

**Jesus as *Kyrios* in the Gospel of John:
A Narrative, Text-Critical and Semantic Study**

Paul C.J. Riley

**Thesis submitted to Flinders University
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences

21 November, 2017

Contents

Summary.....	vii
Declaration.....	ix
Acknowledgements.....	x
1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Outline.....	1
1.2. Key Research Questions.....	2
1.2.1. Narrative.....	2
1.2.2. Textual Criticism.....	2
1.2.3. Semantics.....	2
2. Literature Review.....	3
2.1. Narrative.....	3
2.1.1. Context.....	3
2.1.2. Structure.....	5
2.1.3. Character.....	8
2.1.4. Irony.....	9
2.1.5. Point of View.....	11
2.2. Textual Criticism.....	14
2.2.1. Criteria.....	14
2.2.2. Papyri Dates.....	15
2.2.3. Narrative Solutions.....	16
2.3. Semantics.....	16
2.3.1. Semantic Domains.....	16
2.3.2. Cognitive Semantics.....	17
2.3.3. The Semantics of <i>Kyrios</i>	18
2.3.4. Sociolinguistics and <i>Κόριε</i>	18
2.4. The Gospel of John and <i>Kyrios</i>	19
3. Methodology.....	22
3.1. Narrative Theory.....	22
3.1.1. Reader.....	22
3.1.2. Context.....	23

3.1.3.	Structure	25
3.1.4.	Character	26
3.1.5.	Irony	26
3.1.6.	Point of View.....	27
3.2.	Textual Criticism	28
3.3.	Semantics	29
3.3.1.	Conventional Constraints.....	29
3.3.2.	Contextual Constraints.....	30
3.3.3.	The Article	31
3.3.4.	Sociolinguistic Factors	32
4.	<i>Kyrios</i> in the Gospel of John	34
4.1.	The Way of the <i>Kyrios</i>	34
4.1.1.	Narrative	34
4.1.1.1.	Context	34
4.1.1.2.	Structure	37
4.1.1.3.	Character	39
4.1.1.4.	Irony	41
4.1.1.5.	Point of View.....	43
4.1.2.	Textual Criticism.....	44
4.1.3.	Semantics	46
4.1.4.	Summary.....	47
4.2.	<i>Kyrios</i> in Samaria	48
4.2.1.	Narrative	48
4.2.1.1.	Context	48
4.2.1.2.	Structure	49
4.2.1.3.	Character	50
4.2.1.4.	Irony	53
4.2.1.5.	Point of View.....	54
4.2.2.	Textual Criticism.....	56
4.2.3.	Semantics	61
4.2.4.	Summary.....	63
4.3.	<i>Kyrios</i> and the Royal Official	64
4.3.1.	Narrative	64
4.3.1.1.	Context	64
4.3.1.2.	Structure	65

4.3.1.3.	Character	66
4.3.1.4.	Irony	68
4.3.1.5.	Point of View.....	70
4.3.2.	Semantics	71
4.3.3.	Summary.....	72
4.4.	<i>Kyrios and the Man at the Pool</i>	73
4.4.1.	Narrative.....	73
4.4.1.1.	Context	73
4.4.1.2.	Structure	73
4.4.1.3.	Character	74
4.4.1.4.	Irony	78
4.4.1.5.	Point of View.....	79
4.4.2.	Textual Criticism.....	80
4.4.3.	Semantics	81
4.4.4.	Summary.....	82
4.5.	The Bread of the <i>Kyrios</i>	82
4.5.1.	Narrative.....	82
4.5.1.1.	Context	82
4.5.1.2.	Structure	86
4.5.1.3.	Character	87
4.5.1.3.1.	The Crowd.....	87
4.5.1.3.2.	Peter.....	90
4.5.1.4.	Irony	93
4.5.1.5.	Point of View.....	94
4.5.2.	Textual Criticism.....	95
4.5.3.	Semantics	98
4.5.4.	Summary.....	101
4.6.	<i>Kyrios and the Man Born Blind</i>	102
4.6.1.	Narrative.....	102
4.6.1.1.	Context	102
4.6.1.2.	Structure	105
4.6.1.3.	Character	107
4.6.1.4.	Irony	109
4.6.1.5.	Point of View.....	110
4.6.2.	Textual Criticism.....	110
4.6.3.	Semantics	118

4.6.4.	Summary	119
4.7.	<i>Kyrios Gives Life</i>	119
4.7.1.	Narrative	119
4.7.1.1.	Context	119
4.7.1.2.	Structure	120
4.7.1.3.	Character	121
4.7.1.3.1.	The Disciples	121
4.7.1.3.2.	Mary and Martha	122
4.7.1.4.	Irony	126
4.7.1.5.	Point of View	127
4.7.2.	Textual Criticism	128
4.7.3.	Semantics	130
4.7.4.	Summary	133
4.8.	<i>Kyrios in Jerusalem</i>	134
4.8.1.	Narrative	134
4.8.1.1.	Context	134
4.8.1.2.	Structure	139
4.8.1.3.	Character	141
4.8.1.3.1.	The Crowd	141
4.8.1.3.2.	The Greeks	143
4.8.1.4.	Irony	144
4.8.1.5.	Point of View	145
4.8.2.	Semantics	147
4.8.3.	Summary	148
4.9.	<i>Kyrios and his Disciples</i>	149
4.9.1.	Narrative	149
4.9.1.1.	Context	149
4.9.1.2.	Structure	149
4.9.1.3.	Character	150
4.9.1.3.1.	Peter	150
4.9.1.3.2.	Jesus	152
4.9.1.3.3.	The Other Disciples	154
4.9.1.4.	Irony	155
4.9.1.5.	Point of View	156
4.9.2.	Textual Criticism	157
4.9.3.	Semantics	159

4.9.4.	Summary	161
4.10.	The Risen <i>Kyrios</i>	162
4.10.1.	Narrative	162
4.10.1.1.	Context	162
4.10.1.2.	Structure.....	164
4.10.1.3.	Character	165
4.10.1.3.1.	Mary Magdalene	165
4.10.1.3.2.	The Disciples.....	170
4.10.1.3.3.	Thomas.....	171
4.10.1.4.	Irony	171
4.10.1.5.	Point of View	172
4.10.2.	Semantics	174
4.10.3.	Summary	176
4.11.	It is the <i>Kyrios</i>	176
4.11.1.	Narrative	176
4.11.1.1.	Context	176
4.11.1.2.	Structure.....	177
4.11.1.3.	Character	178
4.11.1.3.1.	The Disciple whom Jesus Loved	178
4.11.1.3.2.	Peter	179
4.11.1.4.	Irony	180
4.11.1.5.	Point of View	181
4.11.2.	Semantics	181
4.11.3.	Summary	183
5.	Conclusion	184
5.1.	Summary of Findings	184
5.1.1.	Narrative	184
5.1.2.	Textual Criticism.....	186
5.1.3.	Semantics	187
5.2.	Contributions of this Study	190
5.2.1.	Narrative	190
5.2.2.	Textual Criticism.....	191
5.2.3.	Semantics	191
5.3.	Avenues for Further Study	192
5.3.1.	Narrative	192

5.3.2. Textual Criticism	193
5.3.3. Semantics	193
5.4. Final Words	193
Bibliography	194

Summary

This thesis is an analysis of the use and significance of the term *kyrios* in the Gospel of John. By means of a sequential application of specific narrative-critical, text-critical and semantic categories, it presents an overarching narrative reading of the Gospel.

For each section of the narrative, text-critically secure occurrences of *kyrios* form the basis of an analysis of narrative context, structure, character, point of view and irony. Following this is the analysis of textual variants related to *kyrios*. This order of operations ensures that initial narrative-critical conclusions inform the evaluation of authorial tendencies for the text-critical analysis. The resulting text-critically secure occurrences of *kyrios* are then analysed to determine their semantic range. The results of this analysis form the basis of concluding summaries which trace the sequential journey of the reader through the narrative.

This thesis finds that there are fifty-one occurrences of *kyrios* in the earliest recoverable text of the Gospel of John. The semantic analysis of each occurrence utilises the semantic domains of Louw and Nida and the cognitive-semantic framework of Alan Cruse. The narrator consistently uses *kyrios* to acknowledge that Jesus is a supernatural being who exercises supernatural authority. Before the resurrection, John (the Baptist) is the only character who uses *kyrios* in this way. Until 20:18, all disciples who address Jesus as *kyrios* do so to acknowledge his authority over them. Others who address Jesus as *kyrios* communicate their respect for him. From 20:18, all characters who use *kyrios* acknowledge that Jesus is a supernatural being who exercises supernatural authority.

This thesis demonstrates that the term *kyrios* functions as a thread within the unified narrative of the Gospel of John. Beginning with 1:23, the term is used to highlight the difference between the narrator's and characters' understanding of Jesus. This thread connects the narrator's presentation of Jesus as the divine *kyrios* with the characters' use of the vocative throughout chapters 1-15. The thread is not picked up throughout the trial and crucifixion of Jesus. It re-emerges, however, in the resurrection narratives, when the gap between the narrator and characters closes. From 20:18 onwards, characters use *kyrios* in unison with the narrator, as they acknowledge that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*.

The thesis also finds that the term *kyrios* in the Gospel of John is connected to the prophecy of Isaiah and the concept of glory. In the Greek of both Isaiah 6 and Isaiah 40-55, *kyrios* is linked

to glory. The Gospel of John calls on this testimony to demonstrate that seeing Jesus' glory is acknowledging his divine identity. When the disciples testify in the first person that they have seen the *kyrios*, the reader considers Isaiah's same testimony in the temple vision (Isa 6:1, 5). As Isaiah saw the *kyrios* revealing his glory, and the narrator informs the reader that this was Jesus' glory (12:41), the disciples also see Jesus, the *kyrios*, revealing his glory.

Declaration

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

Paul Riley

Date.....21/11/2017.....

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors, the Rev. Dr. Vicky Balabanski and Dr. Carl Gross, for their guidance, wisdom and patience throughout the writing of this thesis. It was a privilege to be supervised by them and to learn from them during this candidature. I am especially grateful for their holistic approach to supervision, encompassing both academic and personal support. In addition, I would like to acknowledge the excellent library services from which I have benefitted, both the Flinders University Library Document Delivery Service and the Adelaide Theological Library. For my confirmation of candidature assessment, Prof. Steve Walton provided valuable feedback and has also been generous with his time, advice and expertise in an ongoing way. In personal communication, Dr. Dirk Jongkind provided important guidance regarding textual criticism, and Dr. Stephen Levinsohn gave me valuable assistance regarding the application of discourse analysis to this project. At the Australian and New Zealand Association of Theological Schools conference in Melbourne, 2016, Dr. R. Geoffrey Jenkins and Edmund Fun shared insights and gave encouragement, for which I am very grateful. For valuable feedback, advice and checking of this thesis, I am thankful to my parents, Keith and Ros Riley. My wife, Bethlehem, has been an ongoing source of patient support and encouragement throughout this project. My children, Elijah and Zoe, have given much-needed reminders of the importance of focusing on every moment of every day.

I will give thanks to you, O Lord my God, with all my heart

ἐξομολογήσομαί σοι κύριε ὁ θεός μου ἐν ὅλη καρδίᾳ μου

and I will glorify your name forever.

καὶ δοξάσω τὸ ὄνομά σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

Psalm 86:12 (Grk 85:12)

1. Introduction

The questions which gave rise to this thesis first started to take shape when I was translating the Gospel of John. Of all the translational challenges in the Gospel, the one that was most prominent was how to translate *kyrios*.¹ Having consulted other translations, it became clear that others had wrestled with the question of when *kyrios* communicated recognition of Jesus' divine identity. The key issue I considered was not whether Jesus is recognised as divine in the Gospel of John, but when this recognition takes place. That is, at what point in the narrative will *kyrios* be translated to acknowledge Jesus' divinity? Because this translational concern was at heart a semantic issue, the first question to form was "What does *kyrios* mean in the Gospel of John?" To answer the semantic question, it became obvious that understanding characters in the narrative was crucial. And this, in turn, required knowledge of how the narrative of the Gospel functioned, and the function of *kyrios* within the narrative. As a result, another question which emerged was "How does *kyrios* function in the Gospel of John?" Because a number of the occurrences of *kyrios* in the manuscript tradition of the Gospel of John have been transmitted with some variation, it was necessary to ask a third question: "Where is *kyrios* in the Gospel of John?" With these questions in mind, I plunged into the narrative to explore the What, How and Where of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John.

1.1. Outline

This study is an analysis of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John. It utilises insights from narrative, text-critical and semantic theory. It begins by setting out the key research questions for this study in the three theoretical areas of focus. A literature review then surveys scholarship related to the three key areas. Following this, the methodology section summarises the key elements of the narrative, text-critical and semantic approaches in this study. The body of the study examines each occurrence of *kyrios*, moving sequentially through the Gospel, dividing the analysis according to sections in the narrative. Each section contains narrative, text-critical and semantic analyses and ends with a summary of the reader's journey until that point in the narrative. The conclusion includes a summary of the findings, key contributions of the study, and outlines potential areas for future research.

¹ Throughout this study, *kyrios* occurs untranslated to avoid the need to make judgements about its meaning before completing a semantic analysis for each occurrence of the word. When this transliterated nominative form is used, its case is incidental, as it represents the lexeme itself. Greek letters occur in direct citations from the Gospel of John, citations of manuscripts in textual critical analyses, and at other times when a specific case is required.

1.2. Key Research Questions

1.2.1. Narrative

1.2.1.1. What is the narrative function of *kyrios*?

1.2.1.2. How does a narrative understanding of *kyrios* relate to the narrative as a whole?

1.2.2. Textual Criticism

1.2.2.1. Where is *kyrios* the earliest recoverable reading in the manuscript tradition?

1.2.2.2. What are the implications of utilising narrative theory to understand intrinsic probabilities?

1.2.3. Semantics

1.2.3.1. What does *kyrios* mean in each of its occurrences in the earliest recoverable text?

1.2.3.2. In what ways does a narrative critical reading facilitate semantic analysis?

2. Literature Review

To understand the Gospel of John as a narrative presupposes the narrative unity of the text. This study proceeds from the position that previous studies of John's literary and stylistic unity have confirmed the validity of approaching the Gospel as a unified narrative from 1:1 to 21:25.² From that viewpoint, it will be possible to review key ideas within Johannine Studies that are relevant to the five areas that comprise the narrative approach of this study: context, structure, character, irony and point of view.

