine instrument) in a sense that God is the initiator of the two and his gracious intention is reflected on both. Moses who metonymically stands for the old covenant, then, provides an ample opportunity to communicate this continuity, as well as the divine provenance and divine nature of Jesus.

Concerning the comparative view of Moses in John and in the contemporary Jewish literature, an ambivalent attitude is found. Although the fourth evangelist takes advantage of the available language and images of Moses, his portrayal is distinctive, especially in his disinterest in the authority of Moses. The positive role of Moses as the mediator of the old covenant is not necessarily denounced, but the denial of his authority and the Johannine presentation of him almost exclusively in terms of witness appears to be a practical demotion in view of the contemporary Jewish traditions. More interestingly, granting him a role of prosecutor of “Jews” is a remarkable reversal of expected roles. All these observations allow one to conclude that the fourth evangelist is a creative theologian notwithstanding his somewhat extensive appropriation of the Jewish languages and imageries related to Moses that were probably available to him and his readers.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

Summary of Foregoing Observations

The main inquiries set out at the beginning of this dissertation concerned two questions: (1) the role of the Old Testament characters in the Gospel of John with particular reference to Christology, and (2) the possible conceptual affinities with the current Jewish religious literature. In order to explore these two areas of inquiry, the first part of each chapter (with the exception of chapter two) examined the early Jewish portrayals of Elijah, David, and Moses with special interest in their messianic expectations as delineated in the intertestamental Jewish documents, such as, the Hebrew and Greek Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, the Qumran writings, and some early Hellenistic Jewish writings including Josephus and Philo. Subsequently, the latter part of each chapter investigated the narrative function of these Old Testament characters (including Jacob and Abraham in chapter 2) for Johannine Christology.

In chapter 2, three pericopae (1:51; 4:10-14; 8:58-58) were examined with particular interest in allusions to Abraham and Jacob. A contextual exegesis of these passages resulted in a consistent portrayal of the two personages in terms of messianic witnesses of Jesus. Their messianic witness function fits nicely in the overall narrative flow of the chapters which surround the texts under discussion. This supportive role stands in contrast to their images conceived in the second temple period, which manifest the recognition of their virtuous characteristics and the provenance of Jewish heritages as one gains a glance of it in chapters 4 and 8. In contrast to this role transformation, however, the presence of the two Jewish patriarchs provides a contact point. That is, the onset of the new redemptive history through Jesus stands in continuity, namely, with the
outworking of the old redemptive history, most remarkably in their foreshadowing of the
divine characteristics of the Messiah. Just as the salvific outworking was unraveled
through Jacob in the Old Testament, so will it be through Jesus in John. On the other
hand, the patriarchs are presented as the point of comparison/contrast since they
demonstrate the enormous magnitude of the radical unfolding of the new redemptive
program. This surpassing and superseding nature of the new redemptive history is
reflected upon the divine nature of Messiah and the gift that is bestowed through him.
These different depictions between John and second temple Judaism call into question the
congruity of the two bodies of literature.

Chapter 3 revealed the fourth evangelist's disinterest in the Jewish messianic
expectations of Elijah _redivivus_. One plausible explanation is due to its marginal
influence in view of the wide spectrum of Jewish messianic hopes (compared to the
Davidic or Mosaic messianic expectations). A more probable reason, however, seems
that the Elijah _redivivus_ hope does not tally with the evangelist's literary schema he
reserved for the Scripture and the Old Testament characters, that is, the role of messianic
witnesses. Both Jesus and John the Baptist are not portrayed as an Elijah-like figure in
the Fourth Gospel. In the case of the Baptist, the Johannine Gospel is remarkably distinct
from the Synoptics, which consistently present him as Elijah _redivivus_. Rather, he
occupies an equal standing with the Scripture and the Old Testament characters, that is,
as a messianic witness in John. This observation points to the evangelist's emphasis on
the witness theme in relation to Christology.

The image of David as envisaged in second temple Judaism and the Fourth
Gospel was addressed in chapter 4. In contrast to the Synoptic Gospels and the Book of
Revelation, the Gospel of John does not display affinity with some intertestamental
Jewish writings that depict him as a royal messianic prefiguration. If a correspondence
must be found, it is not in terms with such a kingly figure but in terms with a righteous
sufferer. However, it must be also pointed out that second temple Judaism does not
frequently appropriate such a theme as a particular mark of the Messiah. A contextual examination of the Johannine passages that relate to David demonstrates that he bears witness to the messianic characteristics of Jesus, his suffering in particular as a messianic qualification. The testimony of David for Jesus’ messianic identity as foreshadowed in Psalms also exhibits the unity of the divine redemptive program in the Old and New Testaments regardless of the fourth evangelist’s recasting of the ideal king figure merely as a witness for the coming Messiah.

Chapter 5 dealt with the depiction of Moses in John’s Gospel and the intertestamental Jewish literature. In contrast to the constant Jewish appeal to Moses who was conceived as the Jewish authority figure, John presents him as a witness for the Christological identity of Jesus, not as a messianic prefiguration. By his participation in the salvific events of the Pentateuch, the prophet par excellence metonymically communicates the gracious nature of the divine redemptive history, which culminates in Jesus events. Because God is the initiator of the salvation histories in Moses and Jesus, Moses stands for the unity between the two Testaments. However, the role transformation of Moses in terms of a messianic witness results in a radical redefinition of his image. Although the positive role of Moses as the active agent of the divine salvation history is not denounced, the denial of his authority and the Johannine presentation of him almost exclusively in terms of witness appear to be a practical demotion in view of the contemporary Jewish traditions. More interestingly, granting him a role of prosecutor of “Jews” is a remarkable reversal of expected roles. These literary schema allow one to label the fourth evangelist as a creative theologian notwithstanding his somewhat extensive appropriation of the Jewish languages and imageries related to Moses.
Research Results

Three final conclusions can be drawn from the foregoing summary. First, the Jewish hopes and the Johannine picture of Messiah via Jewish heroic figures display a certain degree of disparity. Contrary to some scholarly assessment, the messianic expectations via Jewish heroic figures, such as, Elijah, David, and Moses, were not widespread in the second temple period. In addition, the emphasis of Jewish messianism is not on certain personalities but on Yahweh who will be the initiator of the new era. Even when the intertestamental Jewish messianic figures are conceived to play an important part in the eschatological context, their images do not correlate closely with the messianic portrayals of Jesus in John. In particular, the militant warrior image of these figures does not tally with the Johannine picture of Jesus. Furthermore, the vicarious death and resurrection are distinctive features of the Johannine Messiah in the light of the intertestamental eschatological expectations through Jewish heroic figures.¹

Second, occurring in various contexts, the Old Testament characters (Jacob, Abraham, David, and Moses) conspicuously share one function in common in the Gospel of John. That is, they bear witness to the messianic identity of Jesus, and they are not depicted as messianic types. Taking into consideration the varied contexts in which these figures emerge, this uniform function is remarkable. In addition, this witness function of these figures stands in close proximity with that of “scripture.” As reviewed in chapter 1, there are a number of German scholars as well as some scholars from English speaking

¹A recent anthology on the Isaianic suffering servant explored the possibility of the organic link between Jewish and Johannine suffering messianic ideas. According to Martin Hengel and Daniel Bailey, for instance, the concept of a vicarious suffering messiah is not absent, although not prominent, in early Jewish literature. The implication of their assertion is that the fourth evangelist employed such a stream of ideas. Their observation could be valid. However, it seems to be another matter to argue that such a trait of thought (however subtle) played a formative influence on Johannine Christology. In contrast to their position, a question arises because the vicarious suffering of a righteous one is not exclusively Jewish. The extremely sparse description of messiah as a righteous sufferer in intertestamental Jewish writings as well as the resurrection of Christ in John speaks against their proposition. Cf. Martin Hengel and Daniel P. Bailey, “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in the Pre-Christian Period,” in The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 75-146; Peter Stuhlmacher, “Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts,” in The Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources, ed. Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 159-60.
scholarship who consider the main narrative contribution of "Scripture" in John in terms of Christological witness. The same holds true with the Old Testament characters. This observation both confirms the judgment of those scholars and indicates the close correlation between the narrative functions of "Scripture" and the Old Testament figures. This messianic witness function, however, is hardly attested in the Hebrew Old Testament and subsequent early Jewish traditions. These observations allow us to conclude that a messianic typology via the Old Testament figures (i.e., David or Moses) is an inadequate framework to approach Johannine Christology.

