

The Gospel of John

A Commentary

VOLUME I

Craig S. Keener


Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

© 2003 by Craig S. Keener

Published by Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287
www.bakeracademic.com

Baker Academic edition published 2012
ISBN 978-0-8010-4675-9

Previously published in 2003 by Hendrickson Publishers

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

The Library of Congress has cataloged the original edition as follows:

Keener, Craig S., 1960—

The Gospel of John : a commentary / Craig S. Keener.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-56563-378-4 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Bible. N.T. John—Commentaries. I. Title.

BS2615.53.K44 2003

226.5'07—dc22

2003016153

The internet addresses, email addresses, and phone numbers in this book are accurate at the time of publication. They are provided as a resource. Baker Publishing Group does not endorse them or vouch for their content or permanence.

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

To D. Moody Smith, my doctoral mentor at Duke University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	xxv
Approach	xxv
Limitations of this Commentary	xxvi
Nature of the Sources	xxix
Acknowledgements	xxxi
Abbreviations	xxxiii

Introduction

1. Genre and Historical Considerations	3
Proposals concerning Gospel Genre	4
1. Folk Literature or Memoirs?	5
2. Novels and Drama	8
Biographies	11
1. Greco-Roman Biography and History	12
2. How History Was Written	17
3. Evaluating the Accuracy of Particular Works	23
4. Jewish Biographical Conventions	25
The Gospels as Historical Biography	29
Noncanonical Gospel Traditions	34
Source Criticism of the Fourth Gospel	37
John, Historical Tradition, and the Synoptics	40
John and Historical Tradition	42
John's Distinctive Style and Adaptation of the Gospel Form	47
Conclusion	51
2. The Discourses of the Fourth Gospel	53
Oral Traditions, Notes, and Memory	54
1. Oral Cultures	54
2. Note-Taking	55
3. Disciples, Learning, and Memorization	57
4. Memorization of Speeches	60
5. Sayings Traditions	62
Controversy Forms	65
John's Discourses and Ancient Speech-writing	68
1. Speeches as Interpretive Events	69
2. One Jewish Historian's Speeches	71
3. More Accurate Speeches	72
4. Stylistic Freedom	74

Special Factors in Johannine Discourse	76
Conclusion	79
3. Authorship	81
Who Wrote the Fourth Gospel?	82
John the Apostle	83
1. Internal Evidence	84
1A. The Identity of the Beloved Disciple	84
1B. Westcott's Process of Elimination	89
2. Church Tradition	91
2A. The Gnostic and Orthodox Consensus	92
2B. Second-Century Orthodoxy and the Fourth Gospel	93
2C. Papias and John the Elder	95
3. Other External Evidence	98
4. Other Objections	100
Levels of Redaction?	105
1. Brown's Theory of the Community's Development	105
2. The Johannine Circle of Early Christianity	109
3. The Johannine School	109
4. Distinguishing the Beloved Disciple and the Author	111
5. Major Redaction in the Fourth Gospel?	112
Conclusion regarding Authorship	114
The Paraclete and Internal Claims to Inspiration	115
1. The Paraclete and John's Composition	117
2. Prophetic Composition of Discourses?	118
3. Nature of the Inspiration	121
4. Conclusion regarding Inspiration	122
The Author and Other Johannine Literature	122
1. Gospel versus Epistles	123
2. Gospel versus Revelation	126
2A. Vocabulary Differences?	128
Common Language in Both	129
Differences Due to Situation or Genre	130
Arguments from Vocabulary	131
2B. Theological Differences?	133
Theological Similarities	133
Similarities in Apocalyptic Worldview	137
2C. Conclusion on John and Revelation	138
4. Social Contexts	140
Date	140
Provenance and Location of Audience	142
Was John's Community Sectarian?	149
Eastern Mediterranean Backgrounds in General	152
Gentile Backgrounds in General	154
1. General Greek Background	155
2. A Gentile Component in the Johannine Community	158
3. Indian Buddhism? <small>Craig S. Keener, <i>The Gospel of John</i></small>	159
4. Mystery Backgrounds? <small>Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.</small>	160

Gnosticism and the Fourth Gospel	161
1. Gnostic Traits in John?	162
2. Nag Hammadi, the Hermetica, Mandaeism	164
3. Jewish Gnosticism?	166
4. Pre-Christian Gnosticism in General	168
Samaritan Background for the Gospel	169
5. A Jewish Context	171
The Jewishness of the Gospel	172
Diaspora Jewish Background	175
1. What Kind of Diaspora Judaism?	175
2. Relations with the Provincial Administration	176
A Palestinian Jewish Context?	180
1. Methodology	180
2. The Diversity of Early Judaism	181
3. Excursus: The Value of Rabbinic Texts for Johannine Study	185
3A. New Testament Scholarship and Rabbinic Literature	185
3B. Neusner's Minimalism	187
3C. External Support for Some Traditions	191
3D. Difficulties in Tradition Criticism	193
3E. Conclusions	194
Conflict with the Synagogue	194
1. Scholarly Discussion about the Conflict	195
2. Theological Issues	198
2A. Ecclesiology	199
2B. Bibliology	201
2C. Christology	202
2D. Pneumatology	203
3. Unwelcome in the Synagogues	207
4. John's Purpose in This Setting	214
"The Jews" and Johannine Irony	214
1. Negative Uses of "the Jews"	216
2. Previous Discussions of John's "Jews"	219
3. Related Uses of Irony in the Fourth Gospel	223
4. The Jewishness of the Disciples	226
5. "The Jews" and the Johannine Sitz: Pharisaic Power	226
6. Conclusion	227
Galilee versus Judea	228
1. How "Orthodox" Were the Galileans?	228
2. Were More Galileans Revolutionaries?	230
3. Socioeconomic Differences Due to Urbanization	230
4. Location of the Elite	231
5. Theological Motivations	231
Conclusion	232
6. Revelatory Motifs: Knowledge, Vision, Signs	233
Knowledge of God	234
1. Special Hellenistic Concepts in the Gospel of John	234
1A. Hellenistic Knowledge in General	235

1B. Hellenism and Self-Knowledge	236
1C. Hellenistic Knowledge of the Divine	237
1D. John and Gnostic Knowledge	238
2. Knowledge in Various Jewish Sources	239
2A. Knowledge of God in Philo	240
2B. Knowledge in Palestinian Judaism	240
Knowledge in the Qumran Scrolls	240
Other Jewish Conceptions of Knowing God	241
The Old Testament Basis	242
3. Johannine Knowledge of God	243
3A. Distribution of Terms	244
3B. John's Emphasis on Knowledge	246
Revelatory Vision	247
1. Vision of God in Hellenistic Sources	247
2. Vision of God in More Hellenized Judaism	248
3. Vision of God in Less Hellenized Judaism	249
4. Vision of God in the Fourth Gospel	251
Signs in Antiquity, the Jesus Tradition, and the Fourth Gospel	251
1. The Johannine Signs Source	252
2. Ancient Miracles and Miracle Accounts	253
2A. Pagan Parallels to Miracle Accounts	253
2B. Miracle Workers in Pagan Tradition	254
2C. Jewish Parallels to Gospel Miracles	255
3. Historically Evaluating the Jesus Tradition's Miracles	257
3A. Differences between Early Christian and Other Ancient Miracle Stories	258
Differences between Early Christian and Pagan Miracle Stories	258
Comparisons of Jesus' Miracles with Those in Jewish Tradition	259
Parallels and the Authenticity of Jesus' Miracles	260
3B. Historical Authenticity of Accounts	261
A Skeptical Reading of Ancient Accounts	261
Nature Miracles	263
Modern Skepticism toward Miracles	264
4. Miracles and Jesus' Identity	268
4A. The Divine Man Hypothesis	268
4B. A Charismatic Wonder-Worker	270
5. Function of Signs	272
5A. Signs as Authentication	272
5B. Purpose of Signs in the Fourth Gospel	275
5C. Signs-Faith	276
5D. Signs-Faith as a Biblical Allusion	277
Conclusion	279
7. Christology and Other Theology	280
The Thrust of John's Christology	281
John's Christological Distinctiveness	282
Christ	283
1. Messianic Expectation in Judaism	284
2. Divergences in Messianic Expectation	286
3. Jesus and the Messiah	289

Son of God	291
1. Greco-Roman Sons of God	291
2. Jewish Uses of “Son of God”	294
3. Early Christian and Johannine Sonship	296
Lord	297
Jesus’ Deity in Early Christian Tradition	298
1. Greek Divinization or Jewish Monotheism?	298
2. Wisdom Christology	300
3. John’s Christology and Christian Tradition	302
3A. Jesus as Deity in the Synoptic Traditions?	303
3B. Diverse but Complementary Christologies	307
The Motif of Agency	310
1. The Agent in Ancient Society	310
2. The Jewish Agent as New Testament Background?	311
3. Meaning of Agency and Apostleship	313
4. Johannine Usage of Agency	315
Nontraditional Christological Images	317
Conclusion regarding Christology	320
Some Other Johannine Themes	320
1. Realized Eschatology	320
2. Love	324
3. Faith	325
4. Life	328
5. The World	329
Conclusion	330

The Prologue (1:1–18)

Preliminary Introduction	333
An Original Part of the Gospel	333
A Redacted Hymn?	334
Purpose of the Prologue	338
The Gnostic Logos	339
The Logos of Hellenistic Philosophy	341
Philo’s Logos	343
Palestinian Sources besides Wisdom and Torah	347
1. Antecedents	348
2. The Memra	349
Wisdom, Word, Torah	350
1. Personification of the Word	350
2. Wisdom	352
3. Wisdom’s Identification with Torah	354
4. The Role of Torah in Judaism	355
5. The Renewal of Torah in Judaism	358
6. The Personification of Torah in Judaism	359
John’s Logos as Torah	360
Conclusion	363

Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*

The Preexistent Word (1:1–2)	364
1. In the Beginning (1:1a, 2)	365
2. The Word's Preexistence (1:1–2)	367
2A. Wisdom or Torah as God's First Creation	367
2B. The Preexistence of John's Logos	369
2C. The Word Was with God (1:1b)	369
3. The Word's Deity (1:1c)	370
The Word and Creation (1:3)	374
1. Proposed Greek Parallels	375
2. Jewish Views of Creation	377
3. Creation by Word, Wisdom, Torah	379
The Word as Life and Light (1:4–5)	381
1. Uses of Light Imagery	382
2. Jesus as the Life	385
3. Light Prevails over Darkness	386
John Only a Witness (1:6–8)	388
1. Polemic against a Baptist Sect	388
2. John as a Witness	391
The World Rejects the Light (1:9–11)	393
1. The True Light Enlightens Everyone (1:9)	393
2. The World Knew Him Not (1:10)	395
3. His Own Received Him Not (1:11)	398
Those Who Received Him (1:12–13)	399
1. Believers as God's Children (1:12)	399
2. Not According to the Flesh (1:13)	404
The New Sinai (1:14–18)	405
1. The Revelation (1:14)	406
1A. The Word's Incarnation (1:14)	406
1B. The Word Tabernacled among Us (1:14)	408
1C. We Beheld His Glory (1:14)	410
1D. The <i>μονογενής</i> Son (1:14, 18)	412
1E. Full of Grace and Truth (1:14)	416
2. The Baptist's Testimony (1:15)	419
3. Greater than Moses' Revelation (1:16–18)	419
3A. Receiving the Fulness of Grace and Truth (1:16)	420
3B. Christ More Gracious Than Law (1:17)	421
3C. Beholding God's Face in Christ (1:18)	422

Witness in Judea, Samaria, and Galilee (1:19–6:71)

The Witness of the First Disciples	429
The Witness of the Forerunner to Israel (1:19–28)	429
1. Those Who Were Sent (1:19, 24)	431
2. John's Denials (1:20–23)	433
2A. Not Elijah (1:21a)	434
2B. Not the Prophet (1:21b)	436
2C. A Voice Crying (1:23)	437
3. The Purpose of John's Witness	440
3A. The Function of Baptism in This Gospel	440

3B. Proposed Parallels with Other Ancient Baptisms	442
3C. Baptism as a Sign of Conversion	444
3D. John and Proselyte Baptism	447
4. John's Confession of the Greater One (1:27)	448
5. A Historical Note (1:28)	449
The Spirit's Witness about Jesus (1:29–34)	451
1. The Sin-Bearing Lamb (1:29, 36)	452
1A. Proposed Backgrounds	452
1B. Historical Tradition or Johannine Theology?	455
2. Ranked Before the Baptist (1:30)	456
3. Jesus and the Abiding Spirit (1:32–33)	457
4. The Spirit-Baptizer (1:33)	461
5. God's Son or Chosen One (1:34)	463
New Disciples (1:35–42)	465
1. Historical Plausibility	465
2. Following Jesus Home (1:37–39)	467
2A. Low-Key Hospitality	468
2B. Testing Would-Be Disciples	472
3. Andrew and Simon (1:40–42)	475
Philip and Nathanael (1:43–51)	479
1. Jesus Seeks Philip (1:43–44)	480
2. Philip Seeks Nathanael (1:45–46)	482
3. Nathanael Meets Jesus (1:47–51)	485
3A. Nathanael as a True Jacob or Israelite (1:47–48)	485
3B. Jesus as Israel's King (1:49)	487
3C. Jesus as Jacob's Ladder (1:50–51)	488
True Purification	492
Relationship versus Ritual Purification (2:1–11)	492
1. Preliminary Questions	492
2. The Setting of the Sign (2:1–3a)	495
2A. Cana (2:1)	495
2B. The Third Day (2:1)	496
2C. Wedding Customs (2:2–3)	498
3. The Faith of Jesus' Mother (2:3b–5)	501
3A. Jesus' Mother (2:3, 5)	501
3B. Jesus' Answer (2:4)	504
4. Mercy before Ritual (2:6)	509
5. Those Who Recognize the Miracle (2:7–10)	513
6. Manifesting His Glory (2:11)	515
The Old and New Temples (2:12–22)	517
1. Transition (2:12)	517
2. Purifying the Temple (2:13–15)	518
2A. Historical Probability	520
2B. The Merchants	520
2C. History and Special Johannine Features	521
3. Why Jesus Challenged the Temple (2:16)	522
3A. Economic Exploitation? Keener, <i>The Gospel of John</i>	522
3B. Defending the Worship of Gentiles?	524

3C. Judgment on the Temple	524
4. Foreshadowing His Death and Resurrection (2:17–22)	527
Untrustworthy Believers (2:23–25)	531
The Son from Above	533
Nicodemus and the Heavenly Witness (3:1–21)	533
1. Nicodemus Comes to Jesus (3:1–2)	534
1A. Nicodemus (3:1)	535
1B. Nicodemus Comes by Night (3:2)	536
2. Birth from Above (3:3)	537
2A. Birth from Above and Understanding	537
2B. Hellenistic Rebirth	539
2C. Jewish Contexts for Rebirth	542
3. What This Birth Means (3:4–8)	544
3A. Nicodemus Misunderstands (3:4)	545
3B. Born of Water (3:5)	546
3C. Born of the Spirit (3:5)	550
3D. Born of Flesh or of Spirit? (3:6)	552
3E. Explaining the Spirit's Ways (3:7–8)	555
4. The Heavenly Witness (3:9–13)	558
4A. Nicodemus's Ignorance (3:9–10)	558
4B. The Earthly Cannot Grasp the Heavenly (3:12)	559
4C. Jesus' Heavenly Testimony (3:11, 13)	560
5. Trusting God's Uplifted Agent (3:14–21)	563
5A. Lifting Moses' Serpent (3:14)	563
5B. God Gave His Son (3:15–16)	566
5C. Saved from Condemnation (3:17–18)	570
5D. Responding to the Light (3:19–21)	571
The Greater and the Lesser (3:22–36)	574
1. Setting for the Discourse (3:22–26)	575
1A. Jesus' Ministry and John's Ministry (3:22–23, 26)	575
1B. John's Location (3:23)	576
1C. John Was Not Yet in Prison (3:24)	577
1D. John versus Traditional Jewish Purifications (3:25–26)	577
2. Jesus Is Greater Than John (3:27–30)	578
3. Jesus Is God's Supreme Representative (3:31–36)	581
The Response of the Unorthodox	584
True Worshipers in Samaria (4:1–42)	584
1. Theological Themes in the Narrative	585
2. Historical Questions	587
3. The Setting (4:1–6)	587
3A. The Baptism of Jesus' Disciples (4:1–2)	587
3B. Samaria (4:4)	588
3C. Holy Geography (4:3–5)	589
3D. Jacob's Well (4:6)	590
4. Crossing Social Boundaries (4:6–9)	591
4A. The Moral Barrier (4:7–8)	593
4B. The Gender Barrier (4:7–9)	596

4C. Jews Have No Dealings with Samaritans (4:9)	598
5. The Gift of Living Water (4:10–14)	601
5A. Greater Than Our Father Jacob (4:12)	601
5B. Jesus' Gift of Water (4:10–11, 13–14)	602
6. The Moral Question (4:15–18)	605
7. True Worship (4:19–24)	608
7A. You Are a Prophet (4:19)	609
7B. Salvation Is from the Jews (4:22)	610
7C. Worship in This Mountain (4:20)	611
7D. Jerusalem as the Place to Worship (4:20)	613
7E. Worship in Spirit (4:21, 23–24)	615
7F. Worship in Truth (4:23–24)	618
7G. God Is a Spirit (4:24)	618
7H. The Father Seeks Such Worshipers (4:23)	619
8. Jesus' Revelation, the Woman's Witness (4:25–30)	619
8A. The Taheb Is Coming (4:25–26)	619
8B. The Disciples Return (4:27)	620
8C. The Woman Announces Jesus (4:28–30)	621
9. Fulfilling His Mission (4:31–38)	623
10. The Faith of the Samaritans (4:39–42)	626
Received in Galilee (4:43–54)	628
1. Prophet without Honor (4:43–45)	628
2. A Galilean Aristocrat Learns Faith (4:46–53)	630
God's Work on the Sabbath	634
Jesus Heals on the Sabbath (5:1–16)	634
1. Jesus, Not Bethesda, Heals (5:1–9a)	635
1A. The Occasion (5:1, 9)	635
1B. Bethesda (5:2)	636
1C. The Johannine Context	639
1D. The Miracle (5:5–9a)	640
2. Different Views of the Sabbath (5:9b–16)	641
2A. Sabbath Practices (5:9–12)	641
2B. Second Chance (5:13–15)	643
2C. Persecuting Jesus for Sabbath Violation (5:16)	644
The Father Authorized the Son (5:17–47)	645
1. Doing the Father's Will (5:17–30)	645
1A. Annulling the Sabbath and Claiming Equality with God? (5:17–18)	645
1B. The Son Does What the Father Teaches Him (5:19–20)	647
1C. Honor the Son Who Gives Life and Judges (5:21–23)	650
1D. Jesus as Life-Giver in the Present and the Future (5:24–30)	652
2. Witnesses for Jesus (5:31–47)	655
2A. John's Witness (5:33–35)	657
2B. The Father's Witness (5:36–44)	657
2C. The Witness of Moses (5:45–47)	660
Giver of the New Manna	663
Jesus Feeds a Multitude (6:1–13)	663
1. The Setting (6:1–4)	664

2. The Human Solutions (6:5–9)	665
3. The Miracle (6:10–13)	667
4. The Prophet-King (6:14–15)	669
Theophany on the Waters (6:16–21)	671
1. Theological Context for the Account	672
2. The Miracles (6:19, 21)	673
The Manna Discourse (6:22–58)	675
1. The Setting (6:22–25)	675
2. The True Work (6:26–31)	676
3. The Bread of Life (6:32–51)	679
4. Eating Jesus' Flesh (6:52–58)	687
4A. Sacramentalism?	689
4B. The Text	691
Response and Meaning (6:59–71)	692
1. Too Hard to Accept? (6:59–65)	692
1A. Setting (6:59)	692
1B. Misunderstanding and Explanation (6:60–65)	693
2. Stumbling or Persevering (6:66–71)	695

Tabernacles and Hanukkah (7:1–10:42)

The Temple Discourse	703
Jesus Goes to the Feast (7:1–13)	703
1. Jesus and His Brothers (7:1–9)	704
2. Jesus' Secret Presence at the Festival (7:10–13)	708
Jesus Contends with Jerusalemmites (7:14–36)	711
1. The Source of Jesus' Teaching (7:14–18)	712
2. True Keepers of the Law (7:19–24)	714
3. Jesus' True Identity (7:25–31)	718
4. Jesus' Unknown Destination (7:32–36)	720
Responses to Jesus' Revelation (7:37–52)	721
1. Source of Rivers of Life (7:37–39)	722
1A. The Water-Drawing Ceremony	722
1B. The Meaning of the Water	724
1C. To What Scripture Does Jesus Refer (7:38)?	725
1D. From Whom Does the Water Flow?	728
2. The Multitude Divided (7:40–44)	730
3. The Elite Despise Jesus (7:45–52)	731
Condemning a Sinner's Accusers (7:53–8:11)	735
Children of the Devil versus God's Son (8:12–59)	738
1. The True Witness (8:12–20)	739
2. From Above and From Below (8:21–30)	743
3. True Freedom (8:31–36)	746
4. Children of Abraham or the Devil (8:37–51)	752
5. Greater Than Abraham (8:52–59)	765
5A. Assuming Abraham's Superiority (8:52–53)	766
5B. Witnesses to Jesus' Superiority: The Gospel of John	766
5C. Eternal Existence before Abraham (8:57–59)	768

Conflict over the Healing of a Blind Man	775
Blindness and Sin (9:1–34)	775
1. Jesus Heals One Blind from Birth (9:1–7)	776
1A. The Timing (9:1)	776
1B. The Cause of Blindness (9:2–5)	777
1C. Spittle (9:6)	779
1D. Siloam (9:7)	781
2. Initial Responses to the Sign (9:8–23)	783
2A. Responses of Neighbors (9:8–12)	783
2B. Debates among the Pharisees (9:13–17)	784
2C. Interrogating the Blind Man's Parents (9:18–23)	787
3. Debating Jesus' Identity (9:24–34)	789
3A. Is Jesus a Sinner? (9:24–25)	789
3B. Disciples of Moses? (9:26–28)	790
3C. Jesus Is from God (9:29–34)	792
True Shepherd, Sheep, and Thieves (9:35–10:18)	794
1. Jesus Reveals Himself to the Healed Man (9:35–38)	794
2. Jesus Convicts the Pharisees (9:39–41)	795
3. The Shepherd and the Thieves (10:1–10)	797
3A. The Shepherd/Door Parables	797
3B. The General Background of the Sheep and Shepherd Image (10:1–10)	799
3C. Biblical Source for the Sheep and Shepherd Image (10:1–10)	801
3D. Thieves and Robbers (10:1, 5, 8, 10)	803
3E. The Relationship of Shepherd and Sheep (10:3–6)	805
3F. The Fold and the Door (10:2–3, 7, 9)	809
3G. The Shepherd and Thieves Contrasted (10:10)	812
4. The True Shepherd's Sacrifice (10:11–18)	813
4A. The Hiring (10:12–13)	814
4B. The Shepherd's Relationship with the Sheep (10:14–15)	817
4C. Other Sheep and Jesus' Sacrifice (10:16–18)	818
Divided Response to Jesus (10:19–21)	820
Conflict at Hanukkah	821
The Setting (10:22–23)	821
1. Hanukkah (10:22, 36)	821
2. Winter on Solomon's Porch (10:23)	823
Unable to Believe God's Agent (10:24–30)	824
God's Agent and Human Gods (10:31–38)	826
Responses to Jesus (10:39–42)	830

Introducing the Passion (11:1–12:50)

Dying to Live	835
Raising Lazarus (11:1–44)	835
1. John's Account	835
2. The Request (11:1–6)	838
3. Going to Judea (11:7–16)	840
4. Martha Meets the Lord (11:17–27)	842
5. Mourning with Mary and Others (11:28–37)	845

6. The Miracle (11:38–44)	848
Responses to the Raising (11:45–12:11)	850
1. Faith and Betrayal among Witnesses (11:45–46)	851
2. The Elite Plot Jesus' Death (11:47–53)	851
2A. Historical Plausibility	851
2B. Caiaphas, High Priest "That Year" (11:49)	853
2C. The Leaders' Reasoning (11:47–50)	854
2D. Unintended Truth (11:51–53)	856
3. Danger during Passover Season (11:54–57)	858
4. Mary's Lavish Devotion (12:1–8)	859
4A. The Tradition	859
4B. The Setting (12:1–2)	861
4C. The Anointing (12:3)	862
4D. Judas's Protest (12:4–6)	864
4E. Jesus' Response (12:7–8)	865
5. The Danger to Lazarus (12:9–11)	866
Jerusalem and Its King	867
The Arrival of Zion's King (12:12–19)	867
1. Authenticity of the Core Tradition	867
2. The Event and Its Significance (12:12–13)	868
3. Scripture Fulfilled (12:14–16)	870
4. Immediate Responses to Jesus' Entry (12:17–19)	870
Gentiles and the Cross (12:20–36)	871
1. The Coming of Gentiles? (12:20–22)	871
2. The Cross and Divine Glory (12:23–34)	872
2A. Jesus' Hour of Glory (12:23–24)	872
2B. The Price of Following Jesus (12:25–26)	873
2C. Glorifying God by Suffering (12:27–30)	875
2D. Judgment on the World's Ruler (12:31)	879
2E. Jesus' Exaltation by the Cross (12:32–34)	880
3. Inviting Faith in the Light (12:35–36)	882
Israel's Unbelief (12:37–43)	882
1. Isaiah's Revelation (12:37–41)	883
2. Preferring Their Own Glory (12:42–43)	885
Jesus as God's Standard of Judgment (12:44–50)	886

Farewell Discourse (13:1–17:26)

Introductory Issues	893
Unity of the Discourse	893
A Testament of Jesus?	896
The Ultimate Model for Love and Service	899
The Setting (13:1–3)	899
Authenticity and Significance of the Foot Washing	901
1. The Question of Historical Authenticity	901
2. The Message of the Foot Washing	901
3. The Practice of Foot Washing	903
4. The Model of Humility	904

The Foot Washing and Its First Interpretation (13:4–20)	907
1. The Act of Washing (13:4–5)	908
2. The Necessity of the Washing (13:6–11)	908
3. The Interpretation of the Washing (13:12–20)	910
Interpreting the Washing in Light of the Cross (13:21–38)	914
1. The Betrayal Announced (13:21–30)	915
2. The Passion Again Announced (13:31–33)	920
3. Following Jesus' Model (13:34–35)	923
4. Devotion to the Death? (13:36–38)	927
Jesus' Return and Presence	930
Going to the Father (14:1–6)	930
1. Trusting the Father and Jesus (14:1)	930
2. Dwelling in the Father's House (14:2–3)	932
2A. The Father's House (14:2)	932
2B. Dwelling and Deity	933
2C. A Dwelling Place (14:2)	934
2D. A Place Prepared (14:2)	936
2E. Future or Realized Eschatology? (14:2–3)	937
3. Jesus as the Way (14:4–6)	939
3A. Background of "the Way"	940
3B. The Claim's Exclusivism	941
3C. Truth and Life (14:6)	943
Revealing the Father (14:7–14)	943
1. Seeing the Father in Jesus (14:7–9)	944
2. Doing the Father's Works (14:10–11)	945
3. Disciples Doing the Same Works (14:12–14)	946
3A. The Meaning of "Works" (14:12)	946
3B. Prayer in Jesus' Name (14:13–14)	947
Jesus' Coming and Presence by the Spirit (14:15–26)	951
1. Preliminary Questions	951
1A. Structure	951
1B. Theology	952
1C. The Paraclete Passages in Context	953
2. Background of the Paraclete Image	954
2A. Senses Related to Παρακαλέω	955
2B. Forensic Interpretation of the Paraclete	956
2C. Angelic Advocates and Accusers	957
2D. An Advocate in John 14–16?	961
2E. Divine Wisdom	961
3. The Personality of the Spirit in the Fourth Gospel (14:16–17, 26)	962
3A. Wisdom and the Personal Character of the Paraclete	963
3B. The Spirit's Personality and Jesus	964
3C. The Spirit as Jesus' Successor	966
3D. Spirit of Truth (14:17; 15:26; 16:13)	969
4. Coming and Staying (John 14:15–20)	971
4A. The Paraclete Brings Jesus' Presence (14:16–17)	972
4B. Jesus Comes to Testify to the Gospel of John	973
4C. Resurrection Life at Jesus' Coming (14:19–20)	974

5. Revelation to the Obedient (14:21–25)	974
6. Teaching Jesus Tradition (14:26)	977
6A. The Spirit as Teacher and Recaller (14:26)	977
6B. Implications for the Fourth Gospel	979
Encouragement for the Disciples (14:27–31)	982
1. Peace in Jesus' Departure (14:27–29)	982
2. The Coming Prince of the World (14:30)	984
3. Going to the Cross (14:31)	985
Relation to Jesus and the World	988
The Vine and Its Fruitful Branches (15:1–7)	988
1. The Vine Image (15:1)	988
1A. Various Proposed Backgrounds to the Image	990
1B. Israel as a Vine	991
2. The Vinedresser's Pruning (15:1–3)	993
2A. A Vinedresser's Attention	994
2B. "Cleansing" (15:2–3)	996
3. Fruit Bearing (15:2, 4–5, 7–8)	997
4. Perseverance or Apostasy (15:6)	998
4A. The Johannine Meaning of "Abiding"	999
4B. Burning Unfruitful Branches	1000
The Love Commandment (15:8–17)	1002
1. God Loves Those Who Keep His Commandments (15:8–11)	1003
2. The Love of Friends (15:12–17)	1004
2A. Dying for Friends (15:13)	1004
2B. Kinds of Friendship in Antiquity	1006
2C. Ancient Ideals of Friendship	1009
2D. Friends of God	1011
2E. Friends, Not Servants (15:15)	1013
2F. Concluding Observations on Friendship	1014
2G. Chosen and Appointed (15:16)	1015
The World's Hatred (15:18–16:4)	1016
1. Introductory Matters	1016
1A. Part of the Context	1017
1B. The Worldview of the Passage	1017
1C. The Opposition	1018
2. Hating Father, Son, and Followers (15:18–25)	1019
3. Witnesses against the World (15:26–27)	1021
3A. The Spirit Testifies against the World	1022
3B. The Forensic Context	1023
3C. Prophetic Witness	1024
4. Coming Persecution (16:1–4)	1025
4A. Expulsion from Synagogues	1025
4B. Martyrs	1025
4C. Johannine Irony	1027
Revelation of Jesus	1029
His Departure for Their Good (16:5–15)	1029
The World's Prosecutor (16:8–11)	1030

1. Prosecuting the World	1030
2. Background in the Biblical Prophets	1032
3. The Charges	1034
Revealing Jesus to the Disciples (16:13–15)	1035
1. Function in Context	1035
2. Guiding Believers in Truth (16:13)	1036
3. The Paraclete Speaks for Jesus (16:13)	1038
4. Announcing the Coming Matters (16:13)	1039
5. Sharing What Belongs to Jesus (16:14–15)	1041
Meeting Jesus Again (16:16–22)	1043
1. A Little While (16:16–19)	1043
2. Messianic Travail (16:20–22)	1044
Clearer Understanding (16:23–33)	1046
1. Asking in Jesus' Name (16:23–28)	1046
2. Limited Faith (16:29–33)	1047
Jesus' Prayer for Disciples	1050
Introductory Issues	1050
Reciprocal Glory of Father and Son (17:1–5)	1052
Prayer for the Disciples (17:6–24)	1055
1. What Belongs to Jesus and the Father (17:6–10)	1056
2. Guarding His Own in the World (17:11–19)	1057
2A. Separation from the World (17:11, 14–19)	1057
2B. The Apostate (17:12)	1058
2C. Their Joy May Be Full (17:13)	1059
2D. God Preserves Believers from the Evil One (17:14–17)	1059
3. Prayer for Unity of Later Disciples (17:20–24)	1061
Conclusion: Making God Known (17:25–26)	1064

The Passion and Resurrection (18:1–20:31)

The Passion	1067
Historical Tradition in the Passion Narrative	1067
1. The Genre of the Passion Narratives	1068
2. The Historical Foundation for the Passion Narratives	1070
3. The High Priests and Jerusalem's Elite	1073
Betrayal and Arrest (18:1–11)	1076
1. The Setting and Betrayer (18:1–2)	1076
2. The Troops (18:3)	1078
2A. Roman Participation in the Tradition?	1078
2B. Roman Participation and John's Theology?	1080
2C. Judas's Responsibility	1081
3. Jesus' Self-Revelation (18:4–9)	1081
4. Peter's Resistance (18:10–11)	1082
Priestly Interrogation and Peter's Denial (18:12–27)	1084
1. Who Was Responsible for Jesus' Condemnation?	1084
2. Historicity of the Trial Narrative	1085
2A. Violation of Legal Principles? The Gospel of John	1086
2B. Other Evidence	1088

3. Annas and Caiaphas (18:12–14)	1089
4. Peter’s First Denial (18:15–18)	1090
5. Jesus and the High Priest (18:19–24)	1092
5A. Interrogation and Response (18:19–21)	1093
5B. Abuse of the Prisoner (18:22–24)	1095
6. Peter’s Final Denials (18:25–27)	1096
Pilate’s Inquiry (18:28–38a)	1097
1. The Setting (18:28)	1097
1A. They Came “Early”	1098
1B. The Praetorium and Uncleaness	1099
1C. John’s Passover Chronology	1100
2. Pilate and the Chief Priests (18:29–32)	1103
2A. Pilate’s Historical Involvement	1103
2B. Provincial Politics and Law (18:29–31a)	1104
2C. Capital Jurisdiction (18:31b–32)	1107
3. The Kingdom of Truth (18:33–38a)	1109
3A. Questioning Jesus (18:33–34)	1110
3B. Jesus as King of the Jews (18:33–35)	1111
3C. The Nature of Jesus’ Kingship (18:36–37a)	1112
3D. The Kingdom and Truth (18:37b–38a)	1113
Pilate and the People (18:38b–19:16)	1114
1. Preferring a Terrorist (18:38b–40)	1115
1A. Pilate’s Attempt to Free Jesus (18:38b–39)	1115
1B. The Paschal Amnesty Custom (18:39)	1115
1C. Barabbas, a “Robber” (18:40)	1117
2. Abusing the Prisoner (19:1–3)	1118
2A. The Scourging (19:1)	1118
2B. The Mocking (19:2–3)	1120
3. Rejecting God’s Son (19:4–7)	1123
3A. “Behold the Man” (19:4–5)	1123
3B. The Law and God’s Son (19:6–7)	1124
4. True Authority (19:8–11)	1125
4A. Pilate’s Question and Demand (19:8–10)	1125
4B. Divinely Delegated Authority (19:11)	1126
5. Handing Over the Jewish King (19:12–16)	1127
5A. Pilate’s Political Dilemma (19:12)	1128
5B. The Judgment Seat (19:13)	1129
5C. The Timing (19:14a)	1129
5D. “Behold Your King” (19:14b–15)	1131
5E. Handing Jesus Over (19:16)	1132
Jesus’ Crucifixion (19:17–37)	1133
1. The Crucifixion (19:17–18)	1133
1A. Carrying His Own Cross (19:17a)	1133
1B. Golgotha (19:17b)	1134
1C. Crucifixion (19:18)	1135
2. The Titulus (19:19–22)	1136
3. Dividing Jesus’ Property (19:23–24)	1138
4. The Women at the Cross (19:25–27)	1140

4A. Women Bystanders (19:25)	1141
4B. Jesus' Mother (19:26a)	1143
4C. Entrusting His Mother to His Disciple (19:26b–27)	1144
5. Jesus' Thirst and Death (19:28–30)	1145
5A. Jesus Drinks Sour Wine (19:28–29)	1145
5B. It Is Finished (19:30a)	1147
5C. Handing Over His Spirit (19:30b)	1148
6. Breaking Bones (19:31–37)	1150
6A. The Soldiers Break Bones (19:31–33)	1150
6B. Water from Jesus' Side (19:34)	1151
6C. The Witness of the Disciple and Scripture (19:35–37)	1154
Jesus' Burial (19:38–42)	1157
1. Historical Likelihood of the Burial	1157
2. Joseph and Nicodemus (19:38–39)	1158
2A. Joseph and History	1158
2B. Joseph as a Model	1160
2C. Nicodemus	1161
3. Burial Preparations (19:39–40, 42)	1162
4. The Tomb (19:41)	1164
4A. A New Tomb in a Garden	1164
4B. The Site of the Tomb	1165
Jesus' Resurrection	1167
Historical Questions	1167
1. The Traditions	1167
2. Pagan Origins for the Christian Resurrection Doctrine?	1169
2A. Mystery Cults as Background?	1170
2B. Dying-and-Rising Deities?	1172
2C. Jewish Doctrine of the Resurrection	1175
3. Conclusion: Historicity of the Resurrection Tradition?	1177
Mary at the Tomb (20:1–18)	1178
1. The Empty Tomb (20:1–10)	1178
1A. Mary's Discovery (20:1–2)	1178
1B. The Missing Body (20:1–7)	1180
1C. The Wrappings (20:5–7)	1182
1D. The Beloved Disciple, Peter, and Scripture (20:2–10)	1183
2. Appearance to Mary (20:11–18)	1185
2A. Resurrection Appearances (20:15–29)	1185
2B. The Angelic Testimony (20:11–13)	1188
2C. Recognizing Jesus (20:14–16)	1189
2D. Mary's Testimony (20:17–18)	1191
2E. The Ascension (20:17)	1192
2F. Women's Witness (20:18)	1195
Appearances to the Disciples (20:19–29)	1196
1. Appearance to the Ten (20:19–23)	1196
1A. A Johannine Pentecost?	1196
1B. The Setting (20:19)	1200
1C. Jesus' Appearance to the Disciples, The Gospel of John	1201
1D. The Commissioning (20:21)	1203

1E. Empowerment for the Mission (20:22)	1204
1F. Authority for Forgiveness (20:23)	1206
2. Appearance to Thomas (20:24–29)	1208
2A. Thomas’s Skepticism (20:24–25)	1208
2B. Jesus’ Wounds (20:26–27)	1209
2C. The Climactic Christological Confession (20:28–29)	1210
Conclusion	1213
Many Other Signs	1214
Purpose of the Conclusion	1215
Epilogue (21:1–25)	
The Function of John 21	1219
A Later Addition?	1219
Historical Questions	1222
1. Both Galilean and Judean Revelations?	1222
2. Pre- or Postresurrection Tradition?	1222
The Fish Sign	1225
The Setting: Failing at Fishing (21:1–3)	1225
Jesus Provides Fish (21:4–6)	1227
Recognizing and Approaching Jesus (21:7–8)	1228
Jesus Feeds His Sheep (21:9–14)	1230
1. The Banquet	1230
2. The Abundance of Fish (21:11)	1231
The Call	1234
Feed My Sheep (21:15–17)	1234
1. Peter’s Role	1234
2. The Demand of Love	1235
3. Tending the Flock	1236
The Price of Tending Sheep (21:18–19)	1237
The Beloved Disciple’s Future (21:20–23)	1238
The Close of the Gospel	1240
Bibliography	1243
Index of Modern Authors	1411
Index of Subjects	1443
Index of Scripture and Old Testament Apocrypha	1448
Index of Other Ancient Sources	1515

PREFACE

MY DOCTORAL MENTOR, D. Moody Smith, once noted that older scholars who began full-scale John commentaries (like Hoskyns and Haenchen) usually died before completing them. We joked that I should either not start a John commentary or should do it while I remained relatively young! I have sought to follow the latter path, at the same time seeking to honor both the wisdom of the past and to incorporate whatever fresh insights my own studies, especially in the milieu of early Christianity, have provided. If in my youthful zeal (albeit more youthful when I started than when I finished) I have sometimes attended more than necessary to details of setting, it is because I believed this attention a necessary foundation for any more thematic, integrative approach I might undertake in later years.