2.1. Narrative

2.1.1. Context

Narrative context, both external and internal, is a key area of study for the analysis of the Gospel of John.³ The external context for the Gospel is primarily the socio-religious background of the narrative, and the internal context comprises all of the narrative text that precedes and follows the scene under examination. There are three contextual issues surveyed below which are of particular relevance for a synchronic study of the Gospel of John.

First, when considering the extent of external context, it is important to focus on the text of the Gospel as we have it. Following this strategy, as initiated in the pioneering work of R. Alan Culpepper, it is necessary to distinguish a literary approach from issues of composition. This

² The ground-breaking work of R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983) has been followed by a number of commentaries that will be consulted throughout this study. With regard to stylistic consistency, a study of 153 characteristics of Johannine style is Eugen Ruckstuhl and Peter Dschulnigg, *Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage im Johannesevangelium: Die johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des Neuen Testaments und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums* (Göttingen: Universitätsverlag, 1991). In addition to literary unity, with respect to literary genre, this study proceeds from the position that the Gospel of John is βίος Ἰησοῦ. For the argument that John fits this genre, see Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 213-32. As a result, there is no attempt to undertake a two-level reading whereby the narrative is understood as also describing events experienced by a community associated with the Gospel, as in Raymond E. Brown, *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979) and J. Louis Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003). For recent engagements with two-level readings, and more broadly the notion of the Johannine Community, see Tobias Hägerland, "John's Gospel: A Two-Level Drama?" *JSNT* 25 (2003): 309-22, Richard Bauckham, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 113-24, Edward W. Klink, *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), Jonathan Bernier, *Aposynagōgos and the Historical Jesus in John* (Leiden: Brill, 2013) and David A. Lamb, *Text, Context and the Johannine Community: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Johannine Writings* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).

³ The two categories of "external" and "internal" context parallel the "intertexture" and "inner texture" categories of Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996), 3-4.

ensures that historical concerns do not overshadow the literary insights that come from focusing on the final form of the Gospel.⁴ As a result, when taking a focused narrative approach to the Gospel of John, source criticism is not within the bounds of external context. In retaining this narrow focus, a synchronic approach requires the interpreter to reach conclusions based upon the form of the text as we have it, rather than positing reconstructions and rearrangements. However, this approach is not a dismissal of attempts to examine the historical aspects of the composition of the Gospel. In contrast, the results of a literary-oriented approach can inform future engagement with other important areas of research for understanding the Gospel of John.⁵

Second, a focus on the final form of the text of John does not lessen the need to incorporate external context into the interpretive process. Rather, external context is a crucial element of the interpretive process “in order to read John’s narrative well.”⁶ In this study, the primary focus with regard to external context is the Old Testament.⁷ As Jean Zumstein has argued, an understanding of the broader context of Old Testament citations and allusions in the Gospel of John allows the reader to see both how the narrative illuminates these earlier texts, and also how the narrative of the Gospel is illuminated by them.⁸ This focus on the Old Testament does not negate the importance of other texts that are external to the narrative. These other texts, including the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, the Synoptic Gospels, other New Testament texts, The New Testament Apocrypha, Greco-Roman literature, texts from Second Temple Judaism, and writings from early Rabbinic Judaism, all play valuable roles in understanding the context in which the Gospel of John was published.

Third, to identify the way internal context contributes to the interpretation of the narrative, it is important to orientate oneself to the perspective of the reader.⁹ In this way, only preceding internal context is relevant when approaching each successive scene in the narrative. This concern for the reader guides the way all context, internal and external, is incorporated into the interpretation of the narrative. Francis Moloney’s work illustrates the value of this approach, as

⁴ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 5. These same concerns are expressed by Thomas L. Brodie, *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 11-14, who separated his source-critical study of the Gospel of John from his literary study, publishing it in a separate monograph, *The Quest for the Origin of John’s Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

⁵ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 5.

⁶ Marianne M. Thompson, *John: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015), 23. Francis Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 18, follows a similar approach and states that “[f]irst-century history and culture must play a part in interpretation.”

⁷ For Francis Moloney’s brief discussion of using “Old Testament,” see his *Love in the Gospel of John: An Exegetical, Theological and Literary Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 1.

⁸ Jean Zumstein, “Intratextuality and Intertextuality in the Gospel of John.” in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*, (eds. Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore; Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 121-135 (133-134).

⁹ The reader as ideal, implied reader will be discussed below in 3.1.1.

he draws together narrative threads from the perspective of a reader who is progressively gaining insight into the narrative.¹⁰ For each new scene, readers are aware of all that they have already read in the narrative, but not the detail of what lies ahead. However, it is not as though the reader has no knowledge of the life and ministry of Jesus. In this regard, Moloney argues that “it is impossible that the reader in a Christian Gospel has no knowledge or experience of the story of Jesus of Nazareth.”¹¹ As D. Moody Smith states, the Gospel of John was written for readers who know about Jesus, his death and resurrection before encountering this new narrative.¹²

This brief survey of three guiding principles for narrative context has demonstrated the priority of the text of the Gospel as we have it, the importance of taking external context seriously, and the need to consider the reader in using context for interpretation, giving particular attention to preceding internal context.

2.1.2. Structure

The structure of the Gospel of John at a macro and micro level is a topic of concern for all who seek to interpret it as a narrative. Three key issues in the structure of this Gospel are the prologue, the transition from chapter 12 to 13, and the epilogue.¹³

The opening verses of the Gospel of John are a prologue to the narrative that follows. Although there is debate surrounding both the historical and structural aspects of the prologue, its function as an introduction to major themes in the Gospel is the dominant interpretative position of Johannine scholars.¹⁴ The themes raised in the prologue, which also occur again in the narrative,

¹⁰ In addition to frequent references to the reader throughout his three-volume narrative-critical commentary, Moloney includes a separate reflective summary of the reader’s journey at the end of each of the first two volumes, *Belief in the Word: Reading John 1-4* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 192-7, and *Signs and Shadows: Reading John 5-12* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 202-8. The third volume, *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 182-92, ends with a focus on chapter 21, rather than the reader-oriented reviews found in the first two volumes. In his later single-volume commentary, *The Gospel of John*, Moloney’s concern for the reader likewise orientates his interpretation throughout.

¹¹ Moloney, *John*, 17.

¹² D. Moody Smith, *John* (Nashville: Abingden Press, 1999), 29.

¹³ For a detailed overview of approaches to the structure of the Gospel from 1907-2007, see George Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011), 51-278.

¹⁴ Substantial debate exists surrounding the composition of the prologue, primarily on the relationship between a proposed non-Johannine hymn and other Johannine elements. For an overview of these issues and a survey of relevant scholarship, see Martinus C. de Boer, "The Original Prologue to the Gospel of John." *NTS* 61 (2015): 448-467 (455-460). As the debate on these matters is concerned with diachronic factors outside the scope of this study, they do not feature further. Of more importance to this study, however, is de Boer’s proposal that 1:1-5 is a more suitable candidate for a prologue than 1:1-18, building on the work of Peter J. Williams, "Not the Prologue of John." *JSNT* 33 (2011): 375-386. Prior to both of these studies, in a narrative commentary, J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), similarly proposed that 1:1-5 is best understood as a distinct literary

provide the reader with the narrator's understanding of the identity of Jesus. They establish, amongst other concepts, the contrasts of acceptance-rejection and belief-unbelief in 1:10-11 that permeate the narrative.¹⁵ The prologue also introduces the notions of flesh (σάρξ) and glory (δόξα) in 1:14, which serve as a paradigm for understanding the identity of Jesus, and the responses to him, within the narrative.¹⁶

The second major division in the structure of the Gospel of John is the transition between chapters 12 and 13. Due to the recurring signs (σημεῖα) in the first division (1:19-12:50), Raymond Brown proposed the title "The Book of Signs" to contrast with "The Book of Glory" (13:1-20:31).¹⁷ However, in addition to signs, the first major section of the narrative is also characterised by its description of Jesus' public ministry, in contrast to his private ministry in connection with the disciples, which begins with 13:1. Recognizing this dynamic, Jean Zumstein entitles 1:19-12:50 "The Revelation of Jesus to the World," which he contrasts with "The Revelation of Jesus' Glory to His Own" for 13:1-20:31.¹⁸ This provides a more explicit description than Brown, by elucidating whose glory is revealed, and to whom it is revealed. Despite these differences, both approaches share the dominant view in Johannine scholarship that 13:1 marks the beginning of a new section of the narrative for which glory is a key component.

The internal structure of 1:19-12:50 poses significant complexities for the interpreter. Brown's attitude regarding these matters is instructive, as he proposes a working model for understanding this portion of the narrative "with hesitation, realizing the danger of imposing insights on the evangelist."¹⁹ His hesitation to identify sub-sections stems from the "relatively continuous

preamble. Perhaps the best solution to the questions raised by de Boer, Williams and Michaels is that of Jean Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 73, who both recognises the function of 1:1-18 as the prologue, and also considers 1:1-5 as "Der Prolog im Prolog."

¹⁵ Elizabeth Harris, *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 9-25; Christopher W. Skinner, "Misunderstanding, Christology, and Johannine Characterization: Reading John's Characters through the Lens of the Prologue." in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*, (ed. Christopher W. Skinner; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 111-128.

¹⁶ James L. Resseguie, *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 201.

¹⁷ Brown presented this major structural outline in the introduction to his commentary in 1966 (*The Gospel According to John: Introduction, Translation and Notes* (2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966-70), 1:CXXXVIII), again in *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 334, and maintained the approach in the revision of the introduction to his commentary, published posthumously as *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (ed. Francis J. Moloney; New York: Doubleday, 2003), 298.

¹⁸ "Die Offenbarung Jesu vor der Welt" and "Die Offenbarung der Herrlichkeit Jesu vor den Seinen" (Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 8, 11). Rudolf K. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (trans. George R. Beasley-Murray; Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), ix-x, entitles the two sections "The revelation of the δόξα to the World" and "The revelation of the δόξα before the community."

¹⁹ Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 304.

narrative” the reader encounters throughout the section.²⁰ Brown’s proposed solution is to identify four parts, 1:19-51, 2-4, 5-10, 11-12, with the first three parts connected by “bridge scenes” that appear to bring the previous part to an end, and also introduce the following part.²¹ In contrast to Brown’s desire to group scenes into larger narrative parts, other scholars such as Zumstein do not combine smaller narrative units.²² However, despite not formally relying on a structure like Brown’s, Zumstein still observes that, for example, a function of the second miracle at Cana (4:46-54) is to bracket the section which began with the first miracle at Cana (2:1-11), which corresponds to Brown’s “Cana to Cana” narrative in chapters 2 to 4.²³ In this way, whether interpreters seek to establish larger narrative “parts” or not, in practice these different methods do not prevent similar interpretive conclusions.

The second major part of the Gospel consists of chapters 13-17, 18-19, and 20. Although the nature of 18-19 as the passion narrative and chapter 20 as an account of the resurrection is self-evident, the structure of 13-17 has received significant attention from scholars with a variety of historical and literary concerns.²⁴ This scholarly attention has in large measure been concerned with addressing the repeated themes that appear in 14:1-31 and 16:4b-33. Several scholars have proposed chiasms of varying complexity for the section that attempt to account for these repetitions.²⁵ Brown, however, does not see chiasm as the solution to the “problem” of this section. Rather, he expresses his concern that, instead of accurately reflecting the goals of the one responsible for the text as we have it, chiasmic solutions may reflect “the interpreter’s ingenuity.”²⁶ As an alternative to chiasmic proposals, Brown’s own structural analysis consists of the divisions of 13:1-30, 13:31-14:31, 15-16 and 17, and he proposes numerous sub-divisions and units in an attempt to account for thematic repetitions and shifts.²⁷ Although the details of

²⁰ Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 300.

²¹ Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 300-303.

²² Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 8-11.

²³ Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 199.

²⁴ For the history of interpretation of chapters 13-17, see L. Scott Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 10-78.

²⁵ For a survey of proposed chiasms see Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse*, 61-72.

²⁶ Brown, *John*, 2:597. As Brown did not commence his revision of the structure of the Book of Glory, this discussion draws on the analysis found in his commentary. Francis Moloney, the editor of Brown’s *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 308-309, supplements Brown’s analysis of the Book of Signs with his own treatment of the Book of Glory, including a chiasmic analysis of chapters 13-17.

²⁷ Brown, *John*, 2:545-547. Although Brown bases his analysis on the reconstruction of sources, a process that is not engaged with here, ultimately his conclusions rest on a close reading of the text. Another approach to this section is in the commentary of Zumstein. For an overview of his diachronic “relecture” approach, see Jean Zumstein, “Der Prozess der Relecture in der johanneischen Literatur.” *NTS* 42 (1996): 394-411, and his “Intratextuality and Intertextuality in the Gospel of John,” 121-135 (125-128). For his analysis of 13:31-14:31 and 15:1-16:33, which he entitles “Die erste Abschiedsrede” and “Die zweite Abschiedsrede,” see his *Das Johannesevangelium*, 502-624. Two of Zumstein’s students who earlier applied the same approach to this section of the Gospel of John are Andreas Dettwiler, *Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten. Eine exegetische Studie zu den johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Joh 13:1-16:33) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Relektur-Charakters* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht,

Brown's structure may be open to the same criticism he aimed at chiasmic proposals, his identification of the major divisions appropriately recognises major shifts in this section of the narrative, and provides an appropriate framework for interpretation.

Chapter 21 of the Gospel of John has been the focus of considerable scholarly attention. As stated above, the methodological position that this study proceeds from is that the Gospel of John, from 1:1 to 21:25, is a literary unity.²⁸ From this position, it is possible to incorporate insights from scholars who recognise thematic links across the whole narrative, including the epilogue, into the interpretative process. As a result, from a structural perspective, chapters 1-21 is a literary whole, commencing with a prologue, and ending with an epilogue.²⁹

This brief survey has highlighted the importance of the prologue and the integral nature of the epilogue for understanding the narrative. In addition, it has shown that, despite differences with regard to detailed analyses of structure, there is broad agreement on major structural divisions in the Gospel.