Finally, the rich Old Testament background in echoes of and allusions to the Old Testament characters in John provides an opportunity to further elaborate on Jesus' divinely commissioned nature and his status as being equal to God. In contrast to some Johannine exegetes, the fourth evangelist does not place an emphasis on the messianic prefigurative role of some Jewish heroic figures in promoting such Christology. Rather, the typology set over against this Old Testament background is not with the Jewish heroic figures but with Yahweh himself.

**Implications for Study of John's Gospel**

The preceding discussion fosters some implications for the study of John's Gospel, in particular, and more broadly for the New Testament writings in two respects. First, the consistent and homogeneous depiction of the Old Testament figures in terms of a witness function bears testimony in favor of the competent redactional capability of the fourth evangelist. This point also adds up to the importance of the present form of the Gospel.

Second, the value of the early Jewish traditions for the study of John needs to be reconsidered. The Gospel of John is replete with a large number of Jewish expressions and images. However, their use in John exhibits a considerable degree of conceptual disparity. Exegetes working on a religious comparative investigation are
susceptible to translating these imageries into the theology of John. The unique and creative theological construction of the fourth evangelist even over against his Jewish matrix needs to be given due emphasis. A biblical illustration could be helpful to make this point clearer. In 1 Samuel 12, the prophet Samuel rebuked the Israelites, who, in the face of the Ammonite invasion, wished to appoint one of their own as king over them although Yahweh was their king all along: “No, we want a king to rule over us” (1 Sam 12:12). Likewise, certain Jews of Jesus’ time sought to find a messianic figure when Christ was with them all along from the beginning. The same tendency pervades contemporary Johannine scholarship. Some scholars are still looking for the Messiah who is anyone other than the Jesus of John’s Gospel. Contrary to the repeated pattern of ignorance, the fourth evangelist lays a painstaking stress on the incomparable eminence of Jesus who uniquely shares the divine qualities with God as the premier revelation, through whom the unprecedented divine redemptive history is realized. In this respect, the New Perspective studies especially in terms of the “exile and restoration” paradigm and tradition-historical approaches do not seem to give due emphasis on the intended purpose of the fourth evangelist let alone the history-of-religions school which has not taken into proper perspective the rich Jewish background that permeates the Gospel of John.

**Suggested Further Research**

Interestingly, John seems to decidedly avoid a typology set in terms of personal characters. The lack of such typology stands out in view of the rich Jewish Christological analogies employed in John, such as, light, temple, living water, bread, and the Passover lamb. A further research can be fruitful concerning the narrative function of these non-personal typological symbols over against the analogous early Jewish traditions,
in order to find the possible contact-points with John and the fourth evangelist’s theological appropriation of such conceptual motifs.²

²An example of study from this perspective is Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 79-246.
APPENDIX 1

THE MESSIANISM/CHRISTOLOGY
IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND
IN THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

The exploration of Johannine Christology within Jewish religious dimensions has sparked a heated debate over the provenance of Johannine Christology. Such dissension has been expressed on a number of fronts. To begin with, dissimilar to John, messianism is not a dominant motif running throughout the Old Testament and early Judaism. For instance, Georg Fohrer construes that messianism is not overall the culmination of the Old Testament theology: "Es verhält sich nicht so, daß die Messias-erwartung die Krönung der alttestamentlichen Theologie darstellt." Quantitatively speaking, Daniel Block independently accords with Fohrer's judgment.

With respect to the nature of the Old Testament itself, given the prevalence of messianic expectation in the intertestamental and early New Testament periods, it would be surprising if those responsible for the structure and arrangement of the

---


2 For instance, Charlesworth summarizes the scholarly consensus on the difficulty of messianic discussion in the New Testament: (1) the phrase "Messiah" (ha Mashiach) does not occur in the Old Testament per se, and it occurs only rarely in early Jewish literature in general, (2) Jewish messianism really arose in a noticeable way only in the first century B.C., due to the disintegration of the Hasmonean dynasty, (3) one cannot claim that in Jesus' day all or the vast majority of Jews were looking for a single messiah figure to rescue them, (4) there was no normative concept of messiah by which possible candidates, such as Jesus, were measured, (5) messianic titles and ideas were fluid and often related to each other, and (6) the first clear evidence for the use of messiah as a technical term for a royal figure in the line of David is found in the Psalms of Solomon 17-18 and the Parable of Enoch, both of which probably date to the first century B.C. James H. Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects," in The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity: The First Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 3-35. For another survey of the difficulties, see Dietmar Neufeld, "And When That One Comes?: Aspects of Johannine Messianism," in Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. Craig A. Evans and Peter W. Flint, SDSSRL 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 120-40.

canon were not driven to some extent by messianic hope. . . . As a matter of fact, the books that make up the Old Testament are not obviously preoccupied with the messiah. . . . the messianic hope [in the OT] is embedded like a diamond, precious not only because of its intrinsic value, but in the Hebraic sense also because of its rarity. . . . [that the Old Testament is filled with the divine redemptive hope], but to characterize this as an overtly and pervasively messianic hope is to overstate the case. Explicit reference to the messiah in the Pentateuch can be counted on a single hand. 4

However, Block’s notion of “the prevalence of messianic expectation in the intertestamental period” needs further qualification in view of the majority of biblical scholars’ understanding of messianism in the period. 5 An example of such a majority view is attested in an article contributed to the very volume in which Block’s article is found. Craig Evans, for example, notes the statistical dearth of references to messianism in the Qumran community (of which a large number of scholars find a close affinity, directly or indirectly, with John’s Gospel). 6 Out of all the 870 scrolls recovered from the


5Cf. “My answer to this question [did most Jews look for or yearn for the coming of the Messiah?], based on the vast number of early Jewish texts . . . is probably ‘no.’ What impresses me is that when ‘the Messiah’ is mentioned his functions and his relations to the End of time . . . is far from obvious. I am convinced that the ancient Jew was often intentionally ambiguous. He comprehended that only God knew who would be the Messiah, and what the Messiah would accomplish. An apparent exception may be the Psalms of Solomon, but even in this text . . . the author subordinates the Messiah to God; that is, the Lord of the Messiah is God alone.” Charlesworth, “Introduction,” 5 (italics original).

Qumran caves, 650 are non-biblical. Of these 650, only thirteen scrolls refer to a person who is anointed (messiah is named in six scrolls to be exact) or allude to some messianic symbols (i.e., “prince,” “scepter,” “son,” or “branch of David”). Two of the final four conclusions which Evans reaches are especially pertinent to our discussion. That is, the Qumran community was not preoccupied with messianism; and in comparison with contemporary Jewish messianism, Qumran’s messianism is not distinctive in any significant way. Of course, there are those who do not concur with Block and Evans. These two scholars, however, appear to represent a large segment of biblical scholarship that does not reckon messianism to be the most predominant motif of the Hebrew bible and the Judaism of the Second Temple period.