Approach. In this commentary I have focused on the area where I believe I can make the greatest contribution to Johannine studies, in examining the Gospel in light of its social-historical context. Because the Fourth Gospel is a text, attention to literary and other issues are both essential and inescapable, but my own contributions of the longest range value to other researchers will be my supply of specific social data, which in many cases has not yet been brought to bear on the Gospel, though even here I frequently build on the general work that has gone before.

Ancient readers were not opposed to explaining cultural data to help their audiences understand customs (e.g., Mk 7:3–4) and recognized that some earlier works were less comprehensible because the culture had changed so thoroughly,¹ that people of different eras and locations must be evaluated by the customs of their own cultures,² or that the writer's own words would be understood only within a circle sharing that writer's special information.³ Ancient informed readers understood, as do their modern counterparts, that the more familiar a reader was with the circumstances of a document or speech, the better the reader could comprehend it (e.g., Quintilian 10.1.22). Our culture is so distant from that in which John wrote that even deliberate mysteries of the Gospel, such as Jesus' esoteric speech, become more mysterious than necessary for moderns (who tend to be unfamiliar with ancient sages whose brilliance was sometimes measured by how difficult their riddles were). We will also ask historical questions regarding the passages that may yield some data for addressing these matters, especially to specify where John belongs in the broader generic category in which we place it.

¹ Cf., e.g., the reliable commentator Sextus Caecilius in Aulus Gellius 20.1.6.

² E.g., Cornelius Nepos 15 (Epaminondas), 1.1; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Thucyd.* 29; cf. Cornelius Nepos pref. 5–7.

³ E.g., 2 Thess 2:5; Phaedrus 3.17.5. *Crucible of Culture* knowledge assumed, e.g., in Philostratus *Hrk.* 1.3. Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

In emphasizing this approach, however, we cannot simply ignore matters of the narrative manner in which John wrote, though one should anticipate some differences between ancient Mediterranean and modern narratives. Some scholars question the value of narrative criticism because “it systematically ignores” the likely prehistory of the Fourth Gospel;⁴ but analysis of the finished Gospel as a whole appears to me far more productive and less speculative—particularly on this Gospel—than source and redaction criticism. (Approaching Gospels as cohesive wholes also fits their nature as biographies, as Richard Burridge has noted.)⁵ Thus while we will mention some source-critical controversies, our focus will be on the completed Gospel.

Contemporary literary and historical approaches, with their respective intrinsic and extrinsic concerns, have moved beyond their earlier frequent impasse toward more of a relationship of mutual benefit.⁶ Both historical and literary approaches have essential contributions to make; the implied reader assumed in the Gospel was a first-century reader with specific cultural assumptions.⁷ That is, even if one starts from a purely narrative critical approach, the text implies a social as well as a narrative world.⁸ Of course, a variety of readings from social locations other than the earliest ones are possible;⁹ but we focus this commentary on an ancient Mediterranean context, reconstructing insofar as possible John’s message to his ideal audience in the sort of environment he most likely could have presupposed.

Limitations of This Commentary. The focus of this commentary is the Fourth Gospel in its cultural context as most broadly defined, that is, the eastern Mediterranean cultural, social, political, religious, and ancient literary contexts in which the Gospel would have originally been read. Some reviewers of my earlier commentary on Matthew, while acknowledging its thorough investigation of the light ancient sources bring to bear on Matthew, predictably ignored that explicit focus and concentrated their reviews along traditional lines of liberal or conservative scholarly ideology, or occasionally complaints that they disapproved of a focus on social history. Nevertheless, I emphasize that this approach remains my explicit focus, without the intention of denigrating other scholars’ respective interests.

It is not possible, however, to address fully how the Fourth Gospel would have been heard in its original contexts without also giving some attention to its intrinsic themes, style, and literary development. The completed Fourth Gospel functioned for its first audience and most subsequent audiences as a literary whole, and a piecemeal approach to it violates the text no less than a culturally and linguistically naïve approach would. Although the focus of this commentary does not permit the full exploration of the Gospel from the standpoint of various modern literary techniques, it should be noted that the nature of this commentary should be viewed as complementary to, rather than in opposition to, most of the literary approaches currently in vogue.

⁴ Ashton, *Studying*, 165.

⁵ Burridge, “People,” 127; cf. also Dewey, “Oral-Aural Event,” 145. Some ancient literary critics also insisted on reading a text’s use of a term on the basis of the author’s usage of the term elsewhere (e.g., Seneca *Ep. Lucil.* 108.24–25, explaining Virgil *Georg.* 3.284).

⁶ See McKnight and Malbon, “Introduction,” 18; Donahue, “*Hauptstrasse?*” 45–48; cf., e.g., the overlap in sociorhetorical criticism (see Robbins, “Test Case,” 164–71).

⁷ Koester, “Spectrum,” 5–8; cf. this approach for other ancient documents, e.g., in Maclean and Aitken, *Heroikos*, lxxxvii–lxxxix. Talbert, “Chance,” 236–39, critiques those who insist on only the currently dominant form of literary criticism; some also combine narrative and historical criticism (cf. Motyer, “Method”).

⁸ See O’Day, “Study.”

⁹ See, e.g., Newheart, “Reading, Scrovia, Confusion. Lier and Solotareff. *Symbolism*, offer a psychoanalytic perspective.

Although we occasionally draw on social-sciences commentators, our approach is primarily social-historical. We necessarily extrapolate on the basis of models where hard data is deficient, but anchor as much of our study as possible to extant ancient Mediterranean data. In emphasizing social history, however, we do not seek to denigrate the important contributions of the other approaches, especially in the many cases where hard data is lacking.¹⁰

Examining the Fourth Gospel's genre necessarily invites some examination of the degree to which the Gospel is historically reliable for Jesus research. Most scholars (including myself) agree that John adapts his material more freely than any of the Synoptics. At the same time, John's relative lack of overlap with the Synoptics makes the degree of his adaptation difficult to examine, beyond the basic questions of the ancient biographical genre (which included a broad range of literature) into which this Gospel, like the Synoptics, fits. Given its genre, ancient readers and hearers would be interested in knowing the degree of correspondence between the Gospel's portrayal of Jesus and the historical Jesus (although the intended audience would certainly recognize a correspondence between John's Jesus and their risen Lord). That is, where on the continuum of ancient biographies does this Gospel fit? Thus we must address issues of the historical traditions contained in the Fourth Gospel at relevant points, primarily where these traditions overlap with the Synoptics. This exercise can at most establish an approximation of the Gospel's use of reliable traditions, however; we lack adequate extant data either to verify or falsify most of the events claimed on purely historical grounds.

In contrast to the Synoptics, which lend themselves more readily to historical-critical examination, John weaves his sources together so thoroughly that they usually remain shrouded behind his completed document; as suggested above, Johannine source theories lack the objectivity and consequently the higher degree of academic consensus that tend to surround discussions of the Synoptic sources. While elements of this commentary will focus on the context of Jesus, a more critical question will be the context of the author and his readers, who may have lived far away from Judea and as many as six and a half decades after Jesus' ministry. Thus, despite our frequent interest in historical traditions in the Gospel, our greater interest is what the Gospel as a whole "meant" to readers in the late first century, rather than what the traditions behind the Gospel meant.

Because the focus of the commentary is the original contexts of the Fourth Gospel, it will also focus less on most documentation of secondary modern Johannine scholarship. The volume of bibliographic material on the Fourth Gospel has grown so enormous that it can barely be mastered by any single scholar whose focus is not the sorting and evaluation of such materials,¹¹ though some scholars, such as Bruce Metzger, Rudolf Schnackenburg,¹² and my doctoral mentor, D. Moody Smith, have made significant contributions to that end. *New Testament Abstracts* is an invaluable tool in compiling and

¹⁰ Stanton, *New People*, 85, notes that he uses a social-sciences approach because the social historical approach requires more specific knowledge about the work's particular social setting, but that when such information is available, "social history should normally take precedence over sociological insights." For concerns in this matter, see, e.g., Holmberg, *Sociology and New Testament*, 145–57 (pointed out by Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:16 n. 15); Brown, *Death*, 1:21; Winter, *Paul Left Corinth*, xiii.

¹¹ Boers, *Mountain*, 144 n. 1, rightly complains that commentaries overlap considerably and that fresh readings more than collections of secondary citations are needed. For recent surveys of scholarship, see Schnelle, "Recent Views"; Smith, "Studies since Bultmann"; Morgen, "Bulletin Johannique"; Scholtissek, "Survey of Research"; idem, "Neue Wege."

¹² For the development and stance of Johannine research from 1955 to 1977, see Schnackenburg, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission. "Entwicklung."

summarizing secondary resources, and has proved essential in providing much of this commentary's secondary documentation that may be useful to the reader (especially helpful in trying to summarize works since this commentary's original submission and for languages I do not read or read quickly). A full compilation of secondary research, however, would demand the additional collaboration of a team of scholars. While such an undertaking would be a worthy one, it is not the focus of the present volume.

To admit that the commentary will not focus on secondary scholarship, however, is not to claim independence from prior scholarship. The notes will indicate dependence on previous major lines of Johannine studies, and interact especially with questions currently relevant in the field of John's historical context. This will be particularly true of classical Johannine studies influential in this century, especially from the stream of British and American scholarship of which this commentary is necessarily a part.

Scrupulously avoided, however, has been dependence on earlier compilations of references such as Strack-Billerbeck. This is partly because the scholarship encoded in that volume and those of its predecessors is generally coming to be regarded as out of date and flawed in some serious respects; extensive use of it would thus be inappropriate for a commentary hoping to gain fresh insight into the Fourth Gospel from ancient sources. Works such as *TDNT* have also been minimized for the most part, mainly to focus on fresh insights not available as widely as these works (which most exegetes own). Minimal use has likewise been made of traditional lexicons and the *TLG* computer lexicon, although for an entirely different reason: the *Thesaurus linguae graecae* computer project is so complete and valuable that the sorting of Johannine language according to its data would represent another project of its own, analogous in proportions to this one. These resources are widely available, and the interested reader does not need a commentary to pursue them. My notes acknowledge where any of these sources have been used, and normally where primary sources have been borrowed from other secondary literature, though I have collected more sources from simply working through ancient material. (The notable exception has been my use of secondary collections for many inscriptions and papyri, due to the sheer magnitude of data available in those extant bodies of texts.)

The commentary does not focus on text-critical questions, engaging them only where still debated matters prove relevant for our interpretation quest. Other works investigate these matters more thoroughly, and most scholars and students know the sources to consult.¹³

It might seem strange for a scholarly commentary to note that it is also not a meditative tool, but after finishing this commentary, I believe such a caveat is appropriate in the case of this Gospel (as opposed to my previous work on Matthew and current work on Acts). A Gospel that speaks of "eating" and "drinking" Jesus the way some other ancient works described consuming divine Wisdom may yield some of its treasures more to the sort of mystic contemplation of the divine developed in Eastern Orthodox monasticism than to modern historical critics.¹⁴ As deconstructionist Stephen Moore complains, from a very different perspective, biblical scholars tend to merely "dissect" works rather than feed on them.¹⁵ In the case of the Fourth Gospel, a purely extrinsic approach may well evade part of how John may have invited his first, most sympathetic, ideal audience to hear him.

¹³Besides the obvious Metzger, *Commentary*, those interested in Johannine text-critical questions must consult Ehrman, Fee and Holmes, *Text*, and may consult a variety of other discussions (e.g., Delobel, "Papyri").

¹⁴Contemplation of the divine was known in both Platonist piety (e.g., Maximus of Tyre *Or.* 11.7–12) and Jewish *merkabah* mysticism (e.g., Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*).

¹⁵Moore, *Cadaver*, 270. Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

Nevertheless, commentaries by virtue of their own genre serve limited purposes, and the insights from John's context this commentary seeks to provide may help illumine the text in ways useful for those who wish to listen to the text more deeply in other ways.

One final limitation is that this commentary does not focus on the history of interpretation. That focus is a valid and important historical pursuit, but represents an inquiry often quite different from asking what John's first audience may have heard.¹⁶ For example, for Irenaeus, the Fourth Gospel provided a worthy tool against gnosticism; he apparently sought to rescue it from the gnostics who had found it a useful tool supporting gnosticism. This differs, however, from the likeliest reconstruction of John's original purpose. Later Christians often used John in an anti-Semitic way far removed, if we have understood this Gospel correctly, from how John intended it or how his first audience undoubtedly understood it. Christendom owes many apologies to the Jewish community for misrepresenting and persecuting Jewish people over the centuries. Though we do not have space to repeat those apologies regularly throughout the commentary, the matter merits attention here and elsewhere. Nevertheless, I believe that it is the Christian community's use of the Fourth Gospel rather than the Gospel or its author themselves which requires such apology, as I will argue on pages 194–228 in chapter 5 of the introduction.

Nature of the Sources. Unless otherwise indicated, my primary ancient references are derived from the works cited (either in their original languages or in translation). These references were first examined in their context and considered with regard to the date of the documents or sources in which they occur, as well as the probable reliability of their accurate traditioning before reaching their present form. In most cases I culled my primary references while reading through the ancient documents in which they appear.

The problem with this approach, of course, is that a commentary is not well suited to a detailed comment on every source it cites on any given point, and between certainly useful and certainly useless sources exists a continuum of probable degrees of utility. I have therefore cited even more peripheral sources where they might be useful. For instance, the saying of a fourth-century rabbi may tell us little about the first century, but if the saying reflects by way of specific example a broader cultural way of thinking that obtained or is likely to have obtained in Mediterranean antiquity, this source has been judged worthy of mention.

Readers inclined to make the greatest use of our sources will also be those with the greatest facility in such sources, or have access to easy guides providing dates for those sources. Still, it is important to provide several introductory cautions at this point. One is that some sources are late, and may well reflect Christian influence. Some sources, like the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* in Greek, contain at least Christian interpolations and may have been heavily redacted by Christian traditionaries or editors; at the very minimum, however, they bear accurate witness to the earliest Jewish Christianity in a Hellenistic milieu, which is relevant to the Fourth Gospel. In many of the later "Pseudepigrapha" (an admittedly amorphous category), the date and Christian influences are uncertain, and it is sometimes difficult to tell (e.g., Joseph and Asenath) whether there is substantial Christian influence, or whether the document simply reflects a milieu that deeply affected early Christian manners of expression.

A similar problem obtains in rabbinic literature. Certain bodies of literature probably represent earlier discussions than others, for example, Aboth de Rabbi Nathan, and especially the Mishnah, Tosefta, and Tannaitic Midrashim (*Mekilta*, *Sipra*, *Sipre on Numbers*,

¹⁶For work in this area, one may consult Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary on Scripture*, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2005. Used by permission. A new series that Tom Oden is editing for InterVarsity Press.

and *Sipre on Deuteronomy*). Other collections, like the *Genesis Rabbah*, are later but Palestinian and more representative than still later collections like the Babylonian Talmud or *Pesiqta Rabbati*; baraitot in later documents tend to reflect earlier tradition than the documents in which they occur, but are less reliable in general than plainly earlier documents. (Throughout this commentary we employ “Palestinian” in its standard modern academic sense for Roman Judea, Galilee, and Samaria.)¹⁷ In general, rabbinic scholars concerned to date traditions will regard an attribution as more reliable if it is closer to the date of the compilation in which it occurs.

Naturally many traditions excluded from the Mishnah due to its *Tendenz* or halakic character surface in later sources, preserved orally or in written collections no longer extant, yet such traditions are also sometimes confirmed as early by archaeological or nonrabbinic literary evidence. The degree of reliability is still debated in scholarly Jewish circles, and will no doubt continue to be debated for years hence. Our introduction to the life-setting of the Fourth Gospel includes a substantial discussion of our use of rabbinic texts, a necessary prolegomenon to our dependence on them (where other information is lacking) in the current academic climate. But in short, we have proceeded on the assumption that some evidence is better than no evidence; yet we also trust that the reader will take seriously our indications of the difference between “some evidence” and “strong evidence.”

The rabbinic texts pose another problem, however. The rabbinic perspective in some respects reflects the perspective of common Judaism in antiquity, but in other respects reflects the perspective of a particular community within early Judaism, which only gradually achieved dominance and never achieved the hegemony over ancient Judaism that its proponents claimed. (Archaeological evidence testifies to many nonrabbinic customs even in early Byzantine Palestine.) Because the Fourth Gospel was written very late in the first century and in contact with Palestine or Palestinian tradition, it stands far more chance, along with the First Gospel, of interacting with specifically rabbinic-type ideas, than most first-century Christian writings do. But rabbinic Judaism was neither monolithic nor stable in its teachings, and the rabbinic texts, like most other Jewish texts cited in this work, must normally be read as samples of the general milieu in which the Fourth Gospel was written, rather than exact statements of universal views of the time.

Different primary sources that provide windows into the ancient world each offer their own problems. All the Dead Sea Scrolls clearly predate even the earliest dating of John, but, like the rabbis, cannot speak for all of Palestinian Judaism. Josephus represents the right period and addresses a Greek-speaking audience, but has his own apologetic *Tendenz* and aristocratic idiosyncrasies. Philo provides a definite sample of Alexandrian Jewish aristocratic piety, but he seems to be moving in much higher currents of Hellenistic philosophic thought than John approaches. *First Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the *Wisdom of Solomon*, and *Sirach* all have their own idiosyncrasies, though all are extremely valuable and adequately early sources and, taken together, represent a broad enough sampling of early Jewish piety to enable us to place the Fourth Gospel in a probable early Jewish context.¹⁸

¹⁷Feldman, “Palestine,” argues that the designation came into vogue only after 135 B.C., but is not averse to using the term (e.g., in Feldman, “Hellenism”). I note this in response to the occasional reviewer who has alleged that my or others’ terminology likely betrayed a modern political agenda rather than following convention.

¹⁸Reconstructing a probable milieu by utilizing ideas in a variety of early Jewish sources functions as “a kind of criterion of multiple attestation,” as Donaldson notes (*Paul and Gentiles*, 51).

Other sources for John's theology and witness could also be considered, but because they are self-evident and available to everyone who would use this commentary, they are not emphasized as extensively in this work. It is obvious that John meditated deeply on the OT, apparently both in its Hebrew and its Greek forms (see below). It is also self-evident that John was affected by earlier Christian traditions, which are attested in the Synoptics, in Paul, and elsewhere. (John's view of Christ as divine Wisdom, for example, is hardly a late christological development, as some have naïvely argued: it is present in the apparently pre-Pauline tradition in 1 Cor 1:30 and 8:6.) To a great extent, the contours of early Diaspora Jewish Christianity shaped the texture of the Fourth Gospel more eloquently than other Jewish sources could have, but since these contours can be reconstructed for the most part from study of the NT documents themselves and hence are already widely available to modern students of the Fourth Gospel, they are not the heaviest focus of this present work.

I have attempted to structure this commentary as a compromise between John's own structure and the demands of modern outlines. John has major sections that usually break into smaller units, but the intermediate levels of structure expected in modern outlines sometimes exist and sometimes do not. Thus, for example, one can break John 21 into paragraphs like most of the Gospel, but because John 21 must be treated separately from other major sections, in our outline its paragraphs are treated as if they are divisions within larger sections (like, for example, lengthy chapters such as John 4 or 6). This is not true to John's own structure, in which they remain simply paragraphs; it is mandated by the necessity of consistency with modern outlines and a commentary's headings matching such outlines. The commentary's outline, then, follows a somewhat unhappy (but pragmatically workable) compromise between the Gospel's structure and modern outlines.

I offer the following introduction to and commentary on the Fourth Gospel in the hope that, like some of its more illustrious predecessors, this work may advance in some small way the state of Johannine studies.

Acknowledgments. I owe special thanks to Eastern Seminary in Philadelphia for providing for me as Carl Morgan Visiting Professor of Biblical Studies during the 1996–1997 academic year, when the largest bulk of the writing on this commentary was completed. I completed and submitted this commentary in 1997, but when unexpected problems in the editorial process delayed publication, my editor kindly allowed me to add material subsequently. Unfortunately, I was by now under deadline for other projects, so the additions do not reflect fully the publications in Johannine studies during the intervening years (especially foreign-language works). I am grateful to all those at Hendrickson Publishers who worked on this project. I also thank Eerdmans Publishing for allowing me to reuse some material from my 1999 Matthew commentary, especially in the passion narrative.

I am grateful for the opportunity to teach John's Gospel at Hood Theological Seminary (Salisbury, N.C.) and the Center for Urban Theological Studies (Philadelphia, Pa.), for the interaction of my students at both institutions, and for the opportunity to interact on John with Greek exegesis students at Eastern Seminary in the springs of 2000–2002. I am especially grateful to my mentors in Johannine studies at the successive stages of my theological education: Benny Aker, Ramsey Michaels, and Moody Smith. Moody's support and guidance were essential to the completion of my doctoral work at Duke University in 1991.

ABBREVIATIONS

⊂ <i>Abod. Zar.</i>	⊂ <i>Abodah Zarah</i>
⊃ <i>Abot R. Nat.</i>	⊃ <i>Abot de Rabbi Nathan</i> (recensions A and B)
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>
Achilles Tattius	Achilles Tattius <i>Clitophon and Leucippe</i>
<i>Acts John</i>	<i>Acts of John</i>
<i>Acts Paul</i>	<i>Acts of Paul</i>
ad loc.	<i>ad locum</i> , at the place discussed
AE	<i>Année épigraphique</i>
Aelian	Aelian <i>Nature of Animals</i> (for epistles, see Alciphron in bibliography)
Aelius Aristides Or.	Aelius Aristides <i>Oration to Rome</i>
Aeschylus	
<i>Cho.</i>	<i>Libation-Bearers</i>
<i>Prom.</i>	<i>Prometheus Bound</i>
<i>Sept.</i>	<i>Seven against Thebes</i>
<i>Suppl.</i>	<i>Suppliant Women</i>
AJSR	<i>Association for Jewish Studies Review</i>
ANET	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> . Edited by J. B. Pritchard. 3d ed. Princeton, 1969
ANF	<i>Ante-Nicene Fathers</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> . Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972–
Antonius Diogenes	
<i>Thule</i>	<i>The Wonders beyond Thule</i>
<i>apGen</i>	<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>
<i>Ap. Jas.</i>	<i>Apocryphon of James</i>
<i>Apoc. Ab.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Abraham</i>
<i>Apoc. El.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Elijah</i>
<i>Apoc. Mos.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Moses</i>
<i>Apoc. Pet.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Peter</i>
<i>Apoc. Sedr.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Sedrach</i>
<i>Apoc. Zeph.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Zephaniah</i>
<i>Apocr. Ezek.</i>	<i>Apocryphon of Ezekiel</i>
<i>Apocrit.</i>	<i>Apocriticon</i> (Porphyry, <i>Against Christians</i>)
<i>Apoll. K. Tyre</i>	<i>The Story of Apollonius King of Tyre</i>
Apollonius of Rhodes	Apollonius of Rhodes <i>Argonautica</i>
<i>Apos. Con.</i>	<i>Apostolic Constitutions and Canons</i>
Appian	
C.W.	<i>Civil Wars</i>
R.H.	<i>Roman History</i>
Apuleius <i>Metam.</i>	Apuleius <i>Metamorphoses</i>
AQHT	Aqhat Epic
Aram.	Aramaic
⊂ <i>Arak.</i>	⊂ <i>Arak</i>
	Craig S. Keener, <i>The Gospel of John</i>
	Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

Aratus <i>Phaen.</i>	Aratus <i>Phaenomena</i>
Aristophanes	Aristophanes
<i>Ach.</i>	<i>The Acharnians</i>
<i>Lys.</i>	<i>Lysistrata</i>
Aristotle	
<i>E.E.</i>	<i>The Eudemian Ethics</i>
<i>Gen. Anim.</i>	<i>Generation of Animals</i>
<i>Heav.</i>	<i>On the Heavens</i>
<i>Mem.</i>	<i>Concerning Memory and Recollection</i>
<i>Mete.</i>	<i>Meteorology</i>
<i>N.E.</i>	<i>The Nicomachean Ethics</i>
<i>Parv.</i>	<i>Parva naturalia</i>
<i>Poet.</i>	<i>The Poetics</i>
<i>Pol.</i>	<i>Politics</i>
<i>Rhet.</i>	<i>Art of Rhetoric</i>
<i>Soul</i>	<i>On the Soul</i>
ARM.T	<i>Archives royales de Mari: Transcriptions et traductions</i>
Arrian	Arrian
<i>Alex.</i>	<i>Anabasis of Alexander</i>
<i>Ind.</i>	<i>Indica</i>
Artemidorus <i>Onir.</i>	Artemidorus Daldianus <i>Onirocritica</i>
<i>As. Mos.</i>	<i>Assumption of Moses</i>
<i>Ascen. Isa.</i>	<i>Martyrdom and Ascension of Isaiah 6–11</i>
Athenaeus <i>Deipn.</i>	Athenaeus <i>Deipnosophists</i>
Athenagoras	Athenagoras <i>Plea</i>
Augustine	
<i>Cons.</i>	<i>Harmony of the Gospels</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Serm.</i>	<i>Sermons</i>
<i>Tract. Ev. Jo.</i>	<i>Tractates on the Gospel of John</i>
Aulus Gellius	Aulus Gellius <i>Attic Nights</i>
AV	Authorized Version
<i>b.</i>	Babylonian Talmud
<i>B. Bat.</i>	<i>Baba Batra</i>
<i>B. Meši'a</i>	<i>Baba Meši'a</i>
<i>B. Qam.</i>	<i>Baba Qamma</i>
Babrius	Babrius <i>Fables</i>
BAR	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
<i>bar.</i>	<i>baraita</i> (with rabbinic text)
Bar	Baruch
<i>2–4 Bar.</i>	<i>2–4 Baruch</i>
<i>Barn.</i>	<i>Barnabas</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
B.C.E.	Before the Common Era
<i>Bek.</i>	<i>Bekorot</i>
<i>Ber.</i>	<i>Berakot</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>Bik.</i>	<i>Bikkurim</i>
BGU	<i>Ägyptische Urkunden aus den Königlichen Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden.</i> 15 vols. Berlin, 1895–1983
<i>Book of the Dead, Sp.</i>	<i>The Book of the Dead</i> (see bibliography), with spell number
<i>ca.</i>	circa
Caesar	

<i>Gall. W.</i>	<i>Galic War</i>
Callimachus <i>Epigr.</i>	Callimachus <i>Epigrams</i>
Cato	
<i>Coll. dist.</i>	<i>Collection of Distichs</i>
<i>Dist.</i>	<i>Distichs</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CD	Cairo Genizah copy of the <i>Damascus Document</i>
C.E.	Common Era
cent(s).	century(ies)
ch(s).	chapter(s)
Chariton	Chariton <i>Chaereas and Callirhoe</i>
1–2 Chr	1–2 Chronicles
Cicero	Cicero
<i>Acad.</i>	<i>Academicae quaestiones</i>
<i>Agr.</i>	<i>De lege agraria</i>
<i>Amic.</i>	<i>De amicitia</i>
<i>Att.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Atticum</i>
<i>Cael.</i>	<i>Pro Caelio</i>
<i>Cat.</i>	<i>In Catilinam</i>
<i>De or.</i>	<i>De oratore</i>
<i>Div.</i>	<i>De divinatione</i>
<i>Div. Caec.</i>	<i>Divinatio in Caecilium</i>
<i>Fam.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad familiares</i>
<i>Fin.</i>	<i>De finibus</i>
<i>Inv.</i>	<i>De inventione rhetorica</i>
<i>Leg.</i>	<i>De legibus</i>
<i>Mil.</i>	<i>Pro Milone</i>
<i>Mur.</i>	<i>Pro Murena</i>
<i>Nat. d.</i>	<i>De natura deorum</i>
<i>Off.</i>	<i>De officiis</i>
<i>Opt. gen.</i>	<i>De optimo genere oratorum</i>
<i>Or. Brut.</i>	<i>Orator ad M. Brutum</i>
<i>Parad.</i>	<i>Paradoxa Stoicorum</i>
<i>Part. or.</i>	<i>De partitiones oratoriae</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Orationes philippicae</i>
<i>Pis.</i>	<i>In Pisonem</i>
<i>Prov. cons.</i>	<i>De provinciis consularibus</i>
<i>Quinct.</i>	<i>Pro Quinctio</i>
<i>Quint. frat.</i>	<i>Epistulae ad Quintum fratrem</i>
<i>Rab. per.</i>	<i>Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo</i>
<i>Rab. post.</i>	<i>Pro Rabirio postumo</i>
<i>Resp.</i>	<i>De republica</i>
<i>Rosc. Amer.</i>	<i>Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino</i>
<i>Rosc. com.</i>	<i>Pro Q. Roscio comoedo</i>
<i>Sen.</i>	<i>De senectute</i>
<i>Sest.</i>	<i>Pro Sestio</i>
<i>Tusc.</i>	<i>Tusculanae disputationes</i>
<i>Vat.</i>	<i>In Vatinius</i>
<i>Verr.</i>	<i>In Verrem</i>
CIG	<i>Corpus inscriptionum graecarum</i> . Edited by A. Boeckh. 4 vols. Berlin, 1828–1877
CIJ	<i>Corpus inscriptionum judaicarum</i>
CIL	<i>Corpus inscriptionum latinarum</i>
1–2 Clem.	1–2 <i>Clement</i>

Clement of Alexandria	Clement of Alexandria <i>Stromata</i>
<i>Strom.</i>	<i>Codex justinianus</i>
<i>Cod. justin.</i>	<i>Codex theodosianus</i>
<i>Cod. theod.</i>	column
col.	Colossians
Col	
Columella	
<i>Arb.</i>	<i>De arboribus (On Trees)</i>
<i>Rust.</i>	<i>De re rustica (On Agriculture)</i>
1–2 Cor	1–2 Corinthians
Cornelius Nepos	Cornelius Nepos <i>Generals</i>
Cornutus <i>Nat. d.</i>	Cornutus <i>De natura deorum</i>
<i>Corp. herm.</i>	<i>Corpus hermeticum</i>
<i>CPJ</i>	<i>Corpus papyrorum judaicorum</i>
<i>Cyn. Ep.</i>	<i>The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition.</i> Edited by Abraham J. Malherbe. Missoula, Mont., 1977
Dan	Daniel
Demetrius	Demetrius <i>On Style (De elocutione)</i>
Demosthenes	
<i>Ag. Androtion</i>	<i>Against Androtion</i>
<i>Crown</i>	<i>On the Crown</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistles</i>
<i>Or.</i>	<i>Oration</i>
Deut	Deuteronomy
<i>Deut. Rab.</i>	<i>Deuteronomy Rabbah</i>
<i>Did.</i>	<i>Didache</i>
<i>Dig.</i>	<i>Digest</i>
Dio Cassius <i>R.H.</i>	Dio Cassius <i>Roman History</i>
Dio Chrysostom <i>Or.</i>	Dio Chrysostom <i>Oration</i>
Diodorus Siculus	Diodorus Siculus <i>Bibliotheca historica</i>
Diogenes Laertius	Diogenes Laertius <i>Lives of Eminent Philosophers</i>
<i>Diogn.</i>	<i>Diognetus</i>
Dionysius of Halicarnassus	
<i>2 Amm.</i>	<i>Second Letter to Ammaeus</i>
<i>Demosth.</i>	<i>Demosthenes</i>
<i>Isoc.</i>	<i>Isocrates</i>
<i>Lit. Comp.</i>	<i>Literary Composition</i>
<i>R.A.</i>	<i>Roman Antiquities</i>
<i>Thucyd.</i>	<i>Thucydides</i>
Disc.	Discourses
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
Eccl	Ecclesiastes
<i>Eccl. Rab.</i>	<i>Ecclesiastes Rabbah</i>
‘ <i>Ed.</i>	‘ <i>Eduyyot</i>
1–3 <i>En.</i>	1–3 <i>Enoch</i> (2 <i>En.</i> has recensions A and J)
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistle</i> (Cynic Epistles)
<i>Ep Jer</i>	Epistle of Jeremiah
<i>Eph</i>	Ephesians
Epictetus	
<i>Diatr.</i>	<i>Diatribai</i>
<i>Ench.</i>	<i>Enchiridion</i>
Epid. inscr.	Epidaurus inscription
epil.	epilogue

Epiphanius <i>Pan.</i>	<i>Panarion (Refutation of All Heresies)</i>
^c <i>Erub.</i>	^c <i>Erubin</i>
1 Esd	1 Esdras
esp.	especially
<i>EstBib</i>	<i>Estudios bíblicos</i>
Esth	Esther
<i>Esth. Rab.</i>	<i>Esther Rabbah</i>
Eunapius <i>Lives</i>	Eunapius <i>Lives of the Sophists</i>
Euripides	
<i>Alc.</i>	<i>Alcestis</i>
<i>Andr.</i>	<i>Andromache</i>
<i>Bacch.</i>	<i>Bacchanals</i>
<i>Cycl.</i>	<i>Cyclops</i>
<i>El.</i>	<i>Electra</i>
<i>Hec.</i>	<i>Hecuba</i>
<i>Heracl.</i>	<i>Children of Hercules</i>
<i>Herc. fur.</i>	<i>Madness of Hercules</i>
<i>Hipp.</i>	<i>Hippolytus</i>
<i>Iph. aul.</i>	<i>Iphigeneia at Aulis</i>
<i>Iph. taur.</i>	<i>Iphigeneia at Tauris</i>
<i>Orest.</i>	<i>Orestes</i>
<i>Phoen.</i>	<i>Phoenician Maidens</i>
<i>Suppl.</i>	<i>Suppliants</i>
<i>Tro.</i>	<i>Daughters of Troy</i>
Eusebius	
<i>Hist. eccl.</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>Praep. ev.</i>	<i>Preparation for the Gospel</i>
EvQ	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
Exod	Exodus
<i>Exod. Rab.</i>	<i>Exodus Rabbah</i>
<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>Expository Times</i>
Ezek	Ezekiel
f(f).	and the following one(s)
frg.	fragment(s)
<i>Frg. Tg.</i>	<i>Fragmentary Targum</i>
Gaius <i>Inst.</i>	Gaius <i>Institutes</i>
Gal	Galatians
Galen N.F.	Galen <i>Natural Faculties</i>
Gen	Genesis
<i>Gen. Rab.</i>	<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>
<i>Git.</i>	<i>Gittin</i>
<i>Gk. Apoc. Ezra</i>	<i>Greek Apocalypse of Ezra</i>
Gorgias <i>Hel.</i>	Gorgias <i>Helena</i>
<i>Gos. Pet.</i>	<i>Gospel of Peter</i>
<i>Gos. Thom.</i>	<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>
<i>Greek Anth.</i>	<i>Greek Anthology</i>
Gregory Nazianzus <i>Or.</i>	Gregory Nazianzus <i>Orationes</i>
Hab	Habakkuk
Hag	Haggai
<i>Hag.</i>	<i>Hagigah</i>
<i>Hal.</i>	<i>Hallah</i>
Hamm.	Code of Hammurabi
Heb	Hebrews
Heb.	Hebrew
Heliodorus <i>Aeth.</i>	Heliodorus <i>Aethiopica</i>

Heraclitus <i>Ep.</i>	Heraclitus <i>Epistle</i>
Herm.	<i>Shepherd of Hermas</i>
<i>Mand.</i>	<i>Mandate</i>
<i>Sim.</i>	<i>Similitude</i>
<i>Vis.</i>	<i>Vision</i>
Hermogenes <i>Issues</i>	Hermogenes <i>On Issues</i>
Herodian	Herodian <i>History</i>
Herodotus <i>Hist.</i>	Herodotus <i>Histories</i>
Hesiod	
<i>Astron.</i>	<i>Astronomy</i>
<i>Op.</i>	<i>Works and Days (Opera et dies)</i>
<i>Scut.</i>	<i>Shield</i>
<i>Theog.</i>	<i>Theogony</i>
Hierocles	
<i>Fatherland</i>	<i>On Duties. How to Conduct Oneself toward One's Fatherland</i>
<i>Love</i>	<i>On Duties. On Fraternal Love</i>
<i>Marr.</i>	<i>On Duties. On Marriage</i>
<i>Parents</i>	<i>On Duties. How to Conduct Oneself toward One's Parents</i>
Hippolytus <i>Haer.</i>	<i>Refutation of All Heresies</i>
<i>Hom. Hymn</i>	<i>Homeric Hymn</i>
Homer	
<i>Il.</i>	<i>Iliad</i>
<i>Od.</i>	<i>Odyssey</i>
<i>Hor.</i>	<i>Horayot</i>
Horace	
<i>Carm.</i>	<i>Odes</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistles</i>
<i>Sat.</i>	<i>Satires</i>
Hos	Hosea
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
<i>Hul.</i>	<i>Hullin</i>
Iamblichus <i>Bab. St.</i>	Iamblichus (2d cent.) <i>A Babylonian Story</i>
Iamblichus (3d–4th cents.)	
<i>Myst.</i>	<i>Mysteries</i>
<i>V.P.</i>	<i>Life of Pythagoras</i>
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>IG</i>	<i>Inscriptiones graecae</i>
<i>IGLS</i>	<i>Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie</i>
<i>Ign.</i>	Ignatius
<i>Eph.</i>	<i>Epistle to the Ephesians</i>
<i>Magn.</i>	<i>Epistle to the Magnesians</i>
<i>Phld.</i>	<i>Epistle to the Philadelphians</i>
<i>Rom.</i>	<i>Epistle to the Romans</i>
<i>Smyrn.</i>	<i>Epistle to the Smyrnaeans</i>
<i>Trall.</i>	<i>Epistle to the Trallians</i>
<i>IGRR</i>	<i>Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes</i>
<i>IIt.</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Italiae</i>
<i>ILS</i>	<i>Inscriptiones latinae selectae</i> . Edited by Dessau
Incant. Text	Incantation text from corpus of Aramaic incantation texts. See bibliography, Isbell, <i>Bowls</i> .
intr.	introduction
Irenaeus <i>Haer.</i>	Irenaeus <i>Against Heresies</i>
Isa	Isaiah

Isocrates

<i>Ad Nic.</i>	<i>To Nicocles (Or. 2)</i>
<i>Demon.</i>	<i>To Demonicus</i>
<i>Nic.</i>	<i>Nicocles (Or. 3)</i>
<i>Or.</i>	<i>Oration</i>
<i>Panath.</i>	<i>Panathenaicus</i>
<i>Paneg.</i>	<i>Panegyricus</i>
<i>Peace</i>	<i>On the Peace</i>

Jas

James

JBL

Journal of Biblical Literature

Jdt

Judith

JE

The Jewish Encyclopedia. Edited by I. Singer. 12 vols. New York, 1925

Jer

Jeremiah

Jerome

<i>Comm. Gal.</i>	<i>Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians</i>
<i>Pelag.</i>	<i>Dialogues against the Pelagians</i>

JETS

Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society

JJS

Journal of Jewish Studies

John Chrysostom

<i>Hom. Jo.</i>	<i>Homilies on St. John</i>
<i>Hom. Matt.</i>	<i>Homilies on St. Matthew</i>

Jos. Asen.

