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Abstract

The thesis presented in this paper involves the re-evaluation of the Fourth Gospel's narrative in light of intertextual analysis. The aim is to demonstrate how the author of this gospel has exploited Israelite scriptural and historic tradition to depict the Jesus Movement as one motivated by a desire to see Israel reinstated as the elect of Yahweh. This, it is shown, is manifested in a series of highly symbolic actions which echo the pattern of Ezek 16; this pattern reveals the cycle of Israel as Yahweh's "bride". Near the end of this cycle, the Movement takes on a priestly perspective, revealing the establishment of a new, symbolically purified priesthood.
## Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations/Acknowledgements</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter One Consent and Covenant</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathanael</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Marriage</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicodemus</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Two Anticipating Hephzibah</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaritan Woman</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adulteress</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Three The Temple Scenes</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excursus</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Four Mistaken Identity</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healings</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hunger</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Five Election</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Lack of Vision</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emancipation</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priestly Theme</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Six Replacement</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barabbas</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestments and Transference</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153 Fish</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Seven Conclusions</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abbreviations

Bibliographic

BT  The Bible Translator
CBQ  Catholic Biblical Quarterly
JBL  Journal of Biblical Literature
JJS  Journal of Jewish Studies
JSNT  Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNT SS  Journal for the Study of the New Testament/Supplement Series
NT  Novum Testamentum
NTS  New Testament Studies
ZNW  Zeitschrift fur die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

Primary Sources

Josephus:
Ant.  The Antiquities of the Jews
Life.  Life of Flavius Josephus
J. W.  The Wars of the Jews

Biblical/Apocryphal:

BD  Beloved Disciple
FG  Fourth Gospel
Gos.Nic.  Gospel of Nicodemus
Gos.Phil.  Gospel of Philip
Gos.Thom.  Gospel of Thomas
NRSV  New Revised Standard Version
SGM  Secret Gospel of Mark

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate how the Fourth Gospel, through the employment of intertextual echoes, depicts the Jesus Movement as a divinely sanctioned mission to prepare Israel for its anticipated reunion with Yahweh under a new covenant and a new priesthood.

A note on the method employed in this study is necessary as it may be unfamiliar to some, being a relatively recently accepted approach in the field of New Testament (henceforth NT) studies. Scholars interested in the apparent relationship between Scriptural texts have long focused (primarily) on typology, where persons, events or things within the Old Testament (henceforth, OT) are interpreted as precursors, or prototypes of those in the NT. What an intertextual approach does, simply, is to include literary/interpretative techniques within that sphere of potential precedents.

Intertextual analysis\(^1\) expresses the transference of "ideological and cultural" concepts within a context of "social transformation."\(^2\) It is thus an 'organic' approach which attempts

\(^1\) The term was coined by Julia Kristeva, who noted that texts within a given culture have more than just an 'influence' upon later texts, they are actually related in a much more organic sense, i.e., they are part of "an ongoing process of absorption, transformation and permutation... ." George Aichele and Gary Philips, Eds., *Semeia* 69/70 (1995) 300.

\(^2\) George Aichele & Gary A. Philips, "Introduction: Exegesis, Eisegesis, Intergesis," *Semeia* 69/70 (1995) 7-18 (Here, 9). This transference of ideology, etc., is inevitably preceded by a
to illuminate the apparent progression of ideas and beliefs, etc., from one circumstantial matrix to another.

This avenue of investigation has found favour amongst exegetes for whom conventional methods of analysis have proved unsatisfactory with respect to discerning the "meaning" of a text. One area which does have sympathies with intertextuality is that of the feminist approach, for both tend to glean new meaning from familiar texts by removing certain conventional restrictions on interpretation. By reading the text more from an intuitive, reflective and flexible perspective, both feminist and intertextual analyses reveal a plethora of new and stimulating possibilities for "meaning".

Investigation into the potential textual links between the NT and the OT became more widely practised after Michael Fishbane's article on "Inner-Biblical Exegesis". This revealed how established "law, homily, and prophecy" were manipulated by subsequent authors in order to achieve a new significance under the changed circumstances of the day. Fishbane suggested that these "source", which Susan Graham describes in terms of a "cultural code", i.e., there is a level at which the new text delivers 'familiar' material - material the author expects the reader to perceive and through which the reader should interpret the work. This can be done implicitly or explicitly ("Intertextual Trekking: Visiting the Iniquity of the Fathers Upon the 'Next Generation'," Semeia 69/70 (1995) 195-219. Here 199-202).


4 Fishbane, 343.

5 Fishbane, 346.
later authors perceived the revelation of Yahweh within the literary structures, the words, and the historical events recorded earlier in the Hebrew Bible. Established themes, dialogues, events, motifs, etc., could be incorporated into a new text in such a way as to imply utter legitimacy and authority, whilst at the same time providing them with a new, more contemporaneous context.\(^6\)

More recently, in his article concerning the importance of subtle variations between two superficially similar stories (i.e., Gen 24 and Judg 19) David Penchansky made the distinction between "literary text", "social text" and "interpretive text".\(^7\) The first category for analysis allows for recognizable repetitions of preceded vocabulary, structure, etc., but also brings to the fore the variations extant within the latter text; these differences to a generally assumed pattern are areas of concern and demand closer attention.\(^8\) Such deviances point to some altered social factor or influence and this leads the analyst to the second category, which attempts to define a justifiable social context for the composition.\(^9\) The third category introduces a degree of

---

\(^6\) Fishbane, 354. The example of Exod 3-11 and Isa 19 is used here; Fishbane suggests that "the literary tradition of Exod 3-11 had already become sufficiently authoritative so as to provide the foil for [an] audacious, theological counterpoint" in Isa 19. See also 347,349,353.


\(^8\) Penchansky, 79.

\(^9\) Penchansky, 81f.
personal interaction with a group of texts, with the intention of attaining a new level of "understanding".  

These three categories of textual analysis are complemented by three sets of criteria which Craig Evans proposes most concisely. He defines these as "verbal coherence", "thematic coherence" and "exegetical coherence". The first category is self explanatory and corresponds to Penchansky's "literary text"; more specific than, but related to the idea of "social text" is Evans' concentration on thematic clarification of one text through another (i.e., where a passage from the OT serves to illuminate a passage from the NT through familiar setting, action, etc.). Thirdly, Evans notes the influence of early exegetical interpretations of OT texts on the construction (and therefore, interpretation) of NT texts. D.A. Carson, working specifically with the Johannine texts, imposes the three criteria of "direct quotations", "thematic allusions" and "midrash". Whatever the titles given to the categories of investigation into intertextuality, there is a generally accepted triad of verbal/social/interpretive analysis.

---

10 Penchansky, 81.


12 D. A. Carson, "John and the Johannine Epistles," in It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture, D.A. Carson and H. Williamson, Eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988) 245-264 (here, 245-256). The first relates to verbal/literary reflections (intended), the second to the employment of familiar themes in altered contexts, and the third (arising from the second) to the apparent re-interpretation and manipulation of precedent texts in order to give new "meaning".
The three categories (or criteria) which shall be used in this paper for determining intertextual echoes are: a) Literary/Verbal Similarity, i.e., where there is evidence of a technical formula, such as "as it is written,"\(^{13}\) (e.g., John 1:23, 12:38, 5:46), or the repetition of preceded narrative structure, grammar or syntax, b) Thematic/Contextual Reflection, i.e., were there is evidence of comparable socio-religious ideology\(^{14}\) such as the rejection of a corrupt priesthood, a marriage ceremony, a Temple function, a well scenario, etc., and c) Exegesis/Interpretation, i.e., where observations of OT passages altered in their new context by a shift in tense, the interjection of a word not in the original, an apparent change in the subject or object of the sentence, etc., (e.g., John 1:23, 51),\(^{15}\) demand explanation in order to justify their existence within the narrative. A shift in perspective is referred to as in "inverted quotation"\(^{16}\) and in such cases, the original, or 'source', passage must be analyzed in context in order to fully appreciate its adoption in a new text.\(^{17}\)


\(^{14}\) O'Day ("Intertextuality") 265.

\(^{15}\) O'Day ("Intertextuality") 264.


\(^{17}\) Beentjes, 49. Fishbane (361) states that the 'secondary' texts often use their sources "as theological and literary fictions to obscure [their] own innovations." Thus, the 'shift' in perspective, or the change in grammar may indicate a desire to show the original prophecy, law, etc., as being 'unfulfilled' and so it
These criteria are not applied collectively, but individually as each case demands. For each example included in this discussion, there are many other possible "sources" for the echo which could alter the interpretation; represented here, though, are those which best serve to illustrate a coherent and comprehensible train of thought throughout the narrative.

One possible difficulty with the method proposed here is its subjectivity. Readings from an intertextual perspective can only be justified "in terms of the readers' interests or desires to find or give meaning and the impossibility of doing this in any other way."\(^{18}\) However, as the Fourth Gospel (hereafter, FG) provides the exegete with many 'riddles' that standard narrative criticism has not succeeded in explaining, the present application of intertextual analysis may offer a new insight into the "meaning" of the FG. This "meaning", admittedly, as Magonet points out,\(^ {19}\) is based on a relatively subjective reading, and "the best one can hope for is some degree of probability."\(^ {20}\) This degree of "probability" is at the foundation of the exegete's decision in choosing one 'source' over another.

The most fundamental aspect of Jewish ideology, its Credo, becomes a vital part of the 'meaning' of the new text (360) - i.e., it is now being fulfilled.

\(^{18}\) Aichele & Philips 15.


\(^{20}\) Magonet 13.
perhaps, is the anticipated reconstitution or renewal of the divinely ordained "Israel"; it is logical that such a tradition of hope should find its way into the literature of a nation under social/religious oppression, so it would be legitimate to claim this belief is expressed in the Fourth Gospel. Similarly, there is an apparently ancient tradition of echoing previous, well established ideology and/or literary structures in new religious texts; potential adversaries of the claim, here, that the FG continues in this tradition, have the onus placed upon them to demonstrate why such a well used and effective literary heritage had been abandoned.

The areas of concentration will be the seven semeia normally attributed to the FG, plus the pericopae pertaining to the Temple and the more prominent male/female characters; pericopae which do not contain specific intertextual material, or do not assist in the disclosure of the renewal/priestly themes will not be included.
Chapter One: Consent and Covenant

As the area of investigation of this study is that of intertextuality, the aim of this first chapter of analysis is to provide enough evidence of intertextual echoes to propose an intentional depiction of the sanctification of Jesus' mission, its purpose and the formal acceptance of his endeavour to fulfil his task. Through the portrayal of John the Baptist, Nathanael, and the wedding at Cana, and Nicodemus, the narrative creates a coherent foundation upon which the rest of the gospel can expand.

The Baptist

There are three intertextual points of interest in the early depiction of John the Baptist. First, almost as soon as the narrative begins, the reader is presented with a profound example of a "technical" echo, in the rendering of Isa 40:3 in John 1:23. The technical device, "as the prophet said" is explicit, making the echo a fully intentional one. The shift in perspective from the anticipation of the Isaiah passage to the fulfilment of the FG 'echo', exemplifies the "inverted quotation" aspect of intertextuality; the original context of the 'source', then, must be taken into consideration in an interpretation of John's proclamation.

The context of Isa 40 is one of an anticipated deliverance from oppression and 'captivity' for those who attend the "word" of God and have patience in awaiting his 'support'. The "wilderness"
imagery in both instances is figurative, representing not only relative geographical positions, but also the 'state' in which the 'captives' exist, i.e., in a spiritual "wilderness".

There is, however, an alternative echo 'source', which will prove its potential later, in the analysis of the Temple scenes, e.g., Mal 3:1, and the sending of a messenger (cf. John 1:6) to "prepare the way". Whichever point of reference is intended, "by making his career 'in the wilderness' and so presenting Israel with a charged symbol by which to understand him, John [the Baptist] purposefully evoke[s] themes of eschatological restoration." 21

Second, in the primary instance of the FG's consistent use of the analogy of "sight", the Baptist declares to the visiting priests and Levites, "Among you stands one whom you do not know" (John 1:26). The employment of the "sight" motif, the implicit reference to 'leaders' (v.22), the inference that something/someone is present whom some can see and others evidently can not, and the "wilderness" context, all echo Jer 17:5-6, where it is declared that those who put their faith in "mortal" leaders are led into a "wilderness" and will be unable to "see when relief comes". The FG affirms that the saviour of Israel is not recognized, his offer of "relief" not noticed by those who are blinded by the "mortal" leaders (in the FG's case, the Pharisees, primarily) who guide them "away from the Lord".

Third is the profound statement identifying Jesus as the "Lamb of God" (John 1:29), employing the term amnos. This has long been

understood by exegetes\textsuperscript{22} to be an allusion to Isa 53:6-7; it appears, though, that the FG is using the Baptist's alleged claim in quite a different context. It is suggested that John 1:29 is not necessarily an intertextual echo of Isa 53, and that the ideological reflection of Gen 22 is greater (in the FG) than that which results from an alleged echo of Isa 53. Consider the image of the "lamb" in the 'Sacrifice of Isaac' pericope of Gen 22:1-19:

1) This is the only example of a "lamb" coming from God.\textsuperscript{23} All other lambs, etc., are offered up to God (including the lamb of Isa 53:7). 2) The lamb takes the place of the beloved "son". God does not make offerings to himself, so the lamb is seen as the redeeming animal, not, strictly, a sacrificial one.\textsuperscript{24} 3) Because of Abraham's loyalty and faith, God promises that his "offspring shall possess the gate of their enemies...and by [them]...all the nations of the earth [shall] gain blessing for themselves" (Gen 22:17-18).

In sum, then, if we consider John 1:29,26 to be an allusion to Gen 22, we find the consistent themes of i) Jesus being "from God", ii) the "son" (i.e., "Israel") being saved by the "lamb" of God, iii) the promise of an ideal nation through which the rest of the


\textsuperscript{23} Isaiah 53:7 in the LXX does use \textit{amnos}, but in the context of the "silent" sheep, not the killed sheep (there, \textit{probaton}); Genesis 22:13 uses \textit{krios}; Exod 12:5, with respect to the Passover lamb, uses \textit{probaton}. The superior ideological echo of Gen 22 reveals a possible Hebrew-scriptural precedent.

\textsuperscript{24} Note that Num 28:1f stipulates that the burnt offering (sacrifice) is to be "two" male lambs, not one. In instances of sheep being sacrificed for the expiation of "sin", as in Lev-4:32-5:6, a female sheep is offered up.
world can be redeemed, and iv) the elevation of the "lamb" (i.e., as 'smoke' in Gen 22) to God. With this interpretation, the concept of Jesus as the Passover lamb also becomes more comprehensible, for scholars have been hard pushed to reconcile the apparently expiating nature of Jesus' death with this non-sacrificial meal.

According to Exod 13:13f the "firstborn" of the Israelites are "redeemed" through the saving blood of the lamb, which is put upon the door posts of each Israelite home (Exod 12:7); this lamb is thus not only a sacrifice, but also a "sign" (12:13). Similarly, Jesus is the "sign" for those seeking redemption and 'freedom' in the new Kingdom. It is, partly, to this application of the blood and eating of the flesh of the lamb to that which Jesus apparently alludes in John 6:52f; partaking in the meal is equated with the smearing of the blood - all who do so will be saved. Those who reject it, reject God.

Nathanael

It is Nathanael who is at the centre of the pericope 1:45-51, not Jesus; it is Nathanael who questions Jesus' significance

---

25 For an interesting discussion on the connection between the sacrifice of Isaac and the Passover festival read Geza Vermes, "New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac from 4Q225," JJS 67.1 (Spring 1996) 140-146 (especially pg. 144).


(1:46). Rising to the 'test', Jesus responds by making what Munro and von Wahlde both understand to be a "clairvoyant" declaration; he claims that he has "seen" Nathanael "under the fig tree" (v.48), before Philip had even called him. The "fig tree", however, can be taken as a thematic or symbolic echo of precedent uses which describe the ideal of God's protection and mercy (e.g., Jer 24:1-8 and Dan 4:10), the nation (e.g., Joel 1:7, 12), and the image of peace, prosperity and unity (1 Kgs 4:25, 1 Macc 14:11-12, etc). One of the most profoundly eschatological contexts of this theme is that expressed in Zech 3:10, where God promises that on the day when the old priesthood is cleansed of its iniquities and the new high priest crowned, etc., each man shall invite his neighbour under his "vine and fig tree", presumably as a sign of harmony and unity. This example, more than any other, perhaps, acts as an intertextual 'source' for the episode in John 1, for both represent a future rather than a past state of affairs, both incorporate a 'divine' figure making the 'promise', and both allude to an ideal,

---

28 Winsome Munro, "The Pharisee and the Samaritan in John: Polar or Parallel?" CBO 57.4 (October 1995) 710-728 (here 717).


30 Cf. B. Charette, "'To Proclaim Liberty to the Captives': Matthew 11:28-30 In the Light of OT Prophetic Expectation," NTS 38 (1992) 290-297 (here 291). Charette's study of Matt 11:28-30 reveals strong allusions to the OT depiction of the restoration of Israel through the faithful service of the "remnant", whose loyalty to "Torah" (i.e., God's 'yoke') ultimately redeems them from "the 'yoke' of foreign domination". There is no reason to doubt that the Fourth Gospel, also, refers to such an idyllic prospect.
Greater things than this inspirational foresight, however, are promised by Jesus (John 1:50); not just ideals but actions. The imagery of v.51 draws on Jacob's vision of the ladder between heaven and earth, upon which the angels are seen ascending and descending (Gen 28:10-17). The words of Jesus incorporate an explicit, intentional reference to an OT passage, just as 1:23 had done, but this lacks the blatant technical formula which introduces or justifies it. By addressing this vision to Nathanael, the FG infers, or even implies, some identification between this character and Jacob.

The significance of Gen 28:10f is determined by the information God relays and the subsequent response of Jacob: Yahweh declares that he is the God of Abraham and Isaac, he promises prosperity for Jacob's descendants, and he confirms the promise of a return of the land to its rightful inheritors, Jacob and his offspring. God claims that he will be with Jacob and will "keep" him wherever he goes until the promise is fulfilled. Jacob responds to this dream by pronouncing that God has become manifest at this site, and that this is truly the "house of God and...the gate of heaven." He seems surprised at his own ignorance of the sanctity of the place (v.16).

Comparing this to the FG version of the ladder image, the

31 The word *basileus* can mean any foundation of power, ruler of a particular realm, etc., and may just as easily refer to a religious leader as to a political one. There is also a sense in which the title of "king" can be attributed to a bridegroom (G. Lloyd Carr, *The Song of Solomon*, (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1984, 84), a possible allusion made all the clearer in the following paragraphs.
similarities both in format and in ideology become clear; Nathanael receives the vision and the 'promises', he reflects Jacob's astonishment and subsequent conviction (for in his initial reaction on hearing that Jesus of Nazareth has come (John 1:46), Nathanael reveals an ignorance of the true nature of Jesus. After his 'encounter', he reacts in a respectful and devout manner, just as Jacob had done), and Nathanael's exclamation, "you are the Son of God," echoes Jacob's affirmation of God's presence. The FG author intimates that Jesus is acting as God's representative, he is purposefully reflecting his "father", the divine King of Israel who 'stood beside' Jacob and promised him an ideal future, and a 'helping hand' in the meantime. Nathanael recognizes Jesus' authority and exclaims his faith in Jesus' word - he 'sees', he understands. In Nathanael's depiction is foreshadowed the words of Jesus in John 17:6-8.

The Marriage

The reader is immediately invited to a wedding, one of the most profoundly symbolic events in Israelite society, where the vehicle for the theology of the FG is made apparent. From an intertextual perspective, there are, again, three chief areas of interest, namely, that of the sacred day of union, the concept of marriage, and motif of the good and bad wines.

The pericope (2:1f) begins with the temporal marker, "On the third day." The idea of sealing a covenant on the third day first appears in Gen 22:4, with Abraham's proposed sacrifice of Isaac and the subsequent promise of prosperity. In Exod 19:9-15, too, the third day is sacrosanct; it is the day of union and ceremony - it
is the day of 'marriage' for God and his sacred bride, the original priestly kingdom of Israel. Note that Jesus is seen to be cautious about permitting his mother, a gyne, or "woman" (as opposed to a 'pure' virgin, perhaps) near him before his moment of "glory", before his "hour" (John 2:4 cf. Exod 19:11). In John 20:17, allegedly on the third day after Jesus' crucifixion, Mary approaches him but is warned not to touch him before he 'ascends to the Father'. This repetition of the third day/purity/woman format is intended and significant, for it creates an 'inclusio' wherein the narrative of the FG is placed between the two acts of union between the divine and Jesus. One initiates the mission, the other ends it. The "third day" marker, then, acts as both a 'technical' (i.e., verbal) and an ideological (i.e., the concept of covenant) intertextual echo, intended to convey the sense of a sacred union, a sealing of a covenant.