Second, even those Hebrew texts which do entertain Jewish messianic ideas do not present us with a concrete and consistent picture, but paint variegated images of Messiah. Block’s estimation of the unified and linear Davidic royal messianic hope of the Old Testament represents a significant contemporary revival of E. Schürer, who argued that Second Temple Judaism had more or less a monolithic understanding of Messiah and that it could not accept Jesus’ self-designation of Davidic messiah primarily because of his death on the cross. Schürer’s theory, however, has come under severe criticism since the 1990’s, due mainly to the increasing scholarly sensitivity to the inadequate exegetical methods of Schürer and the findings of the Qumran documents. In the face of the variegated images of Messiah, Schürer’s theory seems to run against the plain reading of the Jewish messianic texts. In addition, in the face of the recent evaluations of the Qumran messianic documents (which conceive three redeemer figures, a priest, a prophet, and a prince), it is precarious to speak of a “central theme” of the Jewish eschatological expectations, especially in terms of royal messianism. In short,


12For a research history of this development, see Stefan Schreiber, Gesalbter und König: Titel und Konzeptionen der königlichen Gesalbterwartung in frühjüdischen und urchristlichen Schriften, BZNW 105 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 5-19. Cf. “Christian historians must be honest and admit that the Jesus known to us from the New Testament simply does not fit the profile of the Davidic Messiah which was espoused by many Jews of his time.” Charlesworth, “Introduction,” 6. Also, John Collins does not see the intertestamental messianic expectation to be a uniform system. According to his evaluation of Jewish messianic texts, the early Jewish messianic expectation was, contrary to Schürer and George F. Moore, not ubiquitous and did not have a consistent form. Collins, The Scepter and the Star, 3.

in the early Judaism, along with a royal Davidic figure (which can be said to be the most predominant one), other messianic hopes were also envisaged in priestly, prophetic, or heavenly messianic figures. ¹⁴ However, one caveat is in order with reference to early Jewish messianism. Although the intertestamental messianism was expressed via a range of symbols and figures, the Jews in various times and places held to some common elements of messianism, especially in their understandings of more popular “messianic texts” such as Genesis 49:10, Isaiah 10:34-11:5, and Numbers 24:17. ¹⁵

¹⁴ This second aspect of Jewish messianism poses an intriguing question since the Fourth Gospel seems to consistently portray the typical Jewish messianic figures, who were expected to play redivivus messiah, in terms of messianic witnesses rather than messianic prefigurations or types. The most pressing question is, not whether the Old Testament messianic ideas can be subsumed under a royal Davidic expectation (although it is questionable), but how we account for this novel and seemingly contrasting element of messianism as depicted in John. Martin J. Selman, “Messianic Mysteries,” in The Lord’s Anointed: Interpretation of Old Testament Messianic Texts, ed. Philip E. Satterthwaite, Richard S. Hess, and G. J. Wenham (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 281-302.

Third, although a composite picture of those various Jewish messianic expectations could be supposedly put together as some scholars such as Block suggest, it departs significantly from John's presentation of messiah. Some notable examples can be listed here. First, in contrast to the strenuous emphasis of the Fourth Gospel, the messiahs in Jewish texts usually do not carry a divine connotation, at least not on the level attested to in John.\textsuperscript{16} Second, the suffering and death of messiah is not clearly anticipated.\textsuperscript{17} For instance, it is not entirely clear whether Isaiah 53, one of the favorite Christian messianic proof texts, speaks of the messiah.\textsuperscript{18} Furthermore, the messianic fulfillment formulae in the Gospel of John point to a number of Psalm passages, which of course have David in the historical contexts, and they are certainly not prophetic in nature. Third, in the Old Testament and the intertestamental Jewish literature, the most conspicuous qualification of the messiah was the militant subjugation of the Gentiles, which is unlike the New Testament characterization of the Messiah.\textsuperscript{19} Lastly, the Jewish


\textsuperscript{17}For nonbelievers in antiquity, however, the great objection to the recognition of Jesus as Davidic messiah was not his nonmessianic career, but the shameful defeat of his death." Collins, \textit{The Scepter and the Star}, 207.

\textsuperscript{18}The texts usually attributed to for this concept do not resonate explicit messianic overtones. Bernd Janowski, "The One God of the Two Testaments: Basic Questions of a Biblical Theology," \textit{ThTo 57} (2000): 306-08; Hays, "If He Looks like a Prophet and Talks like a Prophet, Then He Must Be . . .", 65-66.

\textsuperscript{19}Cf. "The concept of a royal messiah was more widespread than any other, and this figure was consistently expected to drive out the Gentiles by force . . . . The degree of messianic expectation probably fluctuated considerably in the first century. There does not, however, appear to have been much variation in the character of royal messiah that was expected . . . . Despite its admitted variety, the evidence of the [Qumran] Scrolls provides a persistent profile of the Davidic/royal messiah. The most striking aspect of this profile is the militancy it involved. It was a primary requirement of the messiah that he overcome the Gentile enemies of Israel. Precisely here lies the anomaly of the messianic claims of Jesus of Nazareth, as Albert Schweitzer already saw. There is little evidence of a militant Jesus in the Gospels." Collins, "Jesus
messiah is hardly expected to be resurrected and to ascend into heaven:

Jewish Religionsgeschichte presents an additional problem. To be sure, we have accounts of the translation of certain righteous men, and we hear also of isolated instances of resurrection. But that a righteous man via resurrection from the dead was appointed as Messiah, is absolutely without analogy. Neither resurrection nor translation have anything to do with messiahship.20

The term, “Christology,” therefore, represents an expression that is thoroughly baptized in Christian nomenclature in contradistinction to its Jewish semantic origin, “Messiah.”21

---


APPENDIX 2

RELIGIONSGESCHICHTE AND
THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Importance of Religionsgeschichte

The question of Religionsgeschichte is of crucial importance for the study of the Fourth Gospel. The reason is two-fold. First, the issue demands certain kinds of religious writings be taken into consideration more seriously than others. Second, the significance of such an inquiry directly impinges upon the importance of the Old Testament and the following Jewish religious traditions for the final analysis of the entire Gospel. In regard to the former, Mandaean and Nag Hammadi documents, instead of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Jewish literature in the second temple period, should be rigorously taken into account. With the latter aspect in view, the outcome of the study on Jewish elements of the Gospel (such as the role of the Old Testament characters) is only marginally relevant to grasping the core message of the Gospel since it only reveals the primitive and rudimentary Palestinian traditions buried underneath the later Hellenistic redactional layers contained in John’s Gospel. Therefore, it is of grave importance to set the issue of the history of religions in proper perspective so as to secure both appropriate methods by which to get at the center of John’s message and to expect the degree of significance that the conclusion of this kind of study will bring forth for a proper understanding of the Gospel of John.

1Two examples of such an outdated and oversimplistic form-critical approach are Claus Westermann, The Gospel of John in the Light of the Old Testament, trans. Siegfried S. Schatzmann (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1998); translated from Das Johannesevangelium aus der Sicht des Alten Testaments (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1994); and Jamie Clark-Soles, Scripture Cannot Be Broken: The Social Function of the Use of Scripture in the Fourth Gospel (Leiden: Brill, 2003). Generally speaking, the former operates on the level of the history of religions perspective and the latter on a socio-political one.
Bickermann/Hengel Theory

The contributions of Bickermann and Hengel have appropriately noticed the inadequate bifurcation of Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaisms in sharply distinct terms, since the Judaism in the Second Temple period was not immune to the contiguous Hellenistic cultures. Accordingly, the classical nomenclature, i.e., “normative Judaism” or even “Hellenistic Judaism” fell out of favor in scholarly dialogues. Nonetheless, it still seems to be legitimate to speak of the distinctly Jewish elements of Judaism against its surrounding cultures in first-century Palestine, not with reference to the language and customs, but particularly with regards to the Jewish monotheism and its concomitant religious practices. This distinction has been duly noted in the recent archaeological discoveries undertaken in Judea and Galilee which strongly suggest that the majority of the Palestinian Jews between the last century B.C. and the first century A.D. (or at least until the first half of the first century) did not compromise, in a substantial measure, their core religious beliefs and practices, such as, monotheism, ethnic exclusivity, particular ethic, the observance of Sabbath, circumcision, the temple cult, and dietary laws.