*Joseph and Aseneth*¹

Josephus

<i>Ag. Ap.</i>	<i>Against Apion</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>
<i>Life</i>	<i>The Life</i>
<i>War</i>	<i>Jewish War</i>

Josh

Joshua

JQR

Jewish Quarterly Review

JSJ

Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods

JSNT

Journal for the Study of the New Testament

JSP

Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha

JTS

Journal of Theological Studies

Jub.

Jubilees

Judg

Judges

Julius Africanus *Arist.*Julius Africanus *Letter to Aristides*

Justin

<i>1 Apol.</i>	<i>First Apology</i>
<i>2 Apol.</i>	<i>Second Apology</i>
<i>Dial.</i>	<i>Dialogue with Trypho</i>

Justinian *Inst.**Justinian Institutes*Juvenal *Sat.**Juvenal Satires**Ker.**Keritot**Ketub.**Ketubbot*

1–2 Kgs

1–2 Kings

*Kil.**KiP'ayim**Kip.**Kippurim* (Tosefta)

KJV

King James Version

KRT

Keret Epic

L.A.B.

Liber antiquitatum biblicarum (Pseudo-Philo)*Lad. Jac.**Ladder of Jacob*

¹I list double enumerations where the OUP translation (listed first) and the standard Greek text differ. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

L.A.E.	<i>Life of Adam and Eve</i>
Lam. Rab.	<i>Lamentations Rabbah</i>
Lat.	Latin
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
Let. Aris.	<i>Letter of Aristeas</i>
Lev	Leviticus
Lev. Rab.	<i>Leviticus Rabbah</i>
lit.	literally
Liv. Pro.	<i>Lives of the Prophets</i> ²
Livy	<i>Livy Annals of the Roman People</i>
Longinus Subl.	Longinus <i>On the Sublime</i>
Longus	Longus <i>Daphnis and Chloe</i>
Lucan C.W.	Lucan <i>Civil War</i>
Lucian	
Abdic.	<i>Disowned</i>
Alex.	<i>Alexander the False Prophet</i>
[Asin.]	<i>Lucius, or The Ass</i>
Hist.	<i>How to Write History</i>
Peregr.	<i>The Passing of Peregrinus</i>
Philops.	<i>The Lover of Lies</i>
Somn.	<i>The Dream, or Lucian's Career</i>
Syr. d.	<i>The Goddess of Syria</i>
Lucretius Nat.	Lucretius <i>De rerum natura</i>
LXX	Septuagint
Lycophron Alex.	Lycophron <i>Alexandra</i>
Lysias Or.	Lysias <i>Oration</i>
m.	Mishnah
Ma ^c as.	<i>Ma^caserot</i>
Ma ^c as. Š.	<i>Ma^caser Šeni</i>
Macc	Maccabees (1–4 Maccabees)
Macrobius	
Comm.	<i>Commentarius</i>
Sat.	<i>Saturnalia</i>
Mak.	<i>Makkot</i>
Makš.	<i>Makširin</i>
Mal	Malachi
Marcus Aurelius	Marcus Aurelius <i>Meditations</i>
Mart. Pol.	<i>Martyrdom of Polycarp</i>
Martial Epigr.	Martial <i>Epigrams</i>
Matt	Matthew
Maximus of Tyre Or.	Maximus of Tyre <i>Oration</i>
Meg.	<i>Megillah</i>
Me ^c il.	<i>Me^cilah</i>
Mek.	<i>Mekilta</i> (ed. Lauterbach)
^c Am.	<i>^cAmalek</i>
Bah.	<i>Bahodeš</i>
Beš.	<i>Bešallah</i>
Nez.	<i>Neziqin</i>
Šab.	<i>Šabbata</i>
Šir.	<i>Širata</i>
Vay.	<i>Vayassa</i> [?]
Menah.	<i>Menahot</i>
Mic	Micah

<i>Mid.</i>	<i>Middot</i>
<i>Midr. Pss.</i>	<i>Midrash on Psalms (Tehillim)</i>
<i>Miqw.</i>	<i>Miqwa'ot</i>
<i>Mo^oed Qat.</i>	<i>Mo^oed Qatan</i>
MSS	some manuscripts
MT	Masoretic Text
Murat. Canon	Muratorian Canon
n(n).	note(s)
Nah	Nahum
NASB	New American Standard Bible
<i>Naz.</i>	<i>Nazir</i>
NEB	New English Bible
<i>Ned.</i>	<i>Nedarim</i>
<i>Neg.</i>	<i>Nega^cim</i>
Neh	Nehemiah
Nestle-Aland	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , Nestle-Aland
<i>Nez.</i>	<i>Neziqin</i>
NHL	<i>The Nag Hammadi Library in English</i> . Edited by James M. Robinson. San Francisco, 1977
<i>Nid.</i>	<i>Niddah</i>
NIDNTT	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</i> . Edited by C. Brown. 4 vols. Grand Rapids, 1975–1985
<i>Nin. Rom.</i>	<i>The Ninus Romance</i> (see Longus in bibliography)
NIV	New International Version
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NS	New Series
NT	New Testament
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
Num	Numbers
<i>Num. Rab.</i>	<i>Numbers Rabbah</i>
<i>Odes Sol.</i>	<i>Odes of Solomon</i>
OGIS	<i>Orientalis graeci inscriptiones selectae</i>
^o <i>Ohal.</i>	^o <i>Ohalot</i>
<i>Or.</i>	<i>Oration</i>
Origen	
<i>Cels.</i>	<i>Against Celsus</i>
<i>Comm. Jo.</i>	<i>Commentary on John</i>
<i>Comm. Matt.</i>	<i>Commentary on Matthew</i>
<i>Hom. Exod.</i>	<i>Homilies on Exodus</i>
OT	Old Testament
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City, N.Y., 1983–1985
Ovid	
<i>Her.</i>	<i>Heroides</i>
<i>Metam.</i>	<i>Metamorphoses</i>
<i>p.</i>	Palestinian (Jerusalem) Talmud
<i>par.</i>	parallel, paragraph(s)
Parthenius	
<i>L.R.</i>	<i>Love Romance</i>
<i>Paul and Thecla</i>	<i>Acts of Paul and Thecla</i>
Pausanias	Pausanias <i>Description of Greece</i>
P.Beatty	Chris S. Keener, <i>The Gospel of John</i>
P.Bour.	Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission. Papyrus Bouriant

P.Cair.Masp.	<i>Catalogue des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire: Papyrus grecs d'époque byzantine</i> , vols. 1–3. Edited by J. Maspero
P.Cair.Zen.	<i>Catalogue des antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire: Zenon Papyri</i> , vols. 1–4. Edited by C. C. Edgar
P.Col.	Papyrus Columbia
PDM	<i>Papyri demoticae magicae</i> . Demotic texts in PGM corpus as collated in <i>The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including Demotic Spells</i> . Edited by H. D. Betz. Chicago, 1996
P.Eleph.	Elephantine Papyri
P.Enteux.	Enteuxeis Papyri
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
Persius Sat.	Persius Satires
Pesah.	<i>Pesahim</i>
Pesiq. Rab.	<i>Pesiqta Rabbati</i>
Pesiq. Rab Kah.	<i>Pesiqta de Rab Kahana</i>
Sup.	Supplement
1–2 Pet	1–2 Peter
Petronius Sat.	Petronius Satyricon
P.Giess.	<i>Griechische Papyri zu Giessen</i> . Edited by E. Kornemann, O. Eger, and P. M. Meyer
PGM	<i>Papyri graecae magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri</i> . Edited by K. Preisendanz. Berlin, 1928
P.Grenf.	<i>Greek Papyri</i> . Edited by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt
P.Gur.	<i>Greek Papyri from Gurob</i> . Edited by J. G. Smyly
Phaedrus	Phaedrus Fables
P.Hal.	Halle Papyri
P.Hib.	Hibeh Papyri
Phil	Philippians
Philo	
Abraham	<i>On the Life of Abraham</i>
Agriculture	<i>On Agriculture</i>
Alleg. Interp.	<i>Allegorical Interpretation</i>
Cherubim	<i>On the Cherubim</i>
Confusion	<i>On the Confusion of Tongues</i>
Congr.	<i>De congressu eruditionis gratia</i>
Contempl. Life	<i>On the Contemplative Life</i>
Creation	<i>On the Creation of the World</i>
Decalogue	<i>On the Decalogue</i>
Dreams 1, 2	<i>On Dreams 1, 2</i>
Drunkenness	<i>On Drunkenness</i>
Embassy	<i>On the Embassy to Gaius</i>
Eternity	<i>On the Eternity of the World</i>
Flaccus	<i>Against Flaccus</i>
Flight	<i>On Flight and Finding</i>
Giants	<i>On Giants</i>
Good Person	<i>Every Good Person Is Free</i>
Heir	<i>Who Is the Heir?</i>
Hypoth.	<i>Hypothetica</i>
Joseph	<i>On the Life of Joseph</i>
Migration	<i>On the Migration of Abraham</i>
Moses 1, 2	<i>On the Life of Moses 1, 2</i>
Names	<i>On the Change of Names</i>
Planting	<i>On Planting</i>
Posterity	<i>On the Posterity of Cain</i>
Prelim. Studies	<i>On the Preliminary Studies</i>

Providence 1, 2	<i>On Providence 1, 2</i>
QE, 1, 2	<i>Questions and Answers on Exodus, 1, 2</i>
QG 1, 2, 3, 4	<i>Questions and Answers on Genesis 1, 2, 3, 4</i>
Rewards	<i>On Rewards and Punishments</i>
Sacrifices	<i>On the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel</i>
Sobriety	<i>On Sobriety</i>
Spec. Laws 1, 2, 3, 4	<i>On the Special Laws 1, 2, 3, 4</i>
Unchangeable	<i>That God Is Unchangeableness</i>
Virtues	<i>On the Virtues</i>
Worse	<i>That the Worse Attacks the Better</i>
Philostratus	
Ep.	<i>Epistles</i>
Hrk.	<i>Heroikos</i>
Vit. Apoll.	<i>Vita Apollonii</i>
Vit. soph.	<i>Vitae sophistarum</i>
Phlm	<i>Philemon</i>
Pindar	
Nem.	<i>Nemean Odes</i>
Ol.	<i>Olympian Odes</i>
Pyth.	<i>Pythian Odes</i>
Pirqe R. El.	<i>Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer</i>
Piska	<i>Pesahim (Tosefta tractate)</i>
Plato	
Alc.	<i>Alcibiades</i>
Apol.	<i>Apology of Socrates</i>
Charm.	<i>Charmides</i>
Crat.	<i>Cratylus</i>
Leg.	<i>Laws</i>
Parm.	<i>Parmenides</i>
Rep.	<i>Republic</i>
Symp.	<i>Symposium</i>
Theaet.	<i>Theaetetus</i>
Tim.	<i>Timaeus</i>
Pliny	
Ep.	<i>Pliny the Younger Epistles</i>
Nat.	<i>Pliny the Elder Natural History</i>
Pan.	<i>Pliny the Younger Panegyricus</i>
P.Lond.	<i>Greek Papyri in the British Museum.</i> Edited by F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell
Plotinus Enn.	<i>Plotinus Ennead</i>
Plutarch	
Alex.	<i>Alexander</i>
Alc.	<i>Alcibiades</i>
Apoll.	<i>Consolation to Apollonius</i>
Borr.	<i>That We Ought Not to Borrow</i>
Bride	<i>Advice to Bride and Groom</i>
Cam.	<i>Camillus</i>
Cic.	<i>Cicero</i>
Cleverness	<i>Cleverness of Animals</i>
Consol.	<i>Consolation to His Wife</i>
Cor.	<i>Marcus Coriolanus</i>
Demosth.	<i>Demosthenes</i>
Dinner	<i>Dinner of the Seven Wise Men</i>
D.V.	<i>On the Delays of the Divine Vengeance</i>

<i>Educ.</i>	<i>The Education of Children</i>
<i>Exile</i>	<i>On Exile</i>
<i>Flatterer</i>	<i>How to Tell a Flatterer from a Friend</i>
<i>Fort. Alex.</i>	<i>On the Fortune or the Virtue of Alexander</i>
<i>Fort. Rom.</i>	<i>Fortune of Romans</i>
<i>Gen. of Soul</i>	<i>Generation of the Soul in the Timaeus</i>
<i>G.Q.</i>	<i>The Greek Questions</i>
<i>G.R.P.S.</i>	<i>Greek and Roman Parallel Stories</i>
<i>Isis</i>	<i>Isis and Osiris</i>
<i>Lect.</i>	<i>On Lectures</i>
<i>L.S.</i>	<i>Love Stories</i>
<i>Many Friends</i>	<i>On Having Many Friends</i>
<i>Moon</i>	<i>Concerning the Face Which Appears in the Orb of the Moon</i>
<i>Mor.</i>	<i>Moralia</i>
<i>Mus.</i>	<i>On Music</i>
<i>Nat. Q.</i>	<i>Natural Questions</i>
<i>Obsol.</i>	<i>Obsolescence of Oracles</i>
<i>O.M.P.A.</i>	<i>Old Men in Public Affairs</i>
<i>Oracles at Delphi</i>	<i>Oracles at Delphi No Longer Given in Verse</i>
<i>Plat. Q.</i>	<i>Platonic Questions</i>
<i>Pleas. L.</i>	<i>That Epicurus Actually Makes a Pleasant Life Impossible</i>
<i>Poetry</i>	<i>How the Young Man Should Study Poetry</i>
<i>Praising</i>	<i>On Praising Oneself Inoffensively</i>
<i>Profit by Enemies</i>	<i>How to Profit by One's Enemies</i>
<i>Rom.</i>	<i>Romulus</i>
<i>R.Q.</i>	<i>The Roman Questions</i>
<i>S.K.</i>	<i>Sayings of Kings and Commanders</i>
<i>S.R.</i>	<i>Sayings of Romans</i>
<i>S.S.</i>	<i>Sayings of Spartans</i>
<i>S.S.W.</i>	<i>Sayings of Spartan Women</i>
<i>Statecraft</i>	<i>Precepts of Statecraft</i>
<i>Stoic Cont.</i>	<i>Stoic Self-Contradictions</i>
<i>Superst.</i>	<i>Superstition</i>
<i>Them.</i>	<i>Themistocles</i>
<i>T.T.</i>	<i>Table Talk</i>
<i>Uned. R.</i>	<i>To an Uneducated Ruler</i>
<i>Virt.</i>	<i>Virtue and Vice</i>
<i>Vit.</i>	<i>Parallel Lives</i>
<i>W.V.S.C.U.</i>	<i>Whether Vice Be Sufficient to Cause Unhappiness</i>
<i>Pol. Phil.</i>	<i>Polycarp To the Philippians</i>
<i>Polybius</i>	<i>Polybius History of the Roman Republic</i>
<i>Porphyry</i>	
<i>Ar. Cat.</i>	<i>On Aristotle's Categories</i>
<i>C. Chr.</i>	<i>Against the Christians</i>
<i>Marc.</i>	<i>To Marcella</i>
<i>V.P.</i>	<i>Life of Pythagoras</i>
<i>P.Oxy.</i>	<i>Papyrus Oxyrhynchus</i>
<i>P.Paris</i>	<i>Les Papyrus grecs du Musée du Louvre.</i> Edited by W. Brunet de Presle and E. Egger
<i>P.Pet.</i>	<i>Flinders Petrie Papyri</i>
<i>Pr. Jos.</i>	<i>Prayer of Joseph</i>
<i>Pr. Man.</i>	<i>Prayer of Manasseh</i>
<i>pref.</i>	<i>preface</i>
<i>prol.</i>	<i>prologue</i>
<i>Propertius Eleg.</i>	<i>Propertius Elegies</i>

Prov	Proverbs
P.Ryl.	<i>Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Rylands Library</i> . Edited by A. S. Hunt, J. de M. Johnson, and V. Martin
Ps	Psalms
Ps.-	Pseudo-
P.Sakaon	Sakaon Papyri
P.S.I.	<i>Papyri della Società Italiana</i> . Edited by G. Vitelli et al.
Ps.-Callisthenes Alex.	Pseudo-Callisthenes <i>Alexander Romance</i>
Ps.-Clem.	<i>Pseudo-Clementines</i>
Ps.-Phoc.	Pseudo-Phocylides
Pss. Sol.	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>
P.Strassb.	Strassburg Papyri
P.Tebt.	<i>The Tebtunis Papyri</i> . Edited by B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, J. G. Smyly, and E. J. Goodspeed
P.Thead.	<i>Papyrus de Théadelphie</i> . Edited by P. Jouquet
Ptolemy Tetr.	Ptolemy <i>Tetrabiblos</i> .
Pyth. Sent.	<i>The Pythagorean Sentences</i>
Q	Quelle (hypothetical common source for Matt and Luke)
1QapGen	Qumran <i>Genesis Apocryphon</i>
1QH	Qumran <i>Thanksgiving Hymns</i>
1QM	Qumran <i>War Scroll</i>
1QpHab	Qumran <i>Peshar (commentary) on Habakkuk</i>
1QS	Qumran <i>Rule of the Community (Manual of Discipline)</i>
1QSa	Appendix A (<i>Rule of the Congregation</i>) to 1QS
4Q285	Qumran <i>Sefer ha-Milhamah</i>
11QT	Qumran <i>Temple Scroll</i>
Qidd.	<i>Qiddušin</i>
Quintilian	Quintilian <i>Institutes of Oratory</i>
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
rec.	recension
Rev	Revelation
Rev. Laws	<i>Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus</i> . Edited by B. P. Grenfell and J. P. Mahaffy (cited in <i>Sel. Pap.</i>)
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RevScRel	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
Rhet. ad Herenn.	<i>Rhetorica ad Herennium</i>
Rhet. Alex.	<i>Rhetorica ad Alexandrum</i>
RivB	<i>Rivista biblica italiana</i>
Rom	Romans
Roš Haš.	<i>Roš Haššanah</i>
Ruth Rab.	<i>Ruth Rabbah</i>
RV	Revised Version
Šabb.	<i>Šabbat</i>
Sallust	<i>War with Catiline</i>
<i>Catil.</i>	
<i>Jug.</i>	<i>War with Jugurtha</i>
1–2 Sam	1–2 Samuel
Sanh.	<i>Sanhedrin</i>
SB	<i>Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten</i> , vols. 1–. Edited by F. Preisigke et al., 1915–
Šeb.	<i>Šebiʿit</i>
Šebu.	<i>Šebuʿot</i>
SEG	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum
Sel. Pap.	<i>Select Papyri</i> . Edited by Hunt and Edgar
<i>Semaḥot</i>	<i>The Gospel of John</i>
<i>Semaḥot</i>	<i>Select Papyri</i> . Edited by Hunt and Edgar

Seneca	
<i>Apocol.</i>	Seneca the Younger <i>Apocolocyntosis</i>
<i>Benef.</i>	Seneca the Younger <i>On Benefits</i>
<i>Consol.</i>	Seneca the Younger <i>De consolatione</i>
<i>Controv.</i>	Seneca the Elder <i>Disputes</i>
<i>Dial.</i>	Seneca the Younger <i>Dialogues</i>
<i>Ep. Lucil.</i>	Seneca the Younger <i>Epistles to Lucilius</i>
<i>Nat.</i>	Seneca the Younger <i>Naturales quaestiones</i>
<i>Sent. Sext.</i>	<i>Sentences of Sextus</i>
<i>Šeqal.</i>	<i>Šeqalim</i>
Sextus Empiricus	
<i>Eth.</i>	<i>Against the Ethicists</i>
<i>Pyr.</i>	<i>Outlines of Pyrrhonism</i>
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>
SIG	<i>Sylloge inscriptionum graecarum</i> . Edited by W Dittenberger. 4 vols. 3d ed. Leipzig, 1915–1924
Sim.	Similitudes of Enoch (<i>1 Enoch</i> 37–71)
sing.	singular
<i>Sipra</i>	
<i>A.M.</i>	² <i>Aḥarê Mot</i>
<i>Behor</i>	<i>Behor</i>
<i>Behuq.</i>	<i>Behuqotai</i>
<i>Emor</i>	<i>Emor</i>
<i>Mes.</i>	<i>Mesora</i>
<i>Neg.</i>	<i>Nega^cim</i>
<i>par.</i>	<i>parashah</i>
<i>pq.</i>	<i>pereq</i>
<i>Qed.</i>	<i>Qedošim</i>
<i>Sav</i>	<i>Sav</i>
<i>Sav M.D.</i>	<i>Sav Mekhilta DeMiluim</i>
<i>Sh.</i>	<i>Shemini</i>
<i>Sh. M.D.</i>	<i>Shemini Mekhilta deMiluim</i>
<i>Taz.</i>	<i>Tazria</i>
<i>VDDeho.</i>	<i>Vayyiqra Dibura Dehobah</i>
<i>VDDen.</i>	<i>Vayyiqra Dibura Denedabah</i>
<i>Sipre Deut.</i>	<i>Sipre on Deuteronomy</i>
<i>Sipre Num.</i>	<i>Sipre on Numbers</i>
Sir	Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
Song	Song of Songs (Song of Solomon, Canticles)
<i>Song Rab.</i>	<i>Song of Solomon Rabbah</i>
Sophocles	
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Antigone</i>
<i>El.</i>	<i>Electra</i>
<i>Oed. col.</i>	<i>Oedipus at Colonus</i>
<i>Oed. tyr.</i>	<i>Oedipus the King</i>
<i>Phil.</i>	<i>Philoctetes</i>
<i>Trach.</i>	<i>Women of Trachis</i>
Stobaeus Ecl.	Stobaeus <i>Eclogues</i> (= <i>Anthology</i> 1–2)
Strabo Geog.	Strabo <i>Geography</i>
Suetonius	
<i>Aug.</i>	<i>Augustus</i>
<i>Calig.</i>	<i>Caligula</i>
<i>Gramm.</i>	<i>De grammaticis</i>
<i>Dom.</i>	<i>Domitian</i>

Tib.	<i>Tiberius</i>
Vesp.	<i>Vespasian</i>
Sup.	Supplement(s)
Sus	Susanna
s.v.	<i>sub verbo</i> , under the word
Syr. Did.	Syriac <i>Didaskalia</i>
Syr. Men.	<i>Sentences of the Syriac Menander</i>
Syr. Men. Epit.	<i>Syriac Menander Epitome</i>
t.	Tosefta
T. 12 Patr.	<i>Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>
T. Ab.	<i>Testament of Abraham</i> (Rec. A, B)
T. Adam	<i>Testament of Adam</i>
T. Ash.	<i>Testament of Asher</i>
T. Benj.	<i>Testament of Benjamin</i>
T. Dan	<i>Testament of Dan</i>
T. Iss.	<i>Testament of Issachar</i>
T. Job	<i>Testament of Job</i>
T. Jos.	<i>Testament of Joseph</i>
T. Jud.	<i>Testament of Judah</i>
T. Levi	<i>Tetament of Levi</i>
T. Mos.	<i>Testament of Moses</i>
T. Naph.	<i>Testament of Naphtal</i>
T. Reu.	<i>Testament of Reuben</i>
T. Sim.	<i>Testament of Simeon</i>
T. Sol.	<i>Testament of Solomon</i>
T. Zeb.	<i>Testament of Zebulun</i>
Ta ^c an.	Ta ^c anit
Tacitus	
Ann.	<i>Annals</i>
Hist.	<i>History</i>
Tanḥ.	<i>Tanḥuma</i>
Tatian	<i>Oration to the Greeks</i>
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–1976
Ṭehar.	<i>Ṭeharot</i>
Tem.	<i>Temurah</i>
Ter.	<i>Terumot</i>
Tertullian	
Apol.	<i>Apology</i>
Bapt.	<i>Baptism</i>
Spec.	<i>The Shows (De Spectaculis)</i>
Tg. 1 Chr.	<i>Targum 1 Chronicles</i>
Tg. Eccl.	<i>Targum Ecclesiastes</i>
Tg. Esth.	<i>Targum Esther</i>
Tg. Hos.	<i>Targum Hosea</i>
Tg. Isa.	<i>Targum Isaiah</i>
Tg. Jer.	<i>Targum Jeremiah</i>
Tg. Job	<i>Targum Job</i>
Tg. Jon.	<i>Targum Jonathan</i>
Tg. Mic.	<i>Targum Micah</i>
Tg. Neof.	<i>Targum Neofiti</i>
Tg. Onq.	<i>Targum Onqelos</i>
Tg. Qoh.	<i>Targum Qoheleth</i>
Tg. Ps.-J.	<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</i>

Tg. Song	<i>Targum Song of Solomon</i>
Tg. Yer.	<i>Jerusalem Targum</i>
Theon <i>Progymn.</i>	<i>Theon Progymnasmata</i>
Theophilus	<i>Theophilus To Autolytus</i>
Theophrastus	
<i>Caus. plant.</i>	<i>De causis plantarum</i>
<i>Char.</i>	<i>Characteres</i>
1–2 Thess	1–2 Thessalonians
Thucydides	<i>Thucydides History of the Peloponnesian War</i>
1–2 Tim	1–2 Timothy
Tit	Titus
Tob	Tobit
trans.	translated by, translation
<i>Treat. Shem</i>	<i>Treatise of Shem</i>
UBS	<i>The Greek New Testament</i> , United Bible Societies
Ulpian <i>Dig.</i>	<i>Ulpian Digests</i>
UT	<i>Ugaritic Tablets</i>
Valerius Flaccus	<i>Valerius Flaccus Argonautica</i>
Valerius Maximus	<i>Valerius Maximus Facta et dicta memorabilia</i>
Varro L.L.	<i>Varro On the Latin Language</i>
Virgil	
<i>Aen.</i>	<i>Aeneid</i>
<i>Catal.</i>	<i>Catalepton</i>
<i>Ecl.</i>	<i>Eclogues</i>
<i>Georg.</i>	<i>Georgics</i>
<i>Priap.</i>	<i>Priapea</i>
Vitruvius <i>Arch.</i>	<i>Vitruvius On Architecture</i>
vs.	versus
<i>W. Chrest.</i>	U. Wilcken, <i>Chrestomathie</i>
Wis	Wisdom of Solomon
WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
WUNT	<i>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i>
Xenophon	
<i>Anab.</i>	<i>Anabasis</i>
<i>Apol.</i>	<i>Apologia Socratis</i>
<i>Cyr.</i>	<i>Cyropaedia</i>
<i>Hell.</i>	<i>Hellenica</i>
<i>Mem.</i>	<i>Memorabilia</i>
<i>Oec.</i>	<i>Oeconomicus</i>
<i>Symp.</i>	<i>Symposium</i>
Xenophon <i>Eph.</i>	<i>Xenophon of Ephesus An Ephesian Tale</i>
<i>Yad.</i>	<i>Yadayim</i>
<i>Yal. Isa.</i>	<i>Yalqut on Isaiah</i>
<i>Yebam.</i>	<i>Yebamot</i>
<i>Zebaḥ.</i>	<i>Zebaḥim</i>
Zech	Zechariah
Zeph	Zephaniah
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>



INTRODUCTION

We must investigate some basic introductory questions concerning the Fourth Gospel before we examine the text in detail. Some issues, such as genre and the document's life-setting, will substantially affect the way we read the Fourth Gospel's narrative (e.g., whether as a transcript of events, pure symbolism, or something in between). Other issues, such as authorship, may contribute to a discussion of the Johannine tradition's reliability but are otherwise less relevant to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel; we will examine them after investigating genre and formal considerations, but they are less clear and less essential to this commentary's primary objective.

1. GENRE AND HISTORICAL CONSIDERATIONS

THE GENRE OF A WORK is its literary “type” or category; the genre’s frequent, hence anticipated, characteristics guide how informed readers will approach it. By conforming in some measure to generic patterns already present in the culture, a writer produces certain expectations in the readers of the work.¹ Although genres as categories are necessarily fluid, identifying the genre can reveal important purposes the author or authors had in seeking to communicate to an intended audience. The idea that genre affects interpretation would have made sense to the first readers of the Gospels,² since Greek writers also distinguished various categories for literary forms.³ Of the diverse models for genre criticism in antiquity, Aristotle’s prevailed longest.⁴ Although they articulated distinctions, however, in practice ancient writers regularly mixed genres.⁵

Although many current theories of interpretation reject the priority of the author’s intention, most recognize it as at least one level of meaning, especially for readers with historical interest.⁶ Many critics regard the author’s intention as unrecoverable; but all historical endeavor is necessarily conditioned by probability, and we may make probable inferences about the *implied* author from the text’s literary strategies in their historical context. As Burrige notes, “the purpose of the author is essential to any concept of genre as a set of expectations or contract between the author and the reader or audience.”⁷ Writers such as those who produced the Gospels sought “to communicate with intended readers,” a purpose that helped determine the text as we have it, whatever our subsequent purposes in utilizing the text.⁸ The kind of “meaning” one pursues will depend to a great extent on one’s goal in interpretation, but the historical goal of recovering how the implied readers of a document in its earliest historical context would have approached the

¹ Cf. Shuler, *Genre*, 25–28; Hirsch, *Interpretation*, 68–126.

² Although the Gospels were probably “heard” more often than “read,” at least aristocratic audiences could be described by ancient writers as their “readers” (e.g., Polybius 9.2.6).

³ E.g., Theon *Progymn.* 2.5–33; even different genres of speeches require different kinds of styles (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Demosth.* 45–46); see also the ancient division of Pindar’s various kinds of hymns and songs (Race, “Introduction,” 1). Of course, such categories were never strictly observed even in Greco-Roman texts, and Israelite-Jewish tradition rarely reflected on the theoretical categories (Aune, *Environment*, 23). Mixed genres were common in the early imperial period (idem, “Problem,” 10–11, 48).

⁴ Burrige, *Gospels*, 27–29.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 33–34, 56–61.

⁶ Certainly ancient writers debated about intention, both regarding deeds and legislative purpose (see Hermogenes *Issues* 61.16–18; 66.12–13; 72.14–73.3).

⁷ Burrige, *Gospels*, 125. See Ashton, *Understanding*, 113.

⁸ See Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts*, 175, also noting the extrinsic reality of this author and audience regardless of our ability to reconstruct them. Craig S. Keener: The Gospel of John
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

document is inseparable from attempts to reconstruct the work's genre and the strategies of the implied author in that historical context.⁹

Proposals concerning Gospel Genre

Readers from the mid-second century through most of the nineteenth century viewed the Gospels as biographies of some sort. This view prevailed until Votaw in 1915,¹⁰ when the Gospels' differences from modern biography led most scholars to seek a new classification for them.¹¹ Thus Burton Mack claims that in the early twentieth century scholars realized "that the gospels were not biographies and that they sustained a very problematic relation to history."¹²

The twentieth century generated a variety of proposals,¹³ some of which have proved less helpful than others. If identifying a document's generic category guides the way the reader interprets it, the earlier standard classification of the NT gospels as "unique"¹⁴ is not very helpful. Most works, including other Greco-Roman documents, are "unique" in some sense.¹⁵ Even though the four canonical gospels are closer to one another than they are to any other documents of antiquity,¹⁶ each is also distinct from the others,¹⁷ and all fit into a broader category of narrative.¹⁸ While it is true that the Gospels tell a unique story, and borrow biblical narrative techniques from their Jewish tradition, Jewish Christian readers would have been most familiar with coherent literary works concerning primary characters in terms of Hellenistic "lives," or ancient biographies.¹⁹

⁹ See, e.g., Allison, *Moses*, 3. If various authorial or redactional levels complicate the question of "authorial intention" in John (Smith, *John* [1999], 13), we mean the level of our completed Gospel in our earliest textual tradition, which we believe remained well within the range of earlier Johannine theology.

¹⁰ Stanton, *Gospels*, 15–17.

¹¹ Talbert, *Gospel*, 2–3, observing that Strauss, Bultmann (see Bultmann, *Tradition*, 372), and their followers rejected the biographical category because they confused the two.

¹² Mack, *Myth*, 16 n. 6; cf. Marxsen, *Mark*, 16.

¹³ For a fuller survey, see Burridge, *Gospels*, 3–25.

¹⁴ W. Schneemelcher in Hennecke, *Apocrypha*, 1:80; Riesenfeld, *Tradition*, 2; Guelich, "Genre." The designation "Gospels" appears to date from the mid-second century (Aune, *Environment*, 18, cites Justin *Dial.* 10.2; 100.1; Irenaeus *Haer.* 3.1.1; Clement of Alexandria *Stromata* 1.21), though some derive it from Mark's (Kelber, *Story*, 15) or Matthew's usage (Stanton, *New People*, 14–16) and it probably has antecedents in the LXX use of the term (Stuhlmacher, "Theme," 19–25; Betz, "Gospel").