2.1.3. Character

Recent studies of characters in the Gospel of John have shown how important characters and characterization are within the narrative.³⁰ This research has also demonstrated characters' complexity and ambiguity. Colleen Conway has argued that ambiguity is a key feature of Johannine characterization, and that this ambiguity renders clear and distinct categorization or evaluation unsuitable.³¹ In a similar way, in her study of a range of characters in the Gospel,

1995), and Klaus Scholtissek, *In ihm sein und bleiben: die Sprache der Immanenz in den johanneischen Schriften* (Freiburg: Herder, 2000). For Scholtissek's complementary synchronic réécriture method, see his "Relecture und réécriture: Neue Paradigmen zur Methode und Inhalt." *TP* 75 (2000): 1-29. As both relecture and réécriture are proposals regarding the compositional processes by which the text of the Gospel of John as we have it came to be, they are not engaged with in this study.

²⁸ For the case for the unity of the whole narrative, including chapter 21, see, for example, Paul S. Minear, "The Original Functions of John 21." *JBL* 102 (1983): 85-98, Brodie, *John*, 572-82, R. Alan Culpepper, "Designs for the Church in the Imagery of John 21:1-14." in *Imagery in the Gospel of John*, (eds. Jörg Frey, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 369-402, Bauckham, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple*, 271-284, and Stanley E. Porter, *John, His Gospel, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 225-245.

²⁹ For use of the term "Epilogue," see Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 773, and Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 773.

³⁰ See, for example, Christopher W. Skinner, *John and Thomas—Gospels in Conflict? Johannine Characterization and the Thomas question* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2009), Christopher W. Skinner ed, *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013), Steven A. Hunt, et al. eds, *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), and Cornelis Bennema, *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014). Bennema provides his full model of character in his *A Theory of Character in New Testament Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014).

³¹ Conway, "Speaking through Ambiguity," 330, writes, "Nicodemus is not the only ambiguous character in the Gospel. Rather, throughout the narrative, the Fourth Evangelist repeatedly portrays characters in indeterminate ways. Again

Susan Hylen argues that an attempt to evaluate characters' faith responses into distinct categories results in the reader missing the richness of the characters' presentation in the narrative.³² These two studies demonstrate that ambiguity represents an integral element of character complexity, rather than a problem to be resolved.

One aspect of narrative theory that is especially relevant to study of characters is the use of recognition (ἀναγνώρισις) scenes. In 1923, F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock presented a literary analysis of the Gospel of John in which he argued that recognition scenes, as defined in Aristotle's *Poetics* as "a change from ignorance into knowledge," are found in John's narrative.³³ Hitchcock identified the presence of recognition scenes during the trial and resurrection narratives, where characters move from ignorance to knowledge with respect to Jesus' identity.³⁴ Sixty years later, Culpepper argued for their pervasive significance for understanding John.³⁵ His more detailed analysis of recognition scenes in John did not come until 1995, when he provided a narrative overview of John's use of this form of type scene, also addressed in his commentary shortly thereafter.³⁶ Kasper Bro Larsen built on the earlier work of Culpepper in identifying and interpreting recognition scenes within the Gospel of John through extensive comparison with a wide range of Greco-Roman literature.³⁷ As the key term under examination in this thesis is closely connected with the characters' understanding of Jesus' identity, recognition scenes will be a valuable tool for analysing the narrative function of *kyrios*.

2.1.4. Irony

In the Gospel of John, readers encounter irony when they comprehend meaning in the narrative that is in opposition to the meaning that a character has understood.³⁸ When this occurs, the reader can understand what a character has not comprehended due to having a privileged

and again, the characters are constructed in ways that pull the reader in multiple directions, frustrating attempts to discern a clearly drawn trait."

³² Susan Hylen, *Imperfect Believers: Ambiguous Characters in the Gospel of John* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009), 160.

³³ F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, "Is the Fourth Gospel a Drama?" *Theology* 7 (1923): 307-17. The translation of the definition of ἀναγνώρισις is from John MacFarlane, "Aristotle's Definition of Anagnorisis." *AJP* 121 (2000): 367-383 (367).

³⁴ Hitchcock "Is the Fourth Gospel a Drama?," 315.

³⁵ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 84.

³⁶ R. Alan Culpepper, "The Plot of John's Story of Jesus." *Int* 49 (1995): 347-358, and *The Gospel and Letters of John* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 72-86. Prior to these larger studies, Mark Stibbe had acknowledged the significance of the theme for understanding John in three works, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 128; *John: A Readings New Biblical Commentary* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 18; and *John's Gospel* (London: Routledge, 1994), 30.

³⁷ Kasper Bro Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

³⁸ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 166.

position of knowing what the narrator has already said.³⁹ The character, however, does not understand, as a result of not having access to the knowledge shared between the narrator and the reader. In this situation, the reader is the observer of irony, and the character is the victim. The reader and the narrator share knowledge which is characterized by the “higher,” “heavenly” or “glorious” realities that the narrator describes, both in the opening verses of the Gospel, and throughout the narrative. The victimized character, on the other hand, manifests a “lower,” “earthly,” or “fleshly” understanding, being ignorant of heavenly realities.⁴⁰

Irony has gained the attention of Johannine scholars precisely due to the nature of the narrative of the Gospel itself. In a study of the Gospel of John that considers irony an integral part of the narrative, C. H. Dodd described irony as a “characteristic” feature of the Gospel that “frequently” occurs, and tentatively named the feature “the Johannine irony.”⁴¹ Since Dodd’s insightful study, a number of scholars have examined this literary device in the Gospel of John.⁴² One outcome of this scholarly attention is the recognition that irony is integral to the theology of the Gospel itself. In this regard, George MacRae contends that “in the Fourth Gospel theology *is* irony” and that “the heart of the Johannine theology is itself the irony of the Logos becoming flesh.”⁴³ Gail O’Day extends this proposal to the notion of “revelation,” and sees irony as a pervasive literary feature through which the narrative reveals the true identity of Jesus.⁴⁴

The two forms of irony most relevant to this study are verbal irony and dramatic irony. Paul Duke distinguishes the two forms by a role reversal. For verbal irony, the characters who speak know more than they say, and the characters who hear are in some way ignorant of the heavenly

³⁹ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 168.

⁴⁰ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 167-168.

⁴¹ C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 89, 297.

⁴² David W. Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel* (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1970), 47-68; Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 165-179; Paul D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985); J. Eugene Botha, "The Case of Johannine Irony Reopened I: The Problematic Current Situation." *Neot* 25 (1991): 209-220, J. Eugene Botha, "The Case of Johannine Irony Reopened II: Suggestions, Alternative Approaches." *Neot* 25 (1991): 221-232, R. Alan Culpepper, "Reading Johannine Irony." in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, (eds. R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black: Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 193-207; Klaus Scholtissek, "Ironie und Rollenwechsel im Johannesevangelium." *ZNW* 89 (1998): 235-255; Saeed Hamid-Khani, *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 75-78; Kevin W. Sarlow, *Ironic Authority: A Rhetorical Critical Analysis of the Stability of Irony in the Fourth Gospel Passion Narrative* (PhD diss., Flinders University, 2017).

⁴³ George W. MacRae, "Theology and Irony in the Fourth Gospel." in *The Word in the World: Essays in Honor of Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.*, (eds. Richard J. Clifford and George W. MacRae; Weston: Weston College Press, 1973), 83-96 (89, 94).

⁴⁴ Gail R. O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); and "Narrative Mode and Theological Claim: A Study in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 105 (1986): 657-668.

meaning of their speech.⁴⁵ In the Gospel of John, this form of irony is often found when Jesus speaks, with his audience not understanding his words. Dramatic irony, on the other hand, involves ignorant speakers who use words that have a heavenly meaning of which they are not aware, while the reader is fully aware of what their words can mean.⁴⁶ The reader witnesses this form of irony in the speech and actions of the majority of characters who encounter Jesus but do not know who he really is.

Irony often occurs in the Gospel of John when a word appears to have two distinct senses in a particular context.⁴⁷ Typically, the two senses can be classified as earthly and heavenly. In this case, for an example of double meaning to be ironic, the two senses must be in some way incompatible or in opposition to each other. In this regard, O'Day has expressed concern that some authors have emphasised opposition in meaning at the expense of recognising the ways in which the two meanings relate to each other.⁴⁸ Even when the two senses are not incompatible, it is still possible that the narrator and the reader can share knowledge which is not available to a character who becomes a victim of ignorance. Richard Bauckham notes this narrative feature in his analysis of the Gospel of John, and argues that, although this is not strictly irony, it is more like irony than other literary devices. He clarifies that, in these instances, the relationship between the two senses is one of "analogy," rather than "contrast."⁴⁹ By following Bauckham's method, it is possible to incorporate the advantages of irony into a reading of the Gospel of John without the semantic restriction placed upon its identification by previous definitions.

2.1.5. Point of View

In the Gospel of John, the narrator is able to tell the story from any location needed, knows how the story will end, and knows what characters are thinking.⁵⁰ In addition, the narrator has a theological perspective that is expressed in the opening verses of the Gospel and confirmed

⁴⁵ Duke, *Irony*, 23.

⁴⁶ Duke, *Irony*, 23.

⁴⁷ The "word" may in fact be a language unit of any size. Considerations of double meaning in John include Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*, 30-46, Duke, *Irony*, 144, Richard E. Shedd, "Expressions of Double Meaning and their Function in the Gospel of John." *NTS* 31 (1985): 96-112, and Resseguie, *Strange Gospel*, 51.

⁴⁸ O'Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel*, 8.

⁴⁹ Richard Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015), 142. Bauckham argues that the repeated use of ἀκολουθέω in 1:37-43 implies that "we are to hear a reference to the following that constitutes discipleship," and that this inference is confirmed by Jesus' use of the imperative ἀκολουθεῖν in 1:43 (144).

⁵⁰ In narrative-theoretical terms, the narrator is spatially omnipresent, temporally retrospective and psychologically omniscient. For these definitions and evaluations, see Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 20-34.

throughout the narrative. Due to the theological nature of the narrative of the Gospel of John, it is this theological point of view that is the key to understanding the narrative.⁵¹

James Resseguie argues that a summary of the narrator's theological point of view is found in 1:14, "and the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, and we have seen his glory."⁵² It is the flesh-glory contrast that is key for the narrator, representing the two levels on which each event in the narrative can be understood – one from above and one from below. Applying this approach throughout the narrative, Resseguie demonstrates how characters' points of view contrast with the narrator's. This allows the reader to see progressively more of the glory of the Word who became flesh.⁵³

The significance of the flesh-glory paradigm calls the reader to understand the relationship between flesh and glory in the Gospel of John. In this regard, Udo Schnelle's case for an antidocetic perspective in the Gospel of John has clarified how the narrative presents flesh and glory.⁵⁴ He emphasises that the glory of 1:14 does not undermine the reality of flesh. Therefore, seeing the glory does not diminish the importance of the flesh. Rather, the importance of the flesh is affirmed by seeing the glory, as it is the incarnation that makes possible the revelation of the glory.⁵⁵ Further, the insights from the work of Dorothy Lee are key to avoiding a misreading of the flesh-glory paradigm.⁵⁶ Following Lee's reading, the flesh is viewed as the good creation through which God is revealed. In this way, the flesh is valued as God's chosen way for revealing himself to humanity, as one of humanity's own. The effect of taking into account the work of Schnelle and Lee is a rejection of a dualism that considers the flesh as insignificant or imperfect.⁵⁷ In contrast, the flesh is the good creation of God into which God enters, and "in and through" this flesh God reveals himself.⁵⁸

⁵¹ David Ball argues for the use of "theological" over the more common "ideological" point of view. For Ball's discussion of the importance of the "theological" point of view, and his case for the revision of terminology, see his *I Am in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 53-56. On the narrator's ideological/theological point of view in the Gospel of John, see Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 32-34; and Resseguie, *Strange Gospel*, 4-5, 200-202.

⁵² Resseguie, *Strange Gospel*, 4.

⁵³ Resseguie, *Strange Gospel*, 201.

⁵⁴ Udo Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

⁵⁵ Schnelle, *Antidocetic*, 227. Compare also the emphasis of Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 85: "Diese dem Glauben zugängliche Herrlichkeit offenbart sich nicht neben, gegen oder durch das Fleisch, sondern im Fleisch."

⁵⁶ Dorothy A. Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel* (London: T&T Clark, 1994); Dorothy A. Lee, *Flesh and Glory: Symbol, Gender and Theology in the Gospel of John* (New York: Crossroad, 2002).

⁵⁷ Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, 231, explains "that *σάρξ* and *δόξα/πνεῦμα* stand not in a dualistic relationship, in the terms of Hellenistic (Platonic) philosophy, but rather relate to each other as symbol to reality." Lee, *Flesh and Glory*, 36, also writes that "Revelation arises from within the structures and shape of human experience and materiality (*sarx*)."

⁵⁸ Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, 232-233: "The divine *δόξα* is not revealed behind the flesh as its essence but rather in and through its structures ... Indeed *σάρξ* gains its deepest meaning in becoming symbolic of the divine *δόξα*." See also Lee, *Flesh and Glory*, 34-36.

The flesh-glory point of view is also important for understanding the narrative structure of the Gospel of John. In an analysis of the place of glory in the structure of the Gospel, Jesper Nielsen argues that, because Jesus' glory is the same as God's glory, Jesus' glory "is his divine identity."⁵⁹ Therefore, to see Jesus' glory is to see that he is divine. Although Jesus reveals God's glory throughout his earthly ministry, many do not recognise the glory in the flesh.

It is through the crucifixion, which Nielsen argues is the "Turning Point" in the narrative, that Jesus commences his return to the Father.⁶⁰ Therefore, it is through his exaltation on the cross that Jesus again manifests the glory that he did in his pre-incarnate state.⁶¹ As a result, when he encounters his disciples on his way to the Father, they are able to perceive his glory fully, and recognise that he is divine.

This approach acknowledges that Jesus does reveal his glory, particularly through his signs, in his earthly ministry, and his disciples do in some way recognise this glory. However, "this recognition is not complete until Jesus himself is glorified and can appear unambiguously to his disciples."⁶² Therefore, the "recognition" is not complete until after the resurrection. This is consistent with the approach of Culpepper, who argues that full recognition is not possible before the crucifixion and resurrection.⁶³ Nielsen is also in agreement with D. Moody Smith, who argues that "until Jesus' hour has come and he has been glorified, he cannot be fully comprehended."⁶⁴

⁵⁹ Jesper T. Nielsen, "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 56 (2010): 343-366 (357). Nielsen does not define "divine identity." Throughout this study, the use of "divine identity" is based on Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel* (Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008). Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 72, defines glory as "the visible manifestation of God."

⁶⁰ For analysis of the way that glorification relates to crucifixion, resurrection and ascension, see Jan G. van der Watt, "Double entendre in the Gospel According to John." in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel*, (eds. Gilbert van Belle, et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 463-482 and William Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 213-240.