Hellenistic (Especially Gnostic) Influence

Broadly speaking, the formative religious backgrounds proposed as the


backdrop of the Fourth Gospel can be broken down into two general categories, namely, Hellenistic (i.e., mystery religion, Gnosticism, Mandaism, and Platonism) and Jewish (i.e., the Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic Jewish scriptures, the Qumran scrolls, the apocrypha, and, with further qualifications, some of the early rabbinic literature). The supposed Hellenistic religious backgrounds theory initially arose from the internal textual dissimilarities between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics during the heyday of source criticism, although other philosophical factors are suspected to have contributed to the development of the Gnostic provenance theory. For instance, a number of scholars point to the anti-supernatural impulse of the enlightenment period and F. C. Baur’s Hegelian dialectical analysis of the developmental history of the early church. These two tendencies are thought to have given impetus to the view that located John’s Gospel in an intermediary stage between Hellenism and Judaism although stemming from a Hellenistic community (so much more Hellenistic than Jewish due to its geographic provenance, i.e., Syria). Based on these two assumptions, the history of religions school thought to have uncovered close parallels of the Gospel in Hellenistic documents (especially Egyptian and middle-Eastern Gnostic). 5

5 F. C. Baur’s historical reconstruction of the development of the early church has been proven to be without an adequate basis in the face of the stunning discovery of the John Rylands papyrus which dates back to 125 A.D. More surprising is the manuscript’s Egyptian origin for there must be a significant block of time for John’s original manuscript to be copied and travel to Egypt. All these factors locate the writing of the Fourth Gospel at least at the end of the first century A.D. Cf. Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 55-56. Contra, Andreas Schmidt, “Zwei Anmerkungen zu P. Ryl. III 457,” APF 35 (1989): 11-12; Georg Strecker, Theology of the New Testament (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 2000), 461.

Idiosyncratic terms and concepts appearing in John’s Gospel have also led a number of scholars to presume disparate religious backgrounds. Such terms as “logos” and “paraclete” are unique to John’s Gospel. In addition, some of the peculiar Johannine concepts include the identification of the revelation with the revealer (Jesus), the I am sayings, the pre-existence of Christ, the descending and ascending of the Son of Man, and the dualistic expressions (above/below, light/darkness, true/false, spirit/flesh, and free/enslaved). 7

A number of scholars have attributed these Johannine phenomena to different religious backgrounds: Jewish Hellenism, Qumran, Pharisaic-Rabbinic Judaism, heretical Judaism, the Hermes myths, and Gnosticism. 8 Among these religious backgrounds, Gnosticism has stirred the fiercest debate as to the extent of its influence on the Gospel.

7 Hans Conzelmann and Andreas Lindemann, *Arbeitsbuch zum Neuen Testament, 14th ed.*, UTB52 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 374-76. Particularly, the Johannine dualism has puzzled the Johannine exegetes of its religious backgrounds. On the possible provenance of the thought pattern from Judaism, see Otto Böcher, *Der Johanneische Dualismus im Zusammenhang des nachbiblischen Judentums* (Gutersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965); from gnosticism, see Luise Schottroff, *Der Glaubende und feindliche Welt: Beobachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannevangelium*, WMANT 37 (S. I.: Neukirchener, 1970). However, Becker presumes that they are only two different expressions of the same concept in different religious paradigms, Jürgen Becker, “Beobachtungen zum Dualismus im Johannevangelium,” *ZNW* 65 (1974): 71-87; idem, “Ich bin die Auferstehung und das Leben: Eine Skizze der johanneischen Christologie,” *TZ* 39 (1983): 138-51. For similar skeptical assessments of the connection between John and Qumran, see Howard M. Tearle, “Qumran and the Origin of the Fourth Gospel,” *NovT* 4 (1960): 6-25; David E. Aune, “Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem,” in *Ne testamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 281-303. Aune is opposed to positing the direct dependence between the Qumran scrolls and the Fourth Gospel. He is probably right to doubt such a linear connection between the two but the Gnostic provenance theory has not yet produced a better solution. The Qumran/the Fourth Gospel comparison, however, seems to demonstrate closer conceptual affinities. “In conclusion, there is a curious irony to be observed. It was the publication of Qumran texts which effected a shift in Johannine scholarship towards recognizing the thoroughly Jewish character of Johannine theology. In retrospect this appears to have been a case of drawing the correct conclusion from the wrong evidence. There is no need to appeal to the Qumran texts in order to demonstrate the Jewishness of the Fourth Gospel’s light/darkness imagery. This can be done more convincingly by comparison with other Jewish sources already available long before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Richard Bauckham, “The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John,” in *Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al. (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 114-15.

The scholars who adhere to a considerable measure of its influence include Bultmann, Käsemann, L. Schottroff, H. Conzelmann, H. Koester, J. Becker, W. Schmithals, and S. Schulz. 9 Of course, however, the degree of influence varies between one extreme to another within the group of scholars. For instance, an interesting debate arose between Bultmann and Käsemann. 10 The former, while acknowledging the significant contact with Gnosticism, proposed that the Fourth Gospel overcame the core concepts of this religion through the community’s unique Christology. On the other hand, Käsemann argued for the close interrelationship of the Gospel with early Gnosticism, which he viewed as being underway to becoming a full-blown development. Thus, for Käsemann, John’s Gospel is extensively a “docetic” document. 11 However, this Gnostic provenance theory has come under heavy criticism, mainly for its anachronistic character and the exegetical inconsistencies inherent in Käsemann and his adherents. 12 Furthermore, some


of the newer insights provided with the recent archaeological and literary findings in the Palestine area, that is, Judaea and Galilee, mitigate substantially the persuasive force of the heavy Hellenistic influence theory.

C. H. Dodd

It was prior to the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls that a great number of critical Johannine scholars enthusiastically probed into the literature represented by the Hellenistic category for alleged affinities with the Gospel. In line with Bultmann, who was then at the high point of his career, C. H. Dodd marked the watershed point in Johannine studies. It was he who assumed the Bultmannian postulation of *Religionsgeschichte* and rigorously applied it into his *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. However, regardless of his painstaking effort to locate the Gospel within the wider Hellenistic cultural realms, Dodd's study showed ironically the marked differences of the Hellenistic aspects (especially the Platonic and the Hermetic) from the Jewish

---


15 C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954). However, Dodd was already aware of the inadequate proposition of Bultmann’s gnostic theory including Mandaeism: “It seems that we must conclude that the Mandaean literature has not that direct and outstanding importance for the study of the Fourth Gospel which has been attributed to it by Lidzbarski, Reitzenstein and Bultmann. . . . But alleged parallels drawn from this medieval body of literature have no value for the study of the Fourth Gospel unless they can be supported by earlier evidence.” Ibid., 130.

16 Against Dodd it should be said that while there is in Philo’s writings extensive use of Greek philosophical ideas that largely have a Middle-Platonic stamp, this is not the case in John.” Peder Borgen, “The Gospel of John and Hellenism: Some Observations,” in Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D.
characteristics inherent in the Gospel as often recognized in the following Johannine scholarship.

The encroachment of the Semitic on New Testament scholarship—an encroachment that has grown ever stronger—so that it also reflects new beginnings. [Dodd’s writings] are a mirror of the transition which has marked our time from a predominantly Hellenistic to a more Semitic approach to the New Testament. In him one world was already dying and another struggling to be born.17

**Semitic Linguistic Features of the Gospels**

The recent discovery of the first century Palestinian documents enabled scholars to engage in philological inquiries into the languages of the Gospels and various contemporary literature in Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic.18 One of the noteworthy observations from such queries is that the alleged New Testament “septuagintalism” which a number of New Testament scholars believe to be the most palatable expression of Hellenized Judaism, fails to stand comparative linguistic analysis on a number of points.19 This estimation reminds us of the long standing fact that the default linguistic

---


19Schlatter finds no intentional dependence on the *LXX* in John. Adolf Schlatter, *Die sprache*
mode of first century Palestine was Semitic, needless to say that Jesus and his disciples spoke most likely in Aramaic. An example to support this judgment can be found in the prologue to the *Wisdom of Ben Sirach*. In it, it can be surmised that it was only after the grandson of Jesus moved to Egypt (132 B.C.E.) when the need became apparent to translate the book into the Greek language.