In order to shed some light on the identity of the 'wedding couple', the reader should turn to John 3:29, where the debate concerning the 'purity' of Jesus (that is, in his role as a 'baptist') is taking place. The word katharismos is employed, here, which also appears in the wedding pericope, with respect to the stone jars of 'purification' water, and thus forms an internal narrative echo of 2:6. In the Baptist's words (vv.27,29) is heard a subtle reminder that Jesus has been granted such a level of purity by virtue of his being 'chosen' by God to receive the "bride".

The wedding format employed in John 2,3 emphasizes the 'commission' nature of Jesus' role; where the 'world' may not
acknowledge Jesus' priestly status, the sanctification of his mission by the Holy Spirit has ensured (or created?) it. Note how the Baptist's reference to 'rejoicing' over the bridegroom echoes the format of Isa 62:4-5, in a subtle example of an "inverted quotation". In Isaiah, the pattern is "bridegroom rejoices over bride / God rejoices over Israel"; in John 3, the Baptist reaffirms not only his own position as Jesus' precursor, but also the idea of fulfilment, for by this expression of 'joy over the bridegroom', the reader is led to suppose that the pattern of Isa 62 will be followed, progressing from the bridegroom's friend, to the groom, to God, with the ultimate effect being restored relations between Yahweh and Israel.

The wedding itself can, therefore, be understood in metaphorical terms, with Jesus, the recognized "Son of God" (i.e., God's representative) accepting his responsibility for Israel. The symbolism of the ceremony, especially the seven-fold blessing which culminates in a prayer for the reunification of Israel, reaffirms the ideal "marriage" of Yahweh and his people. The wedding thus supports the context of renewal/redemption established in John 1.

With the promise of greater things to come, and the vivid

---

32 In the case of John the Baptist, of course, he is the son of a priest, and therefore of priestly stock. His 'right' to perform such an act is not questioned.

33 J. Neusner, The Way of Torah: An Introduction to Judaism, (California: Wadsworth, 1988). 50-51. Some examples of the nuptial imagery in the OT include Isa 54:5; 62:4-5; Jer 2:2. Elsewhere, for instance in the Gos.Phil., the Holy of Holies is likened to a "Bridal Chamber", where only the bridegroom, the high priest, can enter (Barnstone 92,94,95). There is also the correlation of Jesus as the Lamb (John 1:29) and the bridegroom (3:29), to the ideal, eschatological marriage with the new Israel as the bride, in Rev 21:9.
imagery of the idyllic future state, it can not be doubted that the wedding scenario represents the traditional, anticipated union between God and the faithful remnant of Israel. The FG marriage not only makes 'official' Jesus' mission to restore Israel to its former glory, but it sets the ideology for much of the subsequent narrative.

Intertextuality thrives in a context of social (political/religious) crisis (see Introduction); although the context established in John 1 fulfils this, the first semeion, or sign, of the FG reinforces the situation in terms of Jesus' role, and makes the problem far more pragmatic and immediate. The semeion at Cana illustrates the degraded moral condition of Israel and introduces the concept of an 'alternative' way of life by echoing the "drunkenness" ideology in the OT.\(^{34}\) The basic implication of the teachings about wine and strong drink is that the drunken state is self imposed; there is a subsequent lack of knowledge and understanding, followed by an opportunity to re-establish oneself on a righteous path.\(^ {35}\) Here, in John 2, the guests are too

\(^{34}\) The concept of wine, or strong drink, in the OT can be categorized under three general headings, a) wine that offers solace, or is used for celebrations, etc., (e.g., Exod 10:19, Judg 9:13, Ps 104:15, etc.); b) wine which dulls the senses to the imbiber's disadvantage, making the will weak, etc., (e.g., Gen 9:21f, Prov 4:17, 20:1, 31:4-6, Hos 4:11, etc.); and c) wine which acts as the medium for God's wrath or mercy (e.g., Job 21:20, Ps 11:6, Jer 25:15, etc.).

\(^{35}\) Devora Steinmetz, "Vineyard, Farm and Garden: The Drunkenness of Noah in the Context of Primal History," JBL 113.2 (Summer 1994) 193-207.
intoxicated to appreciate the good wine, there is confusion about where the new wine has come from (2:9; note the internal echo of the inability to see 'relief' coming, in 1:26), and the good wine itself represents the righteous path.

Such an opportunity for redemption, however, demands a certain degree of "moral agency" - it demands a "choice" between good and evil. This is precisely the situation portrayed in the FG; a choice has to be made between Jesus, the good wine, the light, the righteous path, etc., and the current establishment (the bad wine) with its tendency toward personal advancement, arrogance and even deceit. The choice will be set before the people through the mission Jesus is about to undertake. It will culminate in the pericope involving Jesus and Barabbas, in John 18.

Nicodemus

Because of the unusual nature of John 3:1-15, scholars have argued from one extreme perspective to another about what is actually going on here, with many analyses concluding either that Nicodemus is ignorant of the 'truth' in Jesus' words/actions, and

36 Cf. Gos. Thom. 28...I took my place in the midst of the world... I found all of them intoxicated; I found none of them thirsty...for the moment they are intoxicated. When they shake off their wine, then they will repent.

37 Steinmetz 207.

38 According to Isa 1:22, "wine mixed with water" (bad/weak wine) is a sign of a debauched society.
that his spiritual progress is thwarted at this early stage,\textsuperscript{39} or that the construction of the narrative, itself, presents "disjunctures" which require elaborate justifications.\textsuperscript{40} Through an analysis of how the FG pericope demonstrates profound verbal/literary and ideological echoes (in this example, of 2 Esdr) Nicodemus is granted a new vitality. The reason for including this pericope in the "Consent and Covenant" category is that Nicodemus' story illustrates how Jesus is going to fulfil his covenant with God.

Symbolically, the name \textit{Nicodemos} is optimistic, for it is often translated to mean "conqueror/victor for the people";\textsuperscript{41} he is immediately associated, therefore, with the positive notion of "victory". It is clearly stated that this character is an archon (John 3:1), or "leader" of the "Jews" – a Pharisee, yet he is also described, by Jesus, as "the teacher of Israel" (3:10), a designation normally granted priests (cf. Deut 31:9-13, 33:10). A cultus which is deeply influenced by Pharisaic belief and authority

\textsuperscript{39} Urban, C. von Wahlde (in "Literary Structure and Theological Argument in Three Discourses with the Jews in the Fourth Gospel," \textit{JBL} 103.4 (December, 1984) 575-584), for example, understands the discussion between Nicodemus and Jesus as one which is intended as a "critique of miracle faith", suggesting that Nicodemus, representing the "authorities", shows an interest but ultimately fails to "accept the conclusions which the signs...force upon [him]" (77). Lee, on the other hand, sees a great deal of symbolism in the pericope, describing the "birth" imagery in terms of humanity's "struggle" to ascend to the divine - the pain of "transition from the old to the new" (43f), with the character ultimately comprehending "nothing at all" (55). The symbolism of v.8 contains elements of both penetration/conception and birth couched in metaphorical terms.

\textsuperscript{40} William C. Grese, "'Unless One Is Born Again': The Use of a Heavenly Journey in John 3," \textit{JBL} 107.4 (December, 1988) 677-693. Here, 678.

\textsuperscript{41} McKenzie, 614.
is thus inferred. The "victory" his name implies is not only a conquest over his own ignorance; it is also a spiritual victory for the people at large, whose 'education' Nicodemus is attributed (3:10) - he can, and must, teach by his example. In this regard he becomes a reflection of Jesus' own 'conquest' of the 'world'.

The thematic context of 2 Esdr is the imminent day of judgement which will separate the faithful from the corrupt, the "dead" from the "living". It is a diatribe against a wilful and wicked people, whose neglect of God has brought them despair. In 2 Esdr 3:28-36, Ezra has been querying the moral status of Israel in God's eyes; he is under the impression that Israel has been loyal and true, but has not been rewarded for its goodness. (Noting the Pharisaic context of Nicodemus' depiction, the 'echo' of this presumption, indeed arrogance, is implicit within the FG's general portrait of the proud Pharisees, especially in their attitude in John 9:40-41). In response to this, the angel Uriel is sent to offer Ezra a path to enlightenment. At the outset, however, Ezra's understanding is weak: "You cannot understand the things with which you have grown up; how then can your mind comprehend the way of the Most High?" demands Uriel (4:10). This is simply paraphrased in John 3:12.

Only those whose origins are "in heaven", the angel continues, can truly understand heavenly matters (v.21). Nicodemus, a Pharisee, is not, by FG standards, "from God" (cf. John 8:47), and thus can not comprehend 'heavenly' matters unless he is reborn from 'above' (3:7).\footnote{The word for "you" here is plural, inferring that Nicodemus, like Nathanael, is representing a group.} Ezra is confused, claiming he does not desire
knowledge of heavenly things, he merely wishes to understand why Israel appears to have been forsaken. Uriel responds by insisting that the root of "evil", the "place where evil has been sown", must "pass away" before the "field where the good has been sown" can "come" (2 Esdr 4:29). This theme, it should be noted, is apparent in the concept of the old/new wines and the old/new Temple, in John 2.

Beginning to perceive that the fault may lie within Israel itself, a fault which prolongs the advent of the 'new era', Ezra demands further insight. In John 7:50-51, Nicodemus perceives a fault in the rash behaviour of his fellow Pharisees, requesting clarification. Uriel uses the imagery of a woman giving birth at the end of her term, insinuating that the 'destruction of the old world' is an inevitability which cannot be avoided - that the evil will be eradicated and the righteous will be 'reborn' from the "womb" of Hades (4:41-42). The 'earthly' woman cannot retrieve her "foetus" (v.40), but the implication is that God can (i.e., where the "foetus" is understood to be the spiritual "child", Israel). The reproductive theme is echoed within the basic premise of the discussion between Jesus and Nicodemus. For Ezra (2 Esdr 4:52ff), and for Nicodemus (John 3:2) the central element of a piqued interest is the matter of "signs" - signs pointing to a new truth, or reality, that is not easily comprehended. "Seeing" the signs and understanding them require a degree of humility and difficulty - the rebirth is a painful one (cf. 2 Esdr 7:14; John 3:8).

Ezra is asked, "why are you disturbed...why have you not considered in your mind what is to come...?" (2 Esdr 7:15-16). Such a question is reflected in Jesus' astonishment over Nicodemus' lack
of understanding even though he represents those who claim to "teach" Israel (John 3:9-10). The inadequacy of these "teachers" is, once again, brought to the fore of the narrative.

The underlying 'order' to Ezra is a commission for him to convey what he has learnt to others - he is to teach from his experience (cf. 2 Esdr 14:22), to show people the "path" to "Life". Just as the 'vision' granted to Nathanael echoes that of Jacob, this 'commission' of Ezra's is echoed in the depiction of Nicodemus, the "teacher of Israel". The only aspect of Jesus' conversation with Nicodemus which does not appear to have a direct precedent in 2 Esdr is the reference to the "Son of Man:" being "lifted up."

In his representative role, the "Son of Man" must be "lifted up" in a sense which evokes the image (and meaning) of Moses raising "Nehushtan" (John 3:14-15; Num 21:4f). This is an explicit use of intertextual echoing, intended to direct the reader to a particular OT precedent. It is claimed in Num 21 that poisonous snakes lurk in the wilderness, and those who are bitten will die unless they look at the bronze serpent. In both Num 21 and the FG, it is suggested, the fundamental theme is the reconfirmation of the power of God. Just as God and his people triumphed over the Egyptians, so "Nehushtan", in the former instance, stands as a

---

reminder that even in the "wilderness", where temptations abound, the saving power of God is there for all who seek it out. It is a beacon of salvation in the wilderness. The "Son of Man" must be raised up in a like manner. 'He' must be set before the nation as a sign by which the remnant, or those "chosen" (cf. 2 Esdr 16:74: "my elect ones") may see the way to an everlasting "life". Where the alternative is a spiritual "death" under the influence of contemporaneous "snakes" (i.e., the Pharisees and the cultus all but ruled by them), Jesus, as the divinely sanctioned agent for Israel, offers himself as the new "Nehushtan", as the righteous, pre-ordained alternative. This may also be intended as a conceptual echo of the commission in Isa 62:10-11: "...lift up an ensign over the peoples...see, your salvation comes."

The significance of this, perhaps the most blatant intertextual echo in the FG, is to reveal the manner in which Jesus is going to complete the 'work' given to him by God: He will use "signs", and he will act as a "sign" himself. It is possible that the character of Nicodemus is to be the 'son of man' (the "human") who is set/raised up as an example for others to follow.

Summary

The intertextual echoes apparent in the three statements of

44 H. Hollis, in "The Root of the Johannine Pun - HYPSOTHENAI," NTS 35 (1989) 475-478, suggests that despite any "theological links" between Num 21 and John 3, a more fruitful link should be made on the linguistic level, where Gen 40:13,19 is cited as precedent for the idea of being 'lifted up'. Here, Hollis states, the understanding of Jesus' impending death and exaltation can be paralleled with the exaltation of the baker and the beheading of the butler in the "dream" narrative. This ignores the specific reference to the intertextual source being employed.
the Baptist in John 1 establish the contextual setting of Jesus' mission. The emphasis is upon the spiritual waywardness of Israel, the failure of those who most require 'help' to see that which is before them, and the anticipated redemption of the sinful nation through the mission of Jesus. The optimistic vision of the future is related through the vision granted to Nathanael, which is presented as an ideological and structural echo of Gen 28:12f. The wedding at Cana is understood to be the personal, or private, affirmation of Jesus' mission. It is, in effect, a symbolic 'marriage' of Jesus to the will of God, but also it echoes Israel's anticipation of a reunion with God under a new covenant. The wine motif reiterates the state of the 'world' alluded to in John 1 (i.e., a spiritual wilderness), echoing the OT theme of God's judgement of, and ultimate mercy on, a people intoxicated by everything but 'the word of God'. The portrait of Nicodemus and the conversation he has with Jesus are a profound echo of the dialogue between Ezra and Uriel in 2 Esdr, where the iniquity of the people is seen to be obscuring the path back to God. Nicodemus, a Pharisee, represents the obstacle Jesus must overcome if he is to 'conquer the world'; a beacon of hope and enlightenment must be set before the people if they are to find the righteous path again. The optimistic naming of Nicodemus, and his similarity to Ezra, are justified in his final appearance in John 19, where he is seen to have overcome the "darkness".

To understand how the FG expands upon the concepts of marriage, and 'regeneration', the next chapter focuses on what may constitute the central literary structure of the FG.
Chapter Two: Anticipating Hephzibah

The rhetorical significance of initiating Jesus' mission in the context of a marriage covenant is made all the more profound by a certain triangular construction involving the depictions of the three chief female characters in the gospel, namely, the Samaritan woman, the adulteress, and Mary.

In his article, "'Covenant' as a Structuring Concept in Genesis and Exodus," Rolf Rendtorff\(^45\) implies that biblical research has hitherto focused on either theological interpretation, or literary criticism, and that current exegetes should attempt to combine these two approaches in a bid to explain theological significance through literary setting, and vice versa. Rendtorff suggests that distinct texts within the canon of the Israelite Scriptures (in his case the story of Noah in Genesis and the Sinai pericopae of Exodus) are potentially related in their theology through an apparently intentional 'echoing' of a central literary structure. This 'structure', Rendtorff suggests, is the pattern of 'covenant made / broken / remade', with the underlying theology of each example being that God adheres to his part of the covenant even when humanity does not, i.e., he had promised an "eternal covenant"\(^46\).

In the Fourth Gospel, there appears to be a similar exploitation of a precedent "literary structure", which acts both as a foundation for the theology of the gospel and as a

\(^{45}\) Rolf Rendtorff, "Covenant as a Structuring Concept in Genesis and Exodus," JBL 108.3 (Fall 1989) 385-393 (here, 385).

\(^{46}\) Rendtorff, 392-393.
synthesizing technique for the literary narrative. The criteria for determining the intertextual echoes which synthesize distinct FG portraits into a recognizable central structure include comparable structure and ideology to a precedent 'prophecy' and, in an oblique sense, the apparent shift from this prophecy to its fulfilment within the narrative, similar to that exhibited by 1:23. This 'three-sided' structure acts as the central theological ideology of the FG.

There is a strong tradition in the OT of depicting the Israel/God relationship in metaphorical terms, including that of a "marriage-divorce-remarriage" scenario.\(^47\) The initial marriage is nullified by the illicit conduct of the 'bride', but a new marriage (i.e., a new covenant) is promised based upon the reformation of her character.\(^48\) In such scenarios, elements of symbolism are used to depict a "harlot" figure,\(^49\) or personification. The anticipation of the re-marriage is illustrated in optimistic terms, as in the passage of Isa 62:4-5, where Yahweh speaks to his people, Israel, saying: "...you shall be called My Delight is in Her, and your land Married." The desperation of the age, the wickedness, the fear, will all pass away, and in that day, Israel shall become as the beloved bride of her God. This redeemed and glorified nation is

---

\(^{47}\) Seock-Tae Sohn in *The Divine Election of Israel*, (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1991) 262-263. Sohn notes that motifs are also taken from nomadic traditions, agriculture, warfare, the royal court, etc.

\(^{48}\) Sohn, 264.

personified in the ideal, "Hephzibah".\(^{50}\) In anticipation of Hephzibah's accession to the right hand of Yahweh, the narrative of the Fourth Gospel provides a matrix from which such a circumstance can evolve.

According to Ezek 16, the portrait of the unfaithful bride of Yahweh follows the pattern: election, bathing (cleansing), anointing, elevation, infidelity, guilt/trial, forgiveness, eternal covenant.\(^{51}\) Each of these factors is represented in the FG narrative; as the pericopae of John the Baptist and the wine at the wedding have shown, Israel is 'currently' in a sorry state - a state corresponding to that of "infidelity". Thus, the pattern begins in medias res.

The Samaritan Woman

Modern exegesis on the Samaritan woman's pericope (John 4) has centred, largely, upon two distinct factors, namely, the rapid progression of faith, in comparison with that of Nicodemus,\(^{52}\) and the possible attribution of distinctly Samaritan influences upon

---

\(^{50}\) Cf. Julia M. O'Brien, "Judah as Wife and Husband: Deconstructing Gender in Malachi," *JBL* 115.2 (Summer, 1996) 241-250. O'Brien notes that the divine-marriage theme shifts in its allocation of gender roles (for God/Israel), as evidenced in Malachi. In fact, the same could be said of the FG, for although there is this central "female" structure, some elements of Ezek 16 correspond with "male" representations of Israel (e.g., the blind man and Lazarus).

\(^{51}\) This pattern is condensed from the outline given by Walther Eichrodt, in *Ezekiel: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970) 205-220.

the construction of the gospel.sup What this section of the present analysis is aimed at revealing is how the two factors of the "well" and the woman's marital status support this character's inclusion in the pattern prescribed by Ezekiel.

In John 2, Jesus is presenting himself to an 'intoxicated' world - a world in which the inhabitants have been seduced by a cheap wine but have remained 'parched'. Here, we see him travel into Samaria, the (alleged) quintessence of debauchery, etc.\textsuperscript{54} The introduction of the well/water scenario allows for Jesus to offer himself as the bearer of a satiating alternative.

The well plays a vital role in both the FG and the Pentateuch, and it does so in much the same way in each. The basic structure of the well tradition is well established and need not be reproduced here; what is important to recall is that the underlying theme of these pericopae is that of the securing of family ties, and the maintaining of the same, through marriage.\textsuperscript{55}

The presence of a woman at the well at the "sixth hour", and in "broad daylight", in Gen 29:7 and John 4:6, respectively, points to an intended correlation with the story of Jacob, echoing the temporal precision of the account (cf. both Gen 24:11 and 29:7 stipulate the 'proper' time for using the well is in the evening).