⁶¹ Nielsen "Narrative Structures," 364-365.

⁶² Nielsen "Narrative Structures," 363.

⁶³ Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 83. Nielsen, "Resurrection, Recognition, Reassuring. The Function of Jesus' Resurrection in the Fourth Gospel." in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*, (eds. Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 177-208 (194), cites Culpepper to conclude his summary of the ways the narrator disqualifies each pre-resurrection confession.

⁶⁴ For example, see Smith, *John*, 223. An exception is Smith's approach to the man born blind in 9:38. Because the man fully recognises Jesus, Smith, *John*, 199, argues that this must be a "postresurrection perspective." Nicolas Farelly, *The Disciples in the Fourth Gospel: A Narrative Analysis of Their Faith and Understanding* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), considers this post-resurrection viewpoint as a key to interpreting clear demonstrations faith in Jesus throughout the pre-resurrection narrative.

2.2. Textual Criticism

2.2.1. Criteria

One area of scholarship to consider in textual criticism of the New Testament is the criteria used to evaluate variants. Eldon J. Epp's detailed survey of the criteria engages with their historical development, current trends in their application, and reformulates some traditional categories.⁶⁵ He details how the majority of criteria utilised today have been in use for at least a century. However, he also describes the ongoing debate that exists with respect to the application of some of the criteria, such as the criterion of the shorter reading, and the Koine-Atticism criterion.⁶⁶ Epp cautions critics regarding the temptation to apply criteria mechanically, and presents the criteria as weights on a scale of probabilities, so that only when the textual critic has considered all the criteria for a particular reading can a decision be made.⁶⁷ He also places significant emphasis on the "preeminent" criterion under which all other criteria reside, reinforcing that the most primitive reading is the one which best explains the other variants in the textual tradition.⁶⁸ In doing so, his presentation orientates critics to consider the whole manuscript tradition when evaluating variants.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ Eldon J. Epp, "Traditional 'Canons' of New Testament Textual Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability—or Lack Thereof." in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, (eds. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes; Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 79-128.

⁶⁶ Epp, "Canons," 106, 119. That some scribes were more likely to omit for 'singular' readings has been argued in detail by James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 2008). Royse's study, a revision of his 1981 Th.D dissertation, continued and expanded the earlier work on the papyri of Ernest C. Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 1969). Several textual critics have reached similar conclusions, including Peter M. Head, "Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, especially on the Scribal Habits." *Bib* 71 (1990): 240-247, who also wrote a second article "Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John: Some Observations on the Habits of New Testament Copyists." *Bib* 85 (2004): 399-408. Two book-length treatments of scribal habits followed, being Juan Hernández Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006) and Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007). However, Holger Strutwolf, "Scribal Practices and the Transmission of the Biblical Texts: New Insights from the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method." in *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present*, (eds. John S. Kloppenborg and Judith H. Newman; Atlanta: SBL, 2012), 123-138 (147), argues that the results of the ongoing collation work at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, which demonstrate that the textual tradition grows rather than becomes shorter, indicates that the study of singular readings "cannot help us to determine the rules and tendencies that prevail in the general history of the textual transmission as a whole." Strutwolf notes that his conclusion concurs with David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 296, who also calls for critics to acknowledge the distinction between "the habits of individual manuscripts and of textual histories." For a recent study of scribal tendencies with regard to Atticism, see Timo Flink, *Textual Dilemma: Studies in the Second-Century Text of the New Testament* (Joensuu: University of Joensuu, 2009).

⁶⁷ Epp, "Canons," 90: "The critic must employ all applicable criteria, place the results on the balance scale, and make a decision in the direction that the scale tips." Epp notes that the phrase "balance of probabilities," which he builds upon in his model, was used by Samuel Tregelles, *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament* (London: Bagster, 1854), 149-150. The editors, Klaus Wachtel and Michael Holmes, *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research* (Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 11, summarise Epp as preferring "the reading that brings the most weight onto the scales of textual criticism."

⁶⁸ Epp, "Canons," 93

⁶⁹ Another recent survey of the criteria is by Tommy Wasserman, "Criteria for Evaluating Readings." in *The Text of the*

2.2.2. Papyri Dates

A development in the field of textual criticism that is relevant to this thesis is the dating of the Papyri, particularly \mathfrak{P}^{66} and \mathfrak{P}^{75} . These two manuscripts are significant in the evaluation of external evidence for variants related to *kyrios* in the Gospel of John. Until recently, both manuscripts have frequently been assigned a date in the first half of the third century. This date range, which is perhaps most widely cited from the appendix in editions of Nestle-Aland, was affirmed in 2012 by Pasquale Orsini and Willy Clarysse in a study which challenged scholars who had dated both papyri to the second century.⁷⁰ In 2015, Orsini then provided revised dates for both manuscripts, assigning \mathfrak{P}^{66} a range from the middle of the third to the middle of the fourth century, and giving \mathfrak{P}^{75} a range from the late third to the beginning of the fourth century.⁷¹ In addition, Brett Nongbri has challenged the consensus date on both manuscripts. He argues that \mathfrak{P}^{66} is best dated “in the early or middle part of the fourth century,” and for \mathfrak{P}^{75} proposes the “fourth century as an equally likely, if not more likely date” than “the presumed late-second- or early-third-century date.”⁷² A full engagement with these revised dates has yet to be written and it is not within the scope of this study to evaluate them. Therefore, the position from which this study utilises \mathfrak{P}^{66} and \mathfrak{P}^{75} is that the question of their respective dates is in need of further research. Accordingly, neither the previously held consensus (first half of the third century), nor the new proposals by Orsini and Nongbri (up to the fourth century) will be relied upon in analysis of external evidence.

New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis, (eds. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 579-612. Wasserman’s survey is distinguished by its overview of the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method. A detailed presentation of the method is Gerd Mink, “Contamination, Coherence, and Coincidence in Textual Transmission.” in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, (eds. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes; Atlanta: SBL, 2011), 141-216. This approach uses the constantly-growing database of decisions made by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research in Münster for the Editio Critica Maior (ECM) volumes. These results were not available at the time of writing of this study. However, volumes that were available and used for this study are William. J. Elliott and David C. Parker eds, *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John, Volume 1, The Papyri* (Leiden: Brill, 1995) and Ulrich B. Schmid, et al. eds, *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John, Volume 2, The Majuscules* (Leiden: Brill, 2007). The second volume is also available electronically as Ulrich B. Schmid, et al., *An Electronic Version of The New Testament in Greek IV - Vol 2 The Majuscules* (2013); available from <http://iohannes.com/IGNTPtranscripts>. Wasserman also provides an overview of the traditional criteria, based on the presentation of Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 12-14 which are also presented in Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 92-125.

⁷⁰ Pasquale Orsini and Willy Clarysse, “Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography.” *ETL* 88 (2012): 443-474. The Nestle-Aland appendix is in turn based on the Liste, the most up-to-date version of which is Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, *Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (2016); available from <http://ntvnr.uni-muenster.de/liste/>.

⁷¹ Pasquale Orsini, “I papiri Bodmer: scrittura e libri.” *Adamantius* 21 (2015): 60-78 (77), lists Papyrus Bodmer II (\mathfrak{P}^{66}) as “III^{med.} – IV^{med.}” and XIV-XV (\mathfrak{P}^{75}) as “III^{ex.} – IV^{in.}”

⁷² Brent Nongbri, “The Limits of Palaeographic Dating of Literary Papyri: Some Observations on the Date and Provenance of P. Bodmer II (P66).” *MH* 71 (2014): 1-35 (35); Brent Nongbri, “Reconsidering the Place of Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV (\mathfrak{P}^{75}) in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.” *JBL* 135 (2016): 405-437 (437).

2.2.3. Narrative Solutions

Another area of development in textual criticism is the use of narrative-critical principles for evaluating intrinsic probabilities. In this regard, Christopher Skinner has provided a clear model for using narrative-theoretical conclusions to inform the text critic's understanding of authorial tendencies.⁷³ This requires that the narrative-critical study be essentially complete before completing the text-critical analysis. This insightful approach is especially relevant to studies which evaluate textual variants related to key terms. In order to understand intrinsic probabilities, the conclusions of narrative-critical analyses of text-critically-secure uses of the key term can be used. By studying the narrative features of the key term, it is possible to reach a preliminary understanding of the narrator's use of the term for each section of the narrative. Following that analysis, these narrative conclusions will be used in this study to evaluate authorial tendencies and contribute to reaching a final decision on the variant in question.

2.3. Semantics

2.3.1. Semantic Domains

Johannes Louw and Eugene Nida's publications in the field of Greek Lexicography have made several key contributions which are relevant to this study.⁷⁴ First, their method involves the iterative analysis of multiple meanings of one lexeme in combination with multiple lexemes with related meanings.⁷⁵ For a narrative-focused study, this indicates that to understand the use of a single lexeme successfully it is also necessary to take into account other words in the narrative which occur in the same semantic domain. Second, Louw and Nida's lexicon provides full definitions, rather than English glosses.⁷⁶ This significant development prevents analyses of Greek terms morphing into the study of English translations.⁷⁷ Third, in concluding the description of their approach to Greek lexicography, Louw and Nida identify a number of words which are in need of further analysis due to their complex characteristics, the first of which is

⁷³ Christopher W. Skinner, "'Son of God' or 'God's Chosen One'? A Text-Critical Problem and Its Narrative-Critical Solution (John 1:34)." *BBR* 25 (2015): 341-57. Prior to this explicit use of narrative criticism, Skinner had used features of the narrative of the Gospel of Mark to evaluate a variant in his "'Whom He Also Named Apostles': A Textual Problem in Mark 3:14." *BibSac* 161 (2004): 322-329.

⁷⁴ Two of the most significant works which are especially relevant to this study are Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains* (2 vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1989) and Eugene A. Nida and Johannes P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

⁷⁵ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 79.

⁷⁶ Louw and Nida, *Greek-English lexicon*, xii.

⁷⁷ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 42.

kyrios.⁷⁸ This is a confirmation that this study is addressing a topic which the authors considered to be in need of further research.

One area of Louw and Nida's approach in which recent developments in semantic theory have been made is the analysis of unmarked and marked meaning.⁷⁹ This issue is raised by Reinier de Blois in his application of cognitive linguistics to propose refinements to Louw and Nida's framework.⁸⁰ The importance of de Blois' argument for this study is his success in demonstrating the validity of combining the advantages of semantic domains with the insights of cognitive semantics. Because of the relevance of this area for the current study, the next section of this literature review focuses on cognitive semantics.

2.3.2. Cognitive Semantics

The form of cognitive semantic theory which this study will engage with is the dynamic construal approach of Alan Cruse.⁸¹ The explanatory power of his approach will allow fresh contextually-oriented analyses of words and larger units of language, building on the work of Louw and Nida described above.

Cruse argues that "words do not have a set of meanings permanently assigned to them."⁸² As a result, he utilises the notion of constraints, which exert pressure on the speaker who produces the utterance, and the hearer who attempts to construe meaning.⁸³ Cruse attributes the relative stability that some word meanings have to conventional constraints. These are the result of the habitual use of words in a speech community. In contrast, the significant amount of variety

⁷⁸ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 121.

⁷⁹ Louw and Nida, *Greek-English lexicon*, xvi and Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 50.

⁸⁰ Reinier de Blois, "Semantic Domains for Biblical Greek: Louw and Nida's Framework Evaluated from a Cognitive Perspective." in *Foundations for Syriac Lexicography III*, (eds. Janet Dyk and Wido van Peursen; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 265-278.

⁸¹ In 2004, two descriptions of the approach were published. The description which provides the most detailed theoretical background is found in William Croft and D. Alan Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 92-192. Although this work is co-authored, the preface identifies Cruse as responsible for chapters 4-8, which introduce the dynamic construal approach, and the introduction explicitly refers to the theory as Cruse's (*Cognitive Linguistics*, xv, 4). Despite the extensive theoretical grounding for the approach, and the significant attention given to issues of sense boundaries and relations, the approach's core components of "purport," "constraints" and "construal" are described quite concisely (*Cognitive Linguistics*, 97-106). Cruse also outlines his approach in the second edition of his own monograph, *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 261-272. A slightly revised description is provided in the third edition of the same work, *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 119-124. All three descriptions differ in the categorization and details of contextual constraints. As this is the case, the most recent description will be relied upon for applying the approach in this study.

⁸² Cruse, *Meaning in Language*, 119. All references to Cruse's work from this point are to the 2011 edition.

⁸³ Cruse, *Meaning in Language*, 119.

which word meanings can have is due to contextual constraints. These are the linguistic, physical, cognitive, discourse and relational contexts of the communicative act.⁸⁴ Both conventional and contextual constraints are relevant for the analysis of meaning within a narrative, as the concepts which Cruse utilises are paralleled in narrative-critical approaches. As his approach comprises an explicit method for analysing meaning, it will also provide a helpful basis for evaluating previous semantic analyses engaged with in this study.

2.3.3. The Semantics of *Kyrios*

The semantic analysis in this thesis is based on the lexicon of Louw and Nida.⁸⁵ In their entry for *kyrios*, they delineate four possible sense categories.⁸⁶ First, *kyrios* can be used as a term which conveys politeness or respect, acknowledging that the one referred to is of a higher status.⁸⁷ Second, *kyrios* can denote a person who has authority, or rules in some way.⁸⁸ Third, it can also denote a person who owns or possesses things or slaves.⁸⁹ The fourth category is reserved for supernatural beings, particularly the God of Israel and Jesus.⁹⁰ These four semantic categories are in broad agreement with the work of other lexicographers. The differences that do exist in the structure of other lexical descriptions are primarily the result of Louw and Nida's use of semantic domains for the organisation of their lexicon.⁹¹

2.3.4. Sociolinguistics and *Kύριε*

In addition to lexical studies of *kyrios*, important work on the sociolinguistic factors surrounding the use of the vocative *κύριε* has been undertaken by Eleanor Dickey.⁹² In a series of studies

⁸⁴ Cruse, *Meaning in Language*, 120.