**Recent Archaeological Discoveries**

In contrast to the previous generation’s belief, the more recent archaeological discoveries undertaken in Palestine (Judea and Galilee) reveal that the region was pervasively Jewish, much more heavily characterized by distinct Jewish cultural/religious elements than often surmised in the past. The conclusions of these investigations cover

---


a wide range of Palestinian geography and engage in meticulous examinations of the material retrievals. For instance, the evidences for Greek influence, such as, theater or amphitheater in Jerusalem and Sepphoris in the first century C.E., are now refuted (most likely late first or second centuries). 23 Roland Deines' extensive assessment of the stone containers used in first-century Palestine further hints at the Pharisaic/rabbinic ritual practice commonly exercised in the region as briefly recorded in John 2 regarding the wedding in Cana. 24 To offer one more example, Mark Chancey's comprehensive evaluation of the material culture bears witness to the distinctly Jewish culture deeply permeating first-century Galilee. 25 These investigations confirm the accounts of the Gospels in that no significant presence of a Gentile population or its cultural/religious activities is referred to in the four canonical Gospels. 26 Accordingly, recent


24 Deines, Jüdische Steingefässe und pharisäische Frömigkeit, 247-51, 263-75. Also, John C. Thomas, "The Fourth Gospel and Rabbinic Judaism," ZNW 82 (1991): 162-65; E. Regev, "Non-Priestly Purity and Its Religious Aspects according to Historical Sources and Archaeological Findings," in Purity and Holiness, ed. M. J. H. M. Poorthuis and J. Schwartz, JCPS 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 232. Partly built upon this work, Deines goes on to broaden the implication of the thesis into the place of Pharisaism, which he assesses to have constituted the major paradigm of early Judaism in the first century A.D., although the demands of their regulations were not equally required throughout the regions. "Bewegung im Volk, für das Volk, deren Rechtmäßigkeit von weitesten Teilen des Volkes auch akzeptiert wurde, wenn auch die Forderungen derselben nicht im gleichen Maße prakriziert wurden." Deines, Die Pharisäer, 512.


26 Coupled with these Jewish characteristics of the Palestine area, the profuse geographical and cultural details affirm the early date and the Palestinian provenance of the Gospel of John. Paul W. Barnett, "Indications of Earliness in the Gospel of John," RTR 64 (2005): 61-75.
archaeological scholarship has recognized the strong and widespread Jewish cultural presence in first-century Palestine.

In NT times Jews comprised the vast majority of the Galilean population. The view that the area was at that time half-pagan is a modern scientific myth. Josephus refers repeatedly to the piety of the Galileans and their loyalty to the Torah. NT references to the large numbers of synagogues in Galilee confirm this. These references are supported by archaeological findings.27

What is perhaps most striking about the first century is the minimal extent of Roman military-administrative presence in Judea outside of Caesarea and the degree to which Rome relied upon influential priests and laity to maintain the peace.28

Thus, the argument for a pagan Galilee is poorly supported by the literary evidence and receives no confirmation from the archaeological explorations.... Excavations at various sites have uncovered such instruments of the distinctive Jewish way of life as ritual baths (miqvaot), stone jars and natively produced ceramic household ware. These finds indicate a concern with ritual purity emanating from Jerusalem and its temple as well as an avoidance of the cultural ethos of the encircling pagan cities.29

Conceptual Affinities

Finally, the theological presuppositions of the Gospels and the Jewish Scriptures, in contradistinction to their surrounding cultures, have much in common.30

For an example, it is striking that the Gospels make painstaking efforts to preserve monotheism over against the prevalent polytheistic belief and practice of the pan-Mediterranean world. In addition, other symbols and images present in the Gospels are

27Rainer D. Riasner, "Galilee," in DJG, 252.
only comprehensible in view of the conventional Jewish heritages. From the observations mentioned above, therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the Fourth Gospel and the conventional Jewish cultural variables share a great deal of common ground.

After Dodd

Turning our attention back to Dodd, studies subsequent to him, and especially after the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, have reinforced a conviction that “the Fourth Gospel is now judged to be Jewish, and it is [to be] studied in terms of first-century Palestinian Jewish writings.” Such a judgment is justified not because the Fourth Gospel derives its theology from the Qumran traditions but because it reflects common Semitic conceptual currents as attested in the writings of the Qumran community. This hermeneutical penchant is not entirely the latest approach but simply a reaffirmation of the belief shared by a number of scholars at the turn of the past century (such as Dalman, Lightfoot, Westcott, Schlatter, Strack, Billerbeck, and Jeremias).

The accomplishment of scholars like Billerbeck or Jeremias—and also Schlatter—is that they showed that a thorough knowledge of Judaism . . . is one of the non-negotiable requirements in the field of New Testament study. Over against the history of religions tradition which began with W. Bousset and was continued by Rudolf Bultmann and his pupils, whose historical picture of Judaism was based almost entirely on the sources written in Greek, scholars like Strack and Billerbeck and ‘Jeremias & co.’ were among the first who responded to the appeal of the ‘Wissenschaft des Judentums’ which was then beginning to blossom, and they

---

31 A recent attempt to find extensive parallels of Johannine theological concepts that are deeply steeped in an important Old Testament theme (that of covenant) also seems to make a compelling case. John W. Pryor, John: Evangelist of the Covenant People: The Narrative and Themes of the Fourth Gospel (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1992).

thereby helped New Testament scholarship discover the deficits in its knowledge.  

To quote a scholar in this stream of thought, Adolf Schlatter advised that “you must go into the Jewish Literature . . . the Judaism, with which the New Testament stood in fruitful community and fierce conflict, was that of Palestine, of the Pharisees, which you must become acquainted with from its own witness.” To quote another Tübinger, Betz also underscores the value of the Jewish literature for the study of the New and Old Testaments (hence the history of traditions approach).


This favorite disposition toward Judaism for the Gospels is, of course, not unanimously espoused by any means within Johannine scholarship on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. Nonetheless, an increasing number of scholars seem to be leaning sympathetically toward such a perspective. A number of reasons for which the alleged


34 Adolf Schlatter, Rückblick auf meine Lebensarbeit, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1977), 120 (translation mine).

35 Otto Betz, “Das Johannesevangelium und das Alte Testament,” in Wie verstehen wir das Neue Testament? (Wuppertal: Aussaat, 1981), 14-20, here especially 17 for the citation. Here it should be noted that Betz uses the terminologies with different definitions. By him, “the history of tradition approach” refers to a method that takes into account the intertestamental literature whereas “the form historical method” designates the extreme history of religions assumptions, such as maintained by Rudolf Bultmann in the formation of the New Testament writings.

36 So a pupil of Bultmann says as follows: “Rudolf Bultmann proposed the hypothesis that John used a (non-Christian) Gnostic discourse source for their composition. Although this hypothesis has been widely criticized—and the assumption of the use of a non-Christian source is highly problematic—Bultmann may well have been correct with his notion that the Johannine discourses are indebted to a debate with Gnostic materials and were formulated in the context of that debate. The discovery of the Nag Hammadi Library has made a number of writings accessible that assist in the reconstruction of the evolution of such discourses. The Gospel of John is . . . an important witness for the early development of a Gnostic understanding of the tradition of Jesus’ sayings and a spiritualized interpretation of the sacraments.” Koester, History and Literature of Early Christianity, 183-6.
Gnostic influence on John is disavowed could be summarized. John's assumption of his readers' knowledge of certain Jewish symbolisms, festivals (chaps. 6, 7, and 10), and Palestinian topographies; the seeming proximity to midrashic interpretive traits (chapters 5 and 6); numerous Semitic flavors of the Gospel; and the anachronistic linking of the Gospel (whose earliest manuscript p52 dating at 125 CE38) with the extant Gnostic documents (which variously date from third to seventh centuries CE).39