\textsuperscript{54} For a discussion about the ways in which Samaria is presented as the 'whoring' woman, see John J. Schmitt, "The Virgin of Israel: Referent and Use of the Phrase in Amos and Jeremiah," CBQ 53.1 (January, 1991) 365-387. Here, 377-383.

Robinson claims that by coming out at "midday", the Samaritan woman reveals that she was "was forced to go to [Jacob's] well on the main trade-route used by the caravans" because of her "dubious repute". In other words, she was at Jacob's well only because she happened to be avoiding the other women, who would have scorned her as an 'adulteress'. M. Davies, on the other hand, supposes that in requesting a drink from this Samaritan woman, Jesus is demonstrating the "new order of reality which transcends racial and gender distinctions." This is, perhaps, a post-modern imposition of ideals, for as this paper is attempting to demonstrate, the entire theological matrix of the FG is dependant upon there being a "harlot"-type representation. In Ezek 16:51-52, however, it is the Samaritan "sister" Israelites who are deemed more worthy of "favourable judgement" than their Judean counterparts.

Robinson may, therefore, be on the right track. In Hos 3, the prophet Hosea is told to seek out an 'adulterous' woman and to love her. He is to do this in order to symbolize (and understand) the tolerance and forgiveness of God's loyalty to Israel, who has turned against him. By purposefully depicting Jesus as inviting a Samaritan woman into the "fold", the FG echoes the ideology behind Hosea's commission, and echoes the 'favouritism' of Ezek 16:51-52.

The well tradition in Gen 24, though, provides for a stronger intertextual echo based on narrative structure and theme. 

57 M. Davies 79.
58 Cf. Margaret Pamment ("Is There Convincing Evidence of Samaritan Influence on the Fourth Gospel?" ZNW 73 (1982) 222), who (continued...)
there are almost verbatim repetitions of dialogue (e.g., vv.17,33) but also, of thematic structure; like the 'servant' in the former story, Jesus is on an "errand" of sorts, doing the "work" his "master" has given him to do (John 4:34), he enters into a dialogue with a woman which is ultimately concerned with 'marriage', and because he is recognized as God's "messiah", the Samaritan woman and her people do, indeed, "follow" Jesus (vv.39-42), just as Rebekah "follows" the servant of Abraham.\(^59\) The only aspect which is clearly in conflict with the general Gen 24 construction is the relative depiction of the characters' marital status. The woman in the FG is explicitly portrayed as one without maidenly virtue, in direct contrast to Gen 24:16; she has "known" many men. Such a digression from the otherwise strongly adhered to tradition demands investigation.

The incorporation of the number five, in John 4:18, is but one example of symbolic numerology in the FG.\(^60\) According to 2 Kgs 17:24f, Samaritan Israelites have had "five husbands": Babylon, Cuthah, Avva, Hamath and Sepharvaim. Each of these represent one of the five peoples who were integrated into the Israelite society

\(^{58}\) (...continued) notices the stronger similarity to Gen 24 but offers no explanation.


\(^{60}\) E.g., the number 153, in John 21:11, is also symbolic and will be discussed later.
remaining after the mass deportation by the Assyrians.\textsuperscript{61} A 'marriage' of thought and of culture ensued which was officiated, or supervised, by an Israelite (Samaritan) priest.\textsuperscript{62} Because of this sanctification of the previous unions, the idea of 'Yahweh as husband' during this time is compatible. The 'current' immigrant into Samaria, however, is not considered a "husband", for there is no marriage, nor partnership; the "one" who is not a "husband" is Rome. This union is not sanctified and therefore can not include Yahweh.\textsuperscript{63} That the 'woman' is acquiescent and admits to this illicit union (John 4:18) reinforces the culpability of her situation. The scene also echoes Hos 2:5-7 in a sense, for the theme of marriage, lovers and multiple husbands\textsuperscript{64} is integral to

\textsuperscript{61} Ben Witherington, \textit{John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel}, (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster, 1995) 120-121. He suggests that according to early Jewish law three marriages were allowed in a lifetime; as the Samaritan woman was now with yet a sixth man, he could not be considered, legally, a 'husband'. He concludes that the woman would then be living in a state of Levitical uncleanness.

\textsuperscript{62} Cf. Ezra 4:2,10. McKenzie (764) makes the assumption that the "adversaries" in v.1 are yet another nation of peoples, sent into Samaria by Esarhaddon, and that the 'nations' of Osnappar represent yet another group. However, Osnappar was the viceroy of Babylon, and both he and Esarhaddon were kings of Assyria, so, although there may have been waves of entry into Samaria, the number of variant peoples immigrating remains at five.

\textsuperscript{63} It is for this reason Jesus is heard to say, "you worship what you do not know", i.e., like the "Jews" in John 7:29, etc., who also "do not know" God, the Samaritans are in a state of 'divorce' from Yahweh. Cf. Craig R. Koester (in " 'The Saviour of the World' (John 4:42)," JBL 109.4 (Winter, 1990) 665-680. Here, p.669), who compares the "five" husbands in John 4 to the "seven" gods mentioned in 2 Kgs 17:24. Koester admits to some difficulty with this interpretation (676-677), and shifts the emphasis to her representative role as the 'nation', with her husbands, her "people".

\textsuperscript{64} Friedman (200) notes how the remarriage anticipated in Hosea is contingent upon Israel returning to the "wilderness", where the first 'marriage' (i.e., in Exodus) had taken place. Perhaps we can
the portrait, there, of Yahweh's 'bride'. The discussion about marriage, and its symbolic implications, thus fulfills the precedent pattern of the basic well tradition.

The Adulteress

The obscurity of the "adulteress" pericope is well attested, and although some post-modern exegetes tend toward a sympathetic interpretation of the woman's predicament, she must be interpreted in terms of her sexuality because that is the only context in which she is presented; we know nothing else of her.

There can be little doubt that the story of John 7:53-8:11 echoes that of Susanna, in Sus vv.34-41. There is a mutual element of 'catching' the woman in the act of committing adultery, there are "elders" present at each scene, there is a strong desire to put both women to death even before her trial, there is a reticence in see this criterion established in the setting of John 1.

See also: Isa 1:21; Isa 57:8; Jer 3:1, etc. In E.H. Pagels' The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis: Heracleon's Commentary on John, (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 88; Heracleon determined that she represented "wantonness" on a greater scale than her individual depiction at first implied. Margaret Davies' rather feminist (and thus anachronistic) appraisal of the Samaritan woman's depiction "on the basis of her marital status" as being "the fate of most women", and as promoting their "subsidiary function of waiting of men" (227), does not do justice to the magnitude and profundity of her character.


E.g., even as far as to suggest that to understand her in terms of her sexuality is to act like the Pharisees and cast the dreaded "stone" (O'Day, "John 7:53-8:11", 634).
each of the two leading male characters (Daniel and Jesus) to partake in the 'judgement', \(^{68}\) in each case, the woman is acquitted, and in each the accusers are left with the 'guilt'.

In Ezekiel's portrait of the bride of Yahweh, the pattern passes from 'infidelity' to the public show of guilt: "I will judge you as women who commit adultery... They shall bring up a mob against you and they shall stone you..." (Ezek 16:38-40). In John 8 the sequence is adhered to. According to Num 5:13, a woman accused of infidelity, whether "caught in the act" or not, is to be presented before the "priest"; it is possible that Jesus' apparently self-acclaimed priestly status is being tested in John 7:53f.

The NRSV makes a note regarding an additional phrase extant in some ancient versions of v.8; the addition implies that what Jesus inscribes in the soil tradition was held to be, at least, something to do with "the sins of each of them". Keeping in mind the intertextuality of the FG this study is demonstrating, and the theme of 'adultery' in this pericope (as part of a pattern), it is proposed that the potential for an inflammatory echo of Hos 4:14, 

\(^{68}\) Wallace (295) argues that as the verb katakrino is used extensively in John 8:10-11, and elsewhere the verb krino, proponents for the inclusion of this pericope into the main body of the FG must explain why such a verb is employed so peculiarly here and not in 3:18 and 12:47, for example. In these latter cases the emphasis is upon a divine judgement of believers and non-believers. In 8:10, Jesus is forced into a role of earthly judge, thus the shift in terminology is justified. Juridical terms are employed in the overall depiction of Jesus' mission in the FG (Robert Gordon Maccini, "A Reassessment of the Woman at the Well in John 4 in Light of Samaritan Context," JSNT 53 (March 1994) 35-46. Here 35).
is high:⁶⁹ I will not punish your daughters when they play the whore, and your daughters-in-law when they commit adultery; For the men themselves go aside with whores, and sacrifice with temple prostitutes; thus a people without understanding comes to ruin.

This passage follows the order to Hosea to "love a woman...who is an adulteress" (3:1); thus the context is one of the "harlot" bride, but also God's willingness to forgive those who are led astray by others who should know better. If God does not condemn the adulteress (i.e., Israel), neither can Jesus.⁷⁰ The outcome of this pericope, then, anticipates the next stage in Ezekiel's pattern, "forgiveness".

Mary

Mary is introduced twice in the context of an anointing (John 11:1, 12:3), stressing the importance of the action. In the short pericope of John 12:1-3 are echoed at least four key terms from Cant 1: osme ("smell/odour"; Cant 1:3,4,12; John 12:3)⁷¹ / muron

⁶⁹ This may account for the entire pericope having been omitted from some early versions of the text.

⁷⁰ Cf. B. Ehrman, "Jesus and the Adulteress" (43, n.62), who claims that Jesus "is not asked to render a verdict." The scenario would have no purpose, it would seem, if the anticipated act of judgement is removed.

⁷¹ Cf. J.F. Coakley, (in "The Anointing at Bethany and the Priority of John," JBL 107.2 (June 1988) 241-256) who proposes that it is merely the recollection of a strong smell, and need not be seen as being anything more profound (243, n.10); Sanders (83), who supposes that the significance of the action lies in the metaphorical use of the oil, where it is understood to represent a prayer, as in Ps 141:2; and L.W. Countryman, who sees the act as
"ointment"; Cant 1:3,4; John 12:3a,b) / anaklithesomai ("to recline at table"; Cant 1:12; John 12:2) / nardos ("spikenard"; Cant 1:12; John 12:3). Implicit in the context of John 12 is the idea of Jesus as basileus ("king", cf. John 1:49; Cant 1:12), making the echo one based on comparable characters, also. The figure of the "king", in Cant 1, however, is not depicted as being anointed with the nard, he is merely present. This shift in the adopted pattern, like that in the echoed well tradition, demands explanation.

The supplication of Mary at the feet of her master appears in the FG narrative at the juncture (after her public disgrace and before her elevation) where one would expect, according to the apparent echoing of Ezek 16, some act of repentance, forgiveness, etc. This ideal ascent to glory is conveyed in marital terminology and imagery, so Mary's action should be understood in similar terms. There are two instances in the OT where "marriage" and "feet" are intertwined, namely, 1 Sam 25:41-42, and Ruth 2:10-13; 3:7f. In the first case, Abigail offers herself as a "servant", stooping down to wash the mens' feet; she is seen as submitting herself to David, and is taken as his wife. Ruth 2:10-13 emphasizes the 'foreigner' aspect of this female character, but also her conversion to the Israelite faith (also in terms of a "servant"). In the latter scene, Ruth prostrates herself at the feet of Boaz, an action which is explicitly connected with the ritual of one of "worship" (The Mystical Way in the Fourth Gospel: Crossing Over to God, Rev. ed. (Pennsylvania: Trinity, 1994. Here, 87).

72 Cf. Lee, who states that Mary's action is "a proclamation of Jesus' authority..." (220).
betrothal (v.9); she, too, is taken as wife, for she has demonstrated the ideal qualities of the Israelite bride.

In these two examples, especially the latter, can be seen a potential ideological source for the image of Mary at the feet of Jesus (cf. Acts 22:3). In the anticipation of Hephzibah, the submission of Israel before God is a necessary factor; the bride-to-be must prove herself worthy.

The wiping of Jesus' feet with her hair is a complex aspect of Mary's depiction. Coakley, for instance, suggests that the action is "more appropriate to a disreputable woman," and yet he finds it difficult to see the FG "Mary" character as fulfilling this role.\textsuperscript{73} As the 'converted' "harlot" representative, indeed she does. Coakley concludes that the reason why the hair was used to wipe the feet, and not a cloth, for example, "probably cannot be answered".\textsuperscript{74} There is, though, a potential solution: there is a dual anointing taking place in John 12.

In Ps 141:5 is the adjuration, "Never let the oil of the wicked anoint my head". Until this juncture in the echo of Ezek 16, the bride of Yahweh has been depicted in derogatory and humbling terms; now it is time to begin her elevation. It is, therefore, Jesus' feet which are the primary object of Mary's attention; the verb used to reflect her action of 'anointing' is aleipho, which is used in the LXX in the sanctification rituals of Gen 31:13 (Jacob's pillar), Exod 40:15 and Num 3:3 (the ordination of priests). Thus, when Jesus remarks that Mary has the oil in anticipation of his

\textsuperscript{73} Coakley, 249-251.

\textsuperscript{74} Coakley, 251.
burial, her deed becomes one of **premature**, but intentional, sanctification - the day of consecration (his "hour" of "glory") has yet to come, but in her demonstration Mary reveals that she 'believes' it will.\(^75\) Her faith thus outshines even that of the disciples.\(^76\)

Deut 33:24 employs the analogy of an oil-covered foot to symbolize prosperity and 'success'; it is used in the context of Moses' parting song to the Israelites, and in a thematic context of a final victory of God's chosen over their oppressors. This would also fit admirably into the present FG scenario, for the 'farewell discourse' is soon to follow, which focuses on a similar theme.

Secondary to this, however, is Mary's own potential anointing, exhibited through a subtle manipulation of the stipulations regarding nazarite consecration in Num 6. The FG surreptitiously depicts Mary as receiving the same oil that has just sanctified the feet of the new high priest; the hair is deemed the most sacred area of the nazarite's body, for it represents the holy vow itself, imbued, as it is, with the oil of consecration. This purging rite symbolizes a "separation" from one way of life and a 'cleaving' to

\(^75\) Lee suggests (219) Mary's performance is a "prophetic action which functions as a faith confession." Mary recognizes the symbolic precedent of Lazarus' death, Lee continues, and anoints Jesus' feet in preparation for his death, through which believers will gain "life" (221). See also nn. 3,4, regarding the 'unconscious' action theory; if the act is to be understood as a profession of faith, though, the anointing would have to be consciously done.

\(^76\) The 'true' consecration probably takes place in John 19:38f, in preparation for the anticipated ascension of Jesus to the Father; this concurs with the idea, mentioned earlier, that Jesus avoids contact before he 'ascends'. Further, it is done by righteous, male disciples, one of whom is, potentially, the heir to the priesthood, making this a more legitimate scenario of priestly consecration.
another; if this is what is happening in John 12:3, it would complement the entire image of the 'bride-to-be' as defined here.\footnote{Josephus (J.W. 2.15.1) remarks on "Bernice", a woman who undertook a similar vow; he claims that it was often performed by those having undergone some distress, illness, etc. With the corresponding Synoptic images of Mary/the-woman-who-anointed, this element of 'purging' or cleansing becomes all the more pronounced.} Having been depicted as the adulterous woman, and having been publicly exposed, she is, through the character of Mary, "forgiven" and "converted".\footnote{Indeed, in Luke 7:36, the woman clearly receives absolution for her 'sins' after performing this submissive act.} The anointing itself represents, in part, the "anointing" aspect of the Ezek 16 pattern (it culminates in the 'burial' scenario, in John 19).

If John 12:1-3 is to be understood in light of the echoes of vocabulary from Cant 1, the reader is justified in predicting that the character of Mary will further echo that of the "Shulammite", i.e., that she, too, will rise to be the "wife" of a "king". Now, though, the "king" is Yahweh. Fulfilling the "forgiveness" element of Ezek 16, the 'bride' is ready to come into the presence of God.

In John 19:25, at the foot of the cross, stands Mary Magdalene. The name "Magdalene" is often translated to mean "tower", stemming from the Hebrew word, migdalah.\footnote{McKenzie (534), however, suggests "a person from Magdala", basing this upon the reading of Matt 15:39, presumably.} This term, is used in Cant. 4:4, 7:4, and 8:10, where the female figure of the love song is attributed the qualities of a "tower"; her entire character is one which denotes strength, resolution, and, ultimately, elevation. It is possible, then, that the etymological
significance of "Magdalene" lies in the root word, gadal, which means "to make large", i.e., to magnify, to increase, to become great, etc. That is, Mary, now representing the "harlot" motif, having completed her ritualistic purification, has been raised to the height of honour - she becomes the "tower" of God, the 'beloved' and rejoiced-in 'bride', who has turned away from her 'wicked' past and has returned to God. This fully concurs with the expectations of Ezekiel 16 and the 'pattern' for Israel's relationship with Yahweh.

80 The sophistication and importance of biblical etymology, specifically with respect to 'commission names' (i.e., names attributed to individuals according to their character, role, etc.) is supported by Herbert Marks (in "Biblical Naming and Poetic Etymology," JBL 114.1 (Spring, 1995) 21-42), who suggests that such names often retained a "covert meaning" (30) as well as an obvious one; and R.L. Omanson, (in "What's in a Name?" BT 40.1 (January, 1989) 109-119), who suggests that all biblical names require to be understood in terms of their intended, or apparent, context.

81 Cf. Sir 26:22, where a "married woman" is equated to a "tower".

82 One may say that in John 20:17 Jesus' caution in permitting Mary to touch him before his union with the Father is just as much a desire to protect Mary's purity as his own; he has been "dead", remember, and to touch any aspect of the dead, the burial clothes, the tomb, etc., would be a contamination. Note that Mary does not enter the tomb. This imagery echoes that of Jesus outside the tomb of Lazarus.

83 Francois Bouvon (in "Le Privilege Pascal De Marie-Madeleine," NTS 30.1 (January, 1984) 50-62; here, 58), in his study of the various interpretations of Mary Magdalene over the centuries, notes this intriguing "order" allegedly given to her by Jesus from the cross: "...ne laisse pas la frange de ton vetement trainer par terre..." (for bibliographic information, see n.66). The idea of the fringe, according to Num 15:38f and Deut 22:12, was to remind the Israelites of the Commandments. In Matt 23:5, these tassels, now elongated, become a symbol of the arrogance of the Pharisees; allowing the fringe to be long enough to trail on the ground, Mary would be seen to be 'proud', and this she must avoid. This tradition, then, supports the idea of the elevated status of Mary.
Summary

The basis upon which the theology of the FG rests is a triangular construction. The first component is that of the Samaritan woman, whose depiction fulfils the "infidelity" stage of Ezekiel's pattern for the fall/ascent of the divine bride. Her situation reiterates the context of a nation in need of spiritual help, made so apparent in John 1 and 2. The main intertextual themes which link her to the concept of the anticipated re-marriage with Yahweh are the "well" traditions of Genesis, which focus on the securing of the 'perfect' bride, and the cultural history of Samaria, as recorded in 2 Kings. The "adulteress" of John 8 forms the second branch of this construction, echoing the format of the juridical story of Susanna, whilst satisfying the 'public show of guilt' aspect (necessarily in the context of adultery) of Ezek 16. Completing the triad is Mary, the last female in the FG to receive extensive attention. The inclusion of Mary in this central structure stems from the thematic and vocabulary echoes of Canticles and the ideological echo of 1 Sam 25 and Ruth 2. In her reflection of the repentant, forgiven and elevated woman, Mary completes the pattern set out in Ezek 16 - she is cleansed, anointed, and is 'married' to God through a symbolic vow.

With this central structure established, the rest of the FG narrative can be analyzed in an effort to synthesize the distinct pericopae; the aim is to demonstrate how each major event and/or character in the FG contributes to the realization of this "ideal".
Chapter Three: The Temple Scenes

The central theological concept of the FG, which synthesizes the entire gospel narrative is one based on the anticipated 're-marriage' of Israel to Yahweh and itself constitutes a complex of intertextual echoes. The nature of Jesus' mission, as revealed through Nicodemus' story is, evidently, to be demonstrative (i.e., Jesus is to perform signs) and exemplary (i.e., he is to be a sign). The objective of the mission, then, is demonstrated in Jesus' action within the Temple, in John 2:13-22.