⁸⁵ In addition to L&N 1:139 (12§9), 478 (37§51), 559 (57§12), 739 (87§53), other entries on *kyrios* in lexica of the New Testament include BDAG 576-579; Frederick W. Danker, *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 210-211, and Barclay M. Newman, *A Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010), 107. Lexica of the Greek Old Testament include LEH 361-362 and GELS 419-520. Usage of *kyrios* in the papyri is included in the entry of MM 365-366. For earlier usage, lexica include LSJ 1013 (Supplement 190), and Franco Montanari, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (eds. Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 1196. Other important studies that are concerned with diachronic and theological issues include Werner Foerster and Gottfried Quell, "κύριος," TDNT 3:1039-1095, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "κύριος," EDNT 1:328-331, Ceslas Spicq, "κύριος," TLNT 1:341-352, Ben Witherington III, "Lord," DJG 526-535, and Silva, "κύριος," NIDNTE 2:768-778.

⁸⁶ The order of the categories is the reverse of the presentation in L&N.

⁸⁷ L&N 1:739 (87§53). This category is glossed with "Sir." In the Gospel of John, this category is only evident in the vocative.

⁸⁸ L&N 1:478 (37§51), glossed with "Master."

⁸⁹ L&N 1:559 (57§12), glossed with "Owner."

⁹⁰ L&N 1:139 (12§9), glossed with "Lord."

⁹¹ For example, BDAG includes the vocative usage, glossed as "sir," as a subset of a broader category "one who is in a position of authority." In addition, BDAG includes the use of *kyrios* to refer to supernatural beings as a subset of the "one who is in a position of authority" category.

⁹² Dickey's work on this topic includes the monograph *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford:

examining the development of the Greek address system, Dickey has completed diachronic studies of κύριε which seek to explain both the rise of κύριε as a common form of address, and also to account for its particular semantic and pragmatic qualities. Dickey has demonstrated that κύριε was likely a neologism created by the translators of the Greek Old Testament, and that it did not enter non-biblical Greek until around the time that the New Testament documents were being written.⁹³ She sees the extensive use of κύριε in later New Testament books like the Gospel of John as evidence of the widespread adoption of κύριε in the Greek language more generally.⁹⁴ With particular relevance to this study, Dickey's studies demonstrate that the frequent use of κύριε in the Gospel of John is consistent with contemporary sociolinguistic developments in Koine Greek.

2.4. The Gospel of John and *Kyrios*

Kyrios has not attracted significant attention from Johannine scholars. In addition to brief analyses in commentaries, there has been relatively little focused attention on its role in the narrative of the Gospel as a whole. Five studies deserve particular attention due to the impact they had on the approach of this thesis.

John Pryor examines the historical, semantic and theological issues connected to the use of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John.⁹⁵ His study, which features extensive engagement with the Christology of the narrative as a whole, is relevant for this study due to its direct focus on *kyrios* in John, and concern to integrate multiple approaches in a single study of *kyrios*. In his study, Pryor observes that no monograph-length study of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John had until that time been undertaken.⁹⁶

Clarendon Press, 1996). One article which considered politeness is "Κύριε, Δέσποτα, Domine: Greek Politeness in the Roman Empire." *JHS* 121 (2001): 1-11. A later study which specifically addressed kinship terms is "Literal and Extended use of Kinship Terms in Documentary Papyri." *Mnemosyne* 57 (2004): 131-176. Another study which focused on the external influence of Latin is "The Greek Address System of the Roman Period and Its Relationship to Latin." *CIQ* 54 (2004): 494-527. Dickey's primary argument is that the widespread use of κύριε in the late first century can be attributed to external influence from the Latin *domine*. As a result, Dickey argues that κύριε came to be used in similar pragmatic contexts to *domine*.

⁹³ Dickey, "Greek Politeness," 5.

⁹⁴ Dickey, "Greek Politeness," 6.

⁹⁵ John Pryor, "Jesus as Lord: A Neglected Factor in Johannine Christology." in *In the Fullness of Time: Biblical Studies in Honour of Archbishop Donald Robinson*, (eds. David Petersen and John Pryor; Homebush West: Lancer, 1992), 57-78.

⁹⁶ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 57.

Gert Steyn, in his analysis of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John, focuses particularly on issues of misunderstanding and irony.⁹⁷ His study is concerned with integrating the analysis of *kyrios* with theology, and the relationship of Jesus' identity as *kyrios* with the Christology of the Gospel of John. In addition, his sensitivity to narrative critical issues, with particular attention to narrative irony, is directly relevant to the narrative analysis in this study.

Ruth Edwards provides a succinct overview of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John.⁹⁸ In her summary of the key issues, Edwards argues for the importance of *kyrios* for the narrative, challenging the view that the numerous uses of the vocative are unimportant. Despite its brevity, her analysis addresses many of the key narrative issues connected to *kyrios*.

Wolfgang Schenk has argued that the use of *kyrios* follows a structure throughout the Gospel whereby the narrator's use of *kyrios* in the narrative is followed by clusters of uses of κύριε by characters.⁹⁹ Pre-resurrection examples of this clustering are 4:1 with 4:11,15,19; 5:7, 6:23 with 6:34,38; 9:36 and 11:2 with 11:3,21,27,32,34,39. In the post-resurrection narrative, he finds other groupings: 20:20 with 20:28 and 21:12 with 21:15, 16, 17, 20 and 21.¹⁰⁰ Schenk's attention to structural issues and insightful proposal is directly relevant to the text-critical and narrative questions addressed in this study.

C. Kavin Rowe's study of *kyrios* in the Gospel of Luke is followed by a brief exploration into the Gospel of John.¹⁰¹ Rowe's illuminating monograph provided significant impetus for this thesis due to his concern for addressing *kyrios* within a narrative-oriented study. His analysis of the ways the Gospel of John exhibits similarities and differences with the Gospel of Luke with reference to use of *kyrios* was a springboard for this study.

In addition to these focused studies, commentators also provide brief and important analyses of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John. There are three key trends within the commentaries. First, there is

⁹⁷ Gert H. Steyn, "Misunderstanding, Irony and Mistaken Identity in References to Jesus as Κύριος in John's Gospel." in *Miracles and Imagery in Luke and John: Festschrift Ulrich Busse*, (eds. Jozef Verheyden, et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 141-160.

⁹⁸ Ruth B. Edwards, *Discovering John: Content, Interpretation, Reception* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015), 83-85.

⁹⁹ Wolfgang Schenk, *Kommentiertes Lexikon Zum Vierten Evangelium: Seine Textkonstituenten in Ihren Syntagmen und Wortfeldern* (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), 244-245.

¹⁰⁰ In addition to citing Schenk's framework, Gilbert Van Belle, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?" in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, (ed. Adelbert Denaux; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 159-174 (171-172), also notes scholars who have associated *kyrios* in 4:1, 6:23 and 11:2 with miracles, glorification or milestones in Jesus' ministry. These alternative approaches can be understood as complementing Schenk's framework, rather than competing with it.

¹⁰¹ C. Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), 226-230.

a broad consensus amongst interpreters that the meaning of *kyrios* is ambiguous, with the potential for intentional double entendre or irony. Scholars are more prone to emphasise this in pre-resurrection use of the vocative.¹⁰² Second, the use of non-vocatives in the narrative (4:1; 6:23; 11:2) prior to the resurrection are deemed to be textually doubtful, on both external and internal grounds.¹⁰³ Third, in contrast to the prevalence of the vocative pre-resurrection, post-resurrection accusatives and nominatives are normative, reflecting the post-resurrection understanding of the risen Lord.¹⁰⁴

Taken together, these studies and commentaries highlight the significance of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John. Their findings confirm the importance of narrative-oriented analysis, and the need for further work in this area. They also provide a significant foundation from which this study can proceed. Missing from these studies of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John is a full narrative analysis of *kyrios* which considers every occurrence of the term, moving sequentially through the narrative. In addition, although text-critical issues have been acknowledged, they have not received sufficient attention. Furthermore, although semantic issues are addressed, these studies lack an explicit theoretical framework in which semantic analysis can be undertaken. The combination of these factors means that this study is able to build on these insightful analyses to gain a more comprehensive understanding of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John.

¹⁰² Brown, *John*, 1:171; Duke, *Irony*, 102; Brodie, *John*, 282; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 1179; Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 226; and Steyn, "Jesus as Κύριος," 144.

¹⁰³ Brown, *John*, 1:164, 1:258, 1:423; Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 176,217,396; Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (3 vols.; New York: Crossroad, 1982), 1:422, 2:322 and Ernst Haenchen, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John* (eds. Robert W. Funk and Ulrich Busse; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 1:218.

¹⁰⁴ Brown, *John*, 2:984; Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 689; Haenchen, *John*, II:210; Moloney, *Glory Not Dishonor*, 168; Moloney, *John*, 527; and Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1179.

3. Methodology

3.1. Narrative Theory

The narrative analysis incorporates five aspects of narrative-criticism: Context, Structure, Character, Irony and Point of View. As narrative-criticism is conducted from the perspective of the reader, the methodological choices regarding the identity of the reader are addressed first.

3.1.1. Reader

Throughout this study, the unqualified term “the reader” refers to the implied, ideal reader.¹⁰⁵ This reader knows the narrative context needed to understand the narrative fully. In addition, this reader notices any clues or signals in the text and is able to recognise their significance for understanding the narrative. Furthermore, this reader is familiar with the story of Jesus, but does not know the Gospel of John. As a result, the reader does not know the details of what is going to happen in the narrative, only what has already been read in the Gospel of John.¹⁰⁶ This study is oriented from the perspective of this reader, and the journey of discovery that the reader experiences as the narrative unfolds.

The term “the reader” implies a single individual who reads a text. However, this study envisages an intended audience that may read or listen to the narrative, and may be an individual or a group, and that a group may be relatively uniform or diverse.¹⁰⁷ Therefore, when “the reader” occurs, it is also intended to incorporate these other types of audiences.

¹⁰⁵ For implied reader as “ideal recipient,” see Wolf Schmid, “Implied Reader.” in *Handbook of Narratology*, (eds. Peter Hühn, et al.; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 301-309 (302-304).

¹⁰⁶ Francis J. Moloney, “The Reader in/of the Fourth Gospel.” *ABR* 40 (1992): 20-33, examines the theoretical differences between the reader “in the text,” or “implied reader” and the reader “of the text,” or “real reader.” In his single-volume commentary, Moloney states, with regard to terminology, that “[n]arrative critical *theory* rightly distinguishes between an implied reader who emerges from the unfolding narration, the intended reader...and the real reader. Reading *practice* does not make such neat distinctions. Neither will the commentary that follows” (*John*, 17). Moloney later reported that he decided to streamline the terminology within his commentary after finding that “the ‘jargon’ cluttered the text of the commentary, and there was a danger that the wood was being lost for the trees,” in “Recent Johannine Studies: Part One: Commentaries.” *ExpTim* 123 (2012): 313-322 (315). This simplification of terminology leads Moloney to regularly collocate “narrator” with “the reader.” Although in narrative-critical studies strictly the narrator speaks to the narratee, in the Gospel of John, “the narratee cannot be meaningfully distinguished from the implied reader” (Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 206), which renders an attempt to maintain the distinction an unnecessary complexity. On this matter, Jeffrey Staley, who provides a detailed survey of definitions literary critics have formulated for different types of readers, also believes it is appropriate to merge this terminological distinction for a study of the Gospel of John, and argues that “the implied reader and narratee share...much of the same narrative territory in the Fourth Gospel,” in *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: SBL, 1985), 46-47. Brodie, *John*, 13, avoids using “implied reader,” in part out of his concern for clarity.

¹⁰⁷ Klink, *The Sheep of the Fold*, 152-184, considers the potential diversity in the audience of the Gospel of John, as well as the reality of hearers and readers.

3.1.2. Context

Each new section of the narrative analysis will begin with a survey of internal and external context relevant for the portion of the Gospel of John that is in focus. For internal context, this section of the narrative analysis will survey key themes in the preceding narrative that reoccur in the current section.¹⁰⁸

External context will be limited to texts that are explicitly cited or referred to in the narrative. This limits the bounds of relevant external context to the Old Testament. This decision is based on the reader-oriented approach to the narrative. As the Old Testament is the only text to which the narrative explicitly refers, the reader is expected to be familiar with it. This does not deny the value of considering other texts outside of the Old Testament for contextualising interpretation of the Gospel of John. From a narrative perspective, however, an exclusive focus on the Old Testament will allow its relevance and value to be explored in detail.

Analysis of external context will primarily include an examination of explicit quotations from the Old Testament and any relevant allusions in the narrative section in focus. As the narrator provides Greek explanations of Semitic terms within the Gospel for the reader (1:38; 20:16), it is assumed that any Old Testament context needed to interpret the narrative is also in Greek.¹⁰⁹ As a result, the Greek translations of the Old Testament feature throughout this study. The analysis will not include examination of other external sources, either proposed or extant, or proposals regarding the history of the composition of the narrative.¹¹⁰

Consideration of Old Testament context will in large part follow the principles outlined in Richard Hays' work.¹¹¹ Five principles will provide the methodological framework for identifying and interpreting the contributions of implicit and explicit references to the Old

¹⁰⁸ Moloney, *John*, 17.

¹⁰⁹ For the argument that the Greek Old Testament, and specifically a version very close to what is now considered "the Septuagint" is the source of the Old Testament quotations in the Gospel of John, see Bruce G. Schuchard, "Form versus Function: Citation Technique and Authorial Intention in the Gospel of John." in *Abiding Words The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*, (eds. Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 23-46 (27-35). Bruce G. Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), is his earlier, more comprehensive argument for the same conclusion. Wm. Randolph Bynum, *The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), argues for the importance of considering multiple translations of the Old Testament in Greek. He concludes that the pattern of quotations in the Gospel of John cannot be explained by appeal to the "Septuagint" alone. With regard to translation of Semitic terms, Klink, *The Sheep of the Fold*, 171, notes "that the readers may not be familiar with them or know that language."

¹¹⁰ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 5.

¹¹¹ Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014); Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016).

Testament. First, a reader of a Gospel expects that their understanding of the Old Testament be influenced by their reading of the Gospel. Second, the reader's understanding of the Gospel is influenced by their reading of the Old Testament.¹¹² Third, at the beginning of the narrative of the Gospel of John, Jesus is presented as one of whom "the law, and also the prophets" speak, and this calls on the reader to follow this as an interpretive key.¹¹³ Fourth, the Gospel's references to scripture do not depend solely on verbal parallels, but also have conceptual and thematic echoes.¹¹⁴ Fifth, the key relationship of the plan of Jesus' ministry to the Old Testament is that of fulfilment.¹¹⁵

A specific area of the Old Testament which is of significance for understanding the identity of Jesus in the Gospel of John is Isaiah 40-55.¹¹⁶ Richard Bauckham and Larry Hurtado have demonstrated that it is in this specific Old Testament context that many of the themes related to the identity of Jesus are found.¹¹⁷ Therefore, during this study, particular attention will be paid to Isaiah 40-55, whenever it is alluded to or cited in relation to *kyrios*. In addition, as demonstrated through the work of Bauckham and Hurtado, when a reference to Isaiah 40-55 is made, this calls on the reader to consider Isaiah 40-55, and not only the verse which is cited. As a result, when a single verse is quoted or echoed in the Gospel of John, the rest of Isaiah 40-55 is legitimately within view as relevant contextual support for the interpretation of the quotation as it is used in the Gospel of John.