39 The completion of the Mandeans literature took place in the seventh and the eighth centuries CE. Essential elements were present in the third and fourth centuries CE, and the earliest components of the Mandeans could go back as far as the middle of the second century CE. "In the twentieth century scholars came to doubt this portrait (the gnostic influence on NT) as idealistic and inaccurate. . . . If John was written to combat early Gnosticism, why did the Gnostics of the second century find this Gospel so attractive? . . . Scholars have come to recognize that making sharp distinction between 'orthodoxy' and 'heresy' in the first two or three centuries of Christianity tends to be anachronistic and misleading. . . . The major issue that scholars have debated is whether or not Gnosticism, in its earliest forms, contributed to NT theology, particularly Christology, in any significant way. Specifically, attention has focused on the question of whether or not there existed a myth of a descending and ascending redeemer and whether or not if such a myth existed, it existed early enough to have influenced NT Christology. A few scholars answer these questions in the affirmative. Most, it would appear, have grave reservations. Edwin Yamauchi has reviewed all of the proposed evidence and finds little that suggests that Gnosticism existed prior to Christian origins. Charles Talbert finds no reason to believe that Christianity derived its Christology of a descending/ascending heavenly savior from anything other than its Jewish roots. . . . the recent assertions of Gesine Robinson and Jack Sanders that the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel has more in common with the mythology of a gnostic work like the Trimorphic Protomena than it has with anything else are wholly unjustified. Pheme Perkins is much closer to the truth when she concludes that the gnostic writings of Nag Hammadi 'developed their picture of the Savior from traditions quite different from those which underlie NT christological assertions.' Martin Hengel adds: 'In reality there is no gnostic redeemer myth in the sources which can be demonstrated chronologically to be pre-Christian. The basic problem with the views of Robinson and Sanders is that those gnostic writings that bear the closest affinities with John contain allusions to, and sometimes explicit quotations of, the writings of the NT. A. D. Nock was right when he commented: 'Certainly it is an unsound proceeding to take Manichaean and other texts [viz. Mandaean and Coptic gnostic texts], full of echoes of the New Testament, and reconstruct from them something supposedly lying back of the New Testament.'" Craig A. Evans, Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2005), 279-86. Also recently, the alleged link between John and the gnostic movements has been challenged from a historical standpoint. "Surely one of the most striking results of this investigation . . . for other studies have been at least tending towards the same conclusion, is that the major use of the Fourth Gospel among heterodox or gnostic groups up until the Valentinians Ptolemy, Heracleon, and Theodotus, is best described as critical or adversarial. This exposes and should correct the tendency of earlier scholarship to assume that any Johannine borrowings or allusions in gnostic literature are evidence of gnostic/Johannine affinity, or of a common family history. . . . The offence of this Gospel among heterodox writers seems to have centered upon two factors of the Gospel . . .: (1) first and foremost on its Christology, including its presentation of the full incarnation of the Logos God . . ., and (2) its assumption of a special and permanent authority joined to the witness of those who were Jesus' original disciples." Charles E. Hill, The Johannine Corpus in the Early Church (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 466. Similarly, Rudolf Schnackenburg, "The Gnostic Myth of the Redeemer and the Johannine Christology," in The Gospel according to St John, HTCNT (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 1:544-48.
For these reasons and others, Schnelle maintains that “[i]n the most recent research, however, the older thesis [that of Schlatter] that John is to be understood exclusively against the background of the Judaism of the period has recovered a great deal of influence.” In view of such a paradigmatic shift of perspective in Johannine scholarship, it follows naturally that an investigation of the Gospel, particularly its use of the Old Testament, in light of its Palestinian Jewish backdrop rather than its Hellenistic counterpart in the first-and-second century Mediterranean religious movements, is expected to yield much more constructive hermeneutical insights into proper appreciation of the Gospel. Hence “none of the major treatments of New Testament [C]hristology [so far] were able to make use of this data [from Gnostic materials].”

Discretion, however, over the judgment of a close correlation between early Judaism and the Fourth Gospel is in order because the Gospel did not grow naturally from Judaism. It was the Christ-event, not the mother religion, that shaped the theology of the fourth evangelist and eventually set it apart from her. The degree of the influence of early Judaism, therefore, should be taken into account with a measure of discernment in the study of the Fourth Gospel.

---

40 Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John*, 25 (brackets added). “The location of the Gospel of John in its context in the history of religion may no more be explained in terms of a single factor than can its context in the history of traditions. It is rooted in the Old Testament and in the wisdom literature of *Hellenistic Judaism*, while at the same time having indications of a certain proximity to the thought world of Qumran and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, while individual elements have parallels in Hellenistic philosophy and later gnostic texts, but not in a way that lines of direct dependence may be constructed.” Idem, *The History and Theology of the New Testament Writings*, 509.

41 All other Hellenistic influences aside, a “pre-Christian” Gnostic influence is still an object of inquiry for the Johannine *Religionsgeschichte*. Against this stance, see a descriptive summation of some fundamental differences between John and Gnosticism by Herbert Kohler, *Kreuz und Menschwerdung im Johannine Gospel: Ein exegetisch-hermeneutischer Versuch zur johannitischen Kreuzestheologie*, ATANT 72 (Zürich: Theologischer, 1987), 142-58.

APPENDIX 3  
THE OLD TESTAMENT IN  
THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Significance of the Old Testament

Biblical scholars have often pointed out a number of idiosyncratic characteristics of the fourth Gospel from the Synoptics.¹ This aspect is also true of the materials and manner in which the Old Testament is employed in the Gospel.² In fact, John quotes the Scriptures far less than any of the Synoptic Gospels.³ Therefore, some have considered John’s use of the Scriptures to be minimalistic and inaccurate in nature. For instance, Bultmann posited that the evangelist’s recourse to the Scriptures is scantly.⁴ Käsemann also wrote that “[John] did not despise the use of the Old Testament even though he can get along without it in large sections and he always puts it in the shadow of his traditions about Jesus.”⁵ Reim maintained that John’s knowledge or use of the Old Testament is both fragmentary and secondary in that John did not have the Scriptures in front of him, but rather depended on oral traditions (wisdom and rabbinic).⁶

¹For a summary of the history of research on the use of the Old Testament in John, see Andreas Obermann, Die christologische Erfüllung der Schrift im Johannesevangelium: Eine Untersuchung zur johanneischen Hermeneutik anhand der Schriftzitate, WUNT 2/83 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 1-36.

²Crawford H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament (New York: Scribner’s, 1884), xxxv.


However, some Johannine scholars have increasingly noticed the important place of the Old Testament for proper appreciation of John’s Gospel. R. Morgan, for example, underscores the qualitative weight of the Jewish Scriptures, especially as attested in the quotation formulae of the Fourth Gospel.

[The author] makes sure that the Old Testament is present at every crucial moment in the Gospel. This explains the significance of the Johannine quotations from the Old Testament. Their significance does not lie in the frequency of their occurrence, but rather in their presence at every vital moment in the Messiah’s life. It is striking that every crisis in this moving drama of redemption, the Old Testament is there.7

Likewise Freed acknowledges the careful construction of the Scriptures intimately embedded in the plot of the Gospel by stating that “in no other writer are the O.T. quotations so carefully woven into the context and the whole plan of composition as in Jn.”8 In addition, an impressive array of recent Johannine commentators concurs on this judgment.9 From these observations, thus, it becomes obvious that the most Jewish

---

Hanson, The Prophetic Gospels: A Study of John and the Old Testament (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 21-233. However, Reim departed from Bultmann who attributed the Johannine prologue to Gnosticism. Reim is one of the earliest scholars who hold that the Johannine prologue reflects the Jewish wisdom tradition. Günter Reim, Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums, SNTSMS 22 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 188.


element, namely, the Old Testament, stands in close affinity with the fourth evangelist, providing a necessary background for a proper understanding of the Gospel.10

Another piece of evidence for the importance of the Old Testament is attested in the fulfillment themes. Towards the latter half of the fourth Gospel, the Old Testament is closely tied with the fulfillment motif in Jesus’ passion.11 Only Matthew, among the Synoptics, follows a similar pattern.12 Like Matthew, John introduces the Old Testament material with παντός; but unlike the first evangelist, he does not hesitate to put the formula on the mouth of Jesus (13:18; 15:25; 19:28; 20:9; cf. 5:45-6).13

**Fulfillment Motif in the Passion Narratives**

It is obvious that the evangelist explains Jesus’ passion in terms of “fulfillment.” This theme of fulfillment is set forth in chapter twelve and onward. A number of scholars see the fourth Gospel comprised of two main divisions (chaps. 1-11:  


13This was to fulfill the word that he had spoken, “I did not lose a single one of those whom you gave me” (18:9); (This was to fulfill what Jesus had said when he indicated the kind of death he was to die) (18:32).
If such a division is accepted, chapter twelve is a transitional section that commences a new phase. On this ground, it can be argued that the first half of John spells out the greatness of Jesus as confirmed by prominent Old Testament figures, while the latter part justifies how the greatness of Jesus is consistent with the Jews' rejection of him as Messiah, which is already prophesied in the Old Testament. Smith argues that any missionary tractate designed to convince Jews would run into difficulties if a satisfactory explanation of Jesus' rejection and death was not offered. Smith suggests that Jews needed two questions resolved. First, how could the Messiah be crucified? Second, how could Jews reject their Messiah?  