There have been many perspectives on Jesus' storming, or cleansing, of the Temple (John 2:13f), including Lee's view that the pericope revolves around Jesus' risen body as the true and only "sacred site" for worship,^84 Neusner's suggestion that it depicts an intent to destroy not the Temple itself but the Israelite sacrificial system,^85 and Hamilton's theory that Jesus' action implies a usurping of "kingly" power.^86 Where Neusner supposes that Jesus' action would have been "beyond all comprehension" at the time, threatening, as it seemed to, the very life-blood of the Temple (i.e., its sacrificial function), the intertextual echoes in evidence reveal that Jesus' action had both precedent and profound meaning for any who knew the Scriptures.

E. P. Sanders proposes that, if Jesus is interested in

---

^84 Lee, 82-83.


destroying merely the priesthood in order to replace it with another, his actions place him in a comprehensible and completely congruous historical context, but he prefers to see Jesus' threat of destruction more in terms of "'eschaton', not 'purity'." If the action, however, is a "demonstration", a "startling and provocative" portent of "imminent judgement and restoration", as Meyer infers, the precedent prophecies of Jer 7:3-4, Ezek 14:21, etc., prove it to be profoundly imbued with "cleansing" symbolism.

As Hamilton points out, the action may be seen as a partial fulfilment of Zech 14:21, where it is prophesied that, in the days of the glorious return to God and the coming of the Messiah, no "traders" will be in the "house of the Lord". There are, however, other intertextual considerations which may offer more insight into the FG pericope.

The Passover setting at the outset of Jesus' public mission forms an inclusio with the Passover at the end, as if to emphasize both the Exodic nature of the mission, and the sense of regeneration (since the festival takes place in the Spring), the cyclical pattern, etc. It also reflects on the "Lamb" aspect of the

---

88 Sanders, 89.
89 B. Meyer, 197.
90 B. Meyer, 198.
92 For a discussion on the placing of the Temple scene at this early stage of Jesus' career, and on the practice of setting up tables in preparation for the Passover, see Robinson, 128.
Baptist's words in John 1, where Jesus is first attributed the role of "sign" in the context of redemption. The observance of the Passover, of course, is described in Exod 12:1-28, and Jesus' behaviour in the Temple may be intentionally linked to the Exodus precedent. Moses, on seeing his people worshipping the golden calf, had destroyed the sacred tablets of stone (Exod 32:19f); likewise, Jesus performs this violent act of defiance against the impropriety of the 'worship'. In both scenarios the Israelites appear as impatient, lacking true faith, requiring tangible 'proof' of their God, etc. The Temple has, in effect, become but another "golden calf". Destroy the false (tainted) image of God and the true God will forgive and return. This idea is echoed in the destruction of "Nehushtan", the brazen serpent raised in the wilderness by Moses (Num 21:4f); according to 2 Kgs 18:4-6, Hezekiah tore down and demolished the object which had become an idol in its own right; the people were concerned more with making "offerings" to it than with keeping the commandments it represented. This proves to be a major aspect of the pericope's echoed ideology, as will be demonstrated below.

There is another point of reference which may be enlightening for this study, namely, Josh 5:10f. Just before Passover, Joshua prepares the new generation of Israelites for the entry into the Promised Land; the 'wicked' generation has perished in the wilderness, and those who were born out of bondage receive the circumcision of the 'flesh', marking them as the new, cleansed, 'elect' of Yahweh. It is possible that the FG encapsulates Jesus' public mission within two Passover scenarios because his mission is comparable to Joshua's, i.e., he is to lead the new 'elect' into
the spiritual "Promised Land", the "Kingdom of God". If this idea is projected onto the storming of the Temple itself, the next question that must be asked is, "who are the wicked generation who must be replaced, and who are the 'cleansed', in the echo of John 2?"

The first 'clue' perhaps, comes not from the Temple scene itself, but from Jesus' description of Nathanael. The word for "you" in John 1:51 is hymin, suggesting a representative (plural) nature of Nathanael; it is possible that the sacred "remnant" of Israel is intimated in his portrait. The initial impression of Nathanael causes Jesus to remark on his lack of "deceit" (1:47), a sentiment and a term (LXX, dolos), which echo Ps 32:2b. The original context of this Psalm is one of "deliverance", and the promise of instruction of a new "way" for those who will humble themselves and admit their sins.

The word "deceit" also appears in the NRSV version of Ps 101:7: No one who practices deceit shall remain in my house; no one who utters lies shall continue in my presence.

Although the term dolos does not appear in the LXX version, the emphasis is on the arrogance or haughtiness of those who assume control ("poion hyperephanian") and on the deceitful speakers ("lalon adika"). Taken in conjunction with Jesus' condemnation of the followers of the "father of lies" in 8:44-45, it appears that the FG is making a distinction between the established Temple

---

93 The link between Jacob, whose commission name is "Israel" (Gen 35:10), and Nathanael, whose name infers those "given" to Jesus "by God" (i.e., to re-establish as the foundation of the 'new' Israel) is provocative.
cultus, which is corrupt, and the "remnant" of devout Israelites who, perhaps, have set themselves in opposition to this establishment. Certainly, the narrative allows for a "wicked" generation and a "pure" one, and in the implicit adoption of the ideology of Ps 32, any who humble themselves and accept the "instruction of the way" will join the "remnant" in the new Kingdom.

The impulsive and forceful nature of Jesus' action is possibly a thematic echo of Isa 10:20-27, where the situation being depicted is one of dire circumstance; the "remnant of Israel" is oppressed and weary. "Destruction is decreed", but this is a "righteous" destruction, one which will, ultimately, allow the remnant to escape the "rod" of their enemies. It is, then, a destruction which brings about regeneration, renewal.\footnote{This echoes the destruction/renewal central structure of such pericopae as Gen 7-10; Gen 18-19; Gen 22f; Jonah etc.} God will turn his wrath toward the oppressors, "wield[ing] a whip against them" (v.26).\footnote{In the LXX, the term "plege" is used, which has the connotation of 'calamity', as well as 'striking'.} As a result, the oppressed will be emancipated.

In the Book of Malachi, however, is a potentially stronger source for the ideology behind Jesus' demonstration. Here, the emphasis is upon the cessation of meaningless or tainted sacrifices (N.B., not the ritual itself) being performed as part of a corrupt cultus (cf. Jer 7). The covenant with the priests, 2:5 implies, was a covenant "of life"; this was corrupted, and Israel lost favour in the eyes of God, (i.e., "death"). At this juncture (2:14-16), Malachi introduces the "marriage" motif, implying that Israel (the
once priestly/holy kingdom) has been unfaithful to the wife\(^96\) of his youth, namely, Yahweh. Divorce is not the ideal state (v.16), so Israel must amend his ways and work for reconciliation.

In order for God to return to "his temple" (3:1) an \textit{angelos} must first \textit{katharisei}, or "purify" the sons of Levi (the priesthood) of their inherited iniquities (cf. v.7 "\textit{apo ton adikion ton pateron hymon}"). Again, note the use of this concept of 'deceit' in relation to the Temple cultus, and the "father/son" relationship Jesus alludes to in John 8.\(^97\) As in Jesus' declaration of renewal after destruction (John 2:19: Note the use of the "third day" motif here, implying that the 'new' Temple will involve a union with the divine - the anticipated eventuality of Mal 3), so Mal 4:2 brings the promise of "healing" and an emancipation from the "bonds" that bind the righteous.

In the FG, Jesus is seen to wield a whip against the "marketplace"; the term \textit{naos} is used,\(^98\) making the distinction that Jesus' hostility is directed toward the Temple 'proper', the Temple built by priests for priests, not toward the general Temple.

\(^96\) Malachi shifts the genders here, but the effect is identical to that of Ezekiel's, etc.

\(^97\) See also Job 36:8-9 and Isa 5:18-23 for similar depictions of the arrogant, wayward Israel. Compare the decree of destruction preserved in 1 Sam 2:27-36, where the priesthood is threatened with imminent demise because of its iniquities; it is declared that a new, "faithful priest" will be "\textit{raise[d] up}" who will work according to God's will, who will have a new "\textit{house}" built for him, and who will minister "\textit{before}" the Messiah (the "anointed one").

\(^98\) This term is used only in 2:19-21, but elsewhere in the FG, when denoting location, the term \textit{hieron} is employed (5:14, etc.). John P. Meier (in A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, Vol.1, (New York: Doubleday, 1991) 381) notes other scholars' recognition of this distinction, but his discussion centres upon the dating of Jesus' ministry (using the "forty-eight years" as the key issue), rather than on the meaning behind the Temple action.
complex, nor the actual tradesmen. This term is also used in Mal 3:1 (LXX). The Temple, the sacred house, not the precinct, is thus identified with the "marketplace", and its 'traders' with the cultus.99

Excursus

Jesus' public appearance in his role as God's agent begins with a symbolic stand against the impurity of the Temple cultus (and thus the profaning of the Temple itself). In John 10, the repeated Temple setting forms a contextual inclusio with John 2:13f. The festival of Dedication is an apt arena in which to play out Jesus' final public stand against his opponents, representing as it does the "recovery and purification of the Temple" by Judas Maccabbee, after the 'abomination' of illegitimate occupants. But so, too, is the reference to his standing within the portico of Solomon significant, for it was Solomon's original dedication (1 Kgs 8) which inaugurated the new age of the Temple. The "name" of Yahweh would dwell there so long as the people heeded the commandments (see 1 Kgs 8:6f; cf. John 10:27,28): "The dedication of the Temple enable[d] Israel to refocus its attention on following divine commands"100 - this is precisely what the FG is

---

99 Cf. B. Meyer (197), who suggests that Jesus' action in the Temple was a demonstration directed at "all Israel". A.E. Harvey, (in Jesus and the Constraints of History, (London: Duckworth, 1982) 131) suggests that Jesus "does not change things by his actions: but his actions may represent the change which God wills to bring about and which [Jesus] is charged to proclaim". This "change" is, this paper contends, the replacement of one priesthood with another.

attempting to reiterate. Standing in the footsteps of Solomon, Jesus' authority and intent are reaffirmed.\textsuperscript{101}

Summary

The Temple pericope of John 2:13f is seen to convey the objective of Jesus' mission: to cleanse the holy site for the anticipated return of Yahweh. The significance of the intertextuality of this pericope lies in the allusions to the Passover context and the preparation for entry into a new "Promised Land", and also in the reflection of the false worship and tainted sacrifices of the corrupt priesthood, as revealed in Malachi. The "destruction" of the Temple itself, or of the sacrificial ritual, is not, therefore, at the root of Jesus' action in the FG; it has more of a 'purging' quality and in the rejoinder alluding to a renewal on the "third day", the demonstration is wholly optimistic.

Not only is this theme of revival integral to the ideology of Malachi, but the act of "healing" is also a necessary factor of the renewal and emancipation promised in Mal 4. In the next chapter, the emphasis is strongly upon the metaphorical notion of 'healing', with respect to debilitating oppression, and how this message of revival is misinterpreted by those driven by a more pragmatic agenda.

\textsuperscript{101} Knoppers, especially 235-250, which reveals the structure of Solomon's 'prayer' and dedication. Also significant is the comment that the Temple inaugurated a new era in Israelite history (251); for Jesus in the FG, the 'new' Temple will do likewise. As Solomon was granted the authority to establish a new house, so Jesus claims a similar authority.
Chapter Four: Mistaken Identity

The rhetorical/theological pattern of the FG thus far established is one echoing that presented in Ezek 16, where Israel is depicted as the 'harlot-bride' of Yahweh, and whose return to glory is made contingent upon the reformation of her character (as demonstrated by the three-females central structure) and the resurgence of devotion (demonstrated by the Temple pericope of John 2:13f). In this chapter, the combined implications of Jesus' first two healings, the feeding of the multitude and the appearance on the Sea of Galilee, lead the reader to understand that a case of mistaken identity has made Jesus' mission all the more difficult. The potential for intertextuality in these pericopae is profound, especially with respect to Exodic themes and motifs pertaining to the emancipation of the oppressed.

Healings

Is there no balm in Gilead?
Is there no physician there?
Why then has the health of my poor people not been restored?
(Jer 8:28)

The return to the site of Jesus' symbolic marriage (and the undertaking of the responsibility for uniting the people of God), Cana (John 4:46), is apparently intentional. Remaining in the Samaria for two days, the entry into the northern territories is depicted as occurring, symbolically, on the third day, adding theological significance to the pericope. If the third day is a day of union, covenant, etc., perhaps the inference here suggests an
anticipated union also; a union, that is, of the divided Israel itself.

Galilee was once the territory of the northern tribes of Zebulun, Naphtali, Asher, and Issachar, and thus has closer affiliations with the northern house of Joseph than with the southern house of Judah (cf. Isa 9:1). Also, according to several traditions in the Prophets, regarding the reunification of the houses of Joseph and Judah, it is the northern house which is 'called' first. The initiation of the last days, that is, the last days of oppression and disunity, is granted to the northern Israelites in Jer 3:11-4:2, where they are the first to be invited back into God's presence, without punishment. In Ezek 37:15-21, the gathering of the northern tribes instigates the restoration of the nation, with the "rod of Joseph" being taken up first. This 'North first' tradition is thus echoed in the geographical context of Jesus' first 'healing' and is substantiated by the depiction of the object of Jesus' munificence, i.e., the basilikos.

The term basilikos "may denote either a person of royal blood or one in service of a king," obviously in this case, Herod. In his affiliation with Rome, as the "King of the Jews", Herod was obsequious, dedicating new cities to emperors to win favour, acting as "spy for Tiberius upon Roman officers and satellite kings in the East," etc. He was, to many, a 'foreign' king, whose Jewish

---

102 McKenzie 293-294.


104 McKenzie, 356. Cf. the 'despot' in Dan 8:23-25; the elements of "deceit", "cunning", attempted conquest of the "prince", etc., all point to an uncanny anticipation of Herodian
identity itself was a matter of contention. This implicit allusion to Herod and foreign rule is, itself, an echo of the Samaritan woman's depiction, for in her story, too, the 'sixth', illegitimate "husband" was seen to represent Rome. The woman admitted her situation and subsequently chose to reject it, by "following" Jesus. In this current pericope, a similar conversion takes place, but within the very heart of Herod's domain.

A "son" is his father's living echo, the inheritor of his traits, beliefs, nature, etc., as defined in Sir 30:4:

When the father dies he will not seem to be dead, for he has left behind him one like himself...

The "son" of the basilikos, in John 4, then, is destined to become a basilikos in his father's footsteps. It is Jesus who makes this relationship explicit in 4:50 (e.g., huios), revealing the inevitability of 'inheritance' and, with the royal/Herodian affiliation in mind, the emphasis is upon an illicit heritage. The father/son aspect of the pericope echoes the concept of inherited sin as recorded in the blatant declaration of Exod 20:5-6 (Deut 5:9-10). Here, though, in 4:43f, the idea seems to be that the "sins" of the father can be expiated before the child becomes morally responsible for them (before he become "of age"), for the use of paidon (v.49) implies a child under the age of rule.

105 McKenzie, 353.

106 Galilee was part of Herod the Great's kingdom and also part of the tetrarchy of Herod Antipas (McKenzie 294).
responsibility.107

The vocabulary of "life" and "death" reflects that used throughout the FG and is understood, given the context of this present interpretation, to be metaphorical. In the OT, this metaphorical essence of "life" is clear in many passages: Deut 4:4 explicitly equates life with a steadfast devotion to Yahweh; adhering to the Commandments brings life (Deut 6:24); the "circumcision" of the heart to Yahweh brings life to the believer and his "descendants" (Deut 30:6); the 'true' Israel is seen as the "land of the living" (Isa 38:11, 53:8, etc.); and in Mal 2:5, the covenant with the priests is said to have been a "covenant of life". Thus, the basilikos desires for his son a share in the "life" Jesus has to offer - a share in the new kingdom, perhaps even in the new priesthood.

As an echo within the FG narrative, when Jesus says "Unless you see signs and wonders you will not believe," he is reaffirming the promise he had made to Nathanael back in 1:50-51 - the statement implies a belief contingent upon "seeing" and understanding signs (an implication repeated most explicitly in John 6). Except that they108 witness the signs and wonders of Jesus' work (the manifestations of God's will), they can not

---

107 For an interesting discussion on the interpretation of the young boy's condition being 'caused' by "sin" and not by some physical complaint, read Pagels 83-85, where Heracleon's view that the pericope depicts a dual-level conversion of father/son, is explained. Heracleon, too, saw a symbolic significance in the site and in the status of the officer.

108 The plural, idete and pisteusete reflect the representative nature of the officer character.
"believe".\textsuperscript{109}

From an intertextual perspective, the performance of "signs and wonders" in the context of anticipated emancipation from oppressors is well preceded and is recorded, almost invariably, in relation to the Exodus. In Exod 7:3, "signs and wonders" are integral to the transformation of the Pharaoh's "heart"; and in Deut 4:34, they are recalled as the means by which God took one nation "from the midst of another nation" and as the incentive for the people to "acknowledge that the Lord is God" (v.35). The performance of such deeds, therefore, is also equated with 'knowing God', or 'believing' (cf. Num 14:11).

The direct adoption of the "semeia kai terata" format indicates an intentional allusion to Exodic themes; the contextual echo, given the subtle inferences regarding Herod/Rome in the idea of the basilikos and Galilee, shifts the idea of emancipation from Moses/Egypt to Jesus/"believers". Through "signs and wonders" Jesus will free those under religious/spiritual oppression\textsuperscript{110}; he will, in effect, be plucking from the midst of one 'nation' (the sinful Israel), another (the 'believers'). Thus, Jesus' words in John 4:48 suggest an invitation to witness, rather than an admonition against "signs and wonders".

The "sign" to which the people are now witness is the basilikos himself, for the 'healing' takes place some distance

\textsuperscript{109} Newman & Nida (137) suggest that the FG is following the OT construction of "signs and wonders", where the two are taken as "the equivalent of a noun modified by an adjective." Thus, we could read, "wonderful signs", here.

\textsuperscript{110} The context of the original "bondage" was one of religious rights of worship, according to Exod 5:1.
away, out of sight. The man's open confession of faith, and his desire to obtain for his offspring a 'better life', are a profound risk, to say the least, and one which anticipates the context of the healing of the blind man in John 9. That Jesus makes his remark (v.48) addressing the many may suggest that this selfless, courageous act of conversion is the wondrous sign they must recognize.

Returning to the south, Jesus initiates a 'healing' event in Jerusalem. By the "Sheep Gate", at the pool of Beth-zatha\footnote{The Copper Scroll of Qumran supports the "Bethesda" rendition of the name (James, H. Charlesworth Jesus Within Judaism, (New York: Doubleday, 1988) 120). The FG, however, employs a variation, "Beth-zatha", perhaps more an employment of assonance than topographical precision (the intention to place the scene in the area known as "Bethesda" is reflected in the reference to the five porticoes, but the name itself is altered for symbolic purposes). "Beth-zatha" is explicitly referred to as a "Hebrew" name, which may indicate a phonetic implication, etc., e.g., tsarah which can indicate adversity, affliction, or trouble, or tsabah which can mean to "grow turgid", to fight, or swell up. This would suit well the 'rebellion' context of the FG.} (John 5:2f) await many who are "blind" (typhlon), "lame" (cholon) and "withered" (xeron). The first two categories appear in the prohibition of Lev 21:18-21 (LXX), where it is stated that no priests who are blemished in such a way may enter the sanctuary of the holy place. "Blindness" is used metaphorically in such passages as Ps 146:8, where it symbolizes a lack of "wisdom" (cf. Isa-29:9-10; 35:5, etc.), and in Isa 35:6 the dawning of a new "Holy Way" will bring the emancipation of the "lame". The third category, xeron, is fully represented in the "lamentation" for Israel in Ezek 19 (here, vv. 12,13 especially), and Joel 1:8-18 (e.g., v.12). In both these cases Israel is pictured as a once formidable nation,
now besieged and near ruin. The "withered" description is thus metaphorical and is intended to denote a sapping of strength, a reduced effectiveness, etc., usually attributed to being "parched" (cf. Isa 5:13; 35:7). In Joel's account, the lament is targeted toward the priests (v.13), and reflects 'marriage' terminology (e.g., v.8); Ezekiel's is directed toward rulers and the consequences of iniquities (cf. Ezek 18:30).