Imperial ideology and issues of Empire are not considered part of the context of the narrative in this study.¹¹⁸ The primary background for understanding the use of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John is the Old Testament. This is because the first paradigmatic use of *kyrios* in the Gospel comes from the Old Testament (John 1:23, Isa 40:3). In addition, the importance of the Old Testament

¹¹² Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 93.

¹¹³ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 75.

¹¹⁴ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 78.

¹¹⁵ Hays stresses that this fulfilment becomes dominant in the second half of the narrative (*Reading Backwards*, 80).

¹¹⁶ On Isaiah 40-55 and the Gospel of John more generally, see David R. Griffiths, "Deutero-Isaiah and the Fourth Gospel: Some Points of Comparison." *ExpTim* 65 (1954): 355-360. For a study of Isaiah as a whole and the Gospel of John, see James Hamilton, "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John." *Perichoresis* 5 (2007): 139-162

¹¹⁷ For discussions specifically about the Gospel of John, see Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 39-40, 46-50, and Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003).

¹¹⁸ Richard J. Cassidy, *John's Gospel in New Perspective: Christology and the Realities of Roman Power* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1992), 36-39, briefly analyses *kyrios* in the Gospel of John and demonstrates the importance of the term in the narrative. He sees challenges to imperial ideology throughout the narrative, not only in the use of *kyrios*. Ultimately, he argues that the identification of Jesus as *kyrios* is a challenge to Caesar's identity as *kyrios* (105). On John and Empire, see also Lance B. Richey, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007) and Tom Thatcher, *Greater than Caesar: Christology and Empire in the Fourth Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008). Joseph D. Fantin, *The Lord of the Entire World: Lord Jesus, a Challenge to Lord Caesar?* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011), provides a detailed case for the importance of *kyrios* in the Pauline corpus as a challenge to imperial ideology.

for understanding *kyrios* is emphasised at the close of Jesus' public ministry in chapter 12. Although the Old Testament is the most significant narrative context for understanding *kyrios*, this does not deny the possibility that Empire-related issues provide an additional, secondary context.¹¹⁹ However, due to the limits on a study of this size, these issues will not be addressed. A full engagement with Empire studies would be a possible avenue for further research, proceeding from the conclusions drawn from the Old Testament context.

3.1.3. Structure

The narrative analysis proceeds from the position that the Gospel of John has a prologue (1:1-18) which is integral to the narrative as a whole. The next major division at the end of chapter 12 describes the close of Jesus' public ministry and the beginning of a section of the narrative which is intensively focused on his disciples (13-17). This is followed by the passion narrative (18-19), a resurrection narrative (20), and an epilogue (21), which is an integral part of the narrative as a whole.

In addition to these major divisions, analyses of *kyrios* throughout the narrative are divided according to speaker, corresponding with recognized smaller divisions in the narrative based on shifts in location, time or theme. As a result, John the Baptist (1:19-28), the royal official (4:43-54), the man at the pool (5:1-18) and the man born blind (9:1-41) are treated separately. Other analyses incorporate multiple speakers, and are based on acknowledged divisions established by location: Samaria (4:1-42), Galilee (6:1-71), Bethany (11:1-57) and Jerusalem (12:1-50).¹²⁰ Other groupings are based on the major divisions listed above: Jesus and his disciples (13-17), resurrection narrative (20) and epilogue (21).¹²¹ In addition to these divisions, verbal and thematic parallels and shifts will lead to more detailed analyses of narrative structure.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Christopher W. Skinner, "John's Gospel and The Roman Imperial Context: An Evaluation of Recent Proposals." in *Jesus Is Lord, Caesar is Not: Evaluating Empire in New Testament Studies*, (eds. Joseph B. Modica and Scot McKnight; Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2013), 116-129, concludes that, although Empire does have relevance for understanding some elements of the narrative, the Jewish context and themes of the Gospel of John remain primary.

¹²⁰ Due to the methodological constraints of this study, proposed rearrangements regarding chapter 6 are not discussed.

¹²¹ Within 13-17, *kyrios* occurs in the first three divisions which Brown, *John* 2:545-547, proposes: 13:1-30, 13:31-14:31 and 15-16.

¹²² No attempt will be made to construct macro-chiasms from verbal and thematic parallels. For the case against macro-chiasm, see Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed, "Philippians as a Macro-Chiasm and its Exegetical Significance." *NTS* 44 (1998): 213-231 (213-221), David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 96, and Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse*, 63-72.

3.1.4. Character

The focus of this section will be the characters that use *kyrios*. They will be analysed for the contribution which they make to the meaning of *kyrios* and its narrative function. For minor characters, a key focus is the nature of their relationship with Jesus, due to the importance of speaker relationships for determining contextual constraints in the semantic analysis of *kyrios*.¹²³ This study of characters recognises the importance of the notion of ambiguity in analysis, and does not attempt to apply an objective belief-unbelief evaluation to all characters.¹²⁴

In this study, evaluation of characters' understanding of Jesus will be key to determining the meaning of *kyrios*. The analyses will not be full evaluations of each character that uses *kyrios* in the narrative, but will focus on elements that are relevant for understanding *kyrios*. Therefore, the analysis of each character considers the narrative evidence relevant for the semantic analyses. As a result, there are potentially four types of character in the narrative, based on the four semantic categories of Louw and Nida. The first respects Jesus and demonstrates this respect through the use of *kyrios*. The second group acknowledges Jesus' authority over them. A key for determining whether characters fit into this category is their relationship to Jesus as disciples. The third category is for characters owned as slaves. This category will be most relevant for the analysis of chapters 13 and 15, where Jesus uses *kyrios* and δοῦλος. The fourth category is for characters who demonstrate in their usage of *kyrios* that they recognise that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*. These characters acknowledge that Jesus is a supernatural being who exercises supernatural authority.

3.1.5. Irony

Relevant uses of *kyrios* will be analysed with respect to irony. Identification of double meaning will be a key element of the analysis.¹²⁵ In so doing, characters' speech will be compared with the knowledge the narrator has shared with the reader.¹²⁶ In this way, it will be possible that the two senses of the word align with the character's knowledge in contrast to the narrator's and reader's knowledge. However, these two senses are not required to be in complete opposition to each other, and there is scope for the analysis of irony to include analogous sense relationships,

¹²³ Cruse, *Meaning in Language*, 120.

¹²⁴ For ambiguity, see Conway "Speaking through Ambiguity," 324-341, and Hylan, *Imperfect Believers*, 160.

¹²⁵ Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*, 30-46; Duke, *Irony*, 144; Shedd "Expressions of Double Meaning and their Function in the Gospel of John," 96-112; and Resseguie, *Strange Gospel*, 51.

¹²⁶ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 166; Duke, *Irony*, 17.

in addition to those that are classified primarily by contrast.¹²⁷ This process of analysis will identify how *kyrios* may be used to highlight the ignorance of minor characters, and to further enlighten the reader as to the purpose of the narrative.¹²⁸

3.1.6. Point of View

The theological point of view of the narrator is understood as being expressed in 1:14, following Resseguie.¹²⁹ The two key elements of the point of view are “flesh” and “glory.” The flesh is seen by all characters who encounter Jesus; however, the glory is only seen by those who agree with the narrator’s characterization of Jesus established in the prologue. In using Resseguie’s framework, this analysis will be informed by the analysis of irony, due to the close relationship between irony and the narrator’s theological point of view.¹³⁰ The studies of Schnelle and Lee will inform this aspect of the analysis, ensuring that the importance and goodness of “flesh” is retained in the analysis.¹³¹

The narrator’s point of view, the flesh-glory paradigm, is closely related to recognition scenes. Jesper Nielsen’s framework is the starting point from which this study proceeds. Nielsen understands the glory of Jesus as equivalent to his divine identity. If characters see the glory, they have understood that Jesus is divine. Therefore, from the outset, it is not expected that any character will fully recognise Jesus until after he has been glorified, resurrected, and is returning to his Father, following the approaches of Culpepper and Smith.¹³²

This study proceeds from the position that belief in Jesus and recognition of his divine identity do not always coincide.¹³³ During Jesus’ ministry, the narrator describes many characters who believe (πιστεύειν) in him; however, prior to the resurrection, these characters have not seen his glory. That is, it is possible that characters believe in Jesus, without recognising that he is divine. At the same time, belief in Jesus and seeing his glory are not unrelated. In fact, all who see his glory are believers; however, not all who believe have seen his glory. Sometimes, the narrative does not make a verbal distinction between the belief which includes recognition of

¹²⁷ O’Day, *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim*, 8; Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 142.

¹²⁸ Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 167-168.

¹²⁹ Resseguie, *Strange Gospel*, 4-5, 200-202.

¹³⁰ MacRae, "Theology and Irony in the Fourth Gospel," 83-96 (89, 94).

¹³¹ Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*; Lee, *Flesh and Glory*; Schnelle, *Antidocetic*.

¹³² Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*; Smith, *John*.

¹³³ This differs from the approach of Nicolas Farelly, *The Disciples in the Fourth Gospel*, 216-217, who understands the key development after the resurrection is that the believing disciples then come to understand who Jesus is. That is, there is a distinction between belief and understanding.

Jesus' divine identity and that which does not. Before the resurrection and after the resurrection, characters can be described as believing (πιστεύειν), without further distinction (4:53, 20:29). At times, however, the content of characters' faith is made explicit. For example, characters can believe that Jesus is the Messiah (1:41), or a prophet (4:19). In all cases, it is the narrative context which allows the reader to understand whether a character who believes in Jesus has seen his glory, and believed that he is divine.

3.2. Textual Criticism

Occurrences of *kyrios* that require text-critical analysis will be selected by searching the NA²⁸ apparatus. Any occurrence of *kyrios* which has been transmitted with variation, except singular readings, will be analysed within the body of the thesis.¹³⁴ When a variant has been identified, other resources will be used to clarify the extent of external evidence. These include UBS⁵, the available print and online publications of the International Greek New Testament Project, and *Text und Textwert*.¹³⁵

Internal and external evidence will be evaluated in accordance with Epp's exposition of relevant criteria. The analysis of the variants related to *kyrios* will rely on intrinsic probabilities informed by the narrative analysis.¹³⁶ Transcriptional probabilities will be analysed in accordance with the prominence of the preeminent criterion as described by Epp.¹³⁷

The papyri evidence, specifically \mathfrak{P}^{66} and \mathfrak{P}^{75} , is potentially significant for this study. However, due to the publications of Pasquale Orsini and Brent Nongbri, the position of this study is that

¹³⁴ Although it is unlikely that a singular reading could be the earliest recoverable reading, it is not impossible. To balance these factors, singular readings do receive attention, but only in footnotes. In addition, this study does not analyse 7:53-8:11, even though *kyrios* occurs in 8:11 in the manuscript tradition. It proceeds from the position that previous scholarship addressing both stylistic and text-critical issues has established that 7:53-8:11 was a later addition to the Gospel of John. For the arguments for and against the authenticity of the passage, see David Alan Black and Jacob N. Cerone eds, *The Pericope of the Adulteress in Contemporary Research* (London: T&T Clark, 2016). For a detailed study of the pericope, see Chris Keith, *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

¹³⁵ Elliott and Parker, *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John, Volume 1, The Papyri*; Schmid, et al., *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John, Volume 2, The Majuscules*; Schmid, et al., *An Electronic Version of The New Testament in Greek IV - Vol 2 The Majuscules*; Roderic L. Mullen, et al. eds, *The Gospel according to John in the Byzantine tradition* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007); Roderic L. Mullen, et al., *An Electronic Edition of the Gospel according to John in the Byzantine Tradition* (2007); available from <http://www.iohannes.com/byzantine/index.html>. Peter H. Burton, et al., *Vetus Latina Iohannes* (2015); available from <http://iohannes.com/vetuslatina/index.html>; Kurt Aland, et al. eds, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments V. Das Johannesevangelium: Teststellenkollation der Kapitel 1-10* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005).

¹³⁶ Skinner "'Whom He Also Named Apostles'," 322-329; Skinner "'Son of God' or 'God's Chosen One?'," 47-63.

¹³⁷ Epp, "Canons," 93-96.

further analysis of the evidence for dating the manuscripts is needed.¹³⁸ Until that has happened, the work of Orsini and Nongbri cannot be ignored. Therefore, it is necessary to expand the possible dates for both manuscripts to include the fourth century. As a result, P⁶⁶ or P⁷⁵ will not be relied upon to determine if a reading was as early as the third century.

The conclusions of the text-critical stage will establish which occurrences of *kyrios* can be utilised in the semantic analysis and concluding summary of the reader's sequential journey through the narrative.

3.3. Semantics

Analysis of semantics will begin by applying Cruse's conventional and contextual constraints to identify the semantic range of each occurrence of *kyrios*.¹³⁹

3.3.1. Conventional Constraints

Conventional constraints will be understood primarily with the four semantic categories and definitions provided by Louw and Nida which are relevant for *kyrios* in the Gospel of John. The first is "a title of respect used in addressing or speaking of a man."¹⁴⁰ The second is "one who rules or exercises authority over others."¹⁴¹ The third is "one who owns and controls property, including especially servants and slaves."¹⁴² The fourth is for a supernatural being "who exercises supernatural authority."¹⁴³

The final "supernatural" category is in agreement with other statements in the narrative that reflect Jesus' divine identity. As Louw and Nida outline in their approach to semantic analysis, it is important to take into account other lexemes which occur in the same semantic domain.¹⁴⁴ Within the Gospel of John, there are two key terms in the domain "Supernatural Beings" which are used of Jesus with respect to his divine identity. The first is θεός, which is found four times in the narrative with reference to Jesus: twice by the narrator (1:1, 18), once by *Ioudaioi* (10:33)

¹³⁸ Orsini "I papiri Bodmer: scritture e libri," 443-474; Nongbri "The Limits of Palaeographic Dating of Literary Papyri: Some Observations on the Date and Provenance of P.Bodmer II (P66)," 1-35; Nongbri "Reconsidering the Place of Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV (P75) in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," 405-437.