Thus, John 12:39-41, which quotes Isaiah 6:10, stands as the starting point of John's apologetic on behalf of Jesus' passion as reflected in the latter half of John's Gospel. From 12:39-41 on, John forcefully explicates that the rejection of the Messiah accords with God's redemptive program as it is prophesied in the Old Testament. This

---

14 It was first proposed by Dodd (The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, 289) and followed by Brown with a different phrase (book of signs and book of glory, Brown, The Gospel According to John, 1:cxxxviii-ix). Beasley-Murray basically accepts such division but proposes to see the whole Gospel as a book of signs since he sees the purpose of the Gospel as being stated in 21:24-25. Beasley-Murray, John, xc.


is not, however, to say that the Passion was to comply with the prophecies, since Jesus existed before the Old Testament figures.¹⁹

¹⁹Similarly, "These passages [i.e., the Matthean fulfillment texts] are not saying that the Law and the Prophets are just predictions of future events, nor is it saying that Jesus simply fulfills the parts of the Law and the Prophets which happen to be predictions. It means Jesus is the true purpose and goal of the OT." Dan McCartney and Peter Enns, "Matthew and Hosea: A Response to John Sailhamer," *WTJ* 63 (2001): 104.
APPENDIX 4

THE INTERNAL WELL OF LIVING WATER IN JOHN 7:38

And let the one who believes in me drink. As the scripture has said, “out of the believer’s heart shall flow rivers of living water.” (John 7:38 NRSV)

διὶ πιστεῦων εἰς ἐμὲ, κἀγὼ εἰπὲν ἡ γραφή, ποιμαί ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥέουσον ὕδατος ζῶντος (John 7:38 UBS).

This verse has led to an amalgam of scholarly confusion due to three peculiar features: first, the verse is structurally an anacoluthon which has prompted some scholars to debate as to the subject of the sentence. Second, no exact scripture citation is found in the Old Testament as the text claims (“as the scripture said”). Finally, uncertain is the Jewish exegetical source of the concept “the internalized well.”

Contrary to some exegetes who perceive Jesus as the source of living water in this verse, it is syntactically natural to see the water flowing from within the heart of the believer. In addition, the same concept expressed in John 4:14 reinforces this option. It


4Barnabas Lindars, The Gospel of John, NCB (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972), 300-
is surprising that the concept of an internalized well within human beings is unattested in
the previous or contemporary Jewish literature. This expression thus evidently evokes
Jesus’ discourse with the Samaritan woman. Two parallel features in both texts warrant
such a conclusion: the subject of the granting the water is Jesus and the presence of the
unprecedented concept “internalized well.” These two Johannine pericopae make an
unmistakable statement which marks a radical paradigm shift in redemptive history.
Especially noteworthy is the characteristic of the indwelling ministry of the Holy Spirit
since it is unheard of in the previous and concurrent Jewish traditions. At the end, this
prediction of the shift in salvation history serves to attest to the messianic identity of
Jesus just as the previous miraculous signs rendered the same service.

For an extended study on this paradigm shift in John’s Gospel, see James M. Hamilton, Jr.,
God’s Indwelling Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments, NAC Studies in Bible &
Theology (Nashville: B & H, 2006).

After witnessing a number of signs (turning water into wine, 2:1-12; the healing of royal
official’s son, 4:43-54; and of the lame man, 5:1-47; the feeding of the multitude, 6:1-71)
many in the crowd confessed, “When the Messiah comes, will he do more signs than this man has done?” (7:31).
## APPENDIX 5
### EXPLICIT OLD TESTAMENT MATERIALS IN JOHN

Table 4. Direct Quotations with Introductory Formulae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He said, “I am the voice of one crying out in the wilderness, ‘Make straight the way of the Lord,’” as the prophet Isaiah said.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 40:3</td>
<td>A voice cries out: “In the wilderness prepare the way of the LORD, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>His disciples remembered that it was written, “Zeal for your house will consume me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps 69:9</td>
<td>It is zeal for your house that has consumed me; the insults of those who insult you have fallen on me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Our ancestors ate the manna in the wilderness; as it is written, ‘He gave them bread from heaven to eat.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps78:24</td>
<td>He rained down on them manna to eat, and gave them the grain of heaven.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is written in the prophets, ‘And they shall all be taught by God.’ Everyone who has heard and learned from the Father comes to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Isa 54:13</td>
<td>All your children shall be taught by the LORD, and great shall be the prosperity of your children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jesus answered, “Is it not written in your law, ‘I said, you are gods?’”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps 82:6</td>
<td>I say, “You are gods, children of the Most High, all of you.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:14-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jesus found a young donkey and sat on it; as it is written: “Do not be afraid, daughter of Zion. Look, your king is coming, sitting on a donkey’s colt!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ps 62:11; Zech 9:9; cf. Isa 35:4; 40:9</td>
<td>Once God has spoken; twice have I heard this: that power belongs to God; Rejoice greatly, O daughter Zion! Shout aloud, O daughter Jerusalem! Lo, your king comes to you; triumphant and victorious is he, humble and riding on a donkey, on a colt, the foal of a donkey; Say to those who are of a fearful heart, “Be strong, do not fear! Here is your God. He will come with vengeance, with terrible recompense. He will come and save you.”; Get you up to a high mountain, O Zion, herald of good tidings; lift up your voice with strength, O Jerusalem, herald of good tidings, lift it up, do not fear; say to the cities of Judah, “Here is your God!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:38</td>
<td>This was to fulfill the word spoken by the prophet Isaiah: “Lord, who has believed our message, and to whom has the arm of the LORD been revealed?”</td>
<td>Isa 53:1</td>
<td>Who has believed what we have heard? And to whom has the arm of the LORD been revealed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:39</td>
<td>And so they could not believe, because Isaiah also said, “He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, so that they might not look with their eyes, and understand with their heart and turn—and I would heal them.” Isaiah said this because he saw his glory and spoke about him.</td>
<td>Isa 6:10</td>
<td>Make the mind of this people dull, and stop their ears, and shut their eyes, so that they may not look with their eyes, and listen with their ears, and comprehend with their minds, and turn and be healed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:18</td>
<td>I am not speaking of all of you; I know whom I have chosen. But it is to fulfill the scripture, ‘The one who ate my bread has lifted his heel against me.’</td>
<td>Ps 41:9</td>
<td>Even my bosom friend in whom I trusted, who ate of my bread, has lifted the heel against me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:25</td>
<td>It was to fulfill the word that is written in their law, ‘They hated me without a cause.’</td>
<td>Ps 35:19; 69:5</td>
<td>Do not let my treacherous enemies rejoice over me, or those who hate me without cause wink the eye; O God, you know my folly; the wrongs I have done are not hidden from you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:24</td>
<td>So they said to one another, “Let us not tear it, but cast lots for it to see who will get it.” This was to fulfill what the scripture says, “They divided my clothes among themselves, and for my clothing they cast lots.”</td>
<td>Ps 22:18</td>
<td>they divide my clothes among themselves, and for my clothing they cast lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:36</td>
<td>These things occurred so that the scripture might be fulfilled, “None of his bones shall be broken.”</td>
<td>Ex 12:46; Num 9:12; Ps 34:20</td>
<td>It shall be eaten in one house; you shall not take any of the animal outside the house, and you shall not break any of its bones (Ex 12:46); They shall leave none of it until morning, nor break a bone of it; according to all the statute for the passover they shall keep it (Num 9:12); He keeps all their bones; not one of them will be broken (Ps 34:20).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:37</td>
<td>And again another passage of scripture says, “They will look on the one whom they have pierced.”</td>
<td>Zech 12:10</td>
<td>And I will pour out a spirit of compassion and supplication on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, so that, when they look on the one whom they have pierced, they shall mourn for him, as one mourns for an only child, and weep bitterly over him, as one weeps over a firstborn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:28</td>
<td>After this, when Jesus knew that all was now finished, he said (in order to fulfill the scripture), “I am thirsty.”</td>
<td>Ps 22:15</td>
<td>my mouth is dried up like a potsherd, and my tongue sticks to my jaws; you lay me in the dust of death.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Direct Quotations without Introductory Formulae