The three groups are categorized, in John 3, under the general heading of astheneis, which is used extensively in the NT as a description of those who lack morality, authority, or dignity, etc., (e.g., Rom 6:19, 2 Cor 11:21, 13:4, Heb 5:2, etc.,). Each group is also distinctly represented in the FG narrative; the pericope of John 4:10-15 intimates that the people are 'parched', in need of the "living water", in John 5 there is the lame man, and the blind are represented in John 9.

Given this understanding of how the "infirm" are to be perceived in the FG, the imagery of John 5:2-9 proves to be evocative of Ps 107:17-20:

Some were sick through their sinful ways, and because of their iniquities endured affliction; ...and they drew near to the gates of death. ...he sent out his word and healed them, and delivered them from destruction.

The illness, or weakness, is thus a symptom of a more profound 'instability'. The explicit mention of the "Sheep Gate", which was built by the high priest Eliashib and his fellow priests (Neh 3:1f), suggests a priestly matrix for the lame man's tale; he represents, perhaps, the 'ordinary' priests whose oppressors take
the form of Pharisees and their accomplices, the chief-priests.\textsuperscript{112} The impotence of this 'lower' faction of the cultus is reiterated in the lame man's response to Jesus' direct question "Do you want to be made well?" (John 5:6). He replies in a weak and ambiguous manner, blaming his failure to 'rise' above his infirmity on the lack of a 'helper' (v.7; cf. Pss 72:12,14; 107:12, Isa 63:5, Amos 5:2, which speaks of "Israel" having fallen, with "no one to raise her up", and Eccl 4:1, which speaks of the "oppressed" who have no one to comfort them). Others, he moans, reach the water before him, so his anticipation of true 'cleansing' has been postponed for "thirty-eight years", the period of time aptly corresponding to the 'generation' in the wilderness, under Moses.\textsuperscript{113} In the comparable spiritual wilderness, the man awaits the coming of the one who can lead him into the new "Promised Land" - God's angelos, or messenger, Jesus.

With nothing but a commandment to rise, pick up his 'bundle' and walk, Jesus demonstrates the ease with which the oppressed, or misled, can reject their oppressors.\textsuperscript{114} This appears to be a

\textsuperscript{112} These were the priests which formed an "hereditary community" which "traced its genealogy back to Aaron" (Jeremias, 198). Animosity or antagonism had begun to be come between the higher levels of the cultus and these 'ordinary' priests; accusations of nepotism, greed, even cruelty and theft were raised against the chief priests (Jeremias, 180-181), who, themselves, had become strongly influenced by the Pharisees.

\textsuperscript{113} Josephus (\textit{Ant.} 4.4.1) uses the "thirty-eight" year span, which suggests that this was the generally accepted allotment for the Exodus generation.

\textsuperscript{114} The context of Ps 107:2,6 is one of a plea for redemption from "trouble" and "distress": the note, above, concerning a potential interpretation of "Beth-zatha" is aided by this similar perspective in the Psalm.
thematic echo of Jer 10:17 (NRSV):

Gather up your bundle from the ground,
O you who live under siege!

This is the first action conducted directly toward the cultus, thus far; hitherto, there has only been the symbolic gesture of the storming of the Temple, with no direct involvement with its incumbents. Now, though, Jesus is seen to openly challenge the authority of the Pharisees/chief priests over the priesthood by convincing one (or several) priest(s) to rebel; the response is an escalation in the hostility toward Jesus (v.18). The events of John 9 are also foreshadowed by this daring demonstration of divine, as opposed to mundane, 'power'.

The Hunger

John 6 opens with Jesus on a mountain, near the time of the Passover. The two strong images evoke the Exodus story, without doubt, with Jesus' position echoing that of Moses in Exod 19,32-34, and the festival commemorating the original Passover which led to the emancipation of the Israelites from Egypt (Exod 12). Straight away, the prevalent theme is understood as one of "bondage", of "freedom" and of God's desire to redeem his faithful people.115

In the enumeration of the food (e.g., there are five loaves

115 John Painter (in "Tradition and Interpretation In John 6," NTS 35.3 (July 1989) 421-450. Here 432), discusses the narrative in terms of a "quest", suggesting that the first stage of the scenario, the "feeding", depicts a familiar "quest" structure (e.g., where Jesus is faced with the challenge of overcoming "difficulties") and is concerned with "individual" rather than collective response. Von Wahlde ("Literary Structure",582) concurs with this "individualism" perspective of the FG.
and two fish) there is a potential, and profound echo of significant numbers in the early historical tradition of Israel. According to Gen 41:50, two sons were born to "Joseph", and according to 1 Chr 2:4, five to "Judah". The five loaves of John 6, perhaps, represent "Judah", the two fish, "Joseph". By dispersing the food, the "scattering" of the people of Israel is reflected, and in the "gathering" of the fragments into "twelve" baskets (John 6:13), the reconstruction of the ideal Israel is anticipated. The order to collect the "fragments" so that "nothing may be lost" strengthens the thematic connection between this "sign", the statement of Jesus in John 17:12, 18:9 (where he reassures God that none excepting the one destined to be lost has gone missing), and another precedent OT passage, Jer 23:1-4. In Jeremiah, we hear God blaming the bad "shepherds" for scattering

---

116 The "loaves" could be said to represent Judah because Ephraim (i.e., Joseph) was once referred to as "a cake ['hearthcake'] unturned" (Hos 7:8), insinuating that it was not as perfect as Judah; there was also the 'shewbread' which remained in the sanctuary of the Judean Temple. Fish, on the other hand, are commonly associated with the more northerly territories simply because of the Sea of Galilee, where the fishing trade was well established. Newman and Nida (180), interpret the literal translation of "barley bread" and "fish", whilst offering no insight into the possible significance of the numbers used.

117 The numbers 5 and 2, when combined, create the number 7, the number of perfection. It could be claimed, therefore, that where the "Jews" could only offer "six" vessels of water for the rite of purification (John 2:6), Jesus is now offering a means of attaining a spiritual purity which transcends the 'imperfect' ritual. In the FG Jesus has seven distinct disciples even though he is heard to refer to the "twelve" in 6:70; there are seven, also, listed in 21:2.

118 Note that it is only the bread which is collected up, reinforcing the suggestion made here that the "five" loaves represent the northern tribes, i.e., it is the northern peoples who have been scattered and require 'gathering'.
the people of Israel, and in his promise to gather them and return them to the "fold", God assures that they will not be afraid (cf John 6:20), and none will "be missing".

The reaction of the crowd parallels that of Nathanael (1:49) and the Samaritans (4:42) in that they recognize in Jesus' words, or actions, a messianic, or prophetic quality - his 'divine' authority is acknowledged. In John 6, however, there is a difference, for the crowd misinterprets Jesus' "sign"; it appears that they perceive him to be the waited (Davidic) "king". Anticipating a similar rejection of 'misinterpreted' authority in John 8, however, Jesus is seen here to reject it (cf. Judg 8:22, where mundane kingship is rejected in favour of divine kingship).

The word used to describe the action of the crowd is harpazien, i.e., they attempt to "seize" him, to take him by force. The scene strongly echoes the theme of Isa 3:6, for which the context is also one of an internal "oppression" of the people (v.5):

Someone will even seize a relative,
    a member of the clan, saying,
"You have a cloak;
    You shall be our leader,
and this heap of ruins
    shall be under your rule."
(Isa 3:6)

In this Isaian passage, the one "seized" to be king also refuses, blaming the iniquity of Jerusalem for the present state of the ruined nation (3:7-8).

There is also, perhaps, an intertextual echo in this pericope (based upon the comparable action being depicted) of Deut 26.119

119 Perhaps the initial reaction of the reader is to compare this semeion with that of Elisha, in 2 Kgs 4:42-44, but on closer analysis, there is little significance in Elisha's deed which could possibly have any bearing on the FG's ideology.
Here, we see the presentation of a "basket" of food to the "priest who is in office at that time" (vv.2-3), the prayer of thanks and the blessing (vv.11-15), and the distribution of the food amongst many (vv.11-12). The focus of this particular OT passage is the celebration of the emancipation from Egypt through the "signs and wonders" (v.8) of God, and the settlement in the Promised Land (v.15). The distinction between the physical "bread" and the "true bread" (John 6:32) corresponds to the distinction between the terra firma of the original "Promised Land" and the spiritual, ideal "Promised Land" of the FG. Jesus is seen (through this apparent allusion to Deut 26) to assume the role of "priest".120

Johns and Miller rightly point out that, although many scholars polarize "sign" and "spiritual food" in this pericope (suggesting that Jesus is "downplaying" the former), the narrative actually portrays Jesus as being disturbed by the crowd's ignorance of the meaning, or significance, of the signs.121 The polarity of the pericope, rather, should be seen in the contrast between what Jesus seems to be implying and what the crowd comprehends; on the one hand, we see the people attempting to "seize" Jesus to be their "king", and, on the other, we see Jesus retreating, then accusing the crowd of seeking him out because they "ate [their] fill of the loaves" (6:26). Their immediate desire, and the source of their satisfaction, has remained on the level of the mundane - the

120 This function of the "priest" is reflected in the Manual of Discipline, from Qumran (Barnstone 214), where it is required that in a gathering of ten or more men (note the emphasis on "anthropos" in John 6:10) a priest must be present, must sit the men before him, and pronounce a blessing with the first portion of food.

analogy of the crowd taking their fill of physical food corresponds with their mundane expectations and immediate concerns, e.g., a hunger to see Rome destroyed, an eventuality which demands the prowess and authority of the messianic king.

In response to this demonstration of 'mistaken identity', Jesus retreats, only to reappear in a profoundly symbolic context, to reiterate his 'meaning' to his disciples (John 6:16-21).

The "Sea of Galilee" receives two distinct names in John 6:1, the other being the "Sea of Tiberias". The great city of Tiberias was erected by Herod Antipas in c.23 C.E., to mark the 65th birthday of Tiberius Caesar.\textsuperscript{122} It was the showcase of Antipas' tetrarchy, and became his capital, but the site was shunned by devout Jews whose abhorrence of levitical uncleanliness due to contact with the dead (cf. Num 19:11) prohibited them from entering the city. It had been built upon the site of a cemetery, perpetually defiling anyone living there.\textsuperscript{123} This animosity is vital to understanding the 'walking on water' scenario.

In John 6:1, the body of water in Galilee is referred to as a \textit{thalassa}, but Josephus refers to it as a \textit{limne}.\textsuperscript{124} If the latter term was the usual hellenistic designation, as M. Davies proposes,\textsuperscript{125} why should the FG deviate from this? Davies is

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{122} Martin Goodman, \textit{The Ruling Class of Judea}, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987) 94-95.
\item \textsuperscript{123} Josephus (\textit{Ant.} 18.2.3) remarks that Herod bribed "poor people" with houses, in order to raise the population, and many country dwellers were brought by force to reside in the city.
\item \textsuperscript{124} Josephus \textit{Ant.} 18.2.3; \textit{J.W.} 3.3.5.
\item \textsuperscript{125} M. Davies, 268. The designation \textit{thalassa} also appears in Num 34:11.
\end{itemize}
correct in assuming that there is an intended allusion, here, to the Exodus story, with the "menace of the sea" and the related theme of "salvation", but she suggests the pericope is used to reveal a "mounting hostility" toward Jesus and acts as a device which first "divides the people in their response to Jesus, and [then] re-unites them in rejection of him." Thus, the impetus of the "sea" element is rather subdued.

The malevolence of the 'deep', however, is an integral part of the interpretation of John 6, and is preceded in Pss 77:16-20; 114:5, Job 7:12, Job 38:8-11, Isa 27:1, Jonah 1:17, and Dan 7.

The major theme which runs through comparable depictions of men and the sea is the power of God to defend his people from the perils of the "sea" and the "storm", and the 'salvation' of those who trust in him. Psalm 57:1,3, Prov 10:25, and Zech 10:11-12 each allude to the sea in terms of an enemy, oppressor, etc., which God conquers for the sake of his Israel. In Psalm 107:23-30, the same Psalm which speaks of the "distressed" and "afflicted" at the "gates", whom God "heals", the "thirsty" wanderers in the "desert" who are led to salvation by the "straight" path of God's making, and the bondage of those who claim to have "no helper", contains what may be the structural/thematic precedent for the pericope of John 6:16-21. In vv. 23-30 of the Psalm, the scene depicted is one of men in boats on the thalassa, distressed by a storm; turning to God for salvation, the storm calms and they are led safely to their

---

126 M. Davies, 140.
127 M. Davies, 128-129.
128 See also Painter (430-431), who sees this pericope merely as a literary device of transition.
destination.\textsuperscript{129}

One may interpret the pericope of John 6:16-21, then, in the same light, i.e., as being a demonstration against oppression, and of God's power to save. By treading upon the waves of the "Sea of Tiberias", Jesus is seen to place the enemy, Rome (and by extension, Herod), under his foot, rejecting the 'inevitability' of their supremacy. Simply 'destroying' the Romans, without perceiving the 'internal' iniquity which keeps Israel under oppression, however, is no true victory, but in Jesus' semeion is the key to a future emancipation. When Israel accepts God, once again, as their true salvation, they will make themselves worthy in his sight once more, and the 'tools' of God's wrath will be destroyed. By following the traditional depiction of the "sea" scenario, the FG author has already intimated that it is God who is in control of the situation, with Jesus merely the vehicle of his will. Further, by exclaiming "\textit{ego eimi}", Jesus is heard to be echoing the divine "I Am" of Exod 3:13-15, and this is in complete concordance with the FG image of Jesus as God's representative; it does not imply that Jesus is claiming to be God, but that God is \textit{present} (cf. Ps 46:1).\textsuperscript{130} The use of this 'name' enforces the divine

\textsuperscript{129} The added element of "darkness" in the FG scene indicates an intention to convey the idea of 'ignorance', i.e., of the disciples/people; in every other use of the motif, the Pharisees/chief priests become involved (9:4; 11:10; 13:30), revealing their own ignorance of who/what Jesus is.

\textsuperscript{130} Painter (439-440) suggests that the "\textit{ego eimi}" saying in John 6 forces the theme of salvation onto the "\textit{person} of Jesus". The tradition of the Psalms, especially, points strongly towards the potent power of the \textit{name} of God itself - its invocation in such passages as Ps 54:1, 75:1, 79:6, etc., etc., suggests a correlation between keeping the "name" of God alive, and "salvation"; those who "forget" to invoke the name of God, perish. The use of the tetragrammaton by Jesus would, indeed, have been 'blasphemous, but
'authorization' of an agent of God, as in Exod 23:20-21:¹³¹

I am going to send an angel in front of you, to guard you on the way and to bring you to the place that I have prepared. Be attentive to him and listen to his voice...

... for my name is in him.

Summary

By analysing the first two healing semeia, in John 4-5, through their apparent intertextual echoes and political implications, there can be observed a distinction between northern and southern Israel, with respect to the anticipated reunion before the new Kingdom can be inaugurated. Similarly, there is a distinction between the imposition of foreign rule (which suits the 'northern' setting; cf. the Samaritan woman's pericope) and the iniquitous, or ineffectual, priests (suitably, in the context of the Temple site). The concepts of "life", "death", and "signs and wonders" are seen to be metaphorical and as having strong precedents in the context of redemption and emancipation. The feeding of the multitude in 6:2-14 represents the division of Israel, and the anticipated regathering of the representative twelve tribes, forming a potential culmination to the mission, but this is not realized; there is a misunderstanding about Jesus' messianic identity. As God's agent, Jesus is depicted as the locus of divine power and authority; faith in him (and therefore in his

the provocative "ego eimi" offers all the innuendo without the 'sin'!

¹³¹ Cf. Isa 6:8 in the LXX; the prophet uses "ego eimi" in the context of "Here I am, send me", and this is similar to the contexts in which the FG "ego eimi" sayings are used when they are predicated by "the door", "the way", etc. I.e., Jesus is seen to be offering himself as God's instrument.
mission) equates to faith in God - faith in God as the salvation of Israel is the key to suppressing the 'enemy', Rome, for by returning to the 'righteous path', God's anger will be quelled and his people's enemies destroyed.

After the central branch of the theological structure, e.g., the adulteress' story, and its associated juridical debates, etc., the narrative of the FG moves on toward the inauguration of the new priesthood. Following the healing of the "lame" (which condition, it has been suggested, relates metaphorically to those who are "fettered", and therefore ineffectual, e.g., as priests of Yahweh), the healing of the "blind" will emphasize the misplaced pride and ignorance of the Pharisees, and the 'raising' of Lazarus, the emancipation of all the "infirm".
Chapter Five: Election

Preparing for the symbolic 're-marriage' between Israel and Yahweh, Jesus is depicted, in the FG, as performing the necessary 'healing' signs in both northern and southern territories, anticipating, it seems, a 'pre-nuptial' reunification, a 'gathering of the nations', as exhibited in the 'feeding' pericope. The necessity for clarification, as demonstrated in John 6:16-21, brings with it a sense of urgency, as the threat against Jesus is escalated. Here, the two characters of the "blind man" and Lazarus are discussed, in an attempt to reveal how the FG author uses intertextual echoes to illustrate the elimination of ignorance and emancipation of all those who desire to break their 'bonds' and follow Jesus into the new 'Promised Land'. Through these depictions is revealed the genesis of the new priesthood.

A Lack of Vision

Blindness is mentioned in John 12:40 in an "inverted quotation" of Isa 6:10.\textsuperscript{132} Where the initial context is one of a future "healing", the FG makes Jesus the instrument of that restoration.\textsuperscript{133} Also, the replacement of τητυφλοκεν ("he has made

\textsuperscript{132} D. Moody Smith (in "The Setting and Shape of a Johannine Narrative Source," JBL 95.2 (June, 1976) 231-241. Here, 239) suggests that because the FG rendition follows neither the LXX nor the Hebrew versions, its inclusion must be attributed to a later "Christian" hand, and not to the evangelist. The idea of an "inverted quotation" makes the discrepancies productive, rather than hindering, in the interpretation.

\textsuperscript{133} Cf. Judith M. Lieu (in "Blindness in the Johannine Tradition," NTS 34.1 (January, 1988) 83-95. Here, 86), who proposes that the subject, "he", of John 12:40 is to be understood as Jesus, implying that he is the counterpart to Isaiah.
blind") for the original ekammusan ("they have closed") suggests that the quotation is to be understood in light of the "blindness" of John 9, i.e., it is a manifestation of the will of God so that those afflicted will be "converted" and thus reveal his glory.

Conversion, then, should be the context of this FG 'healing' pericope. (A similar deduction from the analysis of John 4:46f, which depicted a conversion in the context of (divine/mundane) monarchical allegiance, complements this). The lame man's story revealed a conversion in the realm of the priests, and here, the blind man is shown to have an intriguing affiliation with the Pharisees, who are later depicted in terms of "blindness" themselves. If the "lame" correspond to the 'fettered' priests, the "blind", it may be proposed, refer to the Pharisees.

Lieu supposes that it is the "response to Jesus" which determines "sin". In the story of the blind man, however, Jesus removes the concept of sin from the "son" before any action/reaction occurs (9:3), and the inherited responsibility of

---

134 Cf. Harvey (117 and n.73), who suggests that the healing of ailments was a sign of emancipation from the "constraint on human dignity and freedom"; in context, though, Harvey's conclusion refers to real physical disabilities, not moral/spiritual 'bindings'.

135 In Gal 4:8-9, the life before 'conversion' is seen as an enslavement, with the old laws (i.e., the Pharisaic laws) imposing a "begging" spirit upon men which they must overcome. The idea of the "prosaton" here, may indicate a similar form of 'bondage', where the blind man, once beholden to the Pharisees, is seen to be 'transformed'.

136 Judith Lieu, "Blindness in the Johannine Tradition," NTS 34.1 (January 1988) 83-95 (here 84). However, with the officer's son, the matter was handled in such a way as to suggest a certain desire to rid the child of the 'sins of the father', illustrating an inherited 'sin', and in the lame man's case, it was determined that the "sin" about which Jesus warns is a state of existence which precedes Jesus' involvement.
guilt, as expressed in Exod 10:5-6, is also immediately precluded in this case. It is, then, something quite different, namely a state of mind imposed upon him by the sect. He may be a young Pharisee, perhaps a novice, or postulant, such as Josephus describes. His age is alluded to twice (vv.21,23) implying that he is "of age" i.e., to make his own choice regarding sectarian membership. The reaction of the parents, later, in 9:22, suggests that the focus of the Pharisees' anger is upon the 'choice' the son has made and their wrath is raised as a threat against any further 'rebellion' from the family. That the Pharisees appear to be taking this event so 'personally' is thus a clue to its interpretation.