¹³⁹ Cruse, *Meaning in Language*, 119-121.

¹⁴⁰ L&N 1:739 (87§53).

¹⁴¹ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

¹⁴² L&N 1:559 (57§12).

¹⁴³ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

¹⁴⁴ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 79.

and once by Thomas (20:28). The second term is *υἰός*, which is used extensively throughout the narrative. On the lips of Jesus, and when used by the narrator, this term identifies Jesus' unique relationship and unity with his Father (1:14, 5:20-23).

3.3.2. Contextual Constraints

Contextual constraints will be based on the observations made during the narrative analysis, relating to internal and external context of the narrative. Adopting Cruse's framework for use with texts, the shared context is understood as existing not only between characters as speakers and hearers, but also between narrator and reader.

There are five contextual constraints.¹⁴⁵ First, linguistic context takes into account other language in the pericope being analysed, both prior to and following the word under analysis. This will also coincide with Louw and Nida's requirement that other lexemes with related meanings be included in the analysis of the semantic range of the lexeme in focus.¹⁴⁶ Second, physical context requires that the narrative setting be incorporated into the semantic analysis. Third, cognitive context requires the interpreter to consider what the speaker might know that contributes to their communicative intent. Fourth, discourse context requires that the type of discourse be considered before attempting to construe the sense of the utterance. A key application of this constraint in the current study will be to distinguish between character speech and comments by the narrator.¹⁴⁷ Fifth, relational context considers the interlocutors' relationship in the context of social factors, and also the relationship between the reader and the narrator.

Having applied these constraints, the results of this stage will aid the clarification of the semantic range of *kyrios* in pericopes for which the meaning is uncertain.

¹⁴⁵ Cruse, *Meaning in Language*, 121.

¹⁴⁶ Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 78-79.

¹⁴⁷ This distinction, however, does not ignore the reality that it is the author who utilises both characters and the narrator to construct the narrative. From the perspective of narrative analysis, character speech is still considered narration, called "showing," in contrast to the narrator's voice, "telling," reflecting the Platonic distinction between *μίμησις* and *διήγησις*. For "showing" and "telling," see Stibbe, *John*, 15, Mark A. Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (London: SPCK, 1993), 52-53, James L. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 126-130, and Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Showing Vs. Telling." in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, (eds. David Herman, et al.; London: Routledge, 2005), 530-531.

3.3.3. The Article

Due to the importance of the Greek article for semantic analysis of *kyrios*, an overview of key features of the article with *kyrios* is presented here. This provides the methodological foundation from which semantic and also text-critical judgements will be made throughout the study.

It is necessary to consider how *kyrios* was used in the Greek translations of the Old Testament, due to the importance of Old Testament citations in passages under examination in this study. The general pattern that scholars have identified is that יהוה is most frequently translated by the anarthrous *kyrios*, with exceptions that reflect the tendencies of different translators, and particular grammatical and lexical contexts.¹⁴⁸ The most important book for the use of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John is Isaiah. In Greek Isaiah יהוה is rendered by *kyrios* 347 times, of which *kyrios* occurs only 19 times with the article.¹⁴⁹ This leaves more than 94% of the occurrences rendered by the anarthrous *kyrios*. Therefore, in Greek Isaiah, when the text refers to יהוה, the God of Israel, it is more likely to have an anarthrous form of *kyrios*, with articular *kyrios* being the less-likely, though possible, alternative.¹⁵⁰ The Greek Translations of Isaiah exhibit a similar usage of the article to that found throughout the Old Testament.¹⁵¹

The use of the article with *kyrios* throughout the Gospel of John also needs to be considered in order to determine any identifiable tendencies. For quotations from the Old Testament, there are two relevant occurrences that are text-critically secure, one in John 12:13 and one in 12:38.¹⁵² The quotation in 12:13 contains the phrase ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, and the lack of the article is in agreement with the Greek translation of Psalm 118:27 (Greek 117:27). Also in 12:38, ὁ βραχίον κυρίου similarly reflects the anarthrous form in the Greek of Isaiah 53:1. Therefore, these two

¹⁴⁸ See, for example, Albert Pietersma, "Kyrios or Tetragram: A renewed Quest for the Original LXX." in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers*, (eds. Albert Pietersma and Claude E. Cox; Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1984), 85-101, John W. Wevers, "The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study." in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, (eds. Robert J.V. Hiebert, et al.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 21-35, and Martin Rösel, "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch." *JSOT* 31 (2007): 411-428.

¹⁴⁹ יהוה is also translated by θεός 62 times in Isaiah. Articular *kyrios* is found in 1:4, 28; 9:12; 11:9; 19:19(2), 21(2); 23:18; 27:13; 30:15, 29; 31:3; 33:6; 42:10; 50:10; 51:1; 62:2. The texts used for this analysis are from Emanuel Tov and Frank Polak, *The Revised CATSS Hebrew-Greek Parallel Text* (Philadelphia: CATSS; BibleWorks, 2004). Although these statistics rely on a single semi-critical text of the Greek Old Testament, they are still useful as indicative of translation tendencies in the Second Temple period.

¹⁵⁰ Throughout this study, "God of Israel" is often used, following the common usage in Isaiah 40-55 (41:17, 45:3, 45:15, 48:1, 2, 52:12) and Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*.

¹⁵¹ Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Morphosyntax and Syntax of Septuagint Greek* (Leuven: Peeters, 2016), 17-20, analyses articular and anarthrous occurrences of *kyrios* in the Pentateuch and the Greek Old Testament as a whole.

¹⁵² The use of the article in 1:23 will be addressed below in the text-critical analysis of 1:23. In 12:38, the texts of John and the Greek of Isaiah 53:1 both also have the vocative κύριε, which is without an equivalent in the Hebrew. As the vocative cannot take the article, however, this cannot be adduced as evidence of authorial tendency with regard to the use of the article.

clear examples provide good evidence that, when using *kyrios* in a quotation from the Old Testament, the author was more likely to use the anarthrous form found in the original reference.

For consideration of the uses of *kyrios* that are not in Old Testament quotations, it is also important to consider the use of the article when *kyrios* refers to Jesus. Excluding all uses of the vocative, text-critically secure examples of *kyrios* used for Jesus are in 11:2;13:13,14; 20:2,13,18,20,25,28; 21:7(2),12. In every case the article is used. This demonstrates that when the narrative includes a reference to Jesus as *kyrios*, it is expected that *kyrios* will occur with the article.

3.3.4. Sociolinguistic Factors

There are three key sociolinguistic factors which influenced the use of *kyrios* when the Gospel of John was published, towards the end of the first century.¹⁵³

The first sociolinguistic factor is that *kyrios* can be used to refer to the God of Israel, and this is almost always anarthrous, but can also be articular. This is based on the understanding that a reader of the Gospel of John in Greek is expected to have knowledge of the Greek Old Testament. A corollary to this is that κύριε can be used for direct address to the God of Israel, witnessed in Isaiah 53:1 and John 12:38. Therefore, any use of *kyrios*, including the vocative and articular form, could represent a verbal echo of the Greek Old Testament's use of the same term for the God of Israel.

The second factor is the prevalence of κύριε as a term of address in Koine Greek. This suggests that the large number of uses of κύριε to address Jesus by those who do not follow him represents a socio-linguistically coherent pattern of usage. As the term was used widely in the Greek-speaking world for addressing individuals with varying degrees of respect, this would be understood as a normative pattern for a narrative text which includes dialogue. Therefore, the Gospel of John contains patterns of language use with respect to κύριε which are consistent with patterns in the Greek language more generally. As a consequence, the occurrence of κύριε does not necessarily suggest that characters that use the term are making christological confessions. In contrast, because the term was so common in Koine Greek, it would be expected that a large

¹⁵³ For a survey of the issues in dating the Gospel, see Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 206-214.

number of the uses follow the sociolinguistic patterns of the language as a whole and are not being used christologically.

The third factor of importance for understanding the sociolinguistic context is the identification of Jesus as *kyrios*/κύριε in Greek-speaking Christian communities.¹⁵⁴ This study assumes that a reader of the Gospel of John at the end of the first century would be in contact with Christians.¹⁵⁵ Therefore, when the reader encounters a character who addresses Jesus as κύριε, it would be possible for this to resonate with the reader. This could reflect the reader's own belief that Jesus is *kyrios*, or echo Christian prayer to and worship of Jesus as κύριε. This does not mean that the reader will distort the narrative by understanding every use of κύριε as christological. It does, however, provide space in the narrative for the dynamic of irony, as readers see a character's confession having significance for the reader, but not for the character.

These three sociolinguistic factors play integral roles in the interpretation of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John. This is because when *kyrios* occurs in the narrative, the reader is able to draw on these factors in order to interpret the significance of the term.

Having established the methodological framework for interpreting *kyrios* in the Gospel of John, it is now possible to begin the analysis.

¹⁵⁴ This practice, which is evidenced early in the Christian movement (Rom 10:9, 1 Cor 12:3), is not found in the Johannine epistles. Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1970), 124-125, 211-212, considered the absence of *kyrios* as important for his reconstruction of early Christian belief about Jesus. He contended that the identification of Jesus as *kyrios* was not an important element of the belief system of the author of the epistles, and its presence in the Gospel of John is most likely the result of redaction. If that reconstruction is accepted, it would be problematic to assume that *kyrios* was an important title in the Gospel of John. However, there are at least two reasons to question Bousset's reliance on the Johannine Epistles to support his proposal. The first reason is genre. In the narrative of the Gospel of John, the majority of occurrences of *kyrios* are in dialogue, a genre feature which is absent from the epistles. In contrast, the narrator identifies Jesus as *kyrios* up to possibly 6 times (4:1, 6:23, 11:2, 20:20, 21:7,12). However, in the same narrative, Jesus is identified as Ἰησοῦς more than 200 times by the narrator. By way of comparison, in the Johannine epistles, Jesus is referred to with the name Ἰησοῦς 14 times. If the epistles and the Gospel exhibited a similar ratio of *kyrios*:Ἰησοῦς, a reader need not expect that the epistles would have even a single occurrence of *kyrios*. Therefore, it is unreasonable to deduce from the absence of *kyrios* in the epistles that there was an absence of *kyrios*-Christology in the communities in which the epistles were written or read. A second reason to question Bousset's conclusion is by asking why it is considered mandatory for an author to use the same title to refer to Jesus in every text that they wrote. The christological titles in the Gospel of John are numerous, and many do not appear in the epistles. It does not follow that, because, for example, Son of Man does not appear, or King of Israel, that these must necessarily be present in the epistles to prove that they were used by the community in which the epistles were written. As a result of these issues, Bousset's redaction proposal is not accepted, and is not engaged with further throughout this study. However, Bousset's interpretation of the text as we have it is engaged with at points.

¹⁵⁵ This does not depend on the reader being a follower of Jesus.

4. *Kyrios* in the Gospel of John

4.1. The Way of the *Kyrios*

The first occurrence of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John is found in 1:23 in a quotation from Isa 40:3 spoken by John the Baptist: ἐγὼ φωνὴ βοᾶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· εὐθύνετε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης.¹⁵⁶

4.1.1. Narrative

4.1.1.1. Context

When John the Baptist states that he is “a voice of one crying in the wilderness,” the quotation is followed by the comment that these words were spoken by “Isaiah the prophet.” It is not clear who the speaker of καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης is. If it is a comment by the narrator, it is information that is shared between the reader and the narrator only. On the other hand, if it is understood as a continuation of the speech of John, then it is directed towards John’s listeners, including the delegation from Jerusalem. In either case, it is information which is made available to the reader, who is invited to explore how the context of Isaiah’s words may assist the interpretation of John’s words and their significance for understanding the narrative.¹⁵⁷

The immediate context for the distilled quotation is found in Isaiah 40:3.¹⁵⁸ If the reader accesses Isaiah 40:3 in the form ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, there are three key differences with John 1:23 that warrant an explanation. First, the

¹⁵⁶ *Kyrios* does also occur in the manuscript tradition before 1:23 at least once, in 1:6, as discussed below in the text-critical analysis.

¹⁵⁷ Those that attribute “as Isaiah the prophet said” to the narrator include Brown, *John*, 42, Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 57, CEV, ESV, GNB, NASB, NET, NIV, NLT and NRSV. Those that include “as Isaiah the prophet said” in the words of John the Baptist include G. R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999), 19, Haenchen, *John*, 1:143, Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:291, CEB, HCSB, NKJV and RSV.

¹⁵⁸ The full quotation is presented according to Joseph Ziegler, *Isaias: Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983), 266-267. For studies of the quotation, see Charles Goodwin, “How Did John Treat His Sources?” *JBL* 73 (1954): 61-75 (64), Edwin D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 1-7, Maarten J. J. Menken, “The Quotation from Isa 40,3 in John 1,23.” *Bib* 66 (1985): 190-205, Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 1-15, Catrin H. Williams, “Isaiah in John’s Gospel.” in *Isaiah in the New Testament*, (eds. Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken; New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 101-116 (102-106), Catrin H. Williams, “Isaiah and Johannine Christology.” in *“As Those Who Are Taught:” The Reception of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*, (eds. Claire M. McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2006), 107-124 (108-112) and Ruth Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture: ‘The Jews’ and the Scriptural Citations in John 1:19-12:15* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 106-121. In contrast to scholars that seek to identify theological reasons for differences between quotations and source texts, Andrew Montanaro, “The Use of Memory in the Old Testament Quotations in John’s Gospel.” *NovT* 59 (2017): 147-70, sees orality as a key factor.

distilled quotation omits the first word of Isaiah 40:3, ἐτοιμάσατε. Maarten Menken argues that this is deliberately omitted to concur with John's statement that he is not Elijah, the eschatological figure who was to prepare the way for the Messiah (1:21).¹⁵⁹ In this way, John's selective quotation from Isaiah is in agreement with his ministry which operates in parallel with Jesus' ministry. Menken's reading of the citation suggests that the idea of preparation is not only omitted but is also excluded from the narrative so that it is not considered by the reader. In contrast, the approach to the Old Testament context followed in this study considers all intertextual context relevant to the interpretation of the citation. Therefore, the notion of preparation, and other concepts within Isaiah 40, are considered when interpreting the citation.