| 1:51 | And he said to him, “Very truly, I tell you, you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man.” | Gen 28:12 | And he dreamed that there was a ladder set up on the earth, the top of it reaching to heaven; and the angels of God were ascending and descending on it. |
| 12:13 | So they took branches of palm trees and went out to meet him, shouting, “Hosanna! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord—the King of Israel!” | Ps 118:25-26 | Save us, we beseech you, O LORD! O LORD, we beseech you, give us success! Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the LORD. We bless you from the house of the LORD. |

Table 6. Introductory Formulae without Explicit Quotations

<p>| 7:38 | and let the one who believes in me drink. As the scripture has said, ‘Out of the believer’s heart shall flow rivers of living water.’” | |
| 7:42 | “Has not the scripture said that the Messiah is descended from David and comes from Bethlehem, the village where David lived?” | |
| 17:12 | While I was with them, I protected them in your name that you have given me. I guarded them, and not one of them was lost except the one destined to be lost, so that the scripture might be fulfilled. | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Biblical Reference</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Philip found Nathanael and said to him, “We have found him about whom Moses in the law and also the prophets wrote, Jesus son of Joseph from Nazareth.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>Jesus answered him, “Are you a teacher of Israel, and yet you do not understand these things?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:39</td>
<td>“You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that testify on my behalf.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:45-7</td>
<td>Do not think that I will accuse you before the Father; your accuser is Moses, on whom you have set your hope. If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote about me. But if you do not believe what he wrote, how will you believe what I say?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:9</td>
<td>for as yet they did not understand the scripture, that he must rise from the dead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 6

IMPORTANT SOURCES ON OT AND EARLY JEWISH LITERATURE


APPENDIX 7

THE USE OF RABBINIC MATERIALS
IN NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES

The use of early rabbinic literature for New Testament studies is increasingly recognized as problematic due to its dating issue and the composite nature which involved an extended period of redactional reworking. Although McNamara suggests an early dating of the Palestinian Targum because the body of literature is supposed to reflect the earliest rabbinic traditions, the philological examination and the extant manuscripts place this group of writings later than the first century A.D. Most scholars date the extant earliest manuscripts (Targum Onqelos and Targum Neofiti I on the Pentateuch) to the late third century and others far later (mostly the seventh to eleventh centuries for Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, the Cairo Geniza, and Targum Jonathan). The


advocates for the rabbinic influence on the New Testament bring up two evidences on their behalf. First, they point to some parts of Targum Jonathan which seem to reflect a national eschatological concern probably current right after the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70-200. Second, three Qumran writings (4QtgLev, 4QtgJob, and 11QtgJob) resemble the midrashic style of early rabbinic exegesis.

However, it must be stressed that no one denies some type of rabbinic interpretative practice probably existed in the first century but the composite nature of the literature renders it extremely difficult to utilize it in a critical way for the investigation of any literary dependence. In addition, the three Qumran fragments contain so literal a rendering of the Hebrew scriptures that their categorization into Targum appears to be a special pleading. E. P. Sanders offers a three-fold caution against the use of the early rabbinic materials for New Testament studies. First, although most scholars accept a general continuity between Pharisaism of the first century and the early rabbinic ideas of the second century onward, it is not entirely certain as to the conceptual coherence between the former and individual rabbis of a later period. This partial disparity requires a discerning use. Second, the long period of the editorial activity significantly reduces one’s confidence in the rabbinic sources’ claim to the early provenance. There is virtually no way to be certain of which part originated from the earliest trait of thought (i.e., second century A.D.). A common mistake scholars make in this regard can be mentioned. D. Daube found a reference to “Moses’ seat” in a post-biblical rabbinic writing. The term is found nowhere else in the body of the early rabbinic literature but only in Matthew 23:2. Thus, he postulates that the rabbinic document reflects the conceptual currents of the first century. However, his logic manifests the fallacy of generalization. The term may have derived from the first century tradition, but it is a

---

3 Chilton, “Targums,” 800.
gross overgeneralization to posit that the entire document that contains the term reflects the Judaism of Jesus’ time in its entirety. Third, the rabbinic materials’ diversity of views hinders the validity of a comparative study because one can often find a contrasting viewpoint from another rabbi.⁵ A fourth reservation can be added to this list. That is, it is possible that a common (oral) Jewish tradition may account for the parallel shared by the New Testament and rabbinic sources.⁶ As such, the main contribution of inquiries into the rabbinic literature for New Testament studies should remain as an aid to clarify the Jewish cultural/religious milieu of the first century Palestine.⁷

---
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ABSTRACT

OLD TESTAMENT CHARACTERS AS
CHRISTOLOGICAL WITNESSES
IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Sanghee Michael Ahn, Ph.D.
The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2006
Chairperson: Dr. John B. Polhill

This dissertation examines the Christological witness function of the Old Testament characters in the Gospel of John. Chapter 1 discusses the problem concomitant to the bi-partite nature of the Christian Bible and the scholarly solutions suggested to remedy this issue. The importance of Christology for John and the Gospel’s indebtedness to the Jewish heritage is also noted. Combining these two aspects, some scholarly attempts to account for Johannine Christology in terms of Jewish hero *redivivus* theories are reviewed. An important consensus has emerged from German scholarship that sees the role of the Old Testament as Christological witness. This perspective gave impetus to the present research concerning the same witness function of the Old Testament characters. The rest of chapter 1 discusses the preliminary questions, such as, the justification, contributions, methodology, terms, and limits of the present study.

Chapter 2 investigates the contribution of Jacob and Abraham to Johannine Christological understanding in view of relevant intertestamental Jewish literature. In contrast to some scholarly arguments, the main function of these patriarchs is to undergird the messianic identity of Jesus.

Chapter 3 concerns Elijah in early Judaism and John. The eschatological expectation of Elijah in the former period is marked by his militant subjugation of the gentiles along with the reconciliation ministry. The contextual reading of the passages related to Elijah in John reveals that he is a type of John the Baptist rather than Jesus.
Chapter 4 examines David, probably the most influential messianic prefiguration of the intertestamental period. He is characterized by his competence as a ruler, his loyalty to Judaism, and his status as an eschatological figure. While the first half of John’s Gospel does not portray Jesus as a Davidic figure, the latter half is replete with the references to the Davidic trials. Although one can argue for a correspondence between David and Jesus in the Johannine passion accounts, the analogy is more evident between Yahweh and Jesus, let alone the suffering aspect of David, which did not constitute the messianic expectations of early Judaism.

Chapter 5 engages in a study of Moses as depicted in early Judaism and John. In contrast to the perspectives of the Hebrew scriptural traditions, in which Moses is understood as the prophet *par excellence*, the fourth evangelist presents him merely as a Christological witness, not as a messianic prefiguration.

Chapter 6 summarizes the foregoing observations and offers hermeneutical implications for the study of the Gospel of John, especially with reference to the redactional capability of the fourth evangelist and the value of the intertestamental Jewish literature.
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