Jesus spits on the ground in order to make a small amount of "clay", with which he anoints the blind man's eyes. The term used for 'anointing' here is epechrio; nearly every instance of individuals being commissioned, chosen, delegated, etc., in the LXX, incorporates or specifies the verb chrio. This may

137 In the case of the officer and that of the lame man, the position of a child, particularly a "son", is determined by his father; the nobleman will give rise to noblemen, the priest to priests. In the case of the Pharisee, the position is one of choice, i.e., it is not an inherited status (Jeremias 251f).

138 Josephus, Life, 1.2.

139 Josephus (ibid) claims that he was a novice in each of the three sects, Pharisees, Essenes, and Sadducees, before making the choice, at the age of nineteen, to adhere to the Pharisees. It is no longer a matter for his parents to influence; that the young man was born into a state of "blindness" may (metaphorically) reflect the initiation into the Pharisaiic sect, in the manner of, but in contrast to the 'illuminating' "birth from above" (i.e., as the initiation into the new kingdom).

140 McKenzie 35; Geza Vermes, Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels, (London: Collins, 1973) 158-159. Also, in Rev 3:18, a similar context is apparent for the employment of the
indicate that in John 9, the application of the wet clay is to be understood in terms of an "election".

Having been anointed/elected, the man is sent to the pool of Siloam to wash away the clay. In the explicit reference to the name of the pool, with the added gloss emphasizing the "sent" element, an intertextual echo of Isa 8:6 is created. Here, the people of Judah are seen as malcontents and deviants, "refusing the waters of Shiloah" which flow gently. For this they must endure the torrent from the north (i.e., Assyria, under the guise of the River Euphrates; in the FG echo, Rome), which will act as a sweeping 'judgement' (vv.5-9). Isaiah is warned not to "conspire" with people who fear (i.e., regard, etc.) men rather than God (vv.12f). In the FG, the blind man is the very antithesis of the "Judah" of Isa 8, for he willingly accepts the gentle waters of Siloam, cleansing himself in its (metaphorical) depths. 141

M. Davies notes that the given translation is not the "passive participial form of the Hebrew verb 'to send'". 142 This term, "Shiloah", however, stems from the Hebrew verb shalach, sometimes translated as "to send" 143, but which also carries the connotation of giving up/leaving, etc., and, appointing/sending out. The intertextual, thematic echo is an intentional one, but the ambiguity of the name is also exploited for symbolic purposes

chrio verb, e.g., a state of 'blindness', an application to the eyes, and a potential for 'sight'.

141 The allusion infers that the defeat of Rome is contingent upon the complete 'submission' of Israel to God, and thus expands on the ideology of John 6.
142 M. Davies, 272.
143 Newman and Nida, 302.
(e.g., as Beth-zatha, etc.). As with the prophet Isaiah, the blind man's connections with the Pharisees (who value their own doctrines more than God's, e.g., John 8:39-47) are severed. Effectively, the blind man renounces the Pharisee's authority in deference to Jesus', becoming one of Jesus' elect, and one of God's new "chosen". Together with the 'anointing' aspect of the "clay", the blind man's conversion/election fully satisfies the "election" element of Ezek 16.

The immediate reaction of the "neighbours" and those who had seen the blind man before is to query whether this changed man was truly the "beggar" they had been acquainted with. In the NT the term "begging" (or "beggar") is used in a very illuminating context in Gal 4:8-9; the life before conversion is seen as an enslavement, with the old laws (i.e., Pharisaic law) imposing a "begging" spirit upon men, which they must overcome.\footnote{144}

It is also possible to see in John 9 a structural/thematic echo of the tale of Balaam, in Num 22. Balaam, a 'seer' sent from king Balak of the Moabs to curse the Israelites, is travelling along the road on a donkey. On three separate occasions the donkey is prevented from continuing on his way by an angel who stands in the road, unnoticed by Balaam (cf. the implication of John 1:26).

\footnote{144 The blind man is taken not to a priest, which was the accepted procedure for the final assurance of 'cleanliness' after an ailment or disease (according to Lev 12ff), but to the Pharisees, whose first reaction is to deny, or refuse to believe, that the man was blind in the first place (v.18). This demonstrates two things, i.e., their own inability to "see" and understand, and also the implicit affirmation of the relationship between the young man and the Pharisees. If the youth is, indeed, a postulant Pharisee, it would make perfect sense for the concerned people to bring him before his mentors if he has performed in any way contrary to their laws and regulations.}
Then, "the Lord open[s] the eyes of Balaam" (v.31); he sees the angel there on the road and falls to the ground before him. "I have come out as an adversary, because your way is perverse before me," warns the angel. Balaam is 'converted' by the angel of God, and he becomes Israel's own prophet, blessing rather than cursing the nation. His "eye" is made "clear"; he sees "the vision of the Almighty" and knows the knowledge of the Most High" (Num. 24:3-4).

In John 9, the character of the blind man echoes that of Balaam, in the initial, respective states of 'blindness', in the spiritual 'conversion' as a result of 'seeing', and in the three-fold blessing/confession each undertake. In Balaam's case, vision is equated with the receiving of divine knowledge, of 'understanding'; this concurs with the LXX version of Ps 146:8, which depicts 'sight' in terms of "wisdom" (sophia).

The character of Balaam appears in several places throughout the Bible, e.g., Num 31:16, Deut 23:4, Josh 24:9, Jude 11, and 2 Pet 2:15, yet in these instances he is depicted in less agreeable terms -in fact he is quite an unsavoury character. What then, makes the portrait in Num 22 so unique? The answer, perhaps, lies in the context of Num 22, and the overall implication of the defeat, or conversion of Balaam. Alleman suggests that the reason Balaam is presented so positively in this initial scene, is that he is being manipulated or exploited by God for the purpose of demonstrating how God frustrates the designs of those who might do harm to his

145 Notice the similarity to the alleged conversion of Paul.
Perhaps there is more, though, in that Balaam is presented as a 'seer' who inquires of Yahweh (in the manner of the Aaronite priest who held the Urim and Thummim), but somehow seems to misunderstand or misinterpret his divine messages (cf. Num 22:22); even though he is proudly claiming to be doing the will of God, his stubbornness and 'blindness', with respect to the angel, reveal his true nature. He is conceited and proud (thus this portrayal is in keeping with the later ones), which is why this demonstrative 'conversion' takes on such a humbling aspect.

The moral of the story seems to be: Those who presume to know and carry out the will of God, but fail to act in accordance with it, really do not know it at all, and must be thwarted (cf. John 10:8). Is this not the message of John 9:40-41, with respect to the Pharisees? If the depiction of the blind man echoes that of Balaam, as it appears to, the probability is that his comparable conversion takes place in a similar context. As a young Pharisee, the blind man would be a potential inhibiter of this anticipated glory for Israel, just as Balaam's curses would have been; Jesus is attributed the role of the angel who comes out as an 'adversary' and who opens the man's eyes (e.g., gives him wisdom).

This, it seems, is why the Pharisees take offense: Jesus is openly commissioning one of their own for his cause. He is, in effect, humiliating them.\textsuperscript{147}

Casey sees problems in the historicity of the alleged threats


\textsuperscript{147} In John 7, the Pharisees find it preposterous that any of their own people should follow Jesus, the irony of their conviction is revealed here, in John 9.
of excommunication (9:22) against those who confessed Jesus the Messiah,\(^{148}\) and this is correct, for it was not a crime to support a Messianic contender. Jesus, in the FG, however, is not a Messianic contender in the traditional, or common, sense; it is, perhaps, because his followers are seen to be adopting a 'new' religious identity that they are dismissed from the synagogues; Jesus is setting up an alternative authority to which the disillusioned and 'oppressed' are beginning to turn, so he is perceived as a threat to the status quo - by creating a new 'priesthood', with himself as the divinely ordained high priest, Jesus symbolically nullifies the authority of the Pharisees,\(^{149}\) but he also rejects the dominion of the current high priest and his intimate circle. Anyone condoning such an act of "blasphemy" would, indeed, be censured and expelled from houses of prayer, i.e., synagogues.\(^{150}\)

**Emancipation**

Barnabas Lindars defends an apparently common theory that the Lazarus story of the FG is but an amalgamation of Synoptic themes

\(^{148}\) Casey, 31.

\(^{149}\) Cf. O'Day ("John 7") 636-637, who suggests a similar result, with respect to the nullified authority of the Pharisees (here, in the context of the adulteress' pericope).

\(^{150}\) Regarding the 'expulsion' of the blind man himself, Lee (178) suggests that he was excommunicated, whereas Von Wahlde ("Literary Structures", 113, n.102) prefers to see him as merely removed from the Pharisees' immediate presence. Perhaps both eventualities take place, the former, as explained above, and the latter, perhaps, as an expulsion from the sect itself. Jeremias (251-252) explains that the sect was governed internally, and such behaviour as the blind man exhibits would, indeed, be cause for dismissal.
plus some, as yet unverified, unique source.151 "There can be no
dispute," he writes, "that it has a theological purpose which
dominates the whole narrative," but because of the profundity of
this theological content, many attempts to discern the "source" of
the composition have been "given up as hopeless".152 As a result,
Lindars concludes, the historical significance of the work has also
been lost.153 By reading the narrative in the light of
intertextuality, however, the Lazarus pericopae reveal both their
' historical' significance for the Jesus Movement and the potential
sources for their construction.

Recognition of the relationship between Jesus and Lazarus,
which is made so explicit at the very start of the narrative, is
important. The phrase, "he whom you love", as used in John 11:3,
implicitly establishes the father/son element of the story.
Precedents for the use of such a saying in the OT are few, and are
as follows: Cant 3:1f (lover/husband), Eccl 9:9 (wife), and Gen
22:2 (father/son). Although the first two are possible contenders
(i.e., in the context of the divine-bride structure), the latter is
the most appropriate for this pericope, for it reflects the
predominant themes of father/son and of 'sacrifice', which will be
discussed in a moment. In this precedent (Gen 22) is the additional

151 Barnabas Lindars, "Rebuking the Spirit: A New Analysis of
the Lazarus Story of John 11," NTS 38.1 (January 1992) 89-104
(here, 97;99).

152 Lindars, 89.

claims that the entire episode causes problems with any attempted
harmonization with the Synoptic sequence, and would benefit the FG
only by its removal!
attribution of ton agapetion, which infers uniqueness, but also a sense of divine favouritism, an aspect of the subsequent FG narrative (i.e., the Beloved Disciple, henceforth, BD. See below).

This father/son perception of the "beloved" is graduated,154 progressing from God to Jesus/Abraham, to Lazarus/Isaac, and is further emphasized in the relative terminology of John 3:14 and 11:23, 12:1. Each of these cases reflects the nature of an elevation; for Jesus, hupsos suggests connotations of exaltation and glory, whilst for Lazarus, two separate terms are employed, anistemi (11:23) and egeiro (12:1), both of which indicate a rather more mundane event such as a rise in stature and/or a type of awakening, etc.155 Jesus, then, is exalted to a 'divine' level (remember the context of Nehushtan, which represented the power of God), whilst Lazarus' elevation is one, perhaps, of hierarchical (earthly) status. Similarly, the Father, Yahweh, must sacrifice the Son, Jesus (John 3:16f, etc.), Abraham must sacrifice his son, Isaac, the "beloved", and so too must Jesus allow Lazarus, his beloved, to "die" (e.g., by remaining at a distance for two days). However, redemption and glorification are essential to each scenario; the sacrifice of Isaac secured the Israelite nation, the 'sacrifice' of Lazarus will secure the glorification of Jesus, and in turn, Jesus' sacrificial death will secure the new Kingdom (cf. John 1:29). This continuity implies that Lazarus is to be

---

154 For a good discussion on the God/Jesus-Israel relationship, see M. Davies, 129-132.

155 Cf. 1 Cor 11:30, 15:18; the first example, it should be noted, however, bears a striking resemblance to the FG in its depiction of the "weak", the "ill" and the "dead", whose condition arises from a lack of spiritual direction/conviction, etc.
interpreted as Jesus' symbolic "son"; in this sense, Lazarus, too, should be understood in terms of "election", and this becomes more evident as the gospel continues.

Lazarus is, initially, declared an asthenon (John 11:1); the category of the "infirm", e.g., those who anticipate a "healing" at the Pool of Beth-zatha, is now represented by Lazarus. There are OT examples of infirmity which depict emotional crises (e.g., Prov 13:12; Dan 8:27, etc.), and others which denote the wayward nature of Israel (e.g., Ezek 34; Hos 5:13). Some shift the emphasis of a story (to change a moral, spiritual, or circumstantial direction of a character or event), such as in 1 Kgs 14, where the concern about the possible death of an individual is shifted to emphasize the potential, spiritual death of Israel.\textsuperscript{156} Such infirmities as do not actually result in physical "death" are, nonetheless, mourned as vehemently as death itself, as in Ps 38:6,8 and Job 2:11-12. Even a trial before the Sanhedrin is treated as a kind of "death".\textsuperscript{157} The ideas of "mourning", of "weeping" and "groaning" are all applied to this state of moral/spiritual predicament; Lazarus' ambiguous 'infirmity/death' is reflective of this moral/spiritual predicament. In effect, Lazarus reflects the debilitated Israel itself.\textsuperscript{158}

The raising of the metaphorically "dead" from one life to another as a sign of God's intention to restore the tainted

\textsuperscript{156} This pericope anticipates the format of John 11:1-3, in that the one who is believed to be able to help the sick boy is sought out by a woman. See also, 2 Kgs 20, Ps 41, etc.

\textsuperscript{157} Josephus, Ant., 14.9.4.

\textsuperscript{158} Where Israel is the elect of Yahweh, Lazarus is also "elected".
relationship between him and his people, to show mercy and exalt the righteous, is strong in the Israelite tradition, as in the FG: "...all who are in their graves will hear his voice and will come out - those who have done good, to the resurrection of life....." (John 5:28-29. Cf. Deut 30:19, 2 Esdr 2:15-16, Ezek 37:12,14). The visual imagery in these OT examples, of a "dead" Israel, lying in its 'tomb' or grave, awaiting the divine gift of the "spirit" in order to bring it back to "life", would not have been a new concept for the early readers of the FG.

From the pattern of confrontation thus far exhibited between Jesus and the Pharisees/chief priests, arises a potential 'confrontation' context for this pericope. In the allusion to daylight and night, in vv. 6-10. Jesus answers the disciples worried statement with the cryptic assurance, "Are there not twelve hours of daylight?" etc. There are twelve divisions of "light"; there is a divinely elected circle of twelve disciples. Those who walk in the light do not "stumble" because God is in that light; those who walk at "night" stumble because the "light is not in them" - God is not in them (cf. 5:40-42, 8:47, etc.). Already we are provided a context of 'battle', or 'contest'; God is on the side of righteousness and Jesus has full confidence in the success of his 'army' of "light". The anticipated glorification of the "Son of God" (John 11:4) demonstrates a belief that God's authority lies with Jesus, not the FG "Jews"; the ideology/theology of the subsequent FG scene, then, profoundly echoes the religious contest between Elijah and the Baal worshippers in 1 Kgs 18:17f. Even the tone, form and context of Jesus' prayer in John 11:41-42 strongly
echoes that of Elijah in 1 Kgs 18:36-37.\textsuperscript{159}

It should be noted here that this glorification "is spelled out in 17:5 as [the] return to the glory shared with the Father from the foundation of the world... ." \textsuperscript{160} Such a definition reflects Jesus' words regarding the return of the "Son of Man" to his 'original' high status "before" (6:62), e.g., before the (spiritual) 'fall' of Israel. It also reflects the central theological structure of the anticipated 're-marriage' of Israel to God.

This final contest is a demonstration of the power of God. It takes place in an extremely symbolic context, which, when analyzed in regard to its apparent intertextual echoes, displays a climactic synthesis of reunification and priestly themes.

The FG author uses the phrase "\textit{enebrimesato to pneumati}" to illustrate the reaction of Jesus when he perceives that Mary has accepted the "mourning" of the "Jews", echoing Saul's behaviour in 1 Sam 11:4f (LXX 1 Kgs 11:4f).\textsuperscript{161} When Saul sees the people "weeping" because they fear they shall never be emancipated from the Ammonites, his "anger [is] greatly kindled" (v.6). He sends out the message that any who do not follow God's chosen leaders are

\textsuperscript{159} For an alternative rendition of this confrontation aspect of the FG, see Judith L. Kovacs, "Now Shall the Ruler of This World Be Driven Out": Jesus' Death As Cosmic Battle in John 12:20-36," JBL 114.2 (Summer 1995) 227-247. Kovacs links the final day of judgement with the coming of the \textit{parakletos} and the ultimate victory over Satan; hers is an analysis leaning more toward the gnostic vision of a universal battle, rather than one based on 'historical' figures.

\textsuperscript{160} Loader, 197.

\textsuperscript{161} Cf. Lindars (92-96), who interprets this description as a "rebuking" of an evil spirit within Lazarus (!).
destined for destruction (v.7). In Jesus, as in Saul, anger arises in the "spirit" (cf. 1 Sam 11:6; John 11:33), indicating that it is not to be attributed to the prophets, per se, but to God himself - it is God, the spirit within, who is enraged, because he has sent his "helper" and the people are still "weeping" for themselves!\^\textsuperscript{162}

In Jesus' own "weeping" (11:35), is observed not the personal "grief" the "Jews" see, but an allusion to Jesus' lamentation for the situation at hand, i.e., the 'captivity' of God's chosen:

...my soul will weep in secret for your pride;  
my eyes will weep bitterly and run down with tears,  
because the Lord's flock has been taken captive.

(Jer 13:17)

The "pride" and the iniquity of the attendant "Jews" makes their mourning both ironic, and an hypocrisy:

Yet even now, says the Lord,  
return to me with all your heart,  
with fasting, with weeping and with mourning;  
rend your hearts and not your clothing.

(Joel 2:12-13)

The actual semeion of the 'raising' of Lazarus is, itself, an example of an intertextual 'inversion', this time of an entire prophetic vision, namely, Ezek 37:1-14. As in John 11, in Ezek 37 there is a prophet who is brought to a place of "death", a divine commission to reveal the glory/knowledge of God (vv.4-6), and a miraculous resuscitation/resurrection of the dead, based on spoken commands (vv.4,9). What makes this vision so significant is its

\^\textsuperscript{162} Cf. Jer 4:19f, where Yahweh speaks of his broken heart and anguish, because his people are so foolish and fail to understand. This also reflects the failure to see the "saviour" in John 1:26.
interpretation given in vv.11-14: the "dead" are Israel. Through this vision, the nation is assured of salvation, even from (what may seem to be) the very 'grave' itself (cf. 37:11, where "death" is equated with a loss of "hope"). After this vision, Ezekiel symbolically unites the houses of Judah and Joseph (Ezek 37:15f).

Given this ideological echo (one which fully complements those of 'salvation' in John 6:13f and of reunion in John 4-5), the resuscitation/resurrection of Lazarus can be interpreted as a fulfilled prophecy of redemption and reunification, no longer a vision of the future, but a reality of the 'present'.Jesus remains beyond the 'tomb', and calls Lazarus from "death" to "life". Metaphorically bound in the cloths of the dead, Lazarus is resurrected. The observers, or mourners, are told to release him from his bonds and to let him go free (John 11:44). This order to 'release' Lazarus from his 'bonds' thus acts as a profound echo of Exod 5:1 (et al): "Let my people go"!

Harvey (103) suggests that the Lazarus semeion used as its frame of reference the "climactic expression of a power over life and death," and need not have been given credence, even in its early days, as a "miracle" in the sense of a "supernatural feat".

Robinson (292), amongst others, has commented on the keiriai of John 11:44, which "are not 'linen bands' but thongs or cords". These are not mentioned in the burial cloths of John 19:40f, and thus have a significance unique to Lazarus. In this representative state of "bondage", the symbolism becomes clear.