¹⁵ Cf. Robbins, *Teacher*, 4–5.

¹⁶ So rightly Borchert, *John*, 29–30 (though noting differences between John and the Synoptics, p. 37).

¹⁷ Marxsen, *Mark*, 150, thus objects to applying Mark's term "Gospel" to Matthew and Luke, arguing that Matthew is a collection of "gospels" and sermons (pp. 150 n. 106; 205–6), and Luke a "life of Jesus" (150 n. 106). He is uncomfortable with the language of a Gospel "genre" (25).

¹⁸ Aune, *Environment*, 83, cites Quintilian 2.42; Cicero *Inv.* 1.27; Sextus Empiricus *Against the Professors* 1.263–264 for the three major categories (history, fiction, and myth or legend), though noting that they overlapped in practice (Strabo *Geog.* 1.2.17, 35); for distinctions between mythography and history proper, see Ford, *Nature of History*, 12.

¹⁹ Luz, *Matthew*, 1:44–45.

1. Folk Literature or Memoirs?

No more helpful or accurate is the suggestion that the Gospels represent *Kleinliteratur*, that is, popular or “folk literature” of the lower classes in contrast to the stylish, sophisticated literature of the upper classes.²⁰ While the Gospels’ oral sources were naturally transmitted in such a folk milieu, such forced categories prove unhelpful for genre criticism of the Gospels; they ignore the continuum between “folk literature” and the more stylish rhetoric and texts that strongly influenced them,²¹ as well as differences among the Gospels themselves (Luke represents a much more rhetorically sophisticated author than Mark).²² Specific genre categories like “biographies” actually appear throughout the continuum (e.g., contrast the popular *Life of Aesop* with the more literary *Agricola*).

The Gospels’ sources may well include collections of “memoirs”²³ (perhaps “Q” may be understood in such terms),²⁴ the sort that could constitute “folk” biographies. Some second-century Christian writers²⁵ viewed the Gospels—alongside other apostolic works—as “memoirs,” probably recalling Xenophon’s *Memorabilia*, a “life” of Socrates. Their use of this term provides attestation that, from an early period, some saw the Gospels as a form of biography.²⁶ A common general pattern does exist, but the canonical gospels may represent a different *kind* of biography from most collections of memoirs; they are complete literary narratives and not simply “folk” biographies, as most such collections would be.²⁷

In their present form the Gospels are relatively polished and intricate works, as literary critics have skillfully demonstrated. Such literary preparation is to be expected for writers in a Greco-Roman context. Ancient speechwriters, for instance, were expected to premeditate their works carefully, arranging the material in advance and fixing it in their memories, so that they needed add only finishing touches once they set out to write their speeches.²⁸ Similarly, writers of Greek and Latin narratives typically began with a rough draft before producing their final work;²⁹ Jewish writers in Greek could do the same.³⁰ The

²⁰This view was proposed by K. L. Schmidt, who provided analogies among later folk literatures of various cultures. He is followed by Kümmel, *Introduction*, 37; cf. Hunter, *Message*, 30; Deissmann, *Light*, 466.

²¹Downing, “Literature”; Aune, *Environment*, 12, 63; Burridge, *Gospels*, 11, 153. Rhetorical principles influenced narrative techniques; see, e.g., Dowden, “Apuleius.”

²²Koester, *Introduction*, 1:108; Kodell, *Luke*, 23; cf. Perry, *Sources*, 7. This is not to mention Luke’s architectonic patterns (for which see Goulder, *Acts*; Talbert, *Patterns*; idem, *Luke*; Tannehill, *Luke*).

²³E.g., Socratics *Ep.* 18, Xenophon to Socrates’ friends. Diogenes Laertius includes compilations of traditions, but from a variety of sources.

²⁴Cf. Papias frg. 6 (Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 3.39), on the hypothesis that Papias’s “Matthew” is our “Q” (cf. Filson, *History*, 83; rejected by Jeremias, *Theology*, 38). Downing, “Like Q,” compares Q with a Cynic “Life” (cf. Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 46); contrast Tuckett, “Q.”

²⁵Justin 1 *Apol.* 66.3; 67.3; *Dial.* 103.8; 106.3 (see Stanton, *New People*, 62–63; Abramowski, “Memoirs,” *pace* Koester).

²⁶See Robbins, *Teacher*, 62–67; Stanton, *New People*, 62–63.

²⁷This is not to deny the Synoptics’ substantial dependence on tradition, but tradition is not so dominant (as Jones, *Parables*, 36, seems to suggest) as to prohibit pursuit of literary coherence.

²⁸Quintilian 10.6.1–2. One should also be ready to add improvisations during the speech (10.6.5).

²⁹Cf., e.g., the opening Virgilic lines of the *Aeneid* removed by the final editors (LCL 1:240–241, esp. n. 1).

³⁰Aune, *Environment*, 128. Chris. Josephus, *The Gospel of John*, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission into better Greek (Ag. Ap. 1.49–50); some think the earlier version was an Aramaic draft, probably

Gospels are thus undoubtedly polished products of much effort, carefully arranged to communicate their points most adequately.³¹

The writers of the Synoptics, like writers of most ancient historical works, probably began with a basic draft of the material in chronological order, to which a topical outline, speeches, and other rhetorical adjustments would be added later.³² It was not, however, usually appropriate to “publish” the work in an unfinished form; one would complete the book, check copyists’ manuscripts when possible, and then give the first copy to the dedicatee when appropriate (Cicero *Att.* 13.21a, 23, 48).³³ Aristotle recommended sketching the plot in outline, then expanding by inserting episodes, and illustrates this with the *Odyssey*.³⁴ Like other Greek writers, Luke follows one source at a time, incorporating a large block of Q material into Mark;³⁵ both Luke and Matthew make Mark the backbone, and supplement Mark from other sources.³⁶ John’s adjustments toward rhetorical sophistication may in some respects be less elaborate than even those of Mark. Depending on the circumstances, some ancient observers could view incorporating preexisting lines as plagiarism, others (if the incorporation was obvious) as flattering the source (Seneca *Suasoriae* 3.7). The Gospels (especially if they were circulating anonymously, though this remains uncertain), however, functioned as common property of the apostolic church.

Whatever their sources, writers would likely normally pay careful attention to how they arranged their material, especially given the importance of arrangement even in oral discourse.³⁷ Some ancient writers recommended connecting episodes to provide continuity,³⁸ a practice followed by Mark (cf. 1:14–39). Others like Polybius, however, allowed disjunctions in their narratives, although recognizing that some disagreed with their practice.³⁹ This may explain the breaks in John’s narrative, which is structured more chronologically (following Jerusalem festivals) than the Synoptics.⁴⁰ The basic plot of this Gospel includes increasing conflict, and its overarching structure moves from signs that reveal Jesus’ identity (chs. 2–12) to instructions for his followers (chs. 13–17), the Passion Narra-

circulated among Parthian Jews (cf. Hata, “Version”), though the thoroughly Greek character of Josephus’s current work might count against this. One could also adapt earlier works; Josephus seems to have employed the *War* as his main source for the comparable portion of the *Antiquities* (Krieger, “Hauptquelle”); 3 and 4 Maccabees adapted material in 2 Maccabees (Gardner, “Mqbym”).

³¹ Thus allowing such literary techniques as foreshadowing (Quintilian 10.1.21). Editing provided the writer a chance to craft the material; thus, e.g., Epictetus’s *Discourses* undoubtedly bear less of Arrian’s stamp than the *Enchiridion*, where Arrian organizes and summarizes Epictetus’s teachings.

³² Burridge, *Gospels*, 203; Aune, *Environment*, 82, citing Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.47–50; Lucian *Hist.* 16, 48; *Demonax*.

³³ Although the old source theories concerning proto-Mark and proto-Luke are unfashionable, it is likely that proto-gospels existed temporarily (though unlikely that they were published); cf. Streeter, *Gospels*, 199–222; Taylor, *Formation*, 6, and appendix A; Wenham, “Parable.”

³⁴ Talbert, *John*, 64, citing Aristotle *Poet.* 17.6–11.

³⁵ Aune, *Environment*, 139.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 65; cf. Downing, “Conventions”; *idem*, “Actuality”; Burridge, *Gospels*, 204–5.

³⁷ See esp. Wuellner, “Arrangement.” Some forms of speeches did allow random sequence, however (Menander Rhetor 2.4.391.19–28; 392.9–14; 393.23–24).

³⁸ Aune, *Environment*, 90, cites Lucian *Hist.* 55; Quintilian 7.1.1.

³⁹ Aune, *Environment*, 90, cites Polybius 38.5.1–8.

⁴⁰ Cf. Bruns, *Art*, 24–25; Tenney, *John*, 40–41. Murray, “Feasts,” prefers John’s chronology to that of the Synoptics; Sanders, *Figures of Luke*, 117–18. Craig S. Keener, “The Gospel of John,” *Baker Academic*, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission. Baker, “Passover,” 316 may be correct that John intends most of the Passover material theologically.

tive (chs. 18–19), and resurrection appearances (chs. 20–21). Instead of strictly linear plot development, however, John’s plot often advances through the agency of repetition.⁴¹

Once a writer had completed such a public work, he (in most cases the writer was “he”) would “publish” it, that is, make it available to its intended readership.⁴² Typically this process would begin through public readings. The well-to-do would have readings as entertainment following dinner at banquets, but the Gospels would be read in gatherings of believers in homes.⁴³ Readers of means who liked a work would then have copies made for themselves, preserving and further circulating the work.⁴⁴ Ancient as well as modern readers recognized the value of rereading a document or speech as often as necessary to catch the main themes and subtleties (Quintilian 10.1.20–21), but given the limited copies of the Gospel available and the general level of public literacy,⁴⁵ much of John’s audience may have depended on public readings.

The Gospels seem to conform to the standards of length appropriate to the scrolls on which they were written, which supports the likelihood that their authors intended them to be published. By some estimates, Luke and Acts are roughly the same length; Matthew is within 1 percent of the length of either; John is within 1 percent of three-quarters this length and Mark is close to half.⁴⁶ As Metzger notes, a normal Greek literary roll rarely exceeds thirty-five feet, but “the two longest books in the NT—the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Acts—would each have filled an ordinary papyrus roll of 31 or 32 feet in length. Doubtless this is one of the reasons why Luke-Acts was issued in two volumes instead of one.”⁴⁷ Scrolls were not always completely filled, sometimes having a blank space at the end,⁴⁸ but the Gospels seem to have used all their space as wisely as possible; Matthew may condense and Luke expand at the end. (Likewise, Josephus seems to have been forced to end suddenly his first scroll of what is now called *Against Apion*, having run out of space; *Ag. Ap.* 1.320.)⁴⁹

The lengths of the canonical gospels suggest not only intention to publish but also the nature of their genre.⁵⁰ All four gospels fit the medium-range length (10,000–25,000 words) found in ancient biographies as distinct from many other kinds of works.⁵¹ A “book” was approximately what one could listen to in a setting.

⁴¹ Cf. Dewey, “Oral-Aural Event,” 148–50 (following Ong, *Orality*, 141–44), on Mark.

⁴² E.g., Josephus *Ant.* 1.proem 2, §5.

⁴³ Burrige, *One Jesus*, 20; Alexander, “Production,” 86, 90; Dewey, “Oral-Aural Event,” 145–47; cf. e.g., Diogenes Laertius 1.122; Cornelius Nepos 25 (Atticus), 14.1; Cicero *Att.* 2.1; 12.44; Seneca *Controv.* 1.pref.19; Seneca the Younger *Ep. Lucil.* 95.2; Statius *Silvae* 2.pref.; Iamblichus *V.P.* 21.98–99; other sources in Keener, *Matthew*, 297. Perhaps they would be read after the Lord’s Supper, a sort of dinner (1 Cor 10:21; 11:20–34; Jude 12).

⁴⁴ E.g., Phaedrus 4.prol.17–19. The wealthy might also have their own readers (Cicero *Fam.* 7.1.3).

⁴⁵ On public literacy, see, e.g., Lewis, *Life*, 61–62, 81–82. It is usually estimated around 10 percent (Meeks, *Moral World*, 62; Botha, “Literacy”), but for a higher estimate (especially relevant for urban settings), see Curchin, “Literacy.”

⁴⁶ Morton in Morton and MacGregor, *Structure*, 16.

⁴⁷ *Text*, 5–6; cf. Bruce, *Books*, 12; Palmer, “Monograph,” 5.

⁴⁸ E.g., Diogenes Laertius 7.2.38, on Diogenes the Cynic.

⁴⁹ Cornelius Nepos 15 (Epaminondas), 4.6, claims that he had to stop his account of Epaminondas’s integrity to provide enough space for his other biographies.

⁵⁰ For length in distinguishing genre see, e.g., Aristotle *Poet.* 24.4, 1459b.

⁵¹ Burrige, *Gospels*, 118, 190. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission. *Cato Minor* (ibid., 225–26).

The average length of a book of Herodotus or Thucydides is about 20,000 words, which would take around two hours to read. After the Alexandrian library reforms, an average 30–35 feet scroll would contain 10,000 to 25,000 words—exactly the range into which both the Gospels and many ancient *bioi* fall.⁵²

Also seeking popular analogies, Moses Hadas and Morton Smith compared the Gospels with aretalogies.⁵³ Aretalogies do have some features in common with some Gospel narratives, but they are normally brief narrations or lists of divine acts, hence do not provide the best analogies for the Gospels as whole works.⁵⁴ These narratives may support the hypothesis of early circulated miracle-collections (such as John’s proposed signs source), and indicate the degree to which narratives could be employed in the service of religious propaganda. They do not, however, explain our current gospels and their length; aretalogy was not even a clearly defined genre.⁵⁵

2. Novels and Drama

Not all literary works concerning specific characters were biographies. Yet all four canonical gospels are a far cry from the fanciful metamorphosis stories, divine rapes, and so forth in a compilation like Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*. The Gospels plainly have more historical intention and fewer literary pretensions than such works. The primary literary alternative to viewing the Gospels as biography, however, is not entertaining mythological anthologies but to view them as intentional fiction,⁵⁶ a suggestion that has little to commend it. First-century readers recognized the genre of novel (the Hellenistic “romance”),⁵⁷ including novels about historical characters,⁵⁸ but ancient writers normally distinguished between fictitious and historical narratives.⁵⁹ As some literary critics have noted, even when historical works have incorrect facts they do not become fiction, and a novel that depends on historical infor-

⁵² Burridge, “People,” 141.

⁵³ Cf. Hadas and Smith, *Heroes*.

⁵⁴ Shuler, *Genre*, 15–20; cf. Talbert, *Gospel*, 12–13. A proposal of aretalogical biographies (Wills, *Quest*) would be more reasonable.

⁵⁵ Burridge, *Gospels*, 18–19. Talbert, *Gospel*, 43, cites biographies of immortals (mainly from the second and third centuries), but, as he admits, the religious or mythical dimension does not affect genre (cf. Shuler, *Genre*, 21); his evidence for specific cultic biographies (*Gospel*, 91–113) is mainly inferential (Aune, “Problem,” 37–42).

⁵⁶ E.g., *Apocrit.* 2.12–15 (possibly by Porphyry); Mack, *Myth*, 11, 322–23.

⁵⁷ Although writers like Apuleius and Achilles Tatius are a century or more after our period, the nineteenth-century view of Greek novels as late (fifth or sixth centuries) is no longer tenable (Aune, *Environment*, 150). Thus elements in Chariton *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, (Pseudo-) Plutarch *Love Stories* (*Mor.* 771E–775E, five brief stories; the heroine of 774E–775B is named Callirhoë, but apart from the suitors the story bears little resemblance to Chariton’s work), Petronius *Satyricon*, *Joseph and Aseneth*, Judith, and other works suggest that the general genre was already established in the NT period.

⁵⁸ Cf., e.g., Lindenberger, “Ahiqar.” Yet even historical novels from the Hellenistic era often exhibited some measure of historical accuracy (cf. Anderson, “3 Maccabees”; Miller, “Introduction,” viii), though it varied considerably (e.g., Tobit exhibits anachronisms, but none as serious as Jdt 4:3). Even a pure novel like Apuleius’s *Metamorphoses* may include some autobiographical hints (e.g., 11.30).

⁵⁹ E.g., Lucian *Hist.* 12, who distinguishes proper biography from falsification and flattery; Plutarch in *Poetry* 2 (*Mor.* 16F) points to fabricated materials in poetry (quite different from his description of his sources in the *Lives*). See also Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission. “Bericht”; Witherington, *Acts*, 25–26; cf. Aune, *Environment*, 79 (who both notes the distinction and recognizes some overlap).

mation does not become history.⁶⁰ Talbert argues that not all biographies were basically reliable like Suetonius and Plutarch; but his examples of unreliable biographies, Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Alexander Romance* and Lucian's *Passing of Peregrinus*, do not make his case.⁶¹ The former is more like a historical novel, and the latter resembles satire. This is not to deny some degree of overlap among categories in historical content, but to affirm that what distinguishes the two genres is the nature of their truth claims.⁶²

Whereas the apocryphal gospels and apocryphal acts betray novelistic characteristics,⁶³ the four canonical gospels much more closely resemble ancient biography.⁶⁴ With a few notable exceptions (like Pseudo-Callisthenes), ancient novelists did not seek to write *historical* novels.⁶⁵ Further, novels typically reflected the milieu of their readership more than that of their characters,⁶⁶ a situation quite different from histories and biographies, which were readily adapted for readers but focused on historical content. Finally, novels were written primarily to entertain rather than to inform.⁶⁷ Some, like Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*, functioned as religious propaganda as well as entertainment, but entertainment remained a key element, and religious propaganda certainly was not restricted to the genre of novels.⁶⁸ Nor are entertaining works necessarily novels; historical works intended primarily to inform were nevertheless typically written in an entertaining manner, though that was not their chief goal.⁶⁹ Works with a historical prologue like Luke's (Luke 1:1–4; Acts 1:1–2) were historical works;⁷⁰ novels lacked such fixtures, although occasionally they could include a proem telling why the author made up the story (Longus proem 1–2).

⁶⁰ Most Greek tragedies reflected and developed earlier tradition; thus in *Helen* Euripides follows the *Recantation of Stesichorus* (which violates the natural reading of Homer), yet to harmonize with Homer must have Menelaus and Helen meet in Egypt and return to Sparta in time for Telemachus's arrival in the *Odyssey*. But such constraints were much more general than with historical works (cf. how closely Matthew or Luke follows Mark).

⁶¹ Talbert, "Acts," 72. Pseudo-Callisthenes mixes both historical and fictitious sources, plus adds his own fictions (e.g., *Alex.* 1.23), 450–750 years after the supposed events. Bowersock's examples of fictionalized history (*Fiction as History*, 21) are also distinctly novelistic.

⁶² Carson, *John*, 64–65, following Sternberg, *Poetics*, 23–35.

⁶³ See, e.g., Aune, *Environment*, 151–53; Bauckham, "Acts of Paul"; Keylock, "Distinctness," 210. One may compare works such as the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* or *Acts of John* 53–64, 73–80, where elements of the romance story line are followed, except that the women become devotees of the male teacher in chasty, devoted not to sexual love but to God's word.

⁶⁴ Some scholars have suggested some overlap in the Gospels, though acknowledging that the degree varies from Gospel to Gospel (e.g., Freyne, *Galilee*, 11).

⁶⁵ Porter, "We' Passages," 550.

⁶⁶ See Wiersma, "Novel."

⁶⁷ Talbert, *Gospel*, 17.

⁶⁸ See Kee, *Miracle*, 193, for other propagandistic narratives in the Isis cult. It is hardly true, however, that the genre as a whole was centered on religious propaganda (Kee, *Miracle*, 193–94). For more Isis aretologies see Horsley, *Documents*, 1:10–21.

⁶⁹ Dio Cassius 1.1.1–2; Fornara, *Nature of History*, 120–33; Palmer, "Monograph," 3, 29, citing, e.g., Cicero *Fam.* 5.12.5; Polybius 1.4.11; 3.31.13; cf. also Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Demosth.* 47. Burridge, *Gospels*, 149–51, includes entertainment among the function of many biographies; and, p. 245, complains that most of Pervo's criteria for identifying novels are so broad they apply to most historical works as well; cf. Porter, "We' Passages," 551–52. Some fiction did occur at times in ancient biography (Chance, "Fiction"), especially when the subject had lived centuries earlier (Lefkowitz, *Africa*, 82).

⁷⁰ Cf. the interesting parallels between Acts and "institutional history" in Cancik, "Historiography." Cancik (p. 673) and others are right to recognize the influence of the genre of Acts on Luke, but the Gospel's focus on a single person still makes it a different genre. The no-rule prohibited an overlap between biography and history.

In contrast to novels, the Gospels do not present themselves as texts composed primarily for entertainment, but as true accounts of Jesus' ministry. The excesses of some forms of earlier source and redaction criticism notwithstanding, one would also be hard pressed to find a novel so clearly tied to its sources as Matthew or Luke is!⁷¹ Even John, whose sources are difficult to discern, overlaps enough with the Synoptics in some accounts and clearly in purpose to defy the category of novel. Despite some differences in purpose among themselves, all four gospels fit the general genre of ancient biography: the "life" (sometimes the public life) of a prominent person, normally written to praise the person and to communicate some point or points to the writer's generation. That they also seek to propagate particular moral and religious perspectives does not challenge this distinction; biographies were also often propagandistic in a more general sense, intended to provide role models for moral instruction.⁷²

Some have proposed that the Fourth Evangelist modeled his Gospel on Greek drama, especially tragedy.⁷³ (This proposal has, however, been more frequently applied to Mark.⁷⁴) The Gospels are, however, too long for dramas, which maintained a particular length in Mediterranean antiquity.⁷⁵ They also include far too much prose narrative for ancient drama. Despite its inadequacy as a full-fledged generic category, however, the proposal has some merit in that it at least invites us to investigate elements of Mediterranean storytelling from this period that were borrowed from Greek drama. The forms of Greek drama pervaded Greco-Roman literature,⁷⁶ tragic touches coloring even Tacitus's writing. Thus, for example, some point out that John generally has only two or at most three active (speaking) characters at a time, which fits rules for staging in Greek drama, and he divides scenes in a manner similar to such works.⁷⁷ Paul Duke regards his "dramatic style" as so similar to classical Greek drama (in contrast with the Synoptics) that he believes the author shows some acquaintance with Greek drama. Clearly the Fourth Gospel is not a play, but it "reflects a cultural milieu in which the ironic style of Homer and the Greek tragedians had made its imprint; and in the late first century few locations would have precluded such an influence."⁷⁸ Jewish works for Greek-speaking audiences sometimes adapted such features.⁷⁹

Thus some have argued that the Fourth Gospel is a biography using the mode of tragedy;⁸⁰ Witherington lists nine parallels between John and Greek tragedy, though most of the elements he lists also appear outside theater.⁸¹ But, as most who recognize dramatic

⁷¹ Cf. also Hengel, "Problems," 212.

⁷² E.g., Aune, *Environment*, 36; see further below.

⁷³ See Domeris, "Drama." The Gospel also pictures Jesus' ministry as a trial (e.g., Kobelski, "Melchizedek," 193; Lincoln, *Lawsuit Motif*; van der Watt and Voges, "Elemente"), but this is not the most prominent aspect of the Gospel's portrayal.

⁷⁴ Bilezikian, *Liberated Gospel*, especially on the plot, 51–78; idem, "Tragedy"; Stock, "Mystery Play"; Stone, "Oedipus"; cf. Via, *Kerygma*, 99–101; Weeden, *Mark*, 17; Cox, "Tragedy," 316–17; Hengel, *Studies in Mark*, 34–36. On the plot, see Aune, *Environment*, 48.

⁷⁵ Burridge, *Gospels*, 225.

⁷⁶ Cf., e.g., Arrian *Alex.* 3.22.2–6; for interchange between drama and rhetoric see Scodel, "Drama and Rhetoric." Stricter historians could, however, criticize others' elaborations intended to evoke pathos (Polybius 2.56.7, 10–11).

⁷⁷ Koester, *Symbolism*, 36; Ellis, *Genius*, 8.

⁷⁸ Duke, *Irony*, 141. He thinks that John used these features for a Jewish purpose. Cultural Roman pessimism, however, may contribute alongside Greek tragedy.

⁷⁹ See esp. Josephus. Schmitt, "Form," finds parallels in Wis 1:1–6:21 (although other scholars would dispute some of these).

⁸⁰ Witherington, *Wisdom*, 4; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*

⁸¹ Witherington, *Wisdom*, 4–5. Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

features in this Gospel concur, there is a difference between a biography with dramatic coloring and a drama; and some of the constituent parts that Aristotle insisted belong in tragedy are simply not present. For example, Jesus' interlocutors or disciples hardly function, even when acting in concert, as a typical χορικός, choral song.⁸² Of the necessary six parts Aristotle identifies in tragedy, John lacks song, though he includes elements such as plot and character (Aristotle *Poet.* 6.9, 1450a); yet nearly all poets include all these characteristics (*Poet.* 6.11). Not only novelists but historians strove to develop internally consistent narrative worlds,⁸³ and among historical writers, those from whom one would expect such attempts at consistency of plot and character, most are biographers.

Some have argued that the Gospels fit the genre of history and not biography.⁸⁴ Dihle argues that though the Gospels are "lives," they differ from Greek lives because they cannot trace moral development in one they regard as God incarnate.⁸⁵ He argues that Roman biographies fall closer to history, starting with Suetonius.⁸⁶ This argument, however, appears problematic: did Tacitus (in his *Agricola*) suddenly develop a new genre in the same era as Suetonius without prior models? Plutarch's biographies also include considerable historical content. Moreover, historical works focused on a particular individual were "lives" (*bioi*), the most natural category in which ancient readers would place the Gospels. (Only Luke might appear more questionable, because it is paired with Acts, which is increasingly recognized as a historical monograph.) Thus we turn directly to the biographical genre.

Biographies

In more recent years scholars have been returning to the consensus that the Gospels represent biographies in the ancient sense of the term.⁸⁷ We might compare them especially with philosophers' *bioi*, which honored founders of philosophic schools and continued their teachings.⁸⁸ Like epistle, biography (the *bios*, or "life") was one of the most common literary genres in antiquity; thus it is not surprising that much of the NT consists of these two genres.⁸⁹ Graham Stanton regards as "surprisingly inaccurate" the older views of Bultmann and others that the Gospels were not biographies.⁹⁰

Richard Burridge, after carefully defining the criteria for identifying genre and establishing the characteristic features of Greco-Roman *bioi*, or lives,⁹¹ shows how both the

⁸² Aristotle *Poet.* 12.1–3, 1452b.

⁸³ See Stibbe, *Gospel*, 32–34.

⁸⁴ Dihle, "Biography," 381.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 379.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 383–84.

⁸⁷ So, e.g., Aune, *Environment*, 46–76; Stanton, *Jesus*, 117–36; Robbins, *Teacher*, 10; Burridge, "People," 121–22; idem, "Biography, Ancient"; Cross, "Genres," 402–4; Frickenschmidt, *Evangelium als Biographie*; for aretalogical biography, see Wills, *Quest.* Some of these writers (e.g., Stanton, *Gospels*, 19) reverse an earlier skepticism toward the biographical proposal (see Stanton, *New People*, 64; cf. Aune, "Problem"). Cf. also Hodgson, "Valerius Maximus."

⁸⁸ See e.g., Culpepper, *John*, 64–66. Some later examples of this form may borrow the gospel form (see Dillon and Hershbell, "Introduction," 25, who also suggest that John's Gospel may well have been available).

⁸⁹ Robbins, *Teacher*, 2–3.

⁹⁰ Stanton, *New People*, 63; idem, *Gospel Truth*, 137.

⁹¹ For criteria for genre, see *Gospel*, 119–22. For pre-Christian Greco-Roman biographies, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2005. Used by permission. 128–53; for later ones, 154–90.

Synoptics and John fit this genre.⁹² So forceful is his work on Gospel genre as biography that one knowledgeable reviewer concludes, “This volume ought to end any legitimate denials of the canonical Gospels’ biographical character.”⁹³ Arguments concerning the biographical character of the Gospels have thus come full circle: the Gospels, long viewed as biographies until the early twentieth century, now again are widely viewed as biographies.

1. Greco-Roman Biography and History

Classifying the Gospels as ancient biography is helpful only if we define some of the characteristics of ancient biography, particularly with respect to its historiographic character. As noted above, although biographies could serve a wide range of literary functions,⁹⁴ ancient biographers intended their works to be more historical than novelistic.⁹⁵ First-century historiography often focused on notable individuals.⁹⁶ The central difference between biography and history was that the former focused on a single character whereas the latter included a broader range of events.⁹⁷ History thus contained many biographical elements but normally lacked the focus on a single person and the emphasis on characterization.⁹⁸ Biographies were less exhaustive, focusing more on the models of character they provided (Plutarch *Alex.* 1.1–3).

Ancient biography differed from modern biography in some historiographic respects. For instance, ancient biographies sometimes differed from their modern namesakes by beginning in the protagonist’s adulthood, as in many political biographies (e.g., Plutarch *Caesar* 1.1–4), the first-century *Life of Aesop*,⁹⁹ and in Mark. In contrast to modern historical biography, ancient biographers also did not need to follow a chronological sequence; most felt free to rearrange their material topically.¹⁰⁰ Some scholars maintain that Peripatetic biographies were literary biographies ordered chronologically, insofar as was possible;¹⁰¹ Alexandrian biographies were arranged more systematically or topically.¹⁰² Although these types were never followed exactly, and chronological biographies appear to have been rare,¹⁰³ Luke seems to fall into the former category (following the order of Mark

⁹² *Ibid.*, 191–219 on the Synoptics, and 220–39 on John.

⁹³ Talbert, “Review,” 715; cf. also Stanton, *New People*, 64.

⁹⁴ Burridge, *Gospels*, 149–52, 185–88. For the divergence, see further Barr and Wentling, “Conventions,” 81–88, although I would not regard all their examples as biographies.

⁹⁵ For substantial overlap between the biography and history (as well as other) genres in antiquity, see Burridge, *Gospels*, 63–67.

⁹⁶ Fornara, *Nature of History*, 34–36, 116.

⁹⁷ Lucian *Hist.* 7; also Witherington, *Sage*, 339, citing Plutarch *Alex.* 1.1–2.

⁹⁸ See Fornara, *Nature of History*, 185.

⁹⁹ Drury, *Design*, 29.

¹⁰⁰ Cf., e.g., the accidental repetition in Plutarch *Alex.* 37.4; 56.1. This contrasts with the more chronological practice of historians (e.g., Thucydides 2.1.1; 5.26.1), although even most historians tended to follow events to their conclusion and not simply strict chronology (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Thucyd.* 9; *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* 3).

¹⁰¹ For examples, see Aune, *Environment*, 34, 63–64 (e.g., the lives of Aesop, Homer, Secundus, and Herakles); cf. *ibid.*, 82.

¹⁰² Aune, *Environment*, 31–32. Disordered chronology was not problematic to ancient readers; thus the writer of 4 Maccabees is aware that the mother’s speech should occur at a certain point in his narrative, and says so (12:7; cf. 2 Macc 7), but chooses to recount it later. Cf. the four categories of ancient biography in Ferguson, *Backgrounds*, 307.

¹⁰³ Stanton argues that our only actual example of a purely Peripatetic biography is not chronological (Stanton, *Jesus*, 119–21). He contends that, of extant biographies, only Tacitus’s *Agricola* is

almost exactly except for several very significant exceptions), whereas Matthew (who is influenced more by Jewish encomium conventions) follows the more common topical format (compare his five topical discourse sections). Many Jewish interpreters doubted that the biblical accounts of Moses at Sinai were arranged chronologically (cf. 4Q158).¹⁰⁴ Nor did early Christians expect the Gospels to reflect chronological sequence; Augustine suggested the evangelists wrote their Gospels as God recalled the accounts to their memory (*Cons.* 21.51; for Mark, see Papias in Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 3.39).¹⁰⁵

Some also argue that ancient biography, in contrast to modern biography or novels, plays down characterization, but this is not accurate. Characterization was often accomplished by how a story was told rather than by specific comments,¹⁰⁶ but such comments do appear often enough in biographies,¹⁰⁷ and rhetoricians often described a person's character directly to make a case (*Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.50.63). Theophrastus even provides, in graphic and often humorous ways, thirty basic character types (such as a flatterer or one overly talkative) that offer various kinds of examples (*Char. passim*). At other times the storytelling was certainly sufficient. Even in Greece's ancient epic poetry, the stark characters of wrathful Achilles, proud Agamemnon, and clever Odysseus are impossible to miss. Ancient literature abounds with developed examples of dysfunctional relationships; for example, Dido in Virgil's *Aeneid* appeared exceptionally susceptible to Aeneas because she had never recovered from her first lover's death. In contrast to some later psychologizing approaches, some ancient biographers also proved reluctant to speculate concerning their characters' inner thoughts, though this again is not a rule (see Arrian *Alex.* 7.1.4).

History, too, was written differently then than in modern times. Biographies were essentially historical works; thus the Gospels would have an essentially historical as well as a propagandistic function. As Aune writes,

... while biography tended to emphasize encomium, or the one-sided praise of the subject, it was still firmly rooted in historical fact rather than literary fiction. Thus while the Evangelists clearly had an important theological agenda, the very fact that they chose to adapt Greco-Roman biographical conventions to tell the story of Jesus indicates that they were centrally concerned to communicate what they thought really happened.¹⁰⁸

Ancient biographies and histories were different genres, yet (as the contemporary debate over the genre of Luke-Acts shows) the former can draw on the principles of the latter enough to allow considerable overlap (thus our examples in this chapter from ancient histories as well as biographies). Yet claiming a basically historical function by ancient standards does not mean that the Gospel writers wrote history the way modern historians

genuinely chronological. Topical arrangement suited episodic narratives about a person (Hemer, *Acts*, 74). Although historical writing and thus biography (Suetonius, Plutarch, *Life of Aesop*, etc.) involved some chronology, it was not the most *significant* feature of any kind of ancient biography.

¹⁰⁴ See Wise, "Introduction to 4Q158."

¹⁰⁵ An aged person might recall many events provided he were permitted to recite them randomly rather than in order (Seneca *Controv.* 1.pref.4).

¹⁰⁶ Stanton, *Jesus*, 125; idem, *Gospel Truth*, 139; BurrIDGE, *Gospels*, 205, 208; in John, see BurrIDGE, *Gospels*, 229–30. Characterization is in fact central in ancient biographies (Fornara, *Nature of History*, 185).

¹⁰⁷ E.g., Cornelius Nepos 4 (Pausanias), 1.1. Josephus adapts some biblical characters, adding virtues (cf., e.g., Feldman, "Jehoram"). Matthew (8:26; cf. 6:30) reduces Mark's "unbelief" to "little faith."

¹⁰⁸ Aune, "Biography," 125; cf. 64–65. Shuler, *Genre*, regards his subject (Matthew) as primarily encomium, or laudatory biography. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission, 88).

would; ancient historiography proceeded on principles different from those of modern historiography. (To insist otherwise is to force ancient works into a genre that did not yet exist.) Because ancient historians lacked most historiographic tools that are now commonplace and were concerned to produce an engaging as well as informative narrative,¹⁰⁹ their motives in writing and hence their treatment of details do not conform to modern standards of historical analysis.

One should also note that writers had their own *Tendenz* (tendentious emphasis), for instance Polybius's pro-Roman *Tendenz*¹¹⁰ or Josephus's apologetic attempt to whitewash his people from excess complicity in the revolt while simultaneously appealing to the dignity of his Roman readership.¹¹¹ (Although the *Cyropaedia* is something of a historical romance, it appears noteworthy that Xenophon's Cyrus even reflects some Socratic ideas—e.g., *Cyr.* 3.1.17!)¹¹² Likewise, they would expect morals to be drawn from their stories.¹¹³ Ancient historians felt that history taught moral lessons,¹¹⁴ and that if one understood why events happened,¹¹⁵ not merely historians but also statesmen could use them as precedents (παράδειγματα).¹¹⁶ Thus some felt that historians should choose a noble subject, so their work would contribute to good moral character as well as information (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 1.2.1). Historians frequently included moralizing narrative asides to interpret history's meaning for their readers, illustrate the fulfillment of prophetic utterances, or provide the author's perspective (e.g., Polybius 1.35.1–10; Diodorus Siculus 31.10.2; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 7.65.2; Dio Cassius 1.5.4; Arrian *Alex.* 4.10.8; Cornelius Nepos 16 [Pelopidas], 3.1).¹¹⁷

¹⁰⁹ Aune, *Environment*, 80, 95. Ancient writers, unlike many modern ones, did not feel that these were mutually exclusive goals. Thus the author of 2 Maccabees notes that he employed many possible sources, but that his document was also written in such a way as to be enjoyed and easily remembered (2:24–25). One can write essentially factual accounts in the entertaining style of current fiction (cf., e.g., Sterling, *Sisters*, 78, on Harriet Brent Jacobs's style).

¹¹⁰ Cf. Momigliano, *Historiography*, 71–73. One may contrast the unexpected degree of impartiality in the Athenian Thucydides' description of the Peloponnesian War. Impartiality claims are most common for those writing of recent events, when patronage associations could be thought to bias them (Witherington, *Acts*, 49).

¹¹¹ Often noted, e.g., Mason, *Josephus and NT*, 60–71, 77–81; cf. *ibid.*, 196–98. For Josephus's pro-Flavian propaganda, see Saulnier, "Josephé."

¹¹² Cicero *Quint. frat.* 1.1.8.23 argues that Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* was intended to teach proper government, not primarily to report historical truth.

¹¹³ Often noted, e.g., Mason, *Josephus and NT*, 63. Outside the genre, one may consider, e.g., Pindar *Encomia* frg. 121; Theophrastus *Char.* proem 3; Philostratus *Lives* 2.1.554; Athenaeus *Deipn.* 1.10e, on what could be done with Homer; or Aesop's morals in his *Fables* (e.g., 172); for theology in rabbinic stories, see Pearl, *Theology*, *passim*; even Tacitus felt no constraint to avoid editorial statements at times (e.g., *Ann.* 4.33).

¹¹⁴ See Frei, "Apologetics," 56, noting that this view was also influential in eighteenth-century England.

¹¹⁵ See, e.g., Polybius 2.56.13; 3.32.2. Ancient historians did not, as some contend, ignore lines of cause and effect (Rajak, *Josephus*, 102).

¹¹⁶ Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 5.56.1; Polybius 3.31.11–13. Rhetoricians used παράδειγματα, human examples, to make moral points in their speeches (*R.A.* 6.80.1; *Rhet. Alex.* 8.1429a.21–1430a.13; Cicero *Sest.* 48.102; cf. also Kennedy, "Survey of Rhetoric," 21). On such historical "paradigms" see also Diodorus Siculus 37.4.1; Herodian 3.13.3. One could advance one's case by contrast or comparison (e.g., Demosthenes *On the Embassy* 174; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Demosth.* 33; as a literary device, see Shuler, *Genre*, 50; Stanton, *New People*, 77–80, 83).

¹¹⁷ Hedrick is thus certainly right to reject John's narrative asides as evidence of redaction ("Unreliable Narration," 132–33, 142; also O'Rourke, "Asides"; Tenney, "Footnotes"; for narrative

Dionysius of Halicarnassus lists three purposes for writing history: first, that the courageous will gain “immortal glory” that outlives them; second, that their descendants will recognize their own roots and seek to emulate their virtue; and finally, that he might show proper goodwill and gratitude toward those who provided him training and information.¹¹⁸ Elsewhere he includes among history’s lessons the virtue of piety toward the gods (R.A. 8.56.1). Livy claimed that history teaches a nation’s greatness and what one may imitate (Livy 1. pref.10).¹¹⁹ Polybius opened his massive history by explaining that the most effective behavioral corrective is “knowledge of the past” (Polybius 1.1.1, LCL 1:3).¹²⁰ The emphasis on imitating ancestral wisdom and learning from both positive and negative historical examples is at least as old as classical Athenian rhetoric (Aeschines *False Embassy* 75–76; Lysias *Or.* 2.61.196) and remained in Roman rhetoric (Cicero *Sest.* 68.143). Second-century C.E. orators continued to expound morals from fifth-century B.C.E. Greek history (Maximus of Tyre *Or.* 6.5); later orators also used Plutarch’s *Lives* this way (Menander Rhetor 2.4, 392.28–31).

Jewish people understood the Bible’s narratives as providing moral lessons in the same manner: the writers recorded examples of virtue and vice for their successors to emulate or avoid (Philo *Abraham* 4; 1 Cor 10:11). They could likewise employ postbiblical models as examples of virtues (e.g., 4 Macc 1:7–8). Because Josephus repeats so much of the biblical narrative in the *Antiquities*, one can readily note the way he adapts biblical characters to accentuate their value as positive (Isaac;¹²¹ Joseph; Moses; Ruth and Boaz; Samuel;¹²² Hezekiah;¹²³ Jehoshaphat;¹²⁴ Josiah;¹²⁵ Daniel; Nehemiah¹²⁶), negative (Jeroboam; Ahab¹²⁷), or intermediate moral models.¹²⁸

No less than other historical writers, biographers frequently sought to teach moral lessons from their stories;¹²⁹ one could in a sense learn from great teachers of the past by proxy, as disciples of their recorded teachings.¹³⁰ Cornelius Nepos, in fact, declares that biographers dwelt on the virtues of their subjects in ways that historians did not, and

asides in histories and biographies, see Sheeley, *Asides*, 56–93; for parenthesis as a rhetorical technique, see Rowe, “Style,” 147; Black, “Oration at Olivet,” 87, citing Quintilian 9.3.23; Anderson, *Glossary*, 89–90). Further, even longer digressions are common in ancient literature (e.g., Josephus *Life* 336–367; Aune, *Environment*, 30, citing, e.g., Thucydides 1.97.1; *ibid.*, 93–95, 102). Although character development was not a central focus of ancient biography, Josephus’s portrayal indicates a (negative) development in Herod the Great’s character.

¹¹⁸ Dionysius of Halicarnassus R.A. 1.6.3–5; cf. Diodorus Siculus 15.1.1; 37.4.1.

¹¹⁹ On the hortatory value of history in Roman historians, see Fornara, *Nature of History*, 115–16.

¹²⁰ For Polybius’s appreciation for history’s political value, see Fornara, *Nature of History*, 113.

¹²¹ For a more detailed study of Josephus’s adaptations see Feldman, “Isaac.”

¹²² Feldman, “Joseph,” “Moses,” and “Samuel”; Levison, “Ruth.” Hata, “Moses,” emphasizes the apologetic value of Josephus’s portrayal of Moses against anti-Semites.

¹²³ See Josephus *Ant.* 10.24–35; Begg, “Illness”; Feldman, “Hezekiah.”

¹²⁴ See Josephus *Ant.* 9.1–17; Begg, “Jehoshaphat”; Feldman, “Jehoshaphat.”

¹²⁵ See Begg, “Josiah”; Feldman, “Josiah.”

¹²⁶ See Feldman, “Daniel,” “Nehemiah.”

¹²⁷ See Feldman, “Jeroboam,” “Ahab.”

¹²⁸ Noah appears positive, but Feldman, “Noah,” thinks Josephus reduced his role because he was ancestor of the Gentiles. In idealizing characters into various types, Josephus may also have used standard Hellenistic typologies for women characters (Sarah as the good wife, Potiphar’s wife as evil, etc.; cf. Amaru, “Women”).

¹²⁹ Burridge, *Gospels*, 150; cf. Ellis, *The Gospel of John*.

¹³⁰ Robbins, *Teacher*, 110–11.

intended their work for less technical audiences (16 [Pelopidas], 1.1). Biographers also could write for apologetic and polemical reasons.¹³¹ Some ancient biographers emphasize moral lessons in their stories more than others; some writers, like Plutarch, vary in their moralizing even from one biography to the next.¹³²

At the same time, the *Tendenz* of the documents does not destroy their historical value; as Jewish scholar Geza Vermes points out, “a theological interest is no more incompatible with a concern for history than is a political or philosophical conviction,” and we can allow for these in interpretation.¹³³ The better historians like Polybius felt that their work should include praise and blame for individuals, but that—in contrast to the practice of many writers—they should pursue truth and fairness (Polybius 8.8), properly evaluating the right distribution of praise and blame (Polybius 3.4.1). They felt free to critique their heroes’ shortcomings (e.g., Arrian *Alex.* 4.7.4; 4.8.1–4.9.6), and most biographies mixed some measure of praise and blame (e.g., Plutarch *Cimon* 2.4–5; Cornelius Nepos 11 [Iphicrates], 3.2).¹³⁴ One could tell a less than flattering story even about one’s own teacher, though apt to report especially favorable matters about him (Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.21.602–603).¹³⁵ One could also criticize some activities of other figures one regarded highly.¹³⁶ Of course some teachers were regarded as exceptional; Xenophon has only good to report about Socrates (*Mem.* 4.8.11), and it is hardly likely that early Christians would find flaws in one they worshiped (cf. later Iamblichus *V.P.* passim). But normally disciples respected their teachers enough to preserve and transmit their teachers’ views accurately, even when they disagreed with them, rather than distort their teachers’ views to fit their own.¹³⁷ Further, when one’s source could not recall the substance of a speech, a biographer might not try to reproduce it (Eunapius *Lives* 484). Much history may be written by the victors,¹³⁸ but even in ancient historiography triumph did not always dictate bias.¹³⁹ All ancient historians and biographers, like many modern ones, had important agendas; they used history to shed light on their own time, no less than did the

¹³¹ Burridge, *Gospels*, 151, 180; for apologetic autobiography, cf., e.g., Josephus *Life* 336–367; 2 Cor 11:8–33; Gal 1:11–24.

¹³² Burridge, *Gospels*, 68–69.

¹³³ Vermes, *Jesus and Judaism*, 19; cf. Levinskaya, *Diaspora Setting*, 2; Hemer, *Acts*, 79–90.

¹³⁴ For Plutarch, see Lavery, “*Lucullus*”; honoring subjects could, but need not, produce distortion (Fornara, *Nature of History*, 64–65). Rhetorical conventions appeared in ancient biography, but more in rhetorical biographers such as Isocrates (see Burridge, “Biography”). Forensic speech, where a primary object was legal victory, was naturally another story (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Lysias* 8).

¹³⁵ One might be thought biased when writing about close friends (Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.33.628), but Tacitus wrote freely of his father-in-law (*Agricola*; see below). One pupil reportedly did omit some of his teacher’s sayings, but because they were rhetorically inappropriate (Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.29.621).

¹³⁶ Eunapius *Lives* 461 (on Iamblichus, who is supernatural in 459); Plutarch *Marcus Cato* 5.1, 5; 12.4; for writers’ style, Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Thucyd.* 1. One could also disagree with the dominant view of one’s school (e.g., Seneca *Ep. Lucil.* 117.6).

¹³⁷ See e.g., Seneca *Ep. Lucil.* 108.17, 20, 22; 110.14, 20; Musonius Rufus 1, 36.6–7 (Pythagoras’s disciples differed, but this was considered noteworthy—Valerius Maximus 8.15.ext.1). Occasionally pupils could even turn against their teachers (Eunapius *Lives* 493), but in such a case they would no longer claim his authority for the source of their teaching.

¹³⁸ Thus Xenophon, largely accurate in what he reports in the *Hellenica*, nevertheless proves biased by what he omits of Thebes’s greatness (Brownson, “Introduction,” ix–x), although he remains our “best authority” for the period.
Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*

¹³⁹ Cf. the respective roles of Pompey and Caesar in Lucan *C.W.* passim.
Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group. © 2003. Used by permission.

Gospels.¹⁴⁰ But had the Gospel writers wished to communicate solely later Christian doctrine and not history, they could have used simpler forms than biography.¹⁴¹

Thus the Gospel writers' purpose is historical as well as theological. As readers of the OT, which most Jews viewed as historically true,¹⁴² they must have believed that history itself communicated theology.¹⁴³ In the context of a Jewish covenantal understanding of history as the framework for God's revelation, the earliest Christians must have been interested in the history of Jesus.¹⁴⁴ The NT writers claimed to use genuine history as their evocative myth, purporting to announce historical truth in the public arena.¹⁴⁵ Uncomfortable as this claim may make some modern students of the material, it deserves to be taken seriously. The most frequent counterclaims—that the earliest church experienced radical amnesia before our earliest record or that the disciples offered their lives to defend willful deception—stretch the bounds of historical credibility far more, relieving modern interpreters from having to address philosophically foreign constructs only by permitting our own bias to eliminate testimony for supernatural phenomena engrained in the tradition.

The Fourth Gospel is both historical *and* literary/theological. Of the four canonical gospels, John is certainly the most literary/theological, but a forced choice between reporting of historical tradition and theological interpretation of that tradition is no more appropriate here than with the other gospels. There are simply too many points at which this Gospel includes what sounds like pure Johannine theology yet is in fact confirmed as earlier tradition by parallels in the Synoptics (see commentary, ad loc.). Unless one dates John first and claims that the Synoptics or their sources drew from John, John shows some dependence on earlier tradition, although thoroughly reworded in his own idiom. If John's central claim is the Word's enfleshment (1:14), he claims not to merely interpret the church's faith but to interpret also "the apostolic witness concerning Jesus' historical self-disclosure."¹⁴⁶ Thus the Paraclete recalls and interprets history, aiding the witnesses (14:26; 15:26–27).¹⁴⁷

2. How History Was Written

Sometimes modern scholars write as if ancient historians and biographers lacked proper historiographic care or interest, but such a sweeping judgment neglects too much

¹⁴⁰ Aune, *Environment*, 62 (citing especially Isocrates *Nic.* 35; *Demon.* 34; Polybius 1.1.2; Livy 1.pref.10–11; Plutarch *Aemilius Paulus* 1.1; Lucian *Demonax* 2). An interpretive framework and even nonhistoric genre need not obscure all historical data; e.g., *Sib. Or.* 5.1–50 recites recent history accurately from its author's conceptual standpoint (i.e., including legends he assumes to be historical), despite some confusion (cf. 5.460–463).

¹⁴¹ Vermes, *Jesus and Judaism*, 20.

¹⁴² E.g., even the allegorist Philo in *Creation* 1–2: Moses refused to invent fables.

¹⁴³ Thus, e.g., the features that Acts shares with OT historical works confirms that Luke intended to write history (Rosner, "History," 81).

¹⁴⁴ Wright, *People of God*, 426. Interest in history distinguished the Christian movement from Mithraism, with its more cosmic emphasis (see Martin, "Mithraism"), but fits the typical commitment of ancient historians (Hemer, *Acts*, 63–70). The Qumran sect emphasized inspired interpretation yet preserved authentic memory of their founding Teacher (Stuhlmacher, "Theme," 13; cf. comment on 14:26), albeit not at length.

¹⁴⁵ Wright, *People of God*, 471.

¹⁴⁶ Ridderbos, *John*, 7, 13. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 14–16. Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

evidence. History was supposed to be truthful,¹⁴⁸ and historians harshly criticized other historians whom they accused of promoting falsehood, especially when they exhibited self-serving agendas.¹⁴⁹ A writer who consistently presents the least favorable interpretation, ignoring the diverse views of his sources, could be accused of malice.¹⁵⁰ (Ancients did, however, permit biography more freedom to be one-sided in praise than academic history.)¹⁵¹ Biographers might also evaluate witnesses' motives; Antiphon's report about Alcibiades is suspect because he hated him (Plutarch *Alc.* 3.1). To a lesser extent, they critiqued those who unknowingly got their facts wrong.¹⁵² This emphasis did not mean that historians could not omit some events¹⁵³—indeed, ancient historiographers demanded selectivity and sometimes made that a major distinction between “history” and “chronicles”¹⁵⁴—but it did prohibit the creation of events.

Aristotle noted that the difference between “history” and “poetry” was not literary style, for one could put Herodotus into verse if one wished; but that history recounts what actually happened whereas poetry tells what might happen.¹⁵⁵ Thus historical inquiry required not merely rhetorical skill but research (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 1.1.2–4; 1.4.2),¹⁵⁶ and those thought guilty of inadequate research or acquaintance with their subjects were likely to be doubted (Arrian *Ind.* 7.1).

Accounts could naturally be expanded or abridged freely without question.¹⁵⁷ Whereas Josephus expands on some biblical narratives while he follows accurately the sequence and substance of the account,¹⁵⁸ 2 Maccabees openly claims to be a careful abridgment of a five-volume work by Jason of Cyrene.¹⁵⁹ Among Theon's rhetorical exercises is the practice of “expanding” and “condensing” fables:¹⁶⁰ “We ‘expand’ by lengthening the speeches-in-character in the fable, and by describing a river or something of this sort. We condense by

¹⁴⁸ E.g., Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.26; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Thucyd.* 8.

¹⁴⁹ Josephus *Life* 336–339; Diodorus Siculus 21.17.1; Lucian *Hist.* 24–25. Those who claimed the superiority of their own works, however, risked the charge of impudence (Josephus *Life* 359).

¹⁵⁰ Plutarch *Malice of Herodotus* 3–7, *Mor.* 855C–856B (but in defense of Herodotus, Plutarch's other extant sources may have followed a *favorable* bias; Plutarch may have his own bias because of Herodotus's critique of Boeotia, Plutarch's homeland). Perhaps more plausibly, cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* 3, on Thucydides' grudge against Athens.

¹⁵¹ So Polybius 10.21.8, contrasting depiction of someone in his history with an earlier biography he had written about the same person.

¹⁵² Diodorus Siculus 1.37.4, 6.

¹⁵³ E.g., Josephus *Life* 339; *Ag. Ap.* 1.60–66; Dio Cassius 1.1.1–2 (though Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 7.66.5; 11.1.1–6 emphasizes that he chose accuracy over brevity). Josephus *Life* 365–367 boasts that Agrippa II testified to the accuracy of his work but offered to supply additional information. In novels as well, retellings could omit some details (e.g., Chaerea's kick in Chariton 2.5.10–11).

¹⁵⁴ Whittaker, “Introduction,” li–lii, citing Lucian *Hist.* 4–6, 27.

¹⁵⁵ Aristotle *Poet.* 9.2, 1451b; thus poetry is more philosophical, conveying general truths, whereas history conveys specific facts (9.3, 1451b).

¹⁵⁶ Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.24–25 also criticizes those more interested in showing off rhetorical skill than in historical truth. Even the best historians employed standards of rhetoric, but they used more restraint (McCoy, “Thucydides,” 29–31; cf. also Witherington's addendum, 23–32).

¹⁵⁷ This calls into question early form-critical studies that supposed that the tradition's tendency was nearly always expansive; see Sanders, *Tendencies*, 19, 46–87, 88–189, 272; cf. Stein, “‘Criteria,’” 238–40. Even oracles, which were considered divine utterances, could be expanded; see Aune, *Prophecy*, 58.

¹⁵⁸ Cf., e.g., Begg, “Blanks,” on Josephus *Ant.* 9.29–43 and 2 Kgs 3:4–27.

¹⁵⁹ 2 Macc 2:24–25, noting the *abridgement* (The Gospel of John 1:14) of abridgement (2:28).

¹⁶⁰ *Progymn.* 4.37–42.

doing the opposite.”¹⁶¹ When applied to other kinds of narrative, this need not tamper with historical details; aside from adding details known from other sources and adding some description that is either implicit in the narrative or inherently probable in itself, Theon’s example for expanding a *chreia* does not make much change in its basic meaning.¹⁶² Likewise, Longinus explains amplification (αὐξησις) as adding more and more phrases to bring home the point with increasing force.¹⁶³

Similarly, that Matthew often abridges Markan accounts was no more problematic than the process of abridgement is today, and may have been welcomed. Greco-Roman writers and rhetoricians appreciated conciseness in a narrative, provided that it did not impair clarity or plausibility.¹⁶⁴ Expansion was sometimes due to the passage of time and consequent growth of tradition;¹⁶⁵ in other cases, long stories were sometimes continually abbreviated over time.¹⁶⁶ Both poets and prose writers sometimes added clauses non-essential to the meaning or removed essential ones simply to make the arrangement sound better (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Lit. Comp.* 9).

Inserting sayings from sayings-collections into narrative, or adding narratives to sayings, was considered a matter of arrangement, not a matter of fabrication.¹⁶⁷ One thing reminding the narrator of another was a common rhetorical technique for transition.¹⁶⁸ It seems to have been understood that sayings in collections were redacted, rather than recited verbatim.¹⁶⁹ Thus Phaedrus feels free to adapt Aesop for aesthetic reasons, meanwhile seeking to keep to the *spirit* of Aesop (Phaed. 2.prol.8). And paraphrase of sayings— attempts to rephrase them without changing their meaning—was standard rhetorical practice, as evidenced by the school exercises in which it features prominently.¹⁷⁰ Such

¹⁶¹ *Progymn.* 4.80–82 (trans. Butts).

¹⁶² *Progymn.* 3.224–240. In *Progymn.* 2.115–123, Theon compares elaborations in earlier historical sources. Elaboration (ἐργασίᾱ) was especially useful for rebuttal (*Progymn.* 1.172–175).

¹⁶³ Longinus *Subl.* 11.1; cf. Menander Rhetor 2.3, 379.2–4.

¹⁶⁴ *Theon Progymn.* 5.39–43, 52–53; Phaedrus 2.prol.12–13; 3, epil. 8–9; 4, epil.7–9; Philostratus *Hrk.* 29.6; in speeches, e.g., Diogenes Laertius 7.1.20; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Thucyd.* 55; *Demosth.* 18, 20, 24; *Lysias* 5; Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.4.569. One could, however, be too brief at times (Phaedrus 3.10.59–60; Dionysius of Halicarnassus 2 *Amm.* 2).

¹⁶⁵ In Jewish sources, cf., e.g., ²*Abot R. Nat.* 7, §21 B (for a pseudonymous claim to have personally witnessed something that earlier tradition simply reports). For a halakic example, cf. Hoenig, “Kinds of Labor.” Amplification and embellishment are thus more characteristic of the apocryphal gospels (Carmignac, “Pré-pascal”).

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Blomberg, “Thomas,” 195, especially on the *Gospel of Thomas* (in which additions primarily reflect gnostic themes, but which was especially abbreviated to streamline, as were Matthew and Mark).

¹⁶⁷ Theon *Progymn.* 4.73–79, on adding narrative to a fable or the reverse (although the narrative is added as a parallel, not as a setting, for the fable). Authors could add maxims to narratives (*Progymn.* 5.388–425) or combine preexisting narratives to relate two or more of them at once (5.427–441). The alternative to combining narratives was simply to relate them in episodic fashion, as Mark sometimes does; this was acceptable for most readers, if not according to the highest literary fashions (Drury, *Design*, 30; cf. Smith, *Magician*, 109).

¹⁶⁸ Quintilian 9.2.60–61. Cf. the discussion of catchwords in Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 145–49, 153; in the Gospels, cf. Bultmann, *Tradition*, 325–26.

¹⁶⁹ Cf., e.g., the redactional structure of *m.* ²*Abot* 2:9, where Johanan ben Zakkai asks five disciples a question in positive form, commending the answer of the fifth; when he repeats the question in negative form, he receives mainly the same answers in negative form, and again commends the fifth.

¹⁷⁰ Theon *Progymn.* 1.93–177. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission. Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission. referring to Plato *Apol.* 29C, 28E (LCL 1:70–71).

paraphrase provided a degree of rhetorical freedom, and in the case of familiar lines would prove more aesthetically appealing than verbatim repetition.¹⁷¹

Thus even writers intending to write accurate history could “spice up” or “enhance” their narratives for literary, moralistic, and political purposes.¹⁷² This is not to say that good historians fabricated events; but they did often alter or add explanatory details to events.¹⁷³ Authors differed among themselves as to how much variation in detail they permitted, but some writers who wanted to guard the historical enterprise from distortion had strong feelings about those who permitted too much.¹⁷⁴ Thus the second-century rhetorician Lucian objected to those historical writers who amplified and omitted merely for literary or encomiastic purposes (i.e., to make the character look better).¹⁷⁵ The earlier historian Polybius reports graphic bloodshed (15.33), but claims that, unlike some other writers, he avoids amplifying it for sensationalism (15.34); indeed, he savages another writer for sensationalism and excess accommodation of tragic conventions (2.56.1–11; with examples, 2.57.1–2.63.6). Diogenes Laertius often cites his sources, and does not fabricate material to produce symmetry in his accounts (for instance, while he cites letters from some ancient philosophers, he apparently has none to cite for others like Socrates, in contrast with some pseudonymous Cynic epistles attributed to Socrates). Often later biographers simply repeat what earlier biographers said (e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Lysias* 1).

To be sure, many ancient writers pointed out the obscurity of the earliest reports, from centuries earlier, while demanding a much higher standard of accuracy when handling reports closer to their own period.¹⁷⁶ When writing about characters of the distant past, historians would have to sort through legendary as well as actual historical data, and might well have difficulty ascertaining which was which.¹⁷⁷ Thus, for example, Plutarch, when

¹⁷¹ Contrast tedious repetition in some earlier literature, e.g., Homer *Il.* 8.402–408, 416–422 (except the change from first to third person).

¹⁷² See esp. Lyons, *Autobiography*, 29–32. Lyons advises reading such texts critically, not completely rejecting their historical value (p. 66). Vividness was important for rhetorical style (Cicero *De or.* 2.45.189; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Lysias* 7), and some writers might add details to augment dramatic effect (Plutarch *Alex.* 70.3).

¹⁷³ Aune, *Environment*, 82. Shuler, *Genre*, 50, cites Aristotle *Rhet.* 1.9.5 to the effect that it is appropriate to bestow praise on a man who has not actually done a given work, if his character is such that he would have done it. But this may imply praise for character or for already reported deeds consistent with that character rather than intentional fabrication of events.

¹⁷⁴ Thus, for instance, Polybius criticized “tragic historians,” who “improperly combined fictional drama with factual history” (Aune, *Environment*, 84). Yet tragic elements, praised in poetry (Quintilian 10.1.64), were not out of place in even the strictest of historians. Without fabricating events, Tacitus certainly stamped many of them with tragic coloring (e.g., *Ann.* 5.9).

¹⁷⁵ Shuler, *Genre*, 11–12; cf. Bowersock, *Fiction as History*, 1–27. See esp. Lucian *Hist.* 7–13; in *A True Story* 1.4 he complains that novelizers failed to recognize how obvious their “lies” were. Herodian (1.1.1–2) shares this criticism despite his own rhetorical adjustments (cf. Whittaker, “Introduction,” xxxviii–xxxix)! The complaint also appears in mythography (cf. Philostratus *Hrk.* 24.1–2).

¹⁷⁶ E.g., Thucydides 1.21.1; Livy 6.1.2–3; 7.6.6; Diodorus Siculus 1.6.2; 1.9.2; 4.1.1; 4.8.3–5; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 1.12.3; *Thucyd.* 5; Pausanias 9.31.7; Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.15, 24–25, 58; cf. Bowersock, *Fiction as History*, 1–2. Some also considered the earlier period qualitatively different because of divine activities (Hesiod *Op.* 158–60, 165; Arrian *Alex.* 5.1.2), but others mistrusted its reports because of such unusual events (Thucydides 1.23.3).

¹⁷⁷ Some, like the author of the *Life of Jesus*, may simply string together all the available popular traditions into a narrative. These traditions had grown over six centuries (see Drury, *Design*, 28–29).

he writes about Theseus, who reportedly lived over a millennium before him, proposes to purify “Fable, making her submit to reason and take on the semblance of History” by determining what is probable and credible.¹⁷⁸ This means that ancient historiography sometimes had to settle for historical verisimilitude, rather than high probability (by modern standards) concerning the events ancient historians reported.¹⁷⁹ Many critically evaluated their mass of sources, sorting what they regarded as credible from what they did not.¹⁸⁰ Somewhat like the form critics’ criterion of coherence, consistency of reported behavior with a person’s known behavior provided a criterion for evaluating the probability of ancient sources’ claims.¹⁸¹ They might recognize exaggeration in an account, while averring that genuine historical tradition stood behind it,¹⁸² or might regard an account as too implausible altogether.¹⁸³ Thucydides even takes into account the material remains of Mycenae in evaluating the *Iliad*’s reliability (1.10.1–2) and takes into account the relative dates of his sources (1.3.2–3). Plutarch disputes Herodotus’s claim (9.85) on the basis of the numbers and an extant inscription (*Aristides* 19.5–6). Writers closer to the events they describe are normally considered more reliable (Plutarch *Malice of Herodotus* 20, *Mor.* 859B).

But even if they could not achieve historical certainty about events of the distant past, their attempts to reconstruct the likeliest past indicates that historical writers were *concerned* with historical probability, as many of them plainly affirm.¹⁸⁴ Even when writing about characters from a period for which the evidence was no longer clear, good historical writers tried to distinguish between accurate and inaccurate sources.¹⁸⁵ Thus Arrian often evaluates various reports by comparing them; he notes that one story too prominent to ignore is not reported by any of the eyewitness writers, hence is probably unreliable (Arrian *Alex.* 6.28.2).¹⁸⁶ In more recent as well as in older times, of all possible sources, eyewitness and firsthand sources were the best;¹⁸⁷ likewise, ancients could also recognize the superior

¹⁷⁸Plutarch *Theseus* 1.3. Arrian accepts but explains on rationalistic grounds some old legends (*Alex.* 2.16.6).

¹⁷⁹See Dio Cassius 62.11.3–4; Aune, *Environment*, 83; Fornara, *Nature of History*, 134–36.

¹⁸⁰E.g., demythologizing in Thucydides 1.21.1–2; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 1.39.1; 1.41.1 (cf. 1.84.4); *Thucyd.* 6; Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.1.554; recognizing how propaganda helped create legend (Arrian *Alex.* 4.28.1–2); applying a criterion of coherency with known customs of a report’s day (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 9.22.1–5); reporting stories as difficult to believe and recommending the reader’s use of discretion (Livy 4.29.5–6; 23.47.8); or examining chronological and other tensions within a text (Maclean and Aitken, *Heroikos*, il–1 [citing Philostratus *Hrk.* 23.5–6; 25.10–13]).

¹⁸¹Arrian *Alex.* 7.14.4–6. The same criterion could apply, however, in fictitious composition or historical reconstruction based on plausibility (cf. Aristotle *Poet.* 15.4–5, 1454a; Theon *Progymn.* 1.46–52; 2.79–81; 8.2–3; in a history, see, e.g., Dio Cassius 62.11.3–4).

¹⁸²E.g., Livy 3.8.10.

¹⁸³Aulus Gellius 10.12.8–10. Some could also caution readers not to be too skeptical of an account that otherwise appeared implausible (Sallust *Catil.* 3.2; Plutarch *Camillus* 6.4).

¹⁸⁴E.g., Josephus *Ant.* 20.156–157; see more extensively Mosley, “Reporting,” *passim*. Even Josephus *Life* 336–339 attests to historians’ concern for accuracy.

¹⁸⁵Excepting when a consensus view was available (cf. Livy 1.1.1).

¹⁸⁶Hearsay without eyewitness testimony is much less credible (Arrian *Ind.* 15.7).

¹⁸⁷See Josephus *Life* 357; *Ag. Ap.* 1.45–49, 56; *War* 1.2–3; Xenophon *Hell.* 6.2.31 (refusing to believe a report until an eyewitness was available); Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Thucyd.* 7; Seneca *Nat.* 3.25.8; 4.3.1; Arrian *Alex.* 1.pref.2–3; 6.11.8; Cornelius Nepos 23 (Hannibal), 13.3; 25 (Atticus), 13.7; 17.1. Historians often preferred sources closer to the events reported (Livy 7.6.6; 25.11.20).

value of sources published while living eyewitnesses could either confirm or dispute the accounts.¹⁸⁸ Others could cite an allegedly genuine letter to challenge other traditions (Plutarch *Alex.* 46.1–2; Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.1.562–563). Of course, whether for bias or memory lapse, even eyewitnesses did not always agree on details, and this would require some weighing of individual testimony (Thucydides 1.22.3). When such distinction between accurate and inaccurate sources was impossible, writers often simply presented several different current opinions on what had happened.¹⁸⁹ A writer might simply admit that he did not *know* how something happened (Sallust *Jug.* 67.3).

Their methods for evaluating that probability usually stressed inconsistencies and unlikelihood, as in ancient lawcourts, rather than questioning the sources behind the writers' own sources. Thus Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*R.A.* 4.6.1) challenges an event recounted in earlier histories because of intrinsic improbabilities in their accounts.¹⁹⁰ But the interest of historical writers was essentially historical, even when their sources, mixed with centuries of accretions, were no longer pure.

That ancient historians, biographers, and anthologists depended on earlier sources is not in question; they frequently cite them,¹⁹¹ and often cite varying accounts, even when preferring one above another.¹⁹² Arrian prefers his two earliest sources, which generally agree, above others, and chooses between them when they diverge;¹⁹³ when sources diverge too much, he frankly complains that the exact truth is unrecoverable.¹⁹⁴ Plutarch cites five sources for one position and nine for another, plus an extant letter attributed to the person about whom he writes; but he then adds that the minor divergence does not affect our view of his hero's character (the main point for him; *Alex.* 46.1–2). Valerius Maximus, a

¹⁸⁸ E.g., Josephus *Life* 359–366. Of course, the events were freshest in a witness's mind immediately after the events (Lysias *Or.* 20.22.160), but testimony within the generation was accepted.

¹⁸⁹ E.g., Diogenes Laertius 1.23: "But according to others"; 6.1.13; 8.2.67–72; Plutarch *Lycurgus* 1.1; Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 1.21.516; 2.5.576; *p. Soṭah* 9:13, §2. Historical distance also increased the possibility of gratuitous errors, as in 4 Macc 4:15 (Antiochus Epiphanes was Seleucus's younger brother rather than his son, but the mistake is understandable).

¹⁹⁰ Cf. also Pausanias 9.31.7; Plutarch *Isis* 8; and Theon's reasons for thinking the account of Medea murdering her children implausible (*Progymn.* 5.487–501; cf. 3.241–276, 4.112–116, 126–134). Arguments from probability and/or internal consistency had become standard (e.g., Demosthenes *On the Embassy* 120; *Against Pantaenetos* 23; Aristotle *Rhet.* 1.15.17, 1376a; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 3.35.5–6; 11.34.1–6; Arrian *Alex.* 3.3.6; Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.219–220, 267, 286; 2.8–27, 82, 148; *Life* 342, 350; Acts 26:8).

¹⁹¹ E.g., 1 Kgs 14:19, 29; 2 Kgs 23:28; 1 Chr 27:24; 29:29; 2 Macc 2:24–25; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 1.6.1; Arrian *Alex.* 6.2.4; Plutarch *Alex.* 31.2. Rabbis, too, emphasized citing sources for traditions (e.g., m. *Abot* 6:6; b. *Nid.* 19b). Even a novelist might occasionally remember to provide verisimilitude by providing a source (Apuleius *Metam.* 9.30).

¹⁹² E.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 1.87.4; 3.35.1–4; 8.79.1; Livy 9.44.6; 23.19.17; 25.17.1–6; Appian *R.H.* 11.9.56; 12.1.1; Plutarch *Alex.* 31.3; 38.4; *Demosth.* 5.5; 29.4–30.4; *Them.* 25.1–2; 27.1; 32.3–4; Apollodorus 1.4.3; 1.5.2; 1.9.15, 19; 2.3.1; 2.5.11; Ovid *Fasti* 6.1–2, 97–100; Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.4.570; Pausanias 2.5.5; 2.26.3–7; Arrian *Alex.* 4.9.2–3; 4.14.1–4; 5.3.1; 5.14.4; 7.14.2; 7.27.1–3; Herodian 7.9.4; 7.9.9; Cornelius Nepos 7 (Alcibiades), 11.1; 9 (Conon), 5.4; *p. Soṭah* 9:13, §2; see further Livy in LCL 12:320 n. 2. Occasionally historians also found ways to harmonize traditions (Diodorus Siculus 4.4.1–5). Outside history, see, e.g., *Contest of Homer and Hesiod* 323; Parthenius *L.R.* 11.1–3; 14.5. Cf. Ovid's account of Lichas's end (*Metam.* 9.225), which diverges from Sophocles *Trach.* 777–782; he claims dependence on prior tradition, but his emphasis on metamorphoses certainly accounts for which tradition he prefers!

¹⁹³ Arrian *Alex.* 1.pref.1.

¹⁹⁴ Arrian *Alex.* 3.3.6.

more popular and less careful writer than some others, rarely cites his sources (and often confuses his data), but he mentions them occasionally when they diverge (e.g., 5.7.ext.1; 6.8.3). Earlier exaggerated contrasts between elite and popular literature aside, the Gospels (to some extent with the exception of Luke) do not reflect an elite audience.

Often ancient writers cited sources, however, only when various sources disagreed (or when the writer wished to criticize them).¹⁹⁵ The Gospels do not explicitly cite sources, perhaps in part because of their relatively popular level but also probably in part because they report recent events on which sources have not yet diverged greatly (like, e.g., Tacitus, who naturally does not need to cite many sources on his father-in-law *Agricola*). It is possible that they also follow some Jewish conventions on this point; in some such works we can identify the sources only because they are extant (e.g., 1 Esdras blends Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah with some midrash).¹⁹⁶ Including material missing from earlier extant sources is not necessarily a sign of fabrication. A writer providing information missing in some earlier historians sometimes was drawing from sources unavailable to the other historians, whether those sources were written, oral, or both.¹⁹⁷

3. Evaluating the Accuracy of Particular Works

Although we often lack direct access to firsthand ancient sources, we can look to the ancient historical writers who still had access to such sources, then test them to determine the degree of their fidelity to those sources. Comparing different ancient historians such as Herodian and Dio Cassius turns up discrepancies, but also confirms that both use substantial historical data.¹⁹⁸ Such a comparison will also reveal that such writers did not always choose to cover the same ground; thus, for example, there are many omissions in Herodian, but hints of the information suggest that he did not lack the information itself.¹⁹⁹

Although ancient historians did not always have access to the best sources for earlier eras, their treatment of more recent history was more dependable. The Roman historian Tacitus, for instance, recorded much of the history of first-century Rome, often using imperial annals.²⁰⁰ He is widely regarded as one of the most reliable sources for the history of this period. When Tacitus wrote biography, he maintained the same standard he had upheld in writing Roman history: although his *Agricola*, a biography of his father-in-law, has a particular agenda (to praise his father-in-law while condemning the depravity of the Flavian era), it is certainly historically reliable. Indeed, Tacitus as *Agricola*'s son-in-law also had firsthand acquaintance with the data he reported.