J.D. Derrett, in "Binding and Loosing (Matt 16:9;18:18; John 20:23)," JBL 102.1 (March 1983) 112-117, notes the theme of release and bondage in John 20:23, in the context of the retention or expiation of "sin" (113). Cf., also, the declaration against "death" Saul makes in 1 Sam 11:13, in direct association with the "deliverance" of Israel. Cf. M. Davies (334) who claims that "Lazarus is resuscitated to an ordinary mundane existence which is vulnerable to death, not resurrected to a transformed life." The motivation is, instead, one of redemption for all Israel.
Priestly Theme

From a priestly perspective, what is most significant in this pericope is the use of symbolic numbers. Jesus delays for TWO days, yet, when he arrives at the crossroads where Martha meets him, Lazarus has already been dead for FOUR days. Without inventing complex reconstructions, what is received from the text is illuminating; there are at least two significant aspects of this specific time reference. Fundamentally, the stay of two days reflects that of John 4:40, where Jesus stays in Samaria for two days before travelling north to conduct the first healing on the third day. In John 11, we find Jesus' arrival on the scene to be, once more, on this significant, ritualistic day, anticipating some form of sacred (re-)union, and, as demonstrated above, this proves to be the case.

By combining the two specified periods of time, e.g., TWO plus FOUR, which would make SIX, Jesus' act of 'resurrection' occurs on the seventh day. These two numbers, "three" and "seven", echo the day of the Sinai covenant (Exod 19:16f) and the period prescribed for the sequestration/ordination of priests (Lev 9:33). (In the comparable Secret Gospel of Mark this same seven-day period is

---

166 Some, such as Von Wahlde ("Literary Structure", 120), and Lee (194, n.3), have supposed the two day delay in 11:6 to represent the determination of Jesus to prove that Lazarus is truly (physically) dead, deferring to the Jewish belief in the retention of the spirit in the body for three days, as evidenced in Hos 6:2, etc. Lee suggests that Lazarus is already dead, i.e., not "ill", when Jesus receives the message, and that Jesus withholds this information from his disciples until he is ready to leave. See also Robinson, 220, n.16 for other assertions.

167 For the text of the SGM see Barnstone, 342 (See "Acknowledgements").
employed in the context of an initiation rite). 168

Having deduced from this use of numbers that the semeion is to be understood in terms of priestly initiation, there is, in the imagery of John 11:44, a consequent echo of the 'order' given to the 'observers' in Zech 3:4: "Take off his filthy clothes". 169 In this precedent pericope is depicted the purification of the priesthood, symbolized by the removal of the "filthy clothes" (cf. "stench" in John 11:39?) and the donning of a "clean turban". 170

In contrast to Lee's conclusion that the author intends no significant etymology in the case of "Lazarus", 171 the findings of this intertextual approach to the pericope indicate that the FG name echoes that of "Eleazar", the name given to the "son" and heir

168 E.g., after six days, i.e., on the seventh, Jesus gives orders to the 'resurrected' youth, who then comes to him later that evening (cf. Lev 9:1), dressed in linen. He undergoes some sort of indoctrination, where he receives the "knowledge" of God. The emphasis on the "linen" garment is noted by Marvin Meyer (in "The Youth in the Secret Gospel of Mark," Semeia 49 (1990) 129-153. Here 145), who suggests it is a "ritual garment". The 'under tunic' of the priest is also of a fine linen. J.D. Crossan (in The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant, (San Francisco: Harper, 1991) 330), suggests that the six-day period mentioned in the SGM is a reflection of "Coptic" baptismal rites.

169 For a discussion on the priestly investiture with respect to this passage, see James C. Vanderkam, "Joshua the High Priest and the Interpretation of Zechariah 3," CBQ 53.1 (January, 1991) 553-570. Here, 556-558 and n.16.

170 Barbara Thiering, (in Jesus the Man, (London: Corgi, 1993) 134) suggests that the cloth which is said to be "wrapped" around Lazarus' face is, in fact, the turban of a priest. Although this remark would help support the hypothesis presented here, it does not tally with Jesus' apparent order for all the burial-cloths to be removed. Ezek 24:17 commands the priest to "bind on [his] turban", but Josephus, Ant. 3.7.3 describes the priestly turban as being wound about the top of the head, like a crown, not as being bound about the face. The transference of the priestly turban comes, as will be shown, later in the narrative.

171 Lee 192, n.1.
of Aaron the priest, in Exod 6:23ff. Jesus' life, as the reader is now well aware, is in jeopardy; if the motivation behind the Movement is, in fact, to create an alternative, purified priesthood through which the repentant Israel can return to God, it is perfectly understandable that Jesus will have to plan ahead, should he himself be unable to lead them into the new Promised Land. Just as Aaron had passed the priesthood on to Eleazar (Num 20:25-26), and as Moses had handed over the "spirit" to Joshua (Deut 34:9), so Jesus will, at the appropriate juncture, pass his authority over to his chosen successor. Again, the concept of "election" is paramount.

Summary

The concept of "blindness" in the FG is seen to be metaphorical, implying a lack of knowledge or wisdom, and this is shown to be aptly demonstrated in the context of the Pharisees' involvement in the blind man's story. In the structural/thematic echo of Num 22, where the conversion of Balaam is instigated by the messenger of God who comes as an "adversary", the blind man is seen to undergo a similar fate in that he appears to convert from the 'ignorance' of the Pharisees to the 'wisdom' of Jesus/God. The application of the "clay", the act of bathing, and the term "Siloam" combine to create the necessary "election" and "cleansing" aspects of the Ezek 16 pattern. This election seems to be of a young Pharisee, complementing the 'priestly' conversion in John 5.

172 Robinson (218, n.11) suggests that the village named "El-Azariyeh" was named after Lazarus; the comparable etymology Robinson accepts is an attestation of the "EL-AZAR" connection.
Lazarus' revival is found to be depicted in a symbolic, metaphorical context which involves two main concerns, namely, the reunification and redemption of Israel, and the inauguration of the priesthood. In the first case, echoes of the Abraham/Isaac tradition are noted, with respect to the father/son - sacrifice/glorification themes, revealing a continuity which infers an intimate relationship between Jesus and Lazarus. The character's predicament is shown to be metaphorical, pertaining to the moral/spiritual state of Israel. This provides for a context of "battle" in which structural and ideological echoes of 1 Sam 11, Ezek 37 and Exodus illustrate the salvific and emancipatory nature of the semeion. In the symbolic employment of highly significant numbers (3,7), allusions are made to the day of covenant and the ordination ritual of priests. An echo of Zech 3 supports this priestly perspective, anticipating the next chapter, which reveals the actual preparation of the new priesthood in the remainder of the FG narrative.
In the last chapter "election" formed the foundation of the "blind man" and "Lazarus" pericopae, with the context of the former, 'conversion', and of the latter, emancipation. Lazarus' story initiates an additional 'priestly' context, which now escalates in the remainder of the gospel narrative. In the central theological structure, which acts as a 'support' for the rest of the text, the basic 'condensed' version of "infidelity, guilt, forgiveness, and elevation," allows for a satisfactory resolution of the echo. However, the blind man's pericope revealed the beginnings of a deviation from this fundamentally feminine perspective of Israel, and shifted the pattern of Ezek 16 into the masculine sphere. From the "election", through "cleansing" and "elevation", a parallel pattern is in evidence, incorporating the preparation and full inauguration of the priesthood.

A week before the final Passover (which will form an inclusio with the Passover of John 2:13, and which will fulfil the word of the Baptist in 1:29), a dinner is given, where Lazarus is "one of those at the table with" Jesus (12:1f). The meal scenario, given the redemptive/emancipatory context of Lazarus' 'raising',

173 Lee, however, remarks that "While Lazarus seems at first to be the central character, his role is a passive one and the text has little to say about his faith." (189. See also 197, n.1). She declares that John 11 is the end of Lazarus, and that "To ask questions of [his] fate...is to move beyond the text" (194 n.1), concluding that it must be the women who are most significant in the Lazarus pericope (189ff). This chapter is aimed at dispelling such conclusions.
functions as a ideological echo of Isa 25:6-10. Here, the 'redeemed' of Israel are to receive a "feast" in celebration of the conquest of God over the (figurative) "death" of the people. In another OT tradition where there is a celebratory 'meal', there is usually to be seen the election of a new "leader". In the case of Aaron and his sons, both before (Lev 9:31f) and after (Lev 10:12f) a week of preparation, the new priests engage in a number of symbolic sacrifices and share in specific ordination meals. The rite serves to establish them as the elite of Israel. In Saul's case, the meal takes on a more profound significance, being at the very core of Samuel's election and elevation of Saul (1 Sam 9:15ff): "for today you shall eat with me", Samuel predicts (9:19).174

In the established priestly hierarchy, it was the duty of the officiating high priest to appoint his "deputy" one week before the traditional Day of Atonement, "in case of [his being] prevented from carrying out his duties on that day."175 If the Passover is to be the setting of Jesus' own atoning 'sacrifice',176 the election of a successor/replacement a week before would be fitting. Only the anointed high priest or the priest "consecrated as priest

174 Great ceremony is made about the serving at the meal (1 Sam 9:23-24; cf. John 12:2) and the sharing of the food with the guests (1 Sam 9:24; cf. John 13:26). Saul is then anointed/appointed as "ruler over [God's] heritage" (1 Sam 10:1). Cf. Heb 10:21.

175 Jeremias 161 and n.47.

176 The death of the high priest could also atone; cf. Num 35:27f; Deut 19:1f. This makes Caiaphas' speech even more ironic!
in his father's place [could] make atonement" (Lev 16:32).\footnote[177]{Note the use of "father" here; although this alludes to Aaron and his sons, it also applies to succeeding high priests and their "sons". Not only does this support the idea of Lazarus being Jesus' 'heir', it also provides a precedent for the understanding of John 8:44, i.e., the "father of lies" (as the corrupt high priest of the Temple).} In this timely portrayal of the celebratory meal is seen not only Lazarus' apparent acceptance of his new status, but also an echo of Jesus' own 'beginnings', where he accepted his own duty at the 'wedding feast', back in John 2.\footnote[178]{And, of course, this is the setting for the 'anointing' of Mary; that she is not the one "serving" implies that she, too, perhaps, is being treated as a guest, a 'celebrity'.}

It is as a consequence of the 'raising' of Lazarus that Caiaphas is heard to pronounce the inevitability of the 'scapegoat' (John 11:49-50); this emphasizes the 'atonement' quality of Jesus' final actions, foreshadowing the imagery of the two 'sacrificial' men before Pilate in John 18:38-40. Also, just as the excessive attention of the Pharisees in John 9 intimated that their's was a vested interest, so the concerns of the chief priests indicate a perception of a 'threat' to their own security (i.e. it could only make sense in the context of a challenge to the priestly status quo).\footnote[179]{Especially with regard to Roman 'appeasement'.} Not only is this ironic because the 'corrupt' high priest is finally speaking the 'truth' (prophecy), but also because in his words lies his own fate; he, as the institutional leader, must 'die' so that the nation may 'live'.

In John 12:9 curious people now come to see Lazarus, not only Jesus. By 12:10-11, the "chief priests" plan to kill Lazarus. Note that the author does not say that this is because of what Jesus did
to Lazarus, but because of Lazarus himself. He is seen as the cause of other "Jews" leaving their posts, i.e., "deserting". Is it possible to infer from this that other priests are "deserting" because of his example, hoping to find a place in the new priesthood?

John 13:3-17 depicts Jesus bathing the feet of his disciples. Segovia rightly asserts that the distinction between louo ("bathing") and nipto ("washing") is intentional, segregating those who are fully 'converted' and those who require to submit themselves further. In his request to receive additional cleansing, Peter unwittingly reveals his own perhaps dubious allegiance, and provides the opportunity for Jesus to remark on the "one" who is wholly 'clean'/converted, namely, Lazarus, the...
"Beloved". As the anticipation of sacrificial atonement provides the setting for this "washing", it is fitting for Jesus' elected successor, his symbolic "son", to be referred to once again in terms which echo his own redemption from "death" (e.g., in the Abraham/Isaac echo). In this regard Lazarus had represented Israel, the "Beloved" of Yahweh, and in his new role, this honour is re-established.

This 'atonement' aspect is further revealed in the echo of Lev 16:4, which stipulates the ritualistic cleansing of the high priest before the Day of Atonement; here, the term louo is employed. In contrast, according to Exod 30:18-21, the high priest and his ministers are required to wash their hands and feet in a basin of water before approaching, or entering the holy site (in this case, the tabernacle), and here, the term nipto is used. Thus the intertextual echo is one based on precedented priestly ritual and terminology. Jesus' elected body of ministers receive their

184 Mark, W.G. Stibbe (in John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel, (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992) is convinced of the identification of Lazarus and the Beloved Disciple, remarking on the fact that previous scholars who have proposed this "radical thesis" have "not been taken seriously enough" (78); he observes that the "BD passages make much better sense" if Lazarus is the BD (79).

185 Casey (25) sees no historical accuracy in the use of the FG's "Father/Son" theme, basing his conclusion on the fact that it does not appear in the Synoptics. Droge (307, n.3), on the other hand, also sees a reflection of the Jesus (son)/God (father) relationship in the BD/Jesus depiction. For the ruling on adoption for the sake of inheritance see Nu 27:1-11. Note also that in 1 Pet 5:13 Peter seems to have 'adopted' Mark as his heir, if this is not actually his true "son".

186 Cf. John 18:36, where Jesus actually refers to his disciples as his huperetai, reflecting their role as servants of the new high priest, and, most importantly, in a context which emphasizes the misapprehension regarding Jesus' acclaimed identity (i.e., earthly kingship versus divine kingdom, etc.).
foot washing in preparation for the 'glorious' entry into the new Kingdom, anticipated by the symbolic entry into Jerusalem in 12:12. In this, the "bathing"/"cleansing" aspect of Ezek 16 is represented.

In Jesus' farewell speech, he reiterates the concept of a death which brings life (15:2f; cf. 12:24), and speaks of the pain of a woman in childbirth and the consequent, overriding sensation of joy once the child is born (16:20), echoing not only the 'birth' theme of John 4, but also the mourning/rejoicing theme of the raising of Lazarus pericope. The inference is that Jesus himself has struggled through a difficult 'birth' and his 'child', the new priesthood, is to be the cause of joy which will override the loss of his presence.

Preparation of the priesthood parallels the preparation of the topos (John 14:2-4). The reference "tē oikía tou patros", in 14:2 echoes "tov oikon tou patros" in 2:16, strongly suggesting that the "house" being referred to in the later statement is, indeed, the Temple (proper). In 8:35, during the debate with the "Jews" about their legitimacy as the "children of Abraham" and their dubious devotion to God, Jesus insinuates that the present incumbents of the Temple are "slaves" who do not see the "truth" which can "free" them. The "slaves", Jesus declares, will not remain in the "house"

187 The scenario of the woman in childbirth is often linked with oppression and the anticipation of redemption; see for example: Isa 13:8, 21:3; Jer 4:31; Mic 4:10.

188 Casey (67) claims that "there is ample evidence that Jesus expected God to vindicate him after his atoning death... [Some] sayings look to the kingdom of God, in which Jesus and his disciples would be prominent." Does not the securing of the new priesthood/temple imply just such a prominence?
for ever, but, on the contrary, the "Son" will.

In 12:12f, Jesus enters the holy city in a celebratory atmosphere, as if to acknowledge his conquest over the corrupt world/cultus there;\(^{189}\) the entry into Jerusalem, though, is depicted in terms of **heavenly** kingship (implicitly reiterating the rejection of Herodian rule), and Jesus does not enter the Temple itself. The Temple has been profaned by the corrupt cultus;\(^{190}\) the ark of the covenant no longer resides there (and the people no longer follow the Commandments; cf. Jer 3:16; 2 Macc 2:5), therefore, neither does God.\(^{191}\)

There is one aspect of the "entry" scenario (12:13) in the FG which makes it unique in the NT; it employs the word **baion**, a direct echo of the only precedent, in 1 Macc 13:51.\(^{192}\) The context there is the entry of the Simon Maccabeus into Jerusalem and the subsequent rededication of the Temple; in the FG such an act is

---

\(^{189}\) Johns and Miller (53) describes Jesus' declaration in 16:33, "I have overcome the world" as meaning "to emerge victorious and justified from a debate."

\(^{190}\) Sanders (336) states that although Jesus' mission was one aimed at **Israel**, and was executed in the name of the God of Israel, Jesus justified leniency in the enforcing of the laws, in his mission to "admit the wicked" into the new kingdom. Casey (73) has a similar opinion, claiming that Jesus 'made it easier' for the average person to return to God, by relaxing the law. A perfect priesthood would follow the law pedantically, as the corrupt one had not; as the representative of the people, if the priests were pure, the positive fate of the nation would be sealed.

\(^{191}\) It should be noted that in both Heb 9:4 and Rev 11:19, in the description of the ideal Temple, the ark has pride of place, once again, suggesting the return of Israel to the commandments of God and the consequent return of the Spirit to dwell there (cf. Jer 7:5-7).

anticipated in the demonstration of 2:13f and is now symbolically fulfilled, here, in 12:13.

If you will walk in my ways and keep my requirements, then you shall rule my house and have charge of my courts, and I will give you the right of access among those who are standing here.

(Zech 3:7)

In relation to this, Jesus' claim that the Father's "house" has many "dwelling places" is taken to be an echo of Ezek 45:4f. In the ideal abode of God, the divine Temple of the eschaton, there will be a place (topos) for all Israel (v.9); in that day "oppression" will cease. This oppression, it is implied, derives from within Israel itself (v.8), and pertains to the equalitarian perception of the divinely ordained nation (cf. Exod 19:6; Num 16:3). Jesus' statement in John 13:16, then, with respect to the exemplary foot-washing, anticipates this necessity for equality, sincerity, tolerance, etc.

When the ark is reinstalled in the ideal Temple, the "spirit" will dwell there; Jesus is, in effect, the 'steward of the house' (cf. Heb 3:6) until such a time as Jerusalem becomes holy once more. He, and by extension his elected successor(s), has become the 'portable tabernacle' wherein the spirit of God will temporarily rest.

193 Note that Ezekiel's Temple follows a plan, much like the tabernacle of Exodus.

194 As the text of 1 Pet 2:5 implies, the followers of Jesus are to emulate the disciples (just as they emulate Jesus), i.e., they are to see themselves as a "holy priesthood", in which "malice...guile, insincerity..." etc., (v.1) are washed away in a spiritual 'rebirth'.
Barabbas

Back in John 10:8, Jesus is heard to rebuke the "thieves and robbers" who lead the "sheep" away from safety and into danger (v.12). The two terms, kleptai and lestai and the idea of 'leading astray' is a strong echo of Hos 7:1 (LXX), where the two terms are employed in a diatribe against the self destructive iniquity of Israel. If Barabbas is to be seen in the same light, as his description in John 19:40 suggests (i.e., he was a lestes), it follows that he is in affiliation either with the Pharisees or the chief priests, the two antagonists in the FG.

In an attempt to clarify the 'meaning' of the Barabbas pericope, Robert E. Merritt and H.Z. Maccoby, propose that it was originally a Marcan interpolation of an actual 'prisoner-release' custom, intended to "deflect the blame for Jesus' death from the Romans to the Jews" and thereby to disassociate the Christians from the Jews. Maccoby is in further agreement with S.L.Davies that the character of Barabbas is, in fact, to be identified with Jesus, based on the interpretation of "Barabbas" as "son of the Father" or "son of the Teacher". This etymological interpretation, however, cannot be accepted without the lestes attribution, a description which does not suit Jesus in the FG. If

---

195 M. Davies (237) makes the connection explicitly to the Pharisees.
196 Robert E. Merritt, "Jesus Barabbas and the Paschal Pardon," JBL 104.1 (March 1985) 57-68.
198 Merritt, 67.
the "father/teacher" referred to here, though, reflects the "father of lies", Barabbas becomes associated with the institutional-high-priesthood, and this provides for some very interesting 'historical' as well as intertextual echoes.

The idea of the Paschal Pardon has long remained a bone of contention amongst NT scholars, with the majority supporting the view that the apparent lack of evidence in external sources implies that no such custom ever existed in Roman occupied Judea.\(^{200}\) Merritt, for one, supposes otherwise, basing his claim on the ancient record of the release of the King of Judah from Babylonian custody, in 2 Kgs 25:27-30 and Jer 52:31-34.\(^{201}\) He also draws a parallel between a similar custom of releasing prisoners in Greece during certain festivals.\(^{202}\) The link to a penal tradition specifically Roman/Jewish, however, is tenuous. Perhaps the answer to this paradox lies elsewhere. It may be that what is transpiring in the FG, is not the release of a "prisoner", for the word is never used by Pilate in John 18:39, but something analogous. Consider, instead, what Josephus writes (added emphasis):

...Vitellius came into Judea, and went up to Jerusalem; it was at the time of that festival which is called the Passover. Vitellius was there magnificently received, and released the inhabitants of Jerusalem from all the taxes upon the fruits that were bought and sold, and gave them leave to have the care of the high priest's vestments, with all their ornaments, and to have them under the custody of the priests in the temple...\(^{203}\)

\(^{200}\) S.L. Davies 260; Maccoby 55-56, etc..