Other historians reporting contemporary or recent events were also substantially reliable, although one must consider how critically each writer used his sources and how freely he adapted them. Suetonius's biographies of the twelve Caesars provide critical information to modern historians of antiquity; they are less reliable than Tacitus, but

¹⁹⁵ See Hemer, *Acts*, 65.

¹⁹⁶ Josephus does not always state his sources, Nicolas of Damascus being an important exception; even Livy can mention that there are many sources while citing only one (Livy 42.11.1).

¹⁹⁷ Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 1.6.1, 3. Oral and written traditions sometimes overlapped (Jeremias in Hennecke, *Apocrypha*, 1:95).

¹⁹⁸ Whittaker, "Introduction," xlv–xlvi.

¹⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, xlviii–lii.

²⁰⁰ Ancients also accepted historical sources that were not annalistic, year-by-year reports (Aulus Gellius 5.18.6–7).

where Suetonius errs it is generally by depending too uncritically on his sources, not by fabricating material. Other historians and biographers, like Livy and Plutarch, took much more freedom to moralize and spice up their narratives. Similarly, Lucan's war poetry could play on the grotesque yet impossible images of his tradition.²⁰¹ But, as noted above, even Plutarch plainly believes that he is using historical data to make his moral points, and his record frequently parallels other historical sources. Historians did make errors,²⁰² but could expect their successors to expose their errors when discovered (Diodorus Siculus 4.56.7–8).

Josephus may provide an example of a freer historian. Josephus's history and autobiography are dominated by his apologetic *Tendenz*.²⁰³ Crossan wryly but accurately remarks of Josephus's *War*, "Nobody from the highest aristocracy on either side is guilty of anything."²⁰⁴ Even many of his adaptations of biblical accounts emphasize points pleasing to his Roman sponsors and Gentile audience.²⁰⁵ Nevertheless, archaeology confirms that he usually gets right even many minor details unaffected by this *Tendenz*, even to the color of paint on Herod's bedroom wall²⁰⁶ (although his accuracy has exceptions).²⁰⁷ Inscriptions likewise sometimes confirm his accuracy on disputed details, against other historians.²⁰⁸ He retells the same event in different ways in different books, a practice that does not suggest that the event never happened, but that he presents it from a different perspective.²⁰⁹ While not striv-

²⁰¹ Because weapons pierced Catus from both sides, the blood did not know which way to flow (Lucan C. W. 3.586–591).

²⁰² E.g., Dio Cassius 48.26.2 (see LCL note), contradicting Josephus (who was earlier; Josephus *Ant.* 14.359–369; *War* 1.268–273) and himself (Dio Cassius 49.22.6); Herodian 3.4.3 (see LCL n. 1); 3.9.3 (LCL n. 3).

²⁰³ As often noted (e.g., Harrington, "Bible," 245; Sanders, *Judaism*, 6; on the autobiography, Mason, *Josephus and NT*, 41–42, 73–76). Clearly Josephus exaggerated in his own interests, though we (with Krieger, "Verwandter") are not sure that he did not belong to the priestly aristocracy.

²⁰⁴ Crossan, *Jesus*, 93. Josephus had too much to lose to tell the truth in all respects. Sometimes the Romans apparently accepted the excuse that a small band had forced others to resist Rome (Livy 24.47.6, 213 B.C.E.).

²⁰⁵ Cf., e.g., Begg, "Amaziah," "Nahum," and "Uzziah"; Feldman, "Asa," "Ezra," "Joseph," "Manasseh," "Pharaohs"; cf. also the transformation of Ahasuerus into a fully positive character in Josephus *Ant.* 11 (Feldman, "Ahasuerus"). Begg, "Gedaliah," suggests that some of Josephus's reports *may* also reflect influence from his experience. Not all changes stem from this motive; it is unlikely that Josephus avoids Nineveh's repentance because of Roman antiproselytism views (Feldman, "Jonah"), given his reports of many conversions elsewhere, and still less likely are some parallels drawn between the Jonah story and the Argonautica (Hamel, "Argo").

²⁰⁶ E.g., Syon, "Gamla"; Cotton and Geiger, "Yyn"; Mazar, "Josephus"; Feldman, "Introduction," 45–46; Thackeray, *Josephus*, 49. Cf. also Josephus's claims concerning an Essene gate (*War* 5.142–45), in Riesner, "Gate"; Pixner, "Gate"; Pixner, Chen, and Margalit, "Zion." If one ignores his use of numbers (population estimates and distances), topographic confirmations show him generally reliable (Safrai, "Description"). Ancient speech-writing conventions allowed more compositional flexibility in speeches, which Josephus utilized freely; but form criticism has demonstrated that the Gospel traditions serve a different purpose; see on the sayings tradition, below.

²⁰⁷ Fischer and Stein, "Marble." Less demonstrably, some have suggested that his use of conventional forms in his suicide accounts militates against the accuracy of his battle suicides (Newell, "Forms").

²⁰⁸ Cf. Kokkinos, "Felix."

²⁰⁹ Wright, *People of God*, 378, also comparing Luke 24:51; Acts 1:3. Cf. also the divergent details in Josephus and Philo on the same events ("The Essene Gospel," 149). Josephus follows but apparently modifies some literary sources (see Pucci Ben Zeev, "Reliability").

ing for modern standards of historical accuracy, “wherever he can be tested, he can be seen to have been a pretty fair historian.”²¹⁰

While adding details and perspectives, he even retains the stories of David’s sin with Bathsheba (*Ant* 7.130–131) and Uriah’s murder (7.131–146), though—perhaps with an eye toward anti-Judaic polemic like Apion’s sources—he omits the episode of the golden calf (*Ant*. 3.95–99). Yet this “substantial” accuracy hardly keeps him from interpreting his sources in strategic ways for his Hellenistic audience. After promising to add nothing to Moses’ laws (*Ant*. 4.196), he finds in Moses’ laws a specific prohibition against theft from pagan temples (*Ant*. 4.207), a prohibition against women’s testimony (*Ant*. 4.219) and the requirement of seven judges per city (*Ant*. 4.214). Numerous studies have traced Josephus’s adaptation of biblical accounts, but whereas the degree of adaptation varies from one account to another, one should also note the degree of fidelity to the basic biblical account.²¹¹

That the Gospels purport to be historical biography is clear, but this does not by itself confirm the reliability of all details or even the reliability of the sources the Gospels use. That the Gospels use recent traditions and that those which can be checked (especially Luke) are careful in their use of sources suggests that the Gospels should be placed among the most, rather the least, reliable of ancient biographies. We will consider this issue further after surveying Jewish biographical conventions and their penchant for haggadic expansion.

4. Jewish Biographical Conventions

Penned in Greek, probably to Diaspora audiences, the canonical gospels reflect Greco-Roman rather than strictly Palestinian Jewish literary conventions.²¹² That is, they share more external characteristics with Diaspora or aristocratic Palestinian Jewish biographies in Greek than they do with many of the Palestinian works composed in Hebrew or Aramaic. Such a statement does not, however, detract from the Jewishness of the Gospels, since Jewish historical writing in Greek generally adopted Greek historiographic conventions, as suggested below for Josephus.²¹³ In contrast to other Greco-Roman biographies, however, the Gospels, like Diaspora Jewish historical texts, show considerable stylistic and theological influence from the LXX. Further, the Gospels vary among themselves in the degree of their Palestinian character: Matthew and John, whose readers apparently have closer continuing ties with Palestinian Judaism, probably reflect more Palestinian literary influences than Mark and Luke.²¹⁴

²¹⁰Sanders, *Judaism*, 6. Many claims against his reliability are overstated; see, e.g., Rajak, *Josephus*, 9–10.

²¹¹For specific examples of Josephus’s adaptations, see, e.g., Begg, “Jotham,” “Fall,” “Putsch,” and “Jehoahaz” (improving the character); Feldman, “Elijah,” and other articles by Feldman noted above; Gafni, “Josephus,” 126–27. In Josephus’s case, the claim not to have added or omitted anything seems pure convention, however (Feldman, “Hellenizations,” 133).

²¹²Bultmann, *Tradition*, 369, exaggerated their Hellenistic character (though allowing some Palestinian tradition); contrast Barrett, *Jesus*, 6. Aune explains Gospel biography by deliberately “oversimplifying” it as exhibiting “Hellenistic form and function with Jewish content” (*Environment*, 22). Hellenistic narrative techniques were standard in Jewish documents written in Greek (e.g., Cohen, *Maccabees*, 43).

²¹³Greek conventions for praising heroes or deities were also sometimes transferred to Jewish heroes; cf., e.g., Van der Horst, “Children.”

²¹⁴This is not to deny that the latter depend on ultimate Palestinian sources (Hengel, “Problems,” 238–43, for example, supports the ancient tradition of Mark’s dependence on Peter) but to argue that they articulate their Gospels for a more pluralistic milieu.

The methodology of Hebrew and Aramaic Palestinian Jewish texts concerning historical figures diverges at significant points from that of Greco-Roman historical writing. Since the Palestinian Jewish roots of the Jesus movement affected Diaspora Christianity, a brief consideration of Jewish biographical conventions may be useful in discussing the traditions behind the Gospels. Failing this, yet more importantly for our purposes, they may be useful in understanding literary techniques particularly adapted by Matthew and John.

Although many individuals feature prominently in the Hebrew Bible and in early Jewish literature, only rarely is a document devoted to a person in such a way that it would be called biography in the sense discussed above; usually the treatment of an individual is part of a larger narrative. Job, Ruth, Judith, Jonah, Esther, Daniel, and Tobit all have books about them in the Greek Bible, but the events rather than the characters dominate the accounts.²¹⁵

The various reports of events in the lives of pious rabbis are too piecemeal to supply parallels to biographies like the Gospels,²¹⁶ but it is possible that some of these stories were collected and told together like some of the brief philosophical lives in Diogenes Laertius. Since no such early collections are extant, however,²¹⁷ rabbinic sources can add little to our discussion of Jewish “biography.” In contrast to Josephus or Tacitus, rabbinic texts are primarily legal, and incidental biographical information tends to serve more purely homiletical than historical purposes.²¹⁸

Some Jewish writers did compose self-contained biographies, though again, not all of them fit the conventions discussed above. Philo’s expositions of Abraham, Joseph, and Moses idealize the figures only to communicate Philo’s philosophical lessons,²¹⁹ though this observation does not negate the evidence for his use of Hellenistic biographical conventions.²²⁰ A collection called the *Lives of the Prophets*, with genre parallels in the Greek lives of poets, resembles the briefer lives.²²¹ Josephus’s accounts about Moses in his *Antiquities* often follow Hellenistic philosophical biography²²² and novelistic conventions,²²³ so

²¹⁵ Stanton, *Jesus*, 126; Aune, *Environment*, 37. Granted, the Gospels could draw on biblical narratives focused on persons as well as on Hellenistic sources (Hengel, “Problems,” 219–20); but the suggestion that ancient Near Eastern models provided the later Greek emphasis on individual characters (cf. Dihle, “Biography,” 366–67) is overstated.

²¹⁶ Against Bultmann, *Tradition*, 57. Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 181–89, comments on narrative in rabbinic tradition, since disciples learned from their teachers’ lives as well as from their words; but as Gundry (“Genre,” 101) points out, this still does not correspond to what we have in the Gospels, nor to the enormous tradition that must stand behind them.

²¹⁷ Neusner, *Biography*, is skeptical even of the attributed sayings. There is certainly nothing comparable to the early nineteenth-century collection of tales, “In Praise of the Baal Shem Tov,” available in English in Ben-Amos and Mintz, *Baal Shem Tov*.

²¹⁸ Neusner, *Legend*, 8.

²¹⁹ Stanton, *Jesus*, 127.

²²⁰ Cf. Canevet, “Genre” (Moses as commander-in-chief). Like other Hellenistic Jewish writers, Philo adjusts biblical accounts where necessary to suit his idealization of virtues; cf. Petit, “Exemplaire.” Philo can nevertheless prove accurate when reporting events surrounding more recent personages (Smallwood, “Historians”).

²²¹ Aune, *Environment*, 41–42.

²²² Van Veldhuizen, “Moses,” 215–24.

²²³ Silver, “Moses” (on Josephus *Ant.* 2:243–253 and Artapanus in Eusebius *Praep. ev.* 9.27). Runnalls, “Campaign,” suggests that Josephus indirectly challenged Artapanus’s account; but the use of the same tradition demonstrates the inroads that Hellenism had made into Moses haggadah (cf. Rajak, “Moses”). Aristobolus (second century B.C.E., frg. 4 [Eusebius *Praep. ev.* 13.13.5]) possibly divinizes Moses with the vision of God. Some Jewish writers may adapt Orphean and Heracleian

also his treatment of Jacob,²²⁴ Joseph,²²⁵ Samson,²²⁶ Saul,²²⁷ Zedekiah,²²⁸ and the Akedah narrative.²²⁹ Thus Cohen lists both 2 Maccabees and Josephus among Jewish works of history owing “more to Herodotus, Thucydides, and Hellenistic historiography than to Kings and Chronicles.”²³⁰

But parallels with broader classes of Jewish narrative literature can also provide insight into Jewish historiographic and novelistic methods. In Aramaic and Hebrew as well as in Greek, such texts could combine both historiographic and novelistic traits without apology, depending on the nature of the text in question. Biblical narratives were often adapted by later storytellers and eventually formalized into separate accounts;²³¹ storytellers especially favored Pentateuchal characters for this sort of development.²³²

Although these reworkings are not strictly midrash nor Targum,²³³ certain midrashic or haggadic principles are sometimes at work in their composition.²³⁴ Some, like Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* (L.A.B.), follow the biblical text very carefully (often virtually quoting the text), though adding many details.²³⁵ Others, like *Assumption of Moses*, have very little to do with the biblical text beyond the characters and a basic story line. The degree of freedom depended also on the nature of one’s work: whereas the LXX preserves

motifs (cf. Philonenko, “Juda”), and some euhemeristically identify pagan figures with biblical ones (e.g., Ps-Eupolemus in Eusebius *Praep. ev.* 9.17.9).

²²⁴ Feldman, “Jacob.”

²²⁵ Aune, *Environment*, 107.

²²⁶ Feldman, “Samson.”

²²⁷ Feldman, “Saul.”

²²⁸ Begg, “Zedekiah,” argues that Josephus portrays him as something of a tragic hero, following Aristotelian conventions.

²²⁹ Feldman, “*Aqedah*.” Joshua may become a Jewish Pericles (Feldman, “Joshua”). See other citations from Feldman above.

²³⁰ *Maccabees*, 194; cf. in general Attridge, “Historiography,” 326; cf. Eisman, “Dio and Josephus.” Even his apology for his “substandard” Greek fits rhetorical conventions for lowering audience expectations and may be compared with Anacharsis’s reported apology to the Athenians (Anacharsis *Epistles* 1.1–6). Other Hellenistic Jewish historians probably employed similar techniques (cf. Rajak, “Justus of Tiberias,” 92). Egyptians and Babylonians likewise sought to present their histories in Greek in that period of Hellenistic cultural dominance (Bartlett, *Jews*, 7).

²³¹ See, e.g., Fisk, “Bible”; Harrington, “Bible.” Harrington, 242–43, does not think these reworkings constitute a distinct genre, since some (like *Jubilees* and *Assumption of Moses*) purport to be apocalypses, while others (he gives *Chronicles* as an example) purport to be straightforward historical narrative.

²³² Cf. *Jubilees*; *Life of Adam and Eve*; *Assumption of Moses*; *History of Joseph* (of indefinite date); L.A.B. (which proceeds through 2 Sam. 1); *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; 1–3 *Enoch* (esp. the Book of Noah in 1 *Enoch*); 1Q19 (1QNoah; related to 1 *En.* 8:4; 9:4; 106:9–10; see Fitzmyer, *Scrolls*, 16); 4Q459; *Genesis Apocryphon*; cf. Yadin, “Commentaries.” Some of those from Qumran are probably pre-Qumranian (Milik, “Ecrits”).

²³³ Harrington, “Bible,” 242.

²³⁴ On *Life of Adam and Eve* cf. Johnson, “Adam,” 252; L.A.B. borrows lines from other passages of Scripture; etc. Goulder, *Midrash*, 30, is probably right when he argues that midrash is creative, but it seemed to the rabbis who engaged in it as if they were deriving all their data from inferences in the text; in many cases, however, antecedent interpretive traditions may be verified from other sources (e.g., postbiblical traditions in Theodotus; cf. Fallon, “Theodotus,” 786). Haggadic traditions were probably more easily remembered than halakic ones (Gerhardsson, *Memory*, 147).

²³⁵ On the nature of *Jubilees*’ revision of Genesis and Exodus, see Vanderkam, “*Jubilees*.” Hellenistic writers like Hecataeus and Manetho had adapted earlier history to meet the contemporary needs, and it is not surprising that Jewish writers of this period sometimes did the same (Mendels, “History”).

incidents of patriarchal deception, Philo and apocryphal works often played down such deception, and Josephus took a middle path.²³⁶ We find a continuum between historical works and novels composed around historical characters, and can best distinguish the two by evaluating their measure of fidelity to sources the writers accepted as historically accurate, especially the OT.

Like other Greco-Roman literature, ancient Jewish literature generally permitted variation in detail. Although amplification in matters of halakah was sometimes discouraged,²³⁷ the practice was especially frequent in narratives, to answer questions posed by a narrative²³⁸ or to heighten the praise of God or the protagonist,²³⁹ sometimes by fanciful midrash.²⁴⁰ Sometimes writers added details for literary purposes, to make a better story;²⁴¹ this could include names,²⁴² sometimes arrived at midrashically or for symbolic value.²⁴³ (This practice is hardly surprising; Greeks also elaborated their sacred stories, filling in details over the centuries.)²⁴⁴ One could emphasize a theme already present in one's source by reiterating it where it appeared and occasionally adding it elsewhere.²⁴⁵ Similarly, negative incidents could be toned down,²⁴⁶ omitted,²⁴⁷ or justified²⁴⁸ in the character's favor.

²³⁶ Freund, "Deception."

²³⁷ *Abot R. Nat.* 1 A. What would have been considered *explanatory* amplification of the words of sages was, however, part of the scribe's traditional vocation (Meeks, *Moral World*, 117, on Sir 39:1–2).

²³⁸ E.g., Demetrius the Chronographer (third century B.C.E.), frg. 5 (Eusebius *Praep. ev.* 9.29.16); *Jub.* 4:1, 9; 12:14; 13:11; 27:1, 4–5 (Esau and Jacob, vs. Isaac and Jacob); *p. Ketub.* 12:4, §8 (fanciful midrash).

²³⁹ 2 Macc 2:1–8 (expanding Jeremiah's mission); *Jub.* 29:14–20 (rhetorically contrasts Jacob's respect for his parents with Esau's disrespect); *T. Job* 9–15 (see *OTP* 1:832); *T. Jos.* 3:1; cf. Josephus's expansion of Philistine casualties (*Ant.* 6.203; cf. 1 Sam 18:27, though the LXX reduced them).

²⁴⁰ *Pesiq. Rab Kah.* 4:3 ("the rabbi" on Solomon); *Gen. Rab.* 43:3; *Exod. Rab.* 10:4; *Pesiq. Rab.* 49:5; cf. Artapanus on Pharaoh's behavior toward Moses in light of 1 Sam 18:17, 21–25 (Eusebius *Praep. ev.* 9.27.7). Genre conventions also could dictate amplifications; *Joseph and Aseneth*, a Hellenistic romance, incorporates features ideal in such romances.

²⁴¹ *Jub.* 11:14–15; 13:18, 22; possibly 4Q160, frg. 3–5, 7; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 50:26; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Exod 13:19.

²⁴² *Jub.* 11:14–15; *Liv. Pro.* 19 (Joad) (§30 in Schermann's Greek text); Josephus *Ant.* 8.231; *L.A.B.* 40:1 (on Pseudo-Philo in general, cf. Bauckham, "'Midrash,'" 67); Plutarch *Alex.* 20.4–5 (questioning Chares' report).

²⁴³ See Rook, "Names," on patriarchal wives in *Jubilees*.

²⁴⁴ See the discussion in Maclean and Aitken, *Heroikos*, li–lii.

²⁴⁵ As *L.A.B.* does in its polemic against idolatry (Murphy, "Idolatry").

²⁴⁶ *L.A.B.* 12:2–3 (Aaron's sin with the golden calf). *T. Job* 39:12–13 (*OTP*)/39:9–10 (Kraft), 40:3/4 seems concerned to soften God letting Job's children die for his test.

²⁴⁷ *Jub.* 13:17–18 (conflict between Lot's and Abram's servants), 14:21–16:22 (omitting Sarah's problems with Hagar, though they surface in 17:4–14), 29:13 (omits Jacob's fear); *T. Zeb.* 1:5–7 (Zebulun did not act against Joseph). On *Jubilees* (e.g., Abram passing off his sister as his wife), see Wintermute, "Jubilees," 35–36; Josephus, cf. Aune, *Environment*, 108; in Greco-Roman literature, see Shuler, *Genre*, 50 (following Cicero *Part. or.* 22). The same tendency of tradition may be noted in the Chronicler's omission not only of David's but also Solomon's sins reported in Samuel-Kings (cf., e.g., Williamson, *Chronicles*, 236).

²⁴⁸ CD 4:20–5:3 (David's polygamy); *Jub.* 19:15–16 (Rebekah, in light of current morality); 27:6–7 (how Jacob could leave his father); 28:6–7 (Jacob's sororal polygyny); 30:2–17 (Simeon and Levi); 41 (Judah and Tamar both made more innocent, though Tamar's deed is interpreted as deathworthy); 1QapGen 20.10–11 (Sarah rather than Abraham proposes the pretense that she is his sister); *Jos. Asen.* 23 (Levi and Simeon).
Craig S. Keener, The Gospel of John
 Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

This could range from the sort of “twist” on a narrative acceptable in modern journalism to fabricating details to explain what was not said. While John, like the Synoptics, is far more like Greco-Roman biography than like such “rewritten” biblical accounts, these Palestinian Jewish narrative techniques must also be considered as part of his general milieu.

Variations in the tradition and/or its editing in these sources were also not problematic;²⁴⁹ a greater degree of freedom in telling the story was then permitted than is standard in historically-oriented works today. As Anderson says about 4 Maccabees, “the discrepancies between the descriptions of the tortures administered to the first son and the other six, here and in 2 Mac, indicate no more than that the story circulated in different forms or that each writer claimed his freedom to shape up the narrative in his own way.”²⁵⁰

Thus a wide variety of writing techniques was available in ancient Jewish as well as broader Greco-Roman writing related to history, and the Gospels could fall anywhere in this range. Intending to be essentially historical in the events they report, in principle they could vary in the accuracy of their details.²⁵¹ Further, as we noted above, paraphrase of sayings was standard Greco-Roman rhetorical practice; Jewish interpreters also regularly employed paraphrase in communicating what they took to be the biblical text’s meaning,²⁵² a practice some interpreters deem relevant to understanding John’s relation to the earlier Gospel tradition.²⁵³

The Gospels as Historical Biography

Although all ancient biographers attempted to write historical accounts, some succeeded at this enterprise better than others. Factors that affected their reliability include how recently the events described occurred, and how closely the writer followed his sources.

In contrast to the contention of some early form critics,²⁵⁴ early Christians were undoubtedly interested in the life and character of Jesus from the beginning.²⁵⁵ It is interesting that, by contrast, Qumran literature has thus far provided no sustained account of the

38:25; *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 38:25–26); *T. Iss.* 3:1 (cf. Gen 49:15); *Tg. Ps.-J.* on Gen 49:28 (all twelve patriarchs were equally righteous).

²⁴⁹ Cf. the variant forms of some sayings in *Ahiqar* (OTP 2:482).

²⁵⁰ Anderson, “4 Maccabees,” 555. Here the freedom is probably that of the author of 4 Maccabees, who appears to expand earlier sources, whereas 2 Maccabees probably stays closer to its sources, since it is an abridgement.

²⁵¹ Cf. Robinson, *Problem*, 60.

²⁵² Cf., e.g., 4Q422, a homiletic paraphrase of Genesis (Elgin, “Section”); see further below on rewritings of biblical history.

²⁵³ Chilton, “Transmission”; idem, “Development,” suggests that Gospel traditions were transmitted and developed in ways similar to targumic traditions. For the view that John developed Jesus’ message in a manner analogous to the Targumim, which included interpretive amplification but sought fidelity to the meaning, see Taylor, *Formation*, 116.

²⁵⁴ The negative use of the criterion of dissimilarity (as applied to Jesus’ continuity with early Judaism and early Christianity) has been severely critiqued in recent years: Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 16; Vermes, *Jesus and Judaism*, 21; Stanton, *Gospels*, 161; idem, *Gospel Truth*, 143; Borg, *Conflict*, 21; Stein, “Criteria,” 242–43; France, “Authenticity,” 110–11; Catchpole, “Tradition History,” 174–76; Young, *Theologian*, 257; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:173; Brown, *Death*, 1:19.

²⁵⁵ See Stanton, *Jesus*, 4–9; Chilton, “Exorcism,” 253, against some earlier scholars, contrasts with modern biography notwithstanding. Skepticism toward traditional form criticism has prevailed especially since Sanders, *Jesus and the Gospels* (Freiszen, *Gospels*, Hill, *Matthew*, 58; Stuhlmacher, *Theme*,” 2–12; cf. Gamble, *Literacy*, 646).

community's founder and the events that brought it into existence, although the documents repeatedly allude to these occurrences. The existence of the Gospels themselves, and the role assigned to Jesus in them, testify that early Christianity had a greater interest in the history of its founder than many comparable contemporary movements did.²⁵⁶ As W. D. Davies puts it, "The first alternative is to believe that for some time after his death and resurrection what Jesus did and said was neglected and so forgotten," and as Christians needed sermon material they "created their own sayings or borrowed material from Jewish and Hellenistic sources and ascribed them to Jesus. The other alternative is to recognize that what Jesus actually taught was remembered by his followers and adapted by the churches as the need arose. On grounds of historical probability, the second alternative is the more likely by far."²⁵⁷

Luke thus mentions that there were already many written narratives before he set out to write one of his own (Luke 1:1). Since writers steeped in the OT would want to testify in historical terms concerning the one they regarded as the fulfillment of Israel's history, the nature of gospels was somewhat predetermined from the start. What form would a Gospel writer have used to describe Jesus' life even if he wished to *avoid* the genre of biography?²⁵⁸ Nevertheless, the Gospel writers would have known that the Gospels would have been read in the Greco-Roman world as "lives" of Jesus.

The Gospels draw on various Septuagintal,²⁵⁹ contemporary Jewish, and Greco-Roman narrative conventions to communicate their portrait of Jesus. Whether or not, or the degree to which, Matthew drew on Jewish midrashic conventions is hotly disputed;²⁶⁰ there is no *a priori* cultural reason to suppose that he did not:

For if even an exacting Greek philosopher could purvey as his master's teachings his own highly advanced development of them, how much more might a midrashically, haggadically oriented Jew do something similar. . . . In the Jewish sphere we find the freedom of midrash and haggadah alongside careful memorization and passing on of both the written and the oral law.²⁶¹

But it should be noted that narratives concerning recent teachers were usually not revised quite as freely as narratives about biblical characters; of many stories about Hanina ben Dosa, none was clearly composed simply on the basis of OT texts.²⁶² And while Matthew undoubtedly adapts his sources somewhat more freely than does Luke,²⁶³ if we may

²⁵⁶ Stanton, *Jesus*, 128.

²⁵⁷ Davies, *Invitation*, 115.

²⁵⁸ Cf. Shuler, *Genre*, 85 (on encomium biography); idem, "Hypothesis." Shuler asserts that encomium biography is the Greco-Roman pattern to which the gospels are closest; cf. the mild cautions of Talbert, *Gospel*, 13. Most biography was, of course, somewhat encomiastic (Josephus *Life* fits this category; see Neyrey, "Encomium"), but writers like Suetonius tend away from this direction (cf. Talbert, *Gospel*, 17).

²⁵⁹ E.g., Elisha narratives; cf. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 162.

²⁶⁰ In favor are Goulder, *Midrash*, passim; Drury, *Design*, 45 (on gospel redaction in general); Gundry, *Matthew*, 628 (citing *Jubilees*, Josephus, and others who took similar liberties but respected the biblical text as God's word). Against are authors such as Scott, "Intention"; Cunningham and Bock, "Midrash"; Payne, "Midrash." See especially the reservations of Chilton, "Midrash," 27–28 on the narrower and broader senses of "midrash."

²⁶¹ Gundry, *Matthew*, 622.

²⁶² France, "Historiography," 114–16. He also points out that writers could draw OT parallels without revising the narrative (e.g., 1 Macc; *ibid.*, 122).

²⁶³ His greatest measure of freedom (and therefore highest level of "Mattheanisms") may be in the birth narratives, where his sources may be oral and not already shaped; but, as Soares Prabhu has

judge by his use of Mark, he adapts them far less than Josephus, and especially *Jubilees* and Pseudo-Philo (*L.A.B.*), adapt the OT.²⁶⁴

To test the accuracy of the authors of the Synoptic Gospels one must test their use of sources. Evaluated by this criterion, they appear among the more accurate of ancient historians.²⁶⁵ One can confirm this relatively easily by examining a collection of Synoptic Gospel parallels. Most scholars agree that the written narratives that Luke included among his sources (Luke 1:1) included Mark and what has come to be called “Q,”²⁶⁶ although debate on the nature of “Q” (as a whole document,²⁶⁷ as oral tradition²⁶⁸ or as a composite of sources)²⁶⁹ continues.²⁷⁰ (Some have offered reconstructions of Q that are far more specific than the evidence warrants;²⁷¹ Q should not at any rate be used to “reconstruct the whole theological outlook” of its community.)²⁷²

When one examines Luke’s use of these sources, one is repeatedly impressed with his restraint. Granted, Matthew and Luke exercise freedom in arranging and editing Mark and other sources that they share in common; but this editing must be judged minimal by ancient standards, not affecting the content as substantially as those who cite this “freedom” often assume.²⁷³ That the Gospel writers themselves saw such variation as within their permissible range may be suggested by Luke’s triple recounting of Paul’s conversion with differences in details each time, though the core of the story remains the same.²⁷⁴ Where Mark and “Q” overlap (e.g., Mark 1:7–13 with Matt 3:7–4:11/Luke 3:7–17, 4:1–13; Mark 3:22–27

shown (*Quotations*), Matthew’s tradition has shaped the citation of OT texts as much as the texts have shaped his use of prior tradition.

²⁶⁴ Cf. also France, “Historiography,” 118–19.

²⁶⁵ See especially Luke’s use of Mark; cf., e.g., Perry, *Sources*, 7, 19–20; Jeremias, *Parables*, 69; Ramsay, *Luke*, 47, 80 (although Ramsay overstates the case). On Mark’s style, see Pryke, *Style*.

²⁶⁶ Many scholars have been reticent to define Q too narrowly; cf. Burkitt, *History*, 123; idem, *Sources*, 42–43; Dodd, *Parables*, 39; idem, *More Studies*, 70; Cadbury, *Making*, 98; Jeremias, *Theology*, 38–39. Cf. Koester, *Introduction*, 2:46, for the likely suggestion that Q was used in various stages of redaction. See especially the caution of Sanders, *Tendencies*, 276–79.

²⁶⁷ This is more likely, given the common sequence of Q in Matthew and Luke (though Ellis, “Criticism,” 35, doubts this common sequence), where Matthew’s topical order does not account for a variation; cf. also Schweizer, *Jesus*, 124–25; Tuckett, *History*, 34–39.

²⁶⁸ Betz, *Jesus*, 22.

²⁶⁹ Cf. the questions of Gundry, “Genre,” 105 n. 31; Petrie, “Q”; Perry, *Sources*, 11.

²⁷⁰ Some dispense with Q altogether: Drury, *Design*, xi, 121; Farrer, “Q”; Abogunrun, “Debate”; Goulder, “Q,” 234; Farmer, *Problem*; Longstaff, *Conflation*, 218; Murray, “Conflator”; Thompson, *Advice* (common traditions); Lowe and Flusser, “Synoptic Theory”; Young, *Parables*, 129–63; Linneman, “Gospel of Q,” 7–11. Such suggestions have, however, been vigorously contested (cf. Martin, “Q”; Grant, “Clock”; idem, *Hellenism*, 120; see esp. Tuckett, *History*, 1–39).

²⁷¹ E.g., Edwards, *Concordance*; idem, *Theology of Q*; esp. Mack, *Myth*, 69, 84; idem, *Lost Gospel*, 6, 73–80. Mack and others create an “early” recension of Q that fits their hypothetical reconstruction of early Christianity, but this approach is circular, as most scholars would acknowledge (see Overman, “Deciphering,” 193; Witherington, *Sage*, 215; Johnson, *Real Jesus*, 52–53; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:177–80; Stanton, *Gospel Truth*, 73–74; Theissen, *Gospels*, 204; Catchpole, *Quest*, 6; Boyd, *Sage*, 136–39; Keener, “Critique”).

²⁷² Stanton, *Jesus*, 5; Hengel, *Atonement*, 35; Aune, *Prophecy*, 213; Keck, “Ethos,” 448; Witherington, *Christology*, 223; idem, *Sage*, 211–12. Q’s theology probably does not differ appreciably from Mark’s (Meadors, “Orthodoxy”; cf. Witherington, *Sage*, 233–36).

²⁷³ Compare Josephus’s demonstrable additions, omissions, conflation, and rearrangement, some of which is similar to, and some of which contrasts with, what we know of the Gospels from redaction critics; cf. the data in Downing, “Redaction Criticism.”

²⁷⁴ See the discussion in Durham, *Acts*, 117; the notes, however, that the words of dialogue remain identical each time (p. 121). Cf. also Luke 24:47–51; Acts 1:8–11.

with Matt 12:24–30/Luke 11:15–23), one gains a similar impression of Mark’s faithfulness to the preexisting tradition.²⁷⁵ Although the differences in the accounts may be more striking to a reader accustomed to harmonizing the Gospels, the points of comparison are generally far more striking when one takes into account that the first three gospels were written at different times, from different possible sources, and to different audiences.

Furthermore, even at their latest possible date of composition, they derive from a period close to the events, when the influence of eyewitnesses of the events remained prominent in the early church. Some scholars may place the dates too early, but even on the consensus datings of the Gospels, they must stem from a period when eyewitness testimony remained central to the church,²⁷⁶ and at least Luke seems to have had direct access to eyewitness corroboration for some of his traditional material (1:1–4). Ancient rhetoricians regularly attack the credibility of witnesses for a contrary position (e.g., Josephus *Life* 356), and courts sometimes dismissed the reliability of some kinds of witnesses on account of their gender or social status.²⁷⁷ One would, however, be hard-pressed to view the earliest disciples’ witness as fabrication, given the price they were prepared to pay for it.²⁷⁸

Luke also claims to have investigated matters thoroughly (1:3). Historians valued such investigation, which often included traveling to the places where events had reportedly occurred,²⁷⁹ and criticized those who failed to accomplish it as well as possible.²⁸⁰ Whereas Roman historians consulted records, the Greek model normally entailed travel and consulting with available eyewitnesses,²⁸¹ although many even in the eastern Mediterranean fell short of this ideal. Evidence strongly suggests that Luke fits the more reliable end of the spectrum.²⁸² Luke’s claim to investigation and his dependence on available eyewitness tradition are especially likely if the “we” sections in Acts, which include a meeting with James the Lord’s brother in Jerusalem (Acts 21:17–18), may be attributed to the author and not to someone else’s travel journal²⁸³ or to a fictitious literary device.²⁸⁴ Whereas “we” ap-

²⁷⁵ Cf. Bultmann, *Tradition*, 13; Wenham, “Note”; Peabody, “Tradition.” Jacobson, “Q,” argues that Mark and Q indicate separate traditions. While this is true for the most part, Mark may have used Q, adopting some material from it (cf. Catchpole, “Beginning”); Q is probably pre-Markan (see Theissen, *Gospels*, 232). For various agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, see Neiryneck, *Agreements*.

²⁷⁶ Some recent scholars have dated the Gospels quite early; see, e.g., Robinson, *Redating*; Wenham, “Gospel Origins”; Carson, Moo, and Morris, *Introduction* (79, 99, 117, 167). Although I am personally inclined to date only Mark before 70 C.E. (Luke perhaps in the early 70s; Matthew the late 70s), in general arguments concerning the situation and date of the Synoptics lack the objective data supporting those of most NT epistles; arguments advanced for earlier dates thus merit more serious consideration than they usually receive.

²⁷⁷ E.g., Justinian *Inst.* 2.10.6; Josephus *Ant.* 4.219; *Sipra VDDeho. pq.* 7.45.1.1.

²⁷⁸ Cf., e.g., Paul’s appeals to public knowledge of his sufferings (1 Cor 4:11–13; 15:30; Phil 1:7; 1 Thess 2:2, 9), though he had much to lose (Gal 1:13–14, 23–24).

²⁷⁹ Appian *R.H.* pref.12. If the events were recent, it could include interviewing eyewitnesses (Thucydides 1.22.2–3; cf. Xenophon *Apol.* 2; Plutarch *Demosth.* 2.1–2); prosecutors preparing cases also did such research (Lysias *Or.* 23.2–8, §§166–167).

²⁸⁰ Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 7.1.4, 6; Herodian 1.1.1–2; cf. Sallust *Catil.* 3.2.

²⁸¹ Polybius 12.25d.1–12.25e.7 critiques Timaeus for failing to do research beyond the many documents available to him and (for the sake of his critique) even ranks field research and interpretive political context above documents (12.25i.2).

²⁸² See Witherington, *Acts*, 26–34.

²⁸³ That Luke uses diary extracts (Foakes-Jackson and Lake, “Evidence,” 158–59; MacGregor in Morton and MacGregor, *Structure*, 41; Cadbury, *Making*, 60–61; Dockx, “Compagnon”) is probable, given the precision of his details. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*

²⁸⁴ Dibelius, *Studies*, 202–3.

appears in novelistic texts, it appears no less in historical texts; its function depended on the genre of the text.²⁸⁵ Further, the “we” sections in Acts may well reflect a travel journal, but it was far more likely Luke’s own than another’s, for Luke is too skilled a writer to leave a secondary source in his narrative unedited. Given the correspondence of the “we” sections to appropriate geographical intervals (16:11–18, 20:6) and the lack of emphasis the writer gives to his own presence (although known to his patron Theophilus and perhaps his implied audience, he remains in the background and appears rarely), the “we” most likely means, as ancient readers would have normally understood, “we.”²⁸⁶ If “we” includes the author or even identifies merely an eyewitness source, Luke may be accepted as all the more dependable.

Like some other early Christian writers (Acts 26:26; 1 Cor 15:6; 2 Cor 12:12), Luke also appeals to “public knowledge” (1:4); he has investigated these matters, but his audience, including his probable patron Theophilus, already has some knowledge about them. Appeals to public knowledge such as that contained in documents,²⁸⁷ claims offered among those who could have refuted them (such as the living eyewitnesses in positions of prominence in the church; cf. Gal 2:9),²⁸⁸ or appeals simply to what was widely known (e.g., Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.107; Xenophon *Agésilau* 5.6) carried tremendous rhetorical weight.

Whatever else may be said about the Fourth Gospel’s genre, it must fall into the same broad category as the Synoptics;²⁸⁹ while it may be strictly independent from the Synoptics (see comments below), it is unlikely that John developed the gospel form independently, and it strains credulity to think that Johannine Christians in either Asia or Syria would be unaware of other written gospels circulating in the Christian communities. (Mark, at least, had circulated for two to three decades, was widespread enough to serve as a major source for Matthew and Luke, and was probably not alone; cf. Luke 1:1.) The genre of the Synoptics is clearly historical biography,²⁹⁰ so the same would likely follow for John.²⁹¹

That the Synoptic Gospels represent substantial historical data does not, however, demonstrate the *degree* of the historical character of the Fourth Gospel. Each of the four canonical gospels applies the biographical genre slightly differently,²⁹² just as many different *Lives* even in Plutarch vary to some degree in content.²⁹³ The Fourth Gospel in some

²⁸⁵ Cf. Aune, *Environment*, 124. For instance, “we” is fictitious in the *Pseudo-Clementines* because the narrative is fictitious, but the author was clearly present in the narrative world; since the account in Plutarch *Dinner of Seven Wise Men* 1, *Mor.* 146BC, takes place centuries before Plutarch’s birth, readers again would have recognized it as a literary fiction.

²⁸⁶ See Dupont, *Sources*, 167–68; Munck, *Acts*, xliii; Fusco, “Sezioni-noi”; cf. Ramsay, *Luke*, 17–18. Maddox, *Purpose*, 7, cites the famed classicist A. D. Nock as regarding the allegedly fictitious “we” of Acts as “virtually unparalleled and most improbable for a writer who makes as much claim as Luke does to historiography.”

²⁸⁷ E.g., Josephus *Life* 342; *Ag. Ap.* 1.20, 23, 28–29. On the lack of public archives in the modern sense in republican Rome (though texts were deposited), see Culham, “Archives.”

²⁸⁸ Also for other historical matters, e.g., Josephus *Life* 363–366; *Ag. Ap.* 1.50–52; Xenophon *Agésilau* 3.1. Such appeals also appeared in fiction, but the purported evidence should be considered as authentic within their *story* world (see Philostratus *Hrk.* 8.12, 14, 17).

²⁸⁹ E.g., Stibbe, *Gospel*, 55.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 55–57; see discussion above; Keener, *Matthew*, 8–36, 51–68.

²⁹¹ Stibbe, *Gospel*, 57–59. He concedes that John reapplies Mosaic and Elijah traditions (pp. 59–60) but argues that John employs both biblical and Hellenistic biographical techniques (pp. 60–63).

²⁹² Cf. the rhetorical differences noted by Keener, “The Gospel of John.”

²⁹³ BurrIDGE, *Gospels*, 68–69.

respects resembles political biographies (as in Cornelius Nepos) because of its polemical material, and in more respects resembles philosophical biographies (as in Diogenes Laertius) with their focus on philosophers' teachings;²⁹⁴ but neither category actually defines John's specific genre.

Neither among the Synoptics nor elsewhere is there a single, precise parallel to John's interpretation of Jesus. For example, one could compare John's interpretive technique with Josephus. In his *Antiquities* Josephus interprets Jewish history for a Gentile audience, creating new speeches where necessary to fit the model of a Hellenistic history. But Josephus writes for a far more literate and hellenized audience than John does, and writes a Hellenistic history, not a biography. Some Jewish works concerning Pentateuchal characters elaborate fancifully, but where we can test him from Synoptic material, John departs from the extant Jesus tradition less than these works depart from the biblical text.

Like the Synoptics and other historical works, but in contrast with early Jewish and Christian novels, John mostly avoids the frequent and imaginative appearances of heavenly beings (although John, like most ancient historical works, does not lack supernatural appearances altogether—cf. 12:28, 20:12). Many early Jewish works give considerable narrative play to heavenly characters and regularly present God speaking; in the Fourth Gospel, however, Jesus himself is usually the voice of God. The narrative style might more resemble Tobit minus supernatural beings like Raphael and Asmodeus, but with the incarnation added; or like 1 Maccabees if it were biographical rather than historical monograph. It resembles the historical sections, or sections in his day *regarded* as historical sections, in the LXX. John develops a skillful plot from pre-Johannine traditions, yet also expounds Jesus' identity more explicitly than the Synoptics do, especially in the dialogue and discourse material (which differ from the Synoptics far more than his narrative does). His discourse expositions may follow a freedom allowed by Jewish and other Greco-Roman historical writers. We will explore below in chapter 7 of our introduction whether his christological evaluations genuinely cohere with authentic Jesus tradition. Here we can only pose such questions, and below provide the best answers the data will allow.

Given its differences from the Synoptics, it is not surprising that the genre of the Fourth Gospel has been compared with other "gospel" traditions, which exhibit far more resemblances to novels than to Greco-Roman biography.

Noncanonical Gospel Traditions

The apocryphal gospels tend to display second-century tendencies far removed from a Palestinian tradition; they exhibit many more clearly secondary and tendentious features than the earlier gospels ultimately received as canonical by the majority of the church.²⁹⁵ The *Gospel of Peter* is not docetic and has some apocalyptic elements, but it would be difficult to argue that this text, with its self-rolling stone, walking cross, and other features uncharacteristic of the Jesus tradition, is earlier than the canonical gospels.²⁹⁶ The apocry-

²⁹⁴ Cf. Witherington, *Wisdom*, 4; Culpepper, *John*, 64–66.

²⁹⁵ See Wright, "Apocryphal Gospels"; cf. Burkitt, *Sources*, 17; Dibelius, *Jesus*, 20; Sanders, *Figure*, 64. A nongospel narrative, *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, may display proto-Montanist tendencies; reports of Maximilla's and Priscilla's adherence to Montanus (cf. Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 5.16) resemble that of chaste women in these texts. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

²⁹⁶ Wright, "Apologetic"; cf. Jeremias, *Sayings*, 17.

phal gospels seem concerned to fill in missing details of Jesus' life,²⁹⁷ and in genre are closer to novels than to biographies.²⁹⁸

With regard to literary form, the gnostic gospels are nothing like the canonical gospels; they are called gospels only because they purport to convey good news.²⁹⁹ Much of what we find in the gnostic "gospels" are random sayings collections that include both sayings of Jesus and later gnosticizing words attributed to him. Most "new" sayings in the gnostic "gospels" are hardly early, though these collections may preserve or adapt some *agrapha* as well as sayings also reported in our canonical gospels;³⁰⁰ the collections as a whole are tendentious in a gnosticizing (and hence later) direction and lack most of the sort of early Palestinian Jewish material frequently found in the Synoptics and John.³⁰¹

Some have argued that apocryphal and gnostic gospels reflect a form earlier than that of the canonical gospels and similar gospels no longer extant.³⁰²

Starting from a study of the apocryphal gospels, Helmut Koester has argued that their forms are not developments from those of the canonical gospels but are rather related to earlier types of gospel literature such as sayings collections, aretologies (miracle collections), and apocalypses. As a result, the Coptic Gospel of Thomas should be seen in a trajectory from Q, the Infancy Gospel of Thomas from collections like the Johannine Semeia source, and the Apocryphon of John from revelations like the Apocalypse of John.³⁰³

In principle, these genre considerations are not objectionable; sayings collections are as old as Israelite and other ancient Near Eastern proverbs, ²*Abot*, and Greek collections of philosophers' witticisms.³⁰⁴ It is not unlikely that the *Gospel of Thomas* intentionally follows a similar form as a sayings collection; but acknowledging this does not require us to retroject incipient gnosticism into earlier Christian sayings collections, or to imply that the sayings genre was opposed in principle to narrative gospels, as some scholars have thought.³⁰⁵ Sayings and narratives were regularly reported separately or

²⁹⁷ Jeremias, *Sayings*, 18–19; compare the function of some Jewish haggadic works above.

²⁹⁸ Cf. Aune, *Environment*, 151–53, especially on apocryphal acts; cf. Bauckham and Porter, "Apocryphal Gospels," 71. Koester, "One Jesus," 158–59, overly skeptical about the canonical gospels, finds barely any historical truth in the apocryphal ones.

²⁹⁹ Jeremias, *Sayings*, 18; Burridge, *Gospels*, 249–50; Wright, *People of God*, 410–11.

³⁰⁰ Though Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 6, appeals to the massive number of *agrapha*, most appear in late documents, and even the small number of *agrapha* accepted by Jeremias are at most possibly authentic (Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:113). Our very inability to distinguish accurate and inaccurate *agrapha* underlines the value of our earlier written documents (Hofius, "Sayings").

³⁰¹ Jeremias, *Sayings*, 26–28; on *Thomas*, cf. *ibid.*, 18; Stanton, *Gospels*, 129; Chilton, "Thomas," 171; Blomberg, "Thomas," 195–196; *idem*, "Where," 24; Wright, *People of God*, 437–43. See Stanton, *Jesus*, 129–35, who addresses very significant contrasts between the canonical gospels and the *Gospel of Thomas* (which itself is closer to our canonical samples than other Nag Hammadi material is).

³⁰² Possibly including the *Gospel of the Nazarenes* (P. Vielhauer in Hennecke, *Apocrypha*, 1:144), though this may be a secondary expansion of Matthew into Aramaic (Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:116).

³⁰³ Talbert, *Gospel*, 8–9. Later Koester came to view the canonical gospels as "aretalogical biographies." On the assumption that Q was purely a sayings gospel, others have compared it to *Thomas*; see, e.g., Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 182; but cf. Keener, "Critique."

³⁰⁴ That ²*Abot* and wisdom literature share the same rhetorical forms (Gottlieb, "Abot") supports the likelihood that early sages like Jesus spoke and were understood in part as wisdom teachers.

³⁰⁵ Kelber, *Gospel*, 199–211; Boring, *Sayings*, 201–3, provide examples of this approach; contrast Gundry, "Genre," 103–7. Of course, even the related proposal that "Q" is entirely a sayings source with no narrative is highly questionable; that the narrative passages in Matt 3:1–12/Lk 3:2–14 and Matt 8:5–10/Lk 7:1–10 occur at the same junctures in their respective narratives (the second

combined at will in antiquity,³⁰⁶ reports of sages' teachings frequently incorporated accounts of their lives or settings for their sayings,³⁰⁷ and Ahiqar's wisdom sayings and narrative were probably already combined more than half a millennium before the Gospels were written.³⁰⁸ Early Christian tradition and use of genre was also not likely isolated in a single stream; where Paul's incidental use attests Jesus traditions, these traditions attest both Q and Markan forms, and some of the Q material is more like Matthew whereas some is more like Luke.³⁰⁹

While sayings collections, like narratives, could be either early or late, both the gnostic texts and their more "orthodox" second-century competitors are clearly later, expansive, and considerably farther removed from the Palestinian Jesus tradition than the canonical gospels. Most scholars today agree that even the *Gospel of Thomas* in its present form (for about one-third of its sayings) is gnostic;³¹⁰ because it has parallels to every stratum of gospel tradition and some of its sayings follow others solely because of the sequence in the canonical gospels, most scholars today acknowledge that *Thomas* in its current form depends on the Synoptics.³¹¹ Other texts contain even less authentic material. *Secret Gospel of Mark*, for instance, is probably a forgery dating from somewhere between the late second and the twentieth centuries.³¹² Apart from a few sayings in *Thomas*, it is unlikely that any of the apocryphal or gnostic gospels reflect any degree of authentic Jesus tradition.³¹³

Noting that the gnostic "gospels" are often sayings collections does, however, eliminate the hope of a complete comparison with our present Fourth Gospel, despite its distinctive speeches. As noted above, all four gospels fall into the range of biography, but gnostic "gospels" constitute an entirely different genre.³¹⁴

Conclusions concerning them should not, therefore, be read back into studies of the extant first-century gospels, although if any of the four gospels would tend toward this

immediately following Jesus' sermon on the mount/plain) indicates a sequential (hence also written and not just oral) tradition at these points (cf., e.g., Theissen, *Gospels*, 226).

³⁰⁶Besides the sayings-chreiai and action-chreiai were mixed chreiai, including both sayings and action (Theon *Progymn.* 3.22–23); sayings-chreiai also could include both statement and response (*Progymn.* 3.27–28). Sayings could also be reported from separate sources after narrating a "life," without implying that the two genres were contradictory (e.g., Plutarch *Timoleon* 15.1); cf. Philostratus *Vit. soph.* 2.5.574); most often biographies included both (Valerius Maximus 1.pref.1).

³⁰⁷E.g., episodes from Aesop's life in a collection of his fables (Phaedrus 2.9.1–4); cf. the combination of sayings and deeds in Diogenes Laertius.

³⁰⁸Cf. Lindenberger, "Ahiqar," 480–82.

³⁰⁹Richardson and Gooch, "Logia," 52.

³¹⁰Stanton, *Gospel Truth*, 87; Wright, *People of God*, 437–43.

³¹¹E.g., Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:123–39. The consensus is summarized, e.g., in Blomberg, "Where," 23–25. In the final analysis, even among scholars who see some early traditions in *Thomas*, very few hold that *Thomas* itself actually predates the Synoptics (Johnson, *Real Jesus*, 89).

³¹²Stanton, *Gospel Truth*, 93; Neusner, "Foreward," xxvii; cf. Losie, "Gospel." Brown, *Death*, 297, dates it earlier, to ca. 125. As late as the 1700s some writers followed the ancient convention of pretending to translate ancient writings seen by no one else (Lefkowitz, *Africa*, 111).

³¹³Stanton, *Gospel Truth*, 77–95; Sanders, *Figure*, 64. Most of this material depends on the canonical gospels; see Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:114–23; on the *Gospel of Peter* and its hypothetical "Cross Gospel," see Brown, *Death*, 1317–49; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:117–18. The fiction of a "secret" traditions works much better for originally secretive groups such as the Pythagoreans (cf. Iamblichus *V.P.* 35.252–253, 258–260) than where something like the public apostolic tradition was already in place.

³¹⁴See BurrIDGE, *Gospels*, 249–50; Wright, *People of God*, 410–1; also Smith, "Gospels," 13–14 (noting that gnostic gospels cannot be dated until the Synoptics and John, as seeking to continue the biblical story).

later type, it would have to be the late-first-century Fourth Gospel. John follows the narrative format also attested in the Synoptics, though developing cohesive discourses and dialogues at much greater length (see our next chapter).³¹⁵ But although gnostics read and developed John, John's speeches are neither gnostic nor mere collections of sayings. Because the Fourth Gospel deals much less with the stream of tradition we are able to test from the Synoptics, examinations of John's relation to history are far less provable than those of his prior siblings. Other putative sources for the Fourth Gospel remain hypothetical.³¹⁶ The extent of John's reliability as a historical source, if ascertainable, will therefore have to be determined on other grounds. If one turns to the question of the burden of proof, we should ask how historically reliable John appears to be where we can check him. Once the question is framed in such terms, we must return to passages where John's story runs parallel to that in the Synoptics.

Source Criticism of the Fourth Gospel

The assumptions of traditional source criticism have proved tenuous in the study of Greco-Roman literature. Writers could depend on a variety of sources and might not need written sources for events that had occurred in their lifetimes.³¹⁷ The case of the Synoptic Gospels is different, where the degree of overlap in particular accounts recited indicates a literary relationship at least between Mark and the other gospels; but the problem is even more difficult in the Fourth Gospel than among most Greek and Roman historians.

Moody Smith's *Composition and Order of the Fourth Gospel* proved a decisive critique of Bultmann's source theories,³¹⁸ and since then these theories have been widely regarded as unproved, except for his signs source (on which see below).³¹⁹ Bultmann's stylistic criteria have failed to persuade scholars, particularly in the discourses.³²⁰ Source criticism on this Gospel is far less popular today, though it has not died out.³²¹ In the 1970s Sydney Temple argued for a very substantial "core" of the Gospel that was quite early,³²² but has not been widely followed. Some scholars have continued to arrive at brilliant but unverifiable constructions of sources. Thomas Brodie, for instance, finds all of Mark, much of Matthew, parts of Luke-Acts, and Ephesians in this Gospel.³²³ A. J. Blasi adopts a sociological approach to identifying sources,³²⁴ but unconvincingly presses too far behind the extant texts. The leading advocate of source criticism on the Fourth Gospel today probably remains Robert Fortna.³²⁵ Von Wahlde also has offered significant work in this area.³²⁶

³¹⁵ For this reason, Dunn, "John," 322, situates John somewhere between the Synoptics and gnostic gospels.

³¹⁶ It is often the case, as Ellis, *Genius*, 3–4, has suggested, that Johannine source theories have more evidence against them than in their favor.

³¹⁷ Whittaker, "Introduction," lxi–lxii.

³¹⁸ Smith, *Composition*.

³¹⁹ Sloyan, *John*, 11. Bultmann's version of the signs source is also open to critique (see Witherington, *Wisdom*, 9–10).

³²⁰ Ashton, *Understanding*, 50.

³²¹ For a survey of positions see Sloyan, *John*, 28–49.

³²² Temple, *Core*; for reconstruction of his "core," see 255–82.

³²³ Brodie, *Quest*, 101–20, 128–34.

³²⁴ Blasi, *Sociology*.

³²⁵ E.g. Fortna, *Predecessor*. Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*

Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

³²⁶ Von Wahlde, *Version*; idem, "Terms."

Nevertheless, sources are next to impossible to distinguish in this Gospel, as most contemporary commentators recognize.³²⁷ As Margaret Davies contends with reference even to the putative signs source, Bultmann and others made valiant attempts, but all “fail because of the Gospel’s impressive stylistic unity.”³²⁸ Schnackenburg followed Bultmann in regarding future eschatological material as redactional, but since other parts of early Christianity held future and realized eschatology together in tension, it makes little sense to exclude these passages that textually and stylistically belong to the whole.³²⁹ An analysis of plot and rhetorical structures fails to coincide with earlier scholarly divisions of the Gospel based on source or redactional theories.³³⁰ Even earlier scholars most inclined to distinguish redactions and locate displacements recognized its stylistic unity.³³¹ C. K. Barrett accepted John’s use of the Synoptics and acknowledged that he used other sources now unrecoverable, but otherwise thought that all other source criticism of the Gospel was pure speculation.³³²

Some scholars have modified or at least qualified their earlier source-critical views. Fernando Segovia, who produced a substantial source-critical study on the Farewell Discourses,³³³ now writes in the forefront of Johannine literary criticism, and recognizes much more unity and coherence in the text.³³⁴ John Ashton concedes that in his earlier, monumental work *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* he accepted too uncritically the common older view of various versions of the Gospel. Although he continues to think there were two editions, he admits that he is no longer sure;³³⁵ authors could certainly tinker with their work, but the image of various editions of books may be “somewhat misleading” before printing presses from the fourteenth century.³³⁶ In our view, if the Gospel had an earlier form (aside from its early draft stage, which was probably not circulated), it may have been the oral form in which the beloved disciple and/or the Fourth Evangelist preached it.³³⁷

The Fourth Gospel functions as a unity, as various comments in our commentary will emphasize. Claiming that the Gospel is a unity does not mean that every element within it readily fits every other element without extrinsic context for both; but such dissonances need not in every case imply distinct sources.³³⁸ As literary deconstructionists have repeatedly shown, such incongruities appear often enough in unified works. This certainly includes ancient Mediterranean works that through most of their ancient history were treated as unities regardless of the disparate oral sources on which they might

³²⁷ E.g., Beasley-Murray, *John*, xxxviii–xliii; Carson, *John*, 41–44; Witherington, *Wisdom*, 6–7; for the current consensus, Schnelle, “Blick.” Cf. Kysar, *John*, 12. This was recognized (and stated eloquently) as early as the source critic Streeter in *Gospels*, 377–82.

³²⁸ Davies, *Rhetoric*, 259–60.

³²⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 264–65.

³³⁰ Staley, *Kiss*, 71.

³³¹ E.g., MacGregor, *John*, xli.

³³² Barrett, *John*, 17.

³³³ See Segovia, *Relationships*.

³³⁴ See Segovia, “Tradition History.”

³³⁵ Ashton, *Studying*, 113.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*, 112. To be sure, various written editions are not impossible; the verb tenses in Cornelius Nepos 25 (Atticus), 13–18, may suggest that these chapters are revisions for a second edition.

³³⁷ See Feuillet, *Studies*, 146; Carson, *John*, 46. Blomberg, *Reliability*, 45, suggests some “loose weaving together of orally preached material” (following Lindars, *Behind*; *idem*, “Discourse and Tradition”; cf. Thatcher, “Riddles in Gospel”).

³³⁸ A more reliable indicator would be the different texture of an account, such as perhaps the tragic material about Panthea in Xenophon *Cyr.* 6.1.31–45; 6.3.11–17; 7.1.29–32; 7.3.3, 13–16.

depend. Thus Harpalion's father Pylaemenes mourned for him in Homer *Iliad* 13.658—but Pylaemenes, Harpalion's father, had already died in 5.576.³³⁹ The story world of the *Iliad* appears inconsistent when Hephaistos took a full day to fall from heaven (*Il.* 1.592), but Thetis could leap directly from Olympus into the sea (*Il.* 1.532), Athene could dart immediately to earth (*Il.* 4.78), and Ares could flee swiftly from earth to heaven (*Il.* 5.885). Some accounts appear inconsistent with the extrinsic world we know: the dog Argos, admittedly old, recognizes Odysseus, though according to the story line, Odysseus has been away twenty years, much longer than a normal dog's life (Homer *Od.* 17.292, 301–302).³⁴⁰

In Ovid's patchwork of stories, the Bears constellations appear unable to descend into the ocean in *Metam.* 2.171–172, yet they became constellations more than fifteen years later (2.497; cf. 2.401–416, 505–507), when they are prohibited from descending into the sea (2.508–531). If one reads the Latin in its most common sense, then Alpheus is both father of Arethusa (Ovid *Metam.* 5.487) and a river god who tries to rape her (5.599–641, likely suggesting inadequate editing of distinct stories). But if such divergences represent sources (which is quite possible), these sources are forever unrecoverable to us today.³⁴¹ Such inconsistencies also appear in historical works, such as Livy's claim that a Numidian's nephew is a brother's son (28.35.8) at one point and a sister's son (27.19.9) at another; this may stem from different sources³⁴²—or from an oversight of Livy's. Although Plutarch reports a detailed tradition (possibly partly legendary) from his own hometown, many pieces of the story fail to cohere because much is missing (why did the Romans not hunt Damon in *Cimon* 1.5–6 [though they do appear in 2.1–2]?). Pseudo-Callisthenes seems to accept conflicting versions of Alexander's paternity (*Alex.* 1.1–14, 30, 35); Parmenion also remains general after being removed from that office for conspiracy (*Alex.* 2.9, 17). In other cases inconsistencies may stem from writers' faulty interpretations, as ancient historians recognized (Polybius 3.8.1–11; 3.9.1–5). Orators expected and exploited inconsistencies in their opponents' accounts (e.g., *Rhet. Alex.* 5.1427b.12–30; 9.1430a.14–21; 10.1430a.26–27).

Some tensions are contradictions; others remain simply tensions, and both tensions and contradictions can represent either inadequately harmonized sources or simply an overarching structure to the narrative inadequate for harmonizing all its details.³⁴³ No finite narrative, even if it reflects many aspects of history, can be complete; it may omit some details that would make fuller sense of others. But this incompleteness does not mean (*pace* radical deconstructionists) that the narrative is *inadequate* for the basic purpose for which it is written (whether history, fiction, or some other purpose).

³³⁹ More loosely, if one allows for hyperbole and figurative language, one may compare the conflicting claims for Cassandra and Laodice in Homer *Il.* 3.124; 13.365–366. Likewise, sleep came on Zeus in *Iliad* 1.610–611, but 2.2 reports that Zeus could not sleep that night. Cf. perhaps the Muse (Homer *Od.* 1.1) and Muses (*Od.* 24.60).

³⁴⁰ Though not completely unheard of. Some ancients also critiqued inconsistencies in Homer; see Maclean and Aitken, *Heroikos*, xli–l.

³⁴¹ Many inconsistencies in Valerius Flaccus's version of the *Argonautica*, however, may stem from the work's unfinished state (Mozley, "Introduction," viii; the end of book 8 is incomplete). By contrast, Menken, *Techniques*, 26, 275–77, demands too much precision, as if John counted the number of words or his literary units were always easily discernible; or to a lesser extent, the excessive detection of chiasmus in Ellis, *Genius*; idem, "Inclusion, Chiasm."

³⁴² So Livy, LCL 8:142 n. 1.

³⁴³ Thus the means of guarding Hector's body vary between Homer *Il.* 23.184–191, 187 on one hand and 24.18–21 on the other, but they are not beyond harmonization.

John, Historical Tradition, and the Synoptics

The thesis of Johannine dependence on the Synoptics has been argued often and thoroughly.³⁴⁴ It has been argued that John used Matthew; both Johannine and Matthean tradition probably originated and developed in Syria-Palestine.³⁴⁵ Scholars more often affirm that John used Luke,³⁴⁶ though common sources might explain the relationship better,³⁴⁷ and one writer even suggests conversely that Luke's research (Lk 1:3) may have included interviewing the beloved disciple.³⁴⁸ More commonly scholars deny John's direct dependence on Luke, appealing instead to minor coincidences and dependence on similar traditions.³⁴⁹ Most often scholars who think John used another Gospel suggest that he used Mark.³⁵⁰ Some also argue that John believed his tradition superior to that of the Synoptics and critiqued them accordingly.³⁵¹

But many parallels indicate only John's use of pre-Synoptic tradition (which could also have been drawn upon at times by Matthew or Luke independently of Mark or Q).³⁵² At other points he could depend on Matthean or Lukan redaction that was incorporated into subsequent preaching tradition,³⁵³ or could have gleaned such tradition from a cursory reading of the Gospels in question without a greater degree of dependence.³⁵⁴ But arguments for even marginal dependence rather than common tradition must be made with caution; a high degree of the minor parallels can be accounted for by coincidence and the

³⁴⁴ E.g., Neiryneck, "Synoptics"; idem, "Moody Smith"; idem, "Recent Commentaries"; Dowell, "Conflict." Koester, *Introduction*, 2:178, allows the possibility in the final stage of the Fourth Gospel's redaction. Cf. Beale, "Daniel," esp. 144, on evidence for Synoptic as well as pre-Synoptic tradition behind Revelation, the author of which he takes to be John.

³⁴⁵ A. M. Farrer in Muddiman, "John's Use"; cf. Gundry, *Matthew*, 2. Although the case for Matthew is not certain, it is often affirmed: e.g., Goppelt, "Church in History," 198; Zumstein, "Antioche"; Gundry, *Matthew*, 609; Ellis, *Matthew*, 6; Hengel, *Acts*, 98; some opt for Palestine, e.g., Viviano, "Matthew." For the suggestion of Matthew's *Sitz im Leben* as conflict with Yavneh or neo-Pharisaic authorities, resembling the scenario often proposed for John, cf. Davies, *Setting*, and Tilborg, *Leaders*.

³⁴⁶ See the thorough treatment of scholars' perspectives on the relationship between John and Luke in Smith, *John Among Gospels*, 85–110. For agreements with Acts, see Cribbs, "Agreements."

³⁴⁷ E.g., Sanders, *John*, 12.

³⁴⁸ Eller, *Disciple*, 47. For the thesis that Luke may have used John in his Passion Narrative, see Matson, *Dialogue*.

³⁴⁹ See Myllykoski, "Luke and John," esp. 152; for the thesis of a common document on which they depend, see Boismard and Lamouille, *Actes*, 1:15.

³⁵⁰ E.g., Streeter, *Gospels*, 393–426 (plus Luke's Passion Narrative). MacGregor, *John*, x, thinks this "can hardly be questioned," though he does not presume that John had Mark directly in front of him.

³⁵¹ Vogler, "Johannes als Kritiker." Some writers did critique predecessors (see, e.g., Diodorus Siculus 1.3.1–2; Wardle, *Valerius Maximus*, 67); others, however, sought merely to supplement them (cf. Xenophon *Apol.* 1; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 1.1.1).

³⁵² Stein, "Agreements." Cf. Smith, *Johannine Christianity*, 12: though Bent Noack has overstated the case, the parallels may indicate oral traditions that the Johannine and Synoptic communities held in common.

³⁵³ Cf. Borgen, "Passion Narrative," 259. But much of their redaction could also depend on prior common tradition.

³⁵⁴ Barrett, "Synoptic Gospels," allows that John had something akin to Mark, but that he only alluded to the material rather than depending on it as Matthew and Luke did. But John's use of Mark may have been even less significant than this, given other available sources (cf. Luke 1:1) and above all his own independent tradition.

simple limitations of vocabulary imposed by the common language in which they wrote.³⁵⁵ Variations among the Gospels on the story of the anointing could have arisen during oral transmission; the writers could have independently drawn elements from different forms of the story³⁵⁶ or two stories, conflating these elements in the process.

Not only John's Passion Narrative³⁵⁷ or the aretalogical signs source often held to stand behind his miracle stories,³⁵⁸ but his entire Gospel has been viewed as independent from the Synoptics.³⁵⁹ This became, in fact, the prevailing view in recent years, although new developments have evaporated what seemed to be a "consensus."³⁶⁰ Although some argue that John used the Synoptics,³⁶¹ probably a greater number of scholars still hold that he simply used independent traditions that have contacts with the Synoptics.³⁶²

Suggesting that the Fourth Gospel is not directly dependent on the Synoptics need not imply that John did not know of the existence of the Synoptics; even if (as is unlikely) Johannine Christianity were as isolated from other circles of Christianity as some have proposed, other gospels must have been known if travelers afforded any contact at all among Christian communities.³⁶³ That travelers did so may be regarded as virtually certain.³⁶⁴ Urban Christians traveled (1 Cor 16:10, 12, 17; Phil 2:30; 4:18), carried letters (Rom 16:1–2; Phil 2:25),³⁶⁵ relocated to other places (Rom 16:3, 5; perhaps 16:6–15), and sent greetings to other churches (Rom 16:21–23; 1 Cor 16:19; Phil 4:22; Col 4:10–15). In the first century many churches knew what was happening with churches in other cities (Rom 1:8; 1 Cor 11:16; 14:33; 1 Thess 1:7–9), and even shared letters (Col 4:16). Missionaries could speak of some churches to others (Rom 15:26; 2 Cor 8:1–5; 9:2–4; Phil 4:16; 1 Thess 2:14–16; cf. 3 John 5–12) and send personal news by other workers (Eph 6:21–22; Col 4:7–9). Although we need not suppose connections among churches as pervasive as Ignatius's letters suggest

³⁵⁵ Cf., e.g., Morris, *Studies*, 16–17, critiquing the strength of Barrett's parallels.

³⁵⁶ Dodd, *Tradition*, 150, 172.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 45, 150.

³⁵⁸ Arguments for this source may be found in Robinson, "Trajectory," 235–38; Appold, *Motif*, 87; Fortna, "Christology," 504. Cf. Smith, "Book of Signs," 441–57, who notes (441) that one need not accept this source as distinct from the Gospel. We are inclined to agree with the judgment of Carson, "Source Criticism," 428, that none of the proposed source theories for the Fourth Gospel has been adequately demonstrated.

³⁵⁹ E.g., Brown, *John*, 1:xliv–xlvii; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:42; Dodd, "'Herrenworte,'" 86; Robinson, *Twelve Studies*, 96; Smalley, *John*, 38; Hunter, *John*, 5; Ladd, *Theology*, 219–20; Morris, *Studies*, 15–63. Gardner-Smith, *Gospels*, was an early and able proponent of this thesis, which carried much of Johannine scholarship.

³⁶⁰ See Smith, *John Among Gospels*, 139–176. This book represents the most thorough treatment of different views on the question to date.

³⁶¹ Davies, *Rhetoric*, 255–59, thinks it probable.

³⁶² E.g., Marsh, *John*, 44–46; Yee, *Feasts*, 11–12; Smith, *John* (1999), 14; see esp. *idem*, *Among Gospels*, 195–241.

³⁶³ Early Christians assumed that John knew the Synoptics and regularly compared them (Wiles, *Gospel*, 13–21); but apologetic considerations more than tradition may have shaped their communal memory.

³⁶⁴ Travelers did bring news regularly (Euripides *El.* 361–62; Demosthenes *Ep.* 5.1; Cicero *Att.* 2.11; Seneca *Ep. Lucil.* 47.1; P.Oxy. 32; Apuleius *Metam.* 1.26; *Apoll. K. Tyre* 8), and churches were certainly networked (1 Cor 1:11; Phil 2:19, 23; Col 1:7–8; 4:7; see Bauckham, "Gospels," 33–44; Thompson, "Internet").

³⁶⁵ People often sent mail when they heard of someone traveling in the right direction (e.g., Cicero *Att.* 1.10, 13; 4.1; 8.14); one letter from as far as Britain reached Cicero in less than a month (Cicero *Quint. frat.* 3.1.8.25). In the present day, despite the availability of a postal service, travelers to and from many parts of Nigeria, Kenya, and Cameroon still carry mail for acquaintances.

perhaps two decades later, neither need we imagine that such connections emerged *ex nihilo* in the altogether brief silence between John's Gospel and the "postapostolic" period. No one familiar with the urban society of the eastern empire will be impressed with the isolation Gospel scholars often attribute to the Gospel "communities."