\(^{201}\) Merritt, 61-62.

\(^{202}\) Merritt, 62f.

\(^{203}\) Josephus, Ant. 18.4.3.
He continues by explaining that Vitellius petitioned Rome (i.e., Tiberius) to have the ban on the vestments, which allowed them to be removed from the fortress of Antonia only on feast days, permanently removed. This act took place in 37 C.E., well within the lifetime of some of the disciples; it is possible that such a monumental event influenced the construction of the FG.

The situation, with both Barabbas (the representative of the Temple high priest) and Jesus (the leader, or "Rabbi" of the Movement against the current cultus) captives of the Roman procurator, could well have inspired the analogous reflection of the handing over of the high priest's vestments. The FG author possibly exploited the tradition of this once customary, and ultimately 'Paschal', "release" to convey the profound implications of the 'choice' the people in the narrative make. By choosing Barabbas, they choose the way of 'destruction' and 'darkness'.

Making the irony of this choice all the more profound is the fact that, although the Romans are seen to release the vestments of the Jewish priesthood into the custody of the Temple, the emancipation is superficial, for those who don them are themselves corrupt, and their iniquity has been, or will be, the 'destruction'

204 Jeremias, 148-149.
205 Jeremias, 149, n.4.
206 In John 3:19, note that it is claimed, in the past tense, that "men loved the darkness more than the light", a retrospective claim to the persistent division between those who chose to follow Jesus (the light) and those who did not. J.D. Crossan makes a similar assessment of the situation in Mark (with Barabbas as an armed rebel versus Jesus as the unarmed 'saviour'): The "narrative about Barabbas was...a symbolic dramatization of Jerusalem's fate, as he saw it" (Who Killed Jesus?, (New York: Harper, 1995) 112).
of the Temple (as expressed figuratively in John 2:19). Jerusalem will never be free, nor the 'new' Temple manifested until "Jesus" is chosen over and against "Barabbas" (the "light" over the "darkness").

Further, in connection with the "atonement" aspect of Jesus' impending demise, the symbolic image of these two men, one figuratively 'released' and one 'killed', reinforces the echo of Lev 16. The one 'released', Barabbas, indeed bears the sins of the nation, whereas the one 'killed', Jesus, is elevated to God. The echo of Lev 16 is complete.

Vestments and Transference

The FG narrative subsequent to the raising of Lazarus reveals a keen interest in the 'vestments' of Jesus, the (alternative) high priest. According to Lev 8:6-9, the investiture of the priests included: tunic, sash, robe, ephod, breast-piece, turban and "crown", seven pieces in all.

Before the foot-washing Jesus is described as putting aside his garments (note the NRSV translation as "removing" an "outer robe") and wrapping around himself a lention, or linen cloth. Heil emphasizes the use of the verb theo in the FG account, making the action of Jesus preparing for the washing of his disciples feet

---

207 Cf. Kovacs (247), who suggests that the day of judgement is not at the Parousia, but now, at the crucifixion.

208 Jeremias (148, n.2) suggests eight, but this includes the 'trouser-like' undergarment mentioned only in Exod 28:42, not in the investiture ceremony. The number "seven" is significant in the FG, and this Levitical "list" may suit the overall symbolism of the narrative better.
analogous to his "laying down" of his life for them. However, the verb theo does not necessarily translate to mean "laying down", as, for example keimai would, but it can mean "to put aside", "to place", etc., which fits well the interpretation of the garment, which restricts manual labour. Compare this to Josephus' description of the priestly vestments and the doing of physical (ritualistic) labour:

[The "kethoneth"] is girded to the breast a little above the elbows, by a girdle often going round, four fingers broad...

the warp was nothing but fine linen.

...when it has gone often round, it is there tied, and hangs loosely there down to the ankles: I mean this all the time the priest is not about any laborious service... that he may not be hindered in his operation by its motion, he throws it to his left and bears it on his shoulder.

The fact that in John 13:4-12 reference to Jesus garments is made three times (vv.4,5,12) is an indication of the precision, formality and importance attributable to Jesus' (priestly) actions.

In the Passion narrative, the six remaining vestments are potentially accounted for. The Roman soldiers place upon Jesus' head a "wreath" (stephanos), and place about him a "purple" garment (John 19:2) in their bid to ridicule him as a self-imposed "king". This is profoundly ironic, for not only is purple also the colour of the altar cloth in Num 4:13 (making Jesus' imminent sacrifice

---


210 Josephus, Ant. 3.7.2.
all the more symbolic); in the NRSV version of Job 29:14, \(^{211}\) "righteousness" and "justice" are worn like a "robe" and a "turban". With the four garments (himatia) of v.23a, six articles are apparent, and with the chiton of v.23b, the vestments are complete. This chiton purposefully described to invoke the image of the high priest's robe, as described by Josephus: "...this vesture was not composed of two pieces, nor was it sewed together upon the shoulders and the sides, but it was one long vestment..."\(^{212}\) In an "inverted quotation" of Exod 28:32, the garment is seen not to be torn because it is stipulated that the "robe" of the high priest is to have a "woven binding around the [neck] opening...so that it may not be torn."\(^{213}\)

The direct quotation from Ps 22:18 (John 19:24) is preceded by a technical formula, implying a fulfilment of scripture. When the original context of this Psalm is taken into consideration, the 'fulfilment' aspect becomes clear. Ps 22 exhibits several of the major FG themes, such as desperation (v.1), weakness and infirmity (vv.11,14-16), faith in the salvation of God (vv.19-21), 'belief' which brings 'food' to the 'hungry'/'afflicted' and an everlasting...

\(^{211}\) In the LXX it reads: "...\textit{isa diploidi}'', or "like a mantle".

\(^{212}\) Josephus, \textit{Ant.} 3.7.4.

\(^{213}\) Heil notes the obvious discrepancy between the "robe" of the high priest and the "tunic" of Jesus, and rationalizes this by claiming \textit{both} are "undergarments"; the former sits under the ephod, the latter under Jesus' four garments (742). It may just as easily be that the FG author, in making a distinction between the institutional high priest and Jesus, intentionally applies the symbolic description of one article, to another. Thus, like the renaming of Bethesda, whilst retaining the "five porticoes" description, this shifting device allows for a symbolic interpretation and an implied identification.
"life" (v.26), the supremacy of God (v.28), and a future devoted to teaching new "generations" about God (vv.29-31). The ascension from despondency to elation is echoed in the overall pattern of the FG narrative, and also in the central theological structure of the 'anticipation of Hephzibah'. Fittingly, the zenith of Jesus' career is at this point - this is his elevation, both in terms of the cross and in terms of the atonement/redemption, i.e., the "lamb" is returned to God (as in Gen 22).

From the cross Jesus is seen to hand his "beloved" over to the character known as Jesus' "mother", who remains anonymous. In this scene of mutual "adoption" the relevant themes of replacement and inheritance are emphasized, anticipating the disciple's own (mundane) elevation. As a consequence of this adoption, the BD apparently assumes Jesus' family name, "Joseph" (14:26; cf. 6:42).

The action performed by the character in John 19:38 echoes that of Joseph, son of Jacob, in Gen 50:4f; both Josephs

---

R.E. Brown (in "The Burial of Jesus (Mark 15:42-47)," CBQ 50 (1988) 233-245. Here, 241) suggests that "...a governor would have given the body to the family of the crucified, but no Gospel suggests that. In John alone the mother of Jesus is at Golgotha; but she and the disciple whom Jesus loved seem to depart before Jesus' death (19:27), and they are absent from the burial account." As "Joseph", however, Jesus' spiritual "son" does receive the "body".

Another subtle point to mention here is that, according to Num 27:5-11, if a man died with no children, his inheritance was to be passed on to his brothers: As there seems to be no interest in Jesus' 'blood-brothers' in the FG, it may be assumed that in passing the BD over to his mother, i.e., as her son, Jesus is creating for himself a "brother" worthy of this inheritance. As an adopted brother, "Joseph" would also function as a 'relative'. Cf. "Joseph" in the Gos.Nic. (Barnstone 368ff): Joseph alone tends to Jesus in the tomb, he is incarcerated by the "Jews", in a "building without a window" (and is sentenced to death), he is emancipated, he is referred to as "Father" as a sign of status, he is anointed, and he witnesses the 'risen' Jesus.
approach a 'foreign' leader with a request to remove the body of one who is much loved. In Genesis, the dead person is Joseph's biological father; in the FG, it is the BD's spiritual father. Both are granted their request.\footnote{215}

When the BD and Peter reach the tomb, in John 20:4-7, they find Jesus' head dressing on one side; it is said to be "rolled up", for which the verb *tulisso* is employed, which means "to entwine/wind up"; it is described in this instance as being "epites kephales", i.e., on/around the head, rather than around the face, as in Lazarus' case. Being "twisted" or "rolled", this object is, perhaps, the priestly turban.\footnote{216} According to Exod 29:29, the sacred vestments should be passed on to the succeeding high priest; in the symbolic gesture of laying the 'turban' to one side, Jesus (or those who had taken the body, etc.,) is shown to be transferring his high-priestly office to his successor. This is the moment of the BD's (mundane) elevation, fulfilling the father/son emulation pattern.

The pattern of Ezek 16 is complete; the relative elevation of Jesus and the BD mirror the ideological elevation of Mary Magdalene, providing the 'perfect' platform from which the new priesthood of Israel will commence its work.

\footnote{215} Also, the fate of both run parallel; e.g., cf. the outline of Joseph in Ps 105.18: he was in bondage, enslaved, etc., then he was released by a "king" and consequently elevated to an important position at the king's right hand.

\footnote{216} This "twisted" appearance reflects the "intertwined" description of the wreath of thorns in 19:2 (e.g., *pleko*), making the irony of the Romans' action all the more apparent.
The precise number of "153" in John 21:11 has long been an enigma to researchers of the NT, but, given that the FG depicts a priestly Movement, one which is aimed at the reconstitution, or renewal of the ideal Israel (in preparation for the true kingdom of God, etc.), the number "153" may well pertain to these general themes. It is the sum of seventy, seventy, and thirteen, a perfectly simple, yet profound example of symbolic numerology: Seventy was the number "born to Jacob" in Egypt (Exod 1:5), and thus reflects the pre-Exodic, unified Israel. If Jesus elects a further seventy to carry on the mission he had started (cf. Luke 10:1), this action would fully echo that of Num 11:16f, where Moses is told by Yahweh that seventy of his elders are to share in the "spirit" with him.

---

217 E.g., Robinson (117, and n.356) offers a breakdown of the variation in terminology for "fish" within the FG, but offers no explanation for the numerology used in 21:11. M. Davies (343) offers the following summary of possible interpretations over the years: a) The number represents the various types of fish in the area (!), b) it is the sum of the numbers one to seventeen (Augustine noticed this), the latter being the sum of seven and ten. Seven then represents the Gentiles, and ten the Jewish nation, the addition of the two representing a world-wide mission. Davies herself offers the idea that the entire number stands for the "non-Jews" who will enter the new community.

218 James G. Williams (in "Number Symbolism and Joseph as Symbol of Completion," JBL 98.1 (March, 1979) 86-87) reveals that through the use of numbers (especially with regard to the ages of individuals) Joseph is found to be depicted in Genesis as the "completion" or perfection of the patriarchs. Joseph, Williams concludes, symbolizes "the divine providence that will bring the story of Israel to a blessed conclusion" (87). Not only is this "conclusion" in the FG depicted through the ascent of a "Joseph", but also the symbolism inherent in the number 153 suggests a similar theological 'resolution'.

219 This 'sending out' of emissaries is also preceded in Isa 66:19, where it is anticipated that the purified Israel will be ordered by Yahweh to send forth messengers into the surrounding
The two seventies reiterate both the innocence and purity of the early nation and the sanctification of the new nation which will be born ("from above") out of Jesus' work. The number thirteen, of course, then represents the new priesthood, with its body of twelve ministers and its high priest.

It is remarked that, although the net held so many "fish", the "net was not torn", a phrase echoing that of 19:24, which pertains, as we have suggested, to the high priest's garment. Thus, the net corresponds with the indestructible mantle of the priesthood; all it encompasses is made sacred.

Summary

In the meal scenario of John 12 are echoed both a tradition pertaining to the celebration of victory over the "death" of Israel and one pertaining to the election of new leaders. The timing and the nature of this gathering are found to be reflective of the levitical rules regarding the election of a substitute high priest before the Day of Atonement, and Lazarus is seen to be this substitute. The keen hostility demonstrated by the chief priests reveals a vested interest, for Lazarus appears to be the reason for other (priestly?) 'conversions'/'desertions'. Following this, the washing of the feet of the disciples serves to reiterate the choice of successor, to introduce the 'vestments' motif, and to fulfil the "bathing/"cleansing" aspect of the Ezek 16 pattern. The new ministers are thus cleansed for their symbolic entry into the new Kingdom.

countries who have not learnt of his "fame" and "glory".
Continuing the 'atonement' theme, Barabbas and Jesus are placed together in the custody of the Roman procurator in a symbolic echo of the "scapegoat" ritual. The scene is also interpreted in terms of the Roman custody of the high priest's vestments, and thus acts as a profound example of the "choice" ultimately made by the people of Israel. The 'vestments' motif is carried through to the crucifixion, where the quota of 'seven' priestly articles is met. Linked to this is the direct echo of Ps 22 which acts as a 'summary' in its own right, encapsulating the entire ideology of the FG.

In the reiteration of the son/successor concept, the BD receives Jesus' 'family' name, Joseph, during the mutual adoption scene under the cross, and this anticipates his elevation to the status of high priest on Jesus' departure. The handing over of the priestly office is symbolically represented by the headcovering left in the tomb. Both the BD's and Jesus' elevation serve to complete the masculine pattern-echo of Ezek 16. The priesthood is thus inaugurated. In the Epilogue is found a numeric reference (153) to the two main concepts of the FG - the unified, perfect Israel (old and new), and the new priesthood.
Chapter Seven: Conclusions

In the analysis of the Fourth Gospel through its apparent intertextual echoes, the following deductions have been made:

A) The context, or setting, in which the narrative begins is one which conveys the moral/spiritual state of Israel. The "wilderness" theme, the inability to "see" salvation when it comes, and the "preparation" of the way all anticipate the coming of one who will rescue Israel from its despondency. The anticipated return to glory is introduced early in the narrative, and is couched in Patriarchal allusions, giving the mission of Jesus both a sense of authority and an agenda - to revive an ideal Israel, a "priestly kingdom". In the dialogue with Nicodemus, the nature of Jesus' mission is revealed, with respect to both the 'obstacles' he is to overcome (e.g., ignorance, the Pharisees, etc.) and the manner in which he will overcome these (through "signs and wonders", setting himself up as a 'beacon', etc.). As a symbolic demonstration of his intent, Jesus is seen to be "cleansing" the Temple, but the subtleties of this depiction reveal an interest in the priesthood itself; the intention is to "purify" the priesthood so that God will 'return' and Israel will become holy once more. This agenda is formalized through the symbolic "marriage" ceremony, and this, in turn, sets the foundation for the central theological/ideological structure of the gospel.

B) The ideological 'core' of the FG is a triangular construction, consisting of the three significant female depictions, i.e., the Samaritan woman, the adulteress, and Mary. This illustration of feminine characters is found to be a thematic
echo of the vicissitudes of Israel, the "bride of Yahweh", as found in Ezek 16. This pattern runs from the initial marriage of Israel to Yahweh, through her infidelity, divorce, humility, forgiveness and joyous re-marriage. In the context/setting already established, the Samaritan woman provides the 'starting point' for the pattern - the state of "infidelity". Commencing from this point, the pattern of Ezek 16 is fully represented in the narrative, primarily through the women, but also shifting to a parallel depiction in the male characters from John 9 onward. The escalation of this symbolic "bride" culminates in three major characters; Mary becomes the Magdalene, representing the re-married bride, Jesus is elevated to the Father, at the crucifixion, and the Beloved Disciple (who is found to be the character of Joseph in this regard), is elevated to the position of high priest in Jesus' stead. The final stage, that of "eternal covenant" is implicit throughout the narrative, e.g., in the "life"/"death" motif, the father/son progression, etc., and acts as the motivation, or incentive for the mission.

C) Fulfilling the tradition of a divine "healing" before the return of Israel to glory, Jesus 'performs' a 'healing' semeion in both the northern provinces and in the vicinity of the Temple. This act symbolizes the reunification of the divided Israel, but it also reveals the distinction between the relative 'obstacles' there, i.e., foreign rule and priestly ineffectuality. Building on this, the two semeia of John 6 bring the messianic nature of Jesus' role into question, for he is seen, once again, to intimate this anticipated reunion of Israel (through the gathering of the fragments, etc.) - the people perceive him to be the awaited military or Davidic Messiah. Rejecting this identity, Jesus
clarifies his position for the sake of the disciples, implying that if the nation trusts in God again and becomes devout again, God will rescue them, and that only in this way can the oppression of Rome cease.

D) The pattern of Ezek 16 branches off into the arena of the male characters, beginning with the "election" of the blind man. Echoing the anticipated victory over 'ignorance' in Nicodemus' story, the healing occurs within the sphere of the Pharisees. A conversion takes place, which escalates hostilities toward Jesus and any who support him. Following this is the raising of Lazarus, which occurs in the context of a divine/mundane battle of power; Lazarus, representing the spiritually "dead" Israel, is called to a new "life" by Jesus. This 'raising', though, is paralleled by the elevation of Lazarus to the status of Jesus' priestly successor.

E) From John 11 onward, priestly themes increase in frequency, e.g., through the use of symbolic numbers, references to vestments, ordination rituals, etc. The crucifixion scenario reaffirms the intensifying depiction of Lazarus/BD as Jesus' successor; in the act of 'adoption' which occurs between the BD and Jesus' mother, this favourite disciple assumes not only Jesus' position as "son", but also the family name, Joseph. The official transference of office is symbolically represented by the 'removed' position of the head covering in Jesus' tomb, i.e., the priestly turban has been passed on to the successor.

F) In the Epilogue, the number "153" symbolizes completion, perfection, and, ultimately, success, for it unites the original ("virgin") Israel (i.e., 70) with the new, redeemed Israel (i.e., 70), under the protective 'mantle' of the purified priesthood
When read in light of its consistent, coherent intertextual echoes, the FG exhibits a profound desire to continue the quest begun by Jesus, that is, to illuminate the path back to God. It is a gospel which, perhaps most loyally, depicts the tenacity and endurance of a 'man of God' in his mission to right the wrongs of Israel...to make her, once more the "Delight" of Yahweh.

Rise, stand erect and see the number of those who have been sealed at the feast of the Lord. Those who have departed from the shadow of this age have received glorious garments from the Lord. Take again your full number, O Zion, and close the list of your people who are clothed in white who have fulfilled the law of the Lord. The number of your children, whom you desired, is now complete; implore the Lord's authority that your people, who have been called from the beginning, may be made holy.

(2 Esdr 2:38-41)
Bibliography


Friedman, Mordechai, A. "Israel's Response in Hosea 2:17b: 'You are my Husband'." JBL 99.2 (June, 1980) 199-204.


Kovacs, Judith L. "'Now Shall the Ruler of This World Be Driven Out': Jesus' Death As Cosmic Battle in John 12:20-36." JBL 114.2 (Summer 1995) 227-247.


Merritt, Robert, E. "Jesus Barabbas and the Paschal Pardon." JBL 104.1 (March 1985) 57-68.


O'Brien, Julia M. "Judah as Wife and Husband: Deconstructing Gender in Malachi." JBL 115.2 (Summer, 1990) 241-250.


Rendtorff, Rolf. "'Covenant' as a Structuring Concept in Genesis and Exodus." JBL 108.3 (Fall, 1989) 385-393.


-----. "New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac from 4Q225." JJS 67.1 (Spring 1996) 140-146.


Williams, James, G. "Number Symbolism and Joseph as Symbol of Completion." *JBL* 98.1 (March, 1979) 86-87.