John could have known one, two, or more other published gospels and yet have chosen not to follow their model or employ them as sources in writing his own.³⁶⁶ (Xenophon, for example, knows of an earlier work recounting the retreat of Greek mercenaries from Persia, mentioned in *Hell.* 3.1.2, but later composes his own eyewitness account.) If, as is likely, Mark circulated widely (and hence could provide a primary framework for both Matthew and Luke), John might even safely assume his readers' knowledge of it.³⁶⁷ Certainly a few decades earlier the tradition was widely known; given its circulation in Jerusalem and Antioch, "it is historically quite unlikely that Paul would have no knowledge of the Jesus-tradition" that circulated in Jerusalem, Antioch, and Damascus, locations he had frequented.³⁶⁸ By John's day, such tradition would be even more pervasive. In other words, independence need not mean anything so dramatic as that Mark and John "developed the gospel form independently."³⁶⁹ John's very divergence from the Synoptics probably led to its relatively slower reception in the broader church until it could be explained in relation to them.³⁷⁰

Whether John draws directly on the Synoptics or (more likely) on independent tradition confirmed occasionally in the Synoptics, we see that the Synoptics sometimes confirm the pre-Johannine character of the events in some stylistically Johannine narratives. In addition to such occasional confirmations, some scholars note points of "'interlocking' . . . where either the Johannine or the Synoptic tradition contains puzzling material that is explained only by information from the other tradition."³⁷¹ Nor in the case of differences need we always prefer the Synoptics' "majority opinion," which may at times reflect a single stream of early tradition that coexisted with others whose emphasis differed (such as Mark and Q). D. Moody Smith has argued that at many points of divergence from the Synoptics (for example, some details of the arrest and trial) John actually provides accounts that cohere better with known historical conditions and are not generated by John's theology.³⁷² In working through the Gospel, my own conclusion is that John tells these stories freely without direct dependence on the Synoptics, whether we think that his source or sources are pre- or post-Synoptic. Yet while John goes his own way, he reflects earlier traditions in these cases. Because these narratives are no different in style from his other narratives, there is no reason to assume that John does not reflect earlier traditions elsewhere.

John and Historical Tradition

A close examination of the Fourth Gospel reveals that John has rearranged many details, apparently in the service of his symbolic message. This is especially clear in the Pas-

³⁶⁶ See esp. Smith, "John and Synoptics," 425–44; also Sanders, *John*, 10; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 324; Goppelt, *Jesus, Paul, and Judaism*, 40–41; Beasley-Murray, *John*, xxxv–xxxvii; Borchert, *John*, 37–41; Witherington, *Wisdom*, 5–9; Brown, *Essays*, 194–96; Dvorak, "Relationship"; Blomberg, *Reliability*, 48–49; Köstenberger, *John*, 37.

³⁶⁷ See Bauckham, "John," 148.

³⁶⁸ Stuhlmacher, "Theme," 16.

³⁶⁹ Against Aune, *Environment*, 20.

³⁷⁰ Smith, "Prolegomena," 179–80.

³⁷¹ Blomberg, *Reliability*, 285; cf. 53–54; Morris, *Studies*, 40–63.

³⁷² Smith, "Problem," 267. Craig S. Keener, The Gospel of John: A Commentary, which he may have imposed on tradition, to evaluate John's reliability (Moloney, Jesus of History).

sion Narrative, where direct conflicts with the presumably widely known passion tradition (most notably that Jesus gives the sop to Judas, is crucified on Passover, and carries his own cross) fulfill symbolic narrative functions. John's long discourses are of a different genre than the sayings collections in Q or even Mark's long "apocalyptic" discourse. Such features naturally invite us to question the nature of (or, by modern historiographic criteria, the degree of) this Gospel's historicity; certainly he is not writing a work of the exact historiographic nature of Luke-Acts.

Nevertheless, scholars who dismiss too quickly the possibility of substantial historical tradition in John ignore abundant details that would have made fullest sense only in a Palestinian Jewish setting, as well as numerous incidental parallels in the Synoptics. Some questions can be answered only by examining passages one at a time (particularly those which appear to overlap or conflict with Synoptic claims).³⁷³ For the most part, such a comparison (see commentary) suggests that John adapts fairly freely at points (more than one would expect from a Luke, for example) but within the setting of traditional events or sayings. It is, however, appropriate to frame the discussion with some general issues here (a few of which summarize arguments above).

The Fourth Gospel, no less than the Synoptics, fits the general format of ancient biography, as we have already suggested.³⁷⁴ Its purpose reported in 20:31 was a legitimate purpose in ancient biographies, especially in philosophical *bioi*.³⁷⁵ The explicit centrality of Jesus' "works" in the Fourth Gospel (John 5:36; 7:3, 21; 9:4; 10:25, 32, 37–38; 14:10–11; 15:24; 17:4) fits the biographical genre followed by the Synoptics and most other biographical works.³⁷⁶ In its genre, John is certainly closer to the Synoptics than to "sayings sources" like Thomas,³⁷⁷ and it is those most familiar with the four canonical gospels, rather than those approaching these gospels in the context of Greco-Roman literature as a whole, who are inclined to emphasize the differences most strongly.³⁷⁸

It is difficult to deny that much historical tradition about Jesus existed in the first century that was never recorded in the Synoptics. No one in Mediterranean antiquity would assume that a one-volume account sampling an oral cycle would be comprehensive; the countless allusions to other stories in Homer (e.g., to the voyage of the Argonauts in *Od.* 12.69–72) lent themselves to later development, but clearly refer to fuller stories Homer's works did not record. In the case of the Gospels, the writers themselves assume knowledge of traditions about Jesus not recorded in their Gospels (e.g., Acts 20:35; John 20:30).

It is furthermore inherently likely that early Christian leaders knew one another better and exchanged more information than scholars have often taken into account (as noted above).³⁷⁹ Some scholars have also found indications that some of John's material, such as Johannine parables, seems to have skipped the processes of tradition which stand behind

³⁷³ Examples of the former are 1:32–33; 6:10–13; 19:38; examples of the latter, 13:26; 18:28; 19:17; see comments on each.

³⁷⁴ See Burridge, *Gospels*, 220–39.

³⁷⁵ See *ibid.*, 236–37.

³⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 208.

³⁷⁷ Wright, *People of God*, 410–11. John is distinctive but more like the Synoptics than like other documents (see Smith, *John* [1999], 21–22; Schnelle, *Christology*, 229).

³⁷⁸ Burridge, *Gospels*, 220. The second-century Christians who titled the Gospel (κατὰ Ἰωάννην) classified it with the Synoptics (Burridge, *Gospels*, 222; cf. Stanton, *Gospel Truth*, 16–18, 98).

³⁷⁹ See Tenney, "Parallels," although his parallels between Peter and John by themselves cannot carry the case. (Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*, Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.)

the Synoptics.³⁸⁰ More clearly, R. A. Culpepper has demonstrated that “the reader has prior knowledge of many of the key elements of the gospel story,” including some elements omitted in the Synoptics (11:2).³⁸¹ John further assumes that most of the geography of the gospel story, like Nazareth and Capernaum, is known to his implied reader, though Judean sites and the topography of Jerusalem are not.³⁸²

In contrast to scholars like Dibelius, who view the Fourth Gospel as a climax of an early Christian development blending tradition and mythology,³⁸³ some prominent scholars have argued for substantial historical tradition in the Fourth Gospel.³⁸⁴ Albright, for instance, asserts that both John’s narratives and sayings material must depend on pre-70 Palestinian tradition, since they presuppose information and language that were lost after that point. John may have adapted his presentation of this material to the needs of his audience, “But there is absolutely nothing to show that any of Jesus’ teachings have been distorted or falsified, or that any vital new element has been added to them.”³⁸⁵ Many of John’s geographical details have no immediate theological significance to Diaspora readers (e.g., Cana, Tiberias), and would therefore seem to stem from his Palestinian tradition. An Australian scholar offers an analogy on a more popular level; while summarizing points where John reflects accurate knowledge of geographical details,³⁸⁶ Barnett focuses on John 10:23, noting that John had no theological reason to indicate that Jesus sought shelter from winter weather in Solomon’s portico. Yet “if someone wrote of a person seeking shelter from the sun on Christmas day in the Bennelong restaurant in the Sydney Opera House, it would be reasonable to conclude that he had first-hand knowledge of the Australian climate and of a Sydney landmark in the period after the year 1973 when the Opera House was completed.”³⁸⁷ This at least suggests that John or his source of tradition was rooted in pre-70 Jewish Palestine, where reliable traditions of Jesus would have flourished; given the incidental character of the remark, it more likely represents a historical reminiscence than a theological or literary embellishment.

Perhaps even more to the point, the Gospel is full of allusions to Jewish traditions that may have made little sense to much of his post-70 audience but that once would have illumined accounts that he relates.³⁸⁸ Tabernacles traditions concerning the use of Siloam (9:7) and rivers of water from the temple (7:37–38) are a case in point (see comments in the commentary).³⁸⁹ The frequent elements of Palestinian Jewish tradition in the Gospel (noted regularly throughout the commentary) support the view that what we

³⁸⁰ Cf. Sturch, “Parables.”

³⁸¹ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 222–23. Davies, *Rhetoric*, 255–59, thinks John’s audience may have known the Synoptic accounts, but some material John presupposes is absent from the Synoptics.

³⁸² Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 216–18. This would not, however, be significant for our present purposes if we posited an original Galilean audience for the Gospel (see on provenance, below).

³⁸³ Dibelius, *Tradition*, 286. Cf. similarly Carroll, “Exclusion,” 31.

³⁸⁴ E.g., Westcott, *John*, liii–lxiii; for the last discourses, cf. *ibid.*, lxiii–lxvi; Morris, *Studies*, ch. 2, “History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel,” 65–138; Lea, “Reliability”; Blomberg, “Reliable”; Wenham, “Enigma”; *idem*, “View”; Moloney, “Jesus of History.”

³⁸⁵ Albright, “Discoveries,” 170–71. Scholars today generally recognize early and Palestinian traditions in John (Brown, *Essays*, 188–90).

³⁸⁶ Barnett, *Reliable*, 63–65.

³⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 63.

³⁸⁸ This approach is central to the argument in Blomberg, *Reliability*, esp. 285, 291.

³⁸⁹ Our sources suggesting that pre-70 tradition explains these “rivers” are themselves post-70, but the tradition would probably not be known to most members of John’s audience unless they had visited Jerusalem before 70.

see as Johannine tradition must have existed alongside what we see as Synoptic tradition in pre-70 Palestine.

C. H. Dodd's general case for historical tradition in the Fourth Gospel is more often cited than these arguments based on geographical details.³⁹⁰ Dodd finds traditional material in the connective passages which provide a chronological framework for the Fourth Gospel.³⁹¹ The chronology of the Fourth Gospel is distinctive, and it may fit some of our other data. Contrary to what one might expect from the Gospel's theology, Jesus' ministry overlaps with the Baptist's (3:23), which probably began in 26 or 27 C.E. (Luke 3:1). This also fits the date suggested by John 2:20 (forty-six years). Presumably, John's readers would not have counted those years even if they could have, but this chronological marker points to about 27 for the beginning of Jesus' public ministry, whereas Jesus was probably crucified about 30—roughly three years later (see commentary ad loc. on these points). If Jesus was “about thirty” when he began public ministry (Luke 3:23), this may also suggest a public ministry that began in the late twenties rather than shortly before his crucifixion, as one might surmise only from the Synoptics.³⁹² Indeed, by the time of Irenaeus, the non-Johannine view of a year's public ministry for Jesus had become no longer acceptable—Irenaeus assumes that his readers know better than the gnostics in this regard.³⁹³ These arguments are not foolproof. Irenaeus could depend on John here as easily as on a parallel but independent tradition,³⁹⁴ and one could argue that John's structure around three Passovers is theologically motivated, to bring the shadow of the cross (and the temple cleansing) to the beginning of his ministry (2:13–14) and perhaps even to create a theological paschal context for the multiplication of the loaves.³⁹⁵ Thus in the final analysis this argument of Dodd's may not prove adequately compelling.

Although Dodd's monumental work demonstrates the possibility of historical traditions in the Fourth Gospel, D. A. Carson is correct that much of the historical information cannot be verified either way.³⁹⁶ As Aune notes, “the claim for historicity is generally limited to narrative sequence and topography; the task of finding genuine Jesuanic traditions in the discourse material is an arduous one, and one for which the appropriate methodological tools are currently non-existent.”³⁹⁷

At the same time, the usual skepticism toward the contents of the Fourth Gospel, which has sometimes proved almost thoroughgoing, seems to be more influenced by scholars' presuppositions than by any demand of historical-critical methodology itself.³⁹⁸ Granted, John adapts the gospel form (see comment below), apparently employing a considerably more creative style than Mark or Luke (though it still falls within the acceptable range of ancient

³⁹⁰ Despite corrections on some points, Dunn, “John,” 299, thinks that “its main findings” will endure.

³⁹¹ Dodd, *Tradition*, 233–47, esp. 243.

³⁹² On Jesus' birth before 4 B.C.E., see, e.g., Keener, *Matthew*, 102; discipleship could continue for many years (e.g., Eunapius *Lives* 461). Streeter, *Gospels*, 419–24, suggests that John's chronology, while perhaps imperfect, is all we have, since Mark does not offer one.

³⁹³ Irenaeus *Haer.* 1.3.3.

³⁹⁴ He argues against the gnostics that Christ was over fifty when he died, though baptized around the age of thirty (2, ch. 22); although this exceeds John's chronology considerably, it is probably rooted in the Fourth Gospel (8:56–57, with Lk 3:23).

³⁹⁵ That John arranges his Gospel by seasons as Thucydides did (e.g., 5.26.1) could suggest deliberate chronologization; but for the dischronologization of the temple cleansing, see comments ad loc.

³⁹⁶ Carson, “Tradition.”

³⁹⁷ Aune, *Eschatology*, 67, n. 3.

³⁹⁸ See Carson, “Tradition.”

biography). But John's adaptation of the Jesus tradition for his community hardly means wholesale fabrication in which Jesus merely symbolizes the community; thus, for example, Jesus is never expelled from the synagogue in this Gospel.³⁹⁹

Points where John overlaps with the Synoptics yet remains independent of them (e.g., 6:1–21; possibly 4:46–54) demonstrate that John freely cast all his material in Johannine idiom,⁴⁰⁰ yet included material that is no farther removed from the source of tradition than the material in the Synoptics is.⁴⁰¹ Jesus' sayings in the Fourth Gospel likewise match much of the sayings material in the Synoptics (e.g., 12:25, 48; 13:16).⁴⁰² The yield would be much higher if we included not only specific parallels but also the *kinds* of materials revealing *coherency* with such content (as is sometimes pursued in Synoptic studies).⁴⁰³ After an extensive study of common material, Leon Morris concludes that John, though without direct literary dependence on the Synoptics, knows the traditions they used: "My conclusion is that John is independent of the Synoptics, but that he is in essential agreement with them."⁴⁰⁴

My own conclusions are similar to Morris's (with the special exception of the Passion Narratives). Although my predisposition is more favorable toward the material than that of many scholars to begin with, most of my early work in John involved John's theology and literary unity, whereas historical tradition in the Gospel seemed to me an untestable matter that was largely irrelevant to the Gospel's meaning in any case. Despite the interest of my doctoral mentor, D. Moody Smith, in the question of John and the Synoptics, I had not pursued that question in any detail until examining some parallel pericopes in the early stages of preparing this commentary, an examination undertaken merely in an effort to be somewhat thorough. What surprised me was that, where John could be tested against the Synoptics, he recounted earlier traditions in the same basic idiom in which he covered ground otherwise unfamiliar to us. While current historical methods cannot locate John precisely on the continuum of historical reliability, they can demonstrate that, where we can test him, John is both historian and theologian. The focal point of our study must be his theology, but he presupposes the Jewish salvation-historical perspective in which God reveals his character (hence true theology) by his acts in history.

Indeed, John's Palestinian cast and his topographical accuracy—verifiable after 70 only by excavations in the twentieth century—lend a greater degree of credibility to John's witness in certain regards.⁴⁰⁵ He updates some language (such as "Pharisees"; see comment on 1:19, 24) but also preserves early traditions (see comment on 7:37–39). Like other ancient writers, John could select and shape events without fabricating them;⁴⁰⁶ as in the

³⁹⁹ Setzer, *Responses*, 84, noting that John's use of Jesus is emblematic but not allegorical, and his sources not necessarily less historical than the Synoptics.

⁴⁰⁰ This would even be the case if one accepted the putative "signs source"; Fortna, "Locale," 60, suggests that John adapted the topography of the source, making geography more theologically prominent.

⁴⁰¹ See Higgins, *Historicity*, 39. Barrett, *John*, 53–54, and Westcott, *John*, lxxxiii, do not regard the differences as irreconcilable, viewing them as in some way superficial.

⁴⁰² Cf. the extensive list of parallels in Howard, *Gospel*, 267–78.

⁴⁰³ Cf., e.g., Ensor, "John 4.35." Although I have occasionally pointed these out in the commentary, I usually have not, since historical setting, rather than historicity of genre, is this commentary's primary focus.

⁴⁰⁴ Morris, *Studies*, 62–63.

⁴⁰⁵ Hunter, "Trends." Streeter, *Gospels*, 393–426, thinks that John knew Mark's and Luke's Passion Narratives but had firsthand knowledge of Jerusalem.

⁴⁰⁶ See Roberson, *Historical Character of the Gospel of John*, 3–16; G. H. H. Hudson, *Gospel*, 85; Hunter, "Trends" (Continued).

Jewish exodus tradition upon which he depends, the theological value of the “signs” he reports depend on their historical validity, and his “witness” is valueless if taken any other way (19:35, 20:26–31).

Raymond Brown summarizes a challenge to the old consensus:

It is well known that the categorical rejection of the historicity of John, so familiar in earlier critical exegesis, can no longer be maintained. We may still find writers stating that the Fourth Gospel cannot be seriously considered as a witness to the historical Jesus, but these represent a type of uncritical traditionalism which arises with age, even in heterodoxy.⁴⁰⁷

Charlesworth suggests that today nearly all John scholars “have concluded that John may contain some of the oldest traditions in . . . the Gospels.”⁴⁰⁸

John’s Distinctive Style and Adaptation of the Gospel Form

Given that John is closer to the Synoptics than to other writings, and that both fall within the spectrum of the ancient biographical genre, one must still seek to account for the differences.⁴⁰⁹ John’s narrative progressively nuances the character of the genre, adapting expectations with which readers more accustomed to such gospels as the Synoptics would have approached his work. That John’s biography of Jesus differs from those of the Synoptic writers is evident; what accounts for these differences?⁴¹⁰

Certainly John’s style, first of all, is distinctive.⁴¹¹ The distinctiveness is most evident in the discourses (John’s most distinctive literary feature vis-à-vis the Synoptics, discussed in our following chapter) but hardly limited to them. Because this commentary’s focus is the Fourth Gospel’s Mediterranean context, we may focus our remarks about John’s style here on the elements that lend themselves most readily to comparison with other ancient style (though, for further discussion, see ch. 2 of the introduction on discourses, and comments on individual passages).

A standard Greek grammar rightly observes that in the technical sense John’s discourses lack “rhetorical art.”⁴¹² John’s style is uniform whether in narrative or discourse,⁴¹³ whereas rhetorically trained writers preferred to adapt speeches even to their specific audiences. Lack of indication of technical rhetorical training does not, however, imply a lack of some rhetorical strategies familiar from the milieu.⁴¹⁴ At various points

⁴⁰⁷ Brown, *Essays*, 187–88.

⁴⁰⁸ Charlesworth, “Scrolls and Gospel,” 66. Robinson, *Priority*, argued that John’s portrait of Jesus was earlier than the Synoptics (though not certain that John wrote earlier).

⁴⁰⁹ Dunn contends for theological as well as historical differences, underlining the diversity of early Christianity (Dunn, “Question”).

⁴¹⁰ Ancient writers understood that different historians would report different points according to their emphases (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *R.A.* 5.56.1), but they did not believe that true histories or other works should contradict one another (Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.15, 37–38).

⁴¹¹ Ancient critics also took style into account—e.g., noting how a writer employed terms elsewhere (e.g., Philostratus *Hrk.* 11.5, on Homer *Od.* 18.359, using *Il.* 21.197).

⁴¹² Blass, Debrunner, and Funk, *Grammar*, §492; cf. also Stamps, “Johannine Writings,” 618–19. This could be acceptable in some sense if appropriate for the audience (cf. *Rhet. Alex.* 22.1434b.27–30); the Gospels, like most novels and other popular works, did not primarily address elite audiences (cf. Dowden, “Callisthenes,” 651).

⁴¹³ Burridge, “Gospels and Acts,” 527.

⁴¹⁴ The Gospel is more advanced than Mark, Burridge, “Gospels and Acts,” 530), though for a professional orator this would not have been a significant claim.

in the commentary, we observe parallels from ancient rhetorical conventions, not because John or his aides would have consciously drawn on rhetorical training but because they are the closest available sources we have for studying speeches disseminated in an ancient Mediterranean context. Many of these parallels apply to the rhythmic patterns in Jesus' speech; such features may, however, simply represent standard techniques of oral patterning for an oral culture, an area that invites much more detailed exploration.⁴¹⁵

Rhetoricians normally emphasized the importance of clarity.⁴¹⁶ John's language is often obscure, which, though generally a rhetorical fault (and probably viewed by some as such if they encountered this Gospel), could be praised when it was deliberate.⁴¹⁷ It could lend an exotic character to speech, sometimes in cultic or theological settings.⁴¹⁸ Some thus connect John's enigmatic style with his high Christology, comparing the grand style of rhetoric.⁴¹⁹ The grand (μέγεθος) style was used where the subject matter was great (Menander Rhetor 2.1–2, 368.9), as in hymns to the gods (Menander Rhetor 1.1, 335.21–22).⁴²⁰ As Maximus of Tyre complains, the subject of the divine merits more splendid diction than mortals can provide (*Or.* 11.1).⁴²¹ Various ancient writers found the eloquence of sublimity appropriate for lofty thoughts.⁴²² Some critics thus conclude that John developed various features of obscurity "to write in a way appropriate to the mysterious and profound nature of his subject."⁴²³

One obvious feature of Johannine style is repetition on a number of levels.⁴²⁴ Although rhetoric did not recommend "a limited repetitive vocabulary," in John's case it does offer "rhetorical emphasis and amplification to the central themes"⁴²⁵ (see our chapter surveying some of the key terms in Johannine theology). Narrative repetition, characteristic of oral narratives,⁴²⁶ is also a paramount feature of this Gospel (see e.g., the standard comparison of the healings in chs. 5 and 9). Repetition to drive home a central point certainly was emphasized in ancient, no less than modern, persuasion.⁴²⁷ Interestingly,

⁴¹⁵ See Harvey, *Listening to Text*.

⁴¹⁶ See, e.g., *Rhet. Alex.* 25.1435a.32–1435b.24 (esp. 1435b.7–16, 19–22); Photius *Bibliotheca* 166.109a (on Antonius Diogenes *Thule*); see further Rowe, "Style," 123–24; Black, "Oration at Olivet," 84 (citing Quintilian 8.2.22).

⁴¹⁷ See Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory*, 17; Black, "Oration at Olivet," 88 (citing Quintilian 9.2.65–95); cf. 2 Pet 3:15–16. Stamps, "Johannine Writings," 620, cites as Johannine examples the abrupt shifts between 5:47 and 6:1 and between 14:31 and 15:1.

⁴¹⁸ Thielman, "Style of Fourth Gospel," 175–77 (citing, e.g., Hermogenes, *Issues* 240.24–241.9; Diogenes Laertius 4.13–14; 9.6, 16; Demetrius 2.101).

⁴¹⁹ Black, "Words," 221–23; Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment*.

⁴²⁰ Menander Rhetor roots this in Homer's grand style (2.1–2, 369.8–9).

⁴²¹ Maximus himself preferred clarity and simplicity (albeit in Atticist terms) except when pursuing such grandeur (Trapp, *Maximus*, xxxiv n. 64, cites as examples of the latter *Or.* 2.10; 10.9; 11.12; 21.7–8; 41.2).

⁴²² Thielman, "Style of Fourth Gospel," 173–75, cites Philo *Worse* 79; *Heir* 4; Longinus *Subl.* 9.3. Stamps, "Johannine Writings," 620, notes asyndeton as a feature of Johannine sublimity (see comment below).

⁴²³ E.g., Thielman, "Style of Fourth Gospel," 182 (cf. John's use of solemnity, 177–78; emphasis and obscurity, 178–80).

⁴²⁴ Thielman, "Style of Fourth Gospel," 172, cites John's redundant use of pronouns, sayings (e.g., 1:15, 30; 4:29, 39; 13:16; 15:20), and on a broader compositional level.

⁴²⁵ Burridge, "Gospels and Acts," 527. John frequently repeats favorite theological terms even though he often varies them with favorite synonyms (see comments on theological language in ch. 7 of the introduction). For the normal preference for stylistic variety, see, e.g., Rowe, "Style," 155.

⁴²⁶ See Dewey, "Oral-Aural Events in the Gospel of John," 148–55 (following Ong, *Orality*, 37–49).

⁴²⁷ See, e.g., Menander Rhetor 2.3, 384.25–27.

emphatic repetition could figure into the grand style,⁴²⁸ and some have suggested a connection with writing about religious themes.⁴²⁹

One should note, however, that the grand style contained amplification and ornament,⁴³⁰ in contrast to John's typically simple style. Simplicity often *was* a rhetorical virtue, at least in many circles.⁴³¹ Certainly, traditional rhetorical theory generally preferred plain, as opposed to flowery, style for narratives.⁴³²

Although his theological complexity is undoubtedly deliberate, however, some obscure features of his grammar prove more surprising. He often includes δέ where we would expect καί and vice-versa, supplies neither where we would expect a conjunction (see comment on 1:17);⁴³³ and includes οὐν in unexpected locations. This pattern, along with often oscillating verb tenses, may reflect a loose storytelling style due to repeated retelling of the Johannine tradition. Otherwise it could resemble a deliberately abrasive κακοφωνία, unexpected syntax meant to hold attention in the forceful style of some rhetoric.⁴³⁴

John's distinctiveness is most evident to the majority of readers, however, at the theological level. Commentators regularly cite the verdict of Clement of Alexandria, preserved in Eusebius, that John differs from the Synoptics as a more "spiritual" gospel, that is, a more theologically interpretive one.⁴³⁵ While this verdict is probably correct, we should note that not all early Christian writers would have concurred to the same degree. Origen regarded John's portrait of Jesus as sometimes only symbolic (although he also allegorized the Synoptics to a lesser degree); but other early Christian commentators did not agree.⁴³⁶ Origen noted disagreements between John and the Synoptics but often resolved them by arguing that John made spiritual points by these divergences;⁴³⁷ Theodore of Mopsuestia sometimes harmonized but sometimes treated the divergences as a sign that John was an eyewitness more accurate than the Synoptics;⁴³⁸ Cyril focused on John's theology, claiming that John addressed the deeper spiritual significance of events, but also harmonized at times.⁴³⁹ Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Augustine worked especially hard to harmonize John and the Synoptics;⁴⁴⁰ the emphasis on harmonization is hardly surprising given the apologetic needs of early Christians.

⁴²⁸ See Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory*, 228 (citing esp. Demetrius 103, 211); for examples of some forms of rhetorical repetition in John, see esp. comment on 6:38–39.

⁴²⁹ Thielman, "Style of Fourth Gospel," 172.

⁴³⁰ See Menander Rhetor 2.6, 399.21–22; 400.7–9 (reflecting the ethos of the Second Sophistic).

⁴³¹ Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Lysias* 2, 4; Menander Rhetor 2.4, 393.21–22; 2.7, 411.23–29; but cf. also 2.7, 411.29–31. On this preference in Koine, cf. Black, "Oration at Olivet," 84.

⁴³² Rowe, "Style," 155–56.

⁴³³ Asyndeton also characterizes John's style (Stamps, "Johannine Writings," 620, lists 1:40, 42, 45; 2:17; 4:6, 7; 5:12, 15; 7:32; 8:27; 9:13; 10:21, 22; 11:35, 44; 20:18); on this style, see *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.30.41; Quintilian 9.3.50; Rowe, "Style," 136 (including Augustine *Serm.* 191.19.5); Lee, "Translations of OT," 779–80 (LXX Job 3:17; 5:10; Isa 1:23); Anderson, *Glossary*, 33–34; also in *Rhet. Alex.* 36.1442a.11–14.

⁴³⁴ In a more technical sense, κακοφωνία is "ill-sounding word order" (Anderson, *Rhetorical Theory*, 187).

⁴³⁵ E.g., Kreitzer, *John*, 5. Other Platonists, however, might find "myth" the best vehicle for allegorical truth (see Maximus of Tyre *Or.* 4.5–6).

⁴³⁶ Wiles, *Gospel*, 22–24.

⁴³⁷ *Ibid.*, 15, though Origen sometimes harmonized as well (16).

⁴³⁸ *Ibid.*, 16–18.

⁴³⁹ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁴⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 14.

With his philosophic penchant for allegory, Origen clearly overstated the case, but in some sense John did engage in more theological exposition than the other gospels;⁴⁴¹ his great number of asides testify to considerable explanation, though much of it is historical. Certainly John's Christology invites more than historical treatment: a Gospel that speaks of "eating" and "drinking" Jesus the way other works described consuming divine Wisdom may invite mystical contemplation of the divine such as appeared in both Platonist and *merkabah* mysticism.⁴⁴² Citing examples such as the anointing story (12:1–8), which shows that John followed his sources but employed them creatively,⁴⁴³ Lindars compares this Gospel with a historical play of Shakespeare that conveys real issues and character yet exhibits freedom in details.⁴⁴⁴ Conservative scholar Bruce puts it similarly, comparing Shakespeare's interpretive paraphrase of Mark Antony's eulogy with a source like Caesar in Plutarch's *Life of Brutus*:

What Shakespeare does by dramatic insight (and, it may be added, what many a preacher does by homiletical skill), all this and much more the Spirit of God accomplished in our Evangelist. It does not take divine inspiration to produce a verbatim transcript; but to reproduce the words which were spirit and life to their first believing hearers in such a way that they continue to communicate their saving message and prove themselves to be spirit and life . . . that is the work of the Spirit of God.⁴⁴⁵

Bruce believes that John's tradition was not simply "*preserved* by John and his disciples . . . it flourished as a living and growing tradition, but remained faithful to its historical basis."⁴⁴⁶ We suspect that John displays more historical substance and interest than Shakespeare, but the analogy of Lindars and Bruce points us in a fruitful direction. John is more "impressionistic" and less "photographic" than the Synoptics, yet clearly works from historical tradition.⁴⁴⁷ All our extant Gospels are interpretive, but John, like the others, "only gave an interpretation where there was something to be interpreted."⁴⁴⁸

Seeking more ancient analogies than Shakespeare, one could compare John's "spiritual" Gospel's interpretation of Jesus (as some early Christians saw it) with Plato's reading of Socrates: a more meditative interpretation of his teacher than Xenophon's or the Synoptics' interpretations of their teachers.⁴⁴⁹ The analogy is helpful but imperfect; evidence for historical tradition in John probably exceeds that for Plato's dialogues. A stronger analogy may be two different kinds of wisdom language; Matthew records especially the sort of wisdom a sage would give in public, John the more esoteric wisdom tradition, both in keeping with Jesus the sage.⁴⁵⁰ Yet another analogy may lie still closer at hand for a Jewish audience. If John was aware of other narrative gospels circulating (and it would be difficult

⁴⁴¹ MacRae, *Invitation*, 16, says that whether or not John used the Synoptics, no one doubts that John reinterprets the Jesus tradition.

⁴⁴² Cf., e.g., Maximus of Tyre *Or.* 11.7–12.

⁴⁴³ Lindars, *John*, 31. Brodie, *Quest*, 153–55, emphasizes John's move from his historical sources to interpretation.

⁴⁴⁴ Lindars, *John*, 25.

⁴⁴⁵ Bruce, *John*, 16.

⁴⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁴⁴⁷ As noted especially in Thompson, "Historical Jesus."

⁴⁴⁸ Gerhardsson, "Path," 96.

⁴⁴⁹ Appian *R.H.* 11.7.41 is skeptical of Plato's accuracy (but paradoxically takes the *Iliad* more seriously, *R.H.* 12.1.1). Cf. also the quite different portrayal of Musonius Rufus in the collections of Lucius and Pollio (Lutz, "Musonius," 15).
Craig S. Keener, The Gospel of John
 Baker Academic, a division of Baker Publishing Group, © 2003. Used by permission.

⁴⁵⁰ See Witherington, *Sage*, 336–38.

to believe that he was not, even if, as we think, he did not have those scrolls open in front of him), his adaptation of the form could well rest on a precedent he found in his Bible.

Thus perhaps more significantly as an analogy, John's Greek-speaking Jewish contemporaries knew Deuteronomy as a sort of "second law," a more cohesive epitome or revisitation of the law from a different angle.⁴⁵¹ John's many speeches may resemble the lengthy deliberative speeches of Moses in Deuteronomy. This is not to suggest that John has structured his Gospel like Deuteronomy, with its blessings or curses. Nor does this Gospel directly resemble the many rewritings of Pentateuchal material from this period.⁴⁵² But the book is full of Deuteronomic and Mosaic allusions (such as Moses' signs) and comparisons favoring Jesus over Moses.⁴⁵³ The prologue presents Jesus as Torah, greater than Moses; assertions of his deity frame the prologue (1:1, 18) and the gospel minus its epilogue (1:1; 20:28). Other texts also present Jesus as greater than Moses (5:45–46; 6:32; 9:28–29; 15:13–15). Jesus' final discourse in the Gospel would fulfill the same function as that of Moses in Deuteronomy, planting the narrative into the life of the future community, followed by the narrative of his death.⁴⁵⁴ Moses was the greatest prophet because he knew God "face to face" (Deut 34:10); Jesus himself is God's face (John 1:18).

Conclusion

The Fourth Gospel is closer in form and substance to the Synoptic Gospels than to the apocryphal and gnostic gospels, but its divergence from dependence on Synoptic tradition makes most of its contents impossible to verify (or falsify) on purely historical grounds. That John falls into the general category of biography, however, at least shifts the burden of proof on the matter of reported events (albeit not the particular ways of describing them) onto those who deny John's use of tradition for the events he describes, although the historical method cannot check the accuracy of most of his individual details. The different portrait of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel suggests that John has taken more sermonic liberties in his portrayal of Jesus, but this does not demonstrate that he lacks historical tradition on which the portrayal is based.⁴⁵⁵ Comparisons with the Synoptics suggest that John both uses historical tradition and tells it in a distinctive way; but this pattern is more obvious for the narratives than for the more interpretive discourses, on which see the next chapter.

⁴⁵¹ Deuteronomy was one of the most popular books, perhaps the most popular book, among early Jewish interpreters, if incidence at Qumran supplies a clue (Cross, *Library*, 43). Westermann, *John*, 22–23, 67, likewise compares the contrast between the interpretive speeches of Deuteronomy and Joshua, on the one hand, with Exodus and Numbers, on the other; Stuhlmacher, "Theme," 15, compares John's use of Jesus tradition with *Jubilees* or 11QT "updating" the Pentateuch.

⁴⁵² As rewritings of Deuteronomy, Ashton, *Understanding*, 472, mentions *Jub. 1; L.A.B. 19; 1Q22; Testament of Moses*. 11QTemple may function as an eschatological Deuteronomy (Wise, "Vision"); at least 11QTemple 51.11–66.11 adapts and often paraphrases Deut (Schiffman, "Paraphrase").

⁴⁵³ For Moses parallels, see, e.g., Teeple, *Prophet*; Glasson, *Moses*; Herlong, "Covenant"; Lacomara, "Deuteronomy"; Ashton, *Understanding*, 472–76. In this Gospel, however, it is Jesus' disciples who are most analogous with Moses, and Jesus as God's glory (1:14).

⁴⁵⁴ For comparisons of John 13–17 with Moses' last discourse, see our comments ad loc. Jesus' promise of the Spirit is his testament to the new community like Jacob's testamentary blessing of the tribes in Gen 49:3–27 and Moses' in Deut 33.

⁴⁵⁵ Dodd, "Portrait," suggests that John supplements what we know from the Synoptics, but argues that the figure of Jesus stands behind both.

This impasse in deciding between John as a substantially reliable historical source (reporting events and Jesus' teachings in his own way) and John as a free adapter of relatively few traditions could be challenged more effectively if we could determine the nature of his sources. Although knowing his sources would not determine the degree of adaptation, dependence on a genuinely historically reliable source would improve our ability to trust the Fourth Gospel's historical witness to Jesus, a trust much of the Johannine community regarded as very important (1 John 4:1–6).

Given the common traditions early Christians shared, the frequency of travel in the Roman world, and the widespread circulation of at least Mark by this period, it is not unlikely that John knew some forms of the Synoptic tradition. Even where he overlaps with this tradition, however, he goes his own way, telling the story independently and probably from memory. But if the author of the Fourth Gospel, its tradition or its nucleus were himself an eyewitness—a view much disputed in recent years but consonant with the claims of the Gospel itself (1:14, 19:35; cf. 1 John 1:1)—independence from the Synoptic tradition would not call into question its essential reliability; indeed, it could (in the documentary sense) make the Fourth Gospel a step closer to the historical Jesus than the Synoptics are. If the Fourth Gospel was not dictated by but nevertheless depends on an eyewitness, its basic claims concerning events remain at least on historical par with the Synoptics. Only if no eyewitness tradition stands behind it on any level, and it was freely composed novelistically or with the most liberal haggadic adaptation (all scholars acknowledge *some* adaptation and conformity with Johannine idiom), does the Gospel fail to provide substantial historical data about Jesus. The question of authorship is therefore important for determining where this Gospel fits within the continuum of ancient biographies' treatment of history. Before we turn to that question, however, we must examine a specific form-critical matter in this Gospel that is distinctive to it vis-à-vis the Synoptics: its speech material.