A second difference between the citation and Isaiah 40:3 is that, in John 1:23, εὐθύνετε is read in the place of εὐθείας ποιεῖτε from Isaiah 40:3, resulting in εὐθύνετε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου. However, as Aquila's version also has εὐθύνετε, it is possible, as Menken argues, that εὐθύνετε was accessible in a Greek version earlier than Aquila's at the time the Gospel of John was written, when Greek translations exhibited a concern for closer alignment with the Hebrew text, demonstrated in this example by εὐθύνετε providing a single-word equivalent for יָרַךְ.¹⁶⁰ If, however, εὐθύνετε is a modification of εὐθείας ποιεῖτε, it may be a further example of the tendency for John's quotation to distil and compress the words of Isaiah 40:3.

Bruce Schuchard sees the use of εὐθύνετε in place of εὐθείας ποιεῖτε as an intentional change to echo use of εὐθύνετε in Wisdom literature such as παρὰ κυρίου εὐθύνεται τὰ διαβήματα ἀνδρὶ in Proverbs 20:24.¹⁶¹ His proposal also counters Menken's explanation for the omission of ἐτοιμάσατε, as in Schuchard's view, the inclusion of εὐθύνετε is not understood as taking the place of ἐτοιμάσατε, but rather a shift to facilitate verbal echoes related to wisdom. In these attempts to explain the differences between a Greek form of Isaiah 40:3 and John 1:23, the common acknowledgement is that the quotation is distilled.

A third difference is that τὰς τρίβους is also absent in the quotation of John 1:23. Catrin Williams considers this omission in keeping with the purpose of the proclamation of John the Baptist to focus upon only one "way," rather than many "paths."¹⁶² This observation highlights

¹⁵⁹ Menken "Isa 40,3," 204. On messianic expectations in the Gospel of John, see Marinus de Jonge, "Jewish Expectations about the 'Messiah' according to the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 19 (1973): 246-270 and Richard Bauckham, "Messianism According to the Gospel of John." in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John* (ed. John Lierman; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 34-68.

¹⁶⁰ Menken "Isa 40,3," 194.

¹⁶¹ Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 11-12.

¹⁶² Williams, "Isaiah in John's Gospel," 104; Williams, "Isaiah and Johannine Christology," 110.

the importance of the singular “way” for the interpretation of the quotation in the context of John’s ministry and the coming of Jesus.

When considering the differences between Isaiah 40:3 and John 1:23 it is important to consider the reasons for selective retention in the quotation. By viewing the citation as the result of selective retention, rather than intentional omission, the quotation presents a challenge to the reader to understand the reasons for what is retained. In the citation of Isaiah 40:3 in 1:23, the most significant element that is retained is the phrase τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, as it is through this that the reader is for the first time introduced to *kyrios* in the narrative. In this way, it is possible to see that τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου is selected in John 1:23 due to the particular semantic advantages of *kyrios*. As a result, the selection of the entire phrase τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου suits the narrative of the Gospel of John in two ways, both by the singular nature of the way, as argued by Williams, and also due to the introduction of *kyrios*.

To analyse the phrase τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, it is important first to consider how the reader understands “the way.” Due to the multiple syntactic options for understanding the genitive construction τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, it is necessary to utilise the context of Isaiah 40:3 and John 1:23 to determine its meaning. Williams has demonstrated that, in the context of Isaiah 40, “τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου” is paralleled with the idea that *kyrios* “is coming” (κύριος ... ἔρχεται 40:10). This suggests that τὴν ὁδὸν is best understood so that it represents “the coming” of the Lord. As Isaiah 40:10 has *kyrios* coming, rather than God’s people coming to him, this further limits the genitive construction as being subjective, rather than objective, so that τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου is the Lord coming, rather than others coming to him.¹⁶³ Thus, when John presents his ministry as making straight “the way,” he is announcing that *kyrios* is coming. This allows the reader to then consider the identity of *kyrios*.

In both Isaiah 40 and John 1, as Williams has shown, “coming” is an important verbal parallel.¹⁶⁴ Even when restricting the context of Isaiah 40:3 to the immediate context of Isaiah 40:1-10, the reader sees that it is *kyrios* who comes (ἔρχεται 40:10). In Isaiah 40:1-10, *kyrios* (40:2, 3, 5, 10) and θεός (40:1, 3, 5, 8, 9) are used interchangeably for the God of Israel. Due to this, it is clear to the reader that *kyrios* is the God of Israel. In John 1, “coming” occurs in a statement by the narrator that “the true light ... was coming” (Ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν ...

¹⁶³ Williams, "Isaiah in John's Gospel," 104.

¹⁶⁴ Williams, "Isaiah in John's Gospel," 104.

ἐρχόμενον 1:9) and John the Baptist refers to “the one coming” (1:15,27,30).¹⁶⁵ Therefore, in the statements by the narrator and John the Baptist, Jesus is the one who is expected to come.

In addition to the parallels of *coming* the idea of *glory being seen* is present in both Isaiah 40:1-10 and John 1, as demonstrated by Ruth Sheridan.¹⁶⁶ In Isaiah 40, it is also *kyrios* whose glory “will appear” (ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου 40:5). As with the references in John 1 regarding “coming,” the one statement by the narrator regarding glory in John 1 also refers to Jesus: ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός (1:14).

In these references, then, Isaiah 40 presents the God of Israel as coming, and as the one whose glory will be revealed, while John 1 presents the idea that the one who is coming, and whose glory has been seen, is Jesus.

4.1.1.2. Structure

This scene (1:19-28) is the first in the narrative after the prologue.¹⁶⁷ In this way, the key elements of the prologue are in closest reach for the reader who encounters this dialogue between John and the delegation from Jerusalem.

The scene begins with an introduction (1:19) which presents a theme or title for this section of the narrative as ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου. However, although the testimony of John is a focus in 19-28, this section of the narrative ultimately is concerned with the identity of Jesus.¹⁶⁸ Also in the introduction, the reader is introduced to several new characters: the *Ioudaioi*, priests and Levites. In contrast to the prologue, which was global in scope, the reader is now introduced to a specific location, Jerusalem. However, this is given only as the origin of the delegation, as at this stage the reader has not been informed where the conversation took place. Also introduced is the purpose of the subsequent dialogue, which is that the delegation from Jerusalem may find out who John is. The reader thus expects that not only will John be testifying during this exchange, but also that the reader and other characters will learn more about the identity of the “man sent from God, whose name was John (1:6).”

¹⁶⁵ Xavier Léon-Dufour, *Lecture de l'Évangile selon Jean* (4 vols.; Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1988-1996), 1:160, considers the broader context of 40:3, and notes the parallel between the coming of *kyrios* in both John 1 and Isaiah 40:10.

¹⁶⁶ Sheridan, *Retelling Scripture*, 114-115. Sheridan demonstrates that verbal and thematic parallels throughout Isaiah 40-66 support this interpretation.

¹⁶⁷ For the widely accepted subdivision of 1:19-28, see, for example, Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 300.

¹⁶⁸ Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 90: “Die Frage nach der Identität Jesu durchzieht die ganze Sequenz und gibt ihr ihren thematischen Zusammenhalt.”

The dialogue itself can be divided into three sections: Negative Confession (1:20-21), Positive Confession (1:22-23) and Explanation (1:25-27), with 1:24 consisting of a comment by the narrator. The first line of the dialogue (1:20) is the first of three negative confessions in 1:20-21. Although the first question from the delegation appears to be merely σὺ τίς εἶ (1:19), John's response is a stark negative confession, Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ χριστός (1:20), and is the first mention of Messiah in the dialogue. It is possible that the reader infers that John introduced this topic into the conversation, or that he was responding to a question about whether he claimed to be the Messiah. This would require the reader to further infer that there was speculation surrounding whether John was or had claimed to be the Messiah, serving as shared cognitive context for the delegation and John.

The reader might also infer that there was dialogue before this first question is reported, or that the first question σὺ τίς εἶ; is not the question to which John responds, but rather a summary of the delegation's mission. In the latter case, the actual first question of the dialogue is not reported, but is inferred from the answer which John gives, and the pattern of the following two questions from the delegation which explicitly mention eschatological figures. Due to the lack of clear guidance in the immediate context, the structuring of this dialogue leaves the reader with a number of questions. The solution for these questions is not immediately apparent in the context of the negative confessions of 1:19-21, during which John states that he is neither Elijah nor the prophet.

The role that τίς εἶ; (1:19) plays in the dialogue might best be understood by noticing its repetition in 1:22. Following John's threefold negative confession, the delegation asks John τίς εἶ; (1:22). If the repetition and placement is understood as highlighting this form of the question as the ultimate goal of their interrogation, the appearance of the same question in 1:19 then serves as a summarizing statement for the dialogue as a whole. Therefore, the reader is encouraged to pay significant attention to the answer to τίς εἶ; as the focus of the conversation. The dialogue of affirmation (1:22-23), then, is the focus of the scene 1:19-28. Its content, particularly John's affirmative confession, is an interpretive key for determining the contribution made by this section of the narrative.

The dialogue of affirmation (1:22-23) is followed by a narrative comment which provides further information regarding the identity or origin of the delegation (1:24). This is then followed by the dialogue of explanation, in which John provides his interlocutors with a justification for his ministry of baptism (1:25-27). The final part of this section of the narrative

is both a conclusion and a transition. It concludes the scene by informing the reader that its location is Bethany beyond Jordan (1:28). At the same time, this also serves as a location-setting introduction for the next section of the narrative based in the same place.

4.1.1.3. Character

The character who uses *kyrios* in this section of the narrative, and who is the focus of this part of the narrative analysis, is John (the Baptist). The character analysis will examine how the preceding narrative and 1:19-28 contribute to the reader's understanding of John's reliability and his vocation.¹⁶⁹

The first information which the reader learns about John, before even learning his name, is that he is "sent from God" (*ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ*, 1:6). This key descriptor as the first narrative comment about him establishes that he is reliable.¹⁷⁰ It gives the reader sufficient evidence to believe that he is a character who will speak on behalf of the God whose reliability is assumed in the narrative. In this way, John's reliability is contingent on his connection to God. This reliability entails that John will also speak in agreement with the narrator, who is established in the prologue as reliable by communicating information that is assumed by the reader to be accessible only to God, implied in the narrator's retelling of Genesis 1. As a reliable character who can speak on behalf of God, John's words can be trusted alongside the words of God and the words of the narrator.¹⁷¹

The vocation of John is established in the prologue. In 1:6, the reader first encounters the notion of John's vocation as one "sent from God." This description indicates that the reader is challenged to clarify the nature of his vocation, comprising the purpose for his sending. This information is provided in the next statement in the prologue, which states that John ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν (1:7). The nature of this testimony, and John's relationship to it, is clarified in the

¹⁶⁹ "Vocation" for divine mission is here drawn from N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (London: SPCK, 1996), 645-650.

¹⁷⁰ For John as a reliable character, see Skinner, "Misunderstanding, Christology, and Johannine Characterization," 111-128 (115), and Catrin H. Williams, "John (the Baptist): The Witness on the Threshold." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 46-60 (53). Bennema, *Encountering*, 62, sees the prologue as establishing that John is "a God-appointed witness." On the relationship between the prologue and John, see Sherri Brown, "John the Baptist: Witness and Embodiment of the Prologue in the Gospel of John." in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*, (ed. Christopher W. Skinner; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 147-164.

¹⁷¹ For further analysis of the ways in which the Gospel of John "relies upon the speech of characters rather than narration to tell the story," see Jo-Ann A. Brant, *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 3. Williams, "John (the Baptist): The Witness on the Threshold," 59-60, considers John as unique in the narrative, and that he is distinguished from all of the disciples of the Jesus in his revelatory understanding of Jesus' identity.

next clause, when the narrator states that he came “in order to testify about the light.” This testimony, in turn, is presented “so that all might believe through him” (1:7). John’s vocation, then, can be summarised as one who testifies about the light who is also called Jesus the Messiah (1:17). As a result, the reader would predict that John’s response regarding his own identity would in some way confirm his vocation-defining relationship to Jesus as a witness.¹⁷² These factors provide further contextual evidence that in 1:23 John is referring to Jesus.

John’s vocation, consisting of his witness to the light, is also highlighted in his own speech. In the first report of John’s words in the Gospel, he describes his own role as one who testifies about the word/light/Jesus (μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ, 1:15).¹⁷³ In addition, the first time that John speaks to other characters in the narrative, his words confirm that he is a person who points away from himself. As John begins to speak to the delegation, the length of his negative responses progressively decreases from Οὐκ εἰμι ἐγὼ ὁ χριστός (1:20) to Οὐκ εἰμί, and then Οὐ (1:21). His next response, which contains only one of his own words, ἐγώ, introduces the words of the prophet Isaiah.¹⁷⁴

John’s identity as a reliable character sent by God is contrastively highlighted when the narrator describes the delegation as being sent by humans (1:19, 24).¹⁷⁵ The function of this comment is to refocus the reader on John’s reliability in preparation for the answers he will provide the delegation in the dialogue. As John responds to the questions presented to him, his reliability is further demonstrated in the answers that he provides. By confessing that he is not the Messiah (1:20), John agrees with the narrator’s earlier statement that “he was not the light.” (1:8). Similarly, by John’s statement about the one “who comes after” him (1:27), he further agrees with the narrator that “he came to testify about the light” (1:7).

As a voice in the wilderness, John cries out εὐθύνατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου. From this quotation, particularly the use of the second-person plural imperative, the reader is invited to consider who is being called upon. A key feature of the Greek of Isaiah 40:2 may provide a clue for this, where the Hebrew reads דְּבַרְוּ עַל־לֵב יְרוּשָׁלַם, and the Greek identifies the audience of the

¹⁷² Gail R. O'Day, "The Gospel of John." in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), 9:491-866 (520): “John has one function in the Gospel: to witness to Jesus.”

¹⁷³ For the importance of characters’ first words in a narrative, see Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 161.

¹⁷⁴ Brodie comments, ‘(t)here is a faint evoking of a process of self-emptying: As he speaks, his replies diminish in quantity’ (*John*, 150). This observation depends on καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὁ προφήτης being understood as a comment by the narrator, and not part of John’s speech.

¹⁷⁵ Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (London: Continuum, 2005), 112.

imperative as *ιερεῖς*, resulting in *ιερεῖς λαλήσατε εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Ἱερουσαλημ*. The audience of this command to speak to Jerusalem, then, is the priests. Thus, it would appear that the same priests who are commanded in 40:2 are also addressed in the Greek version of Isaiah 40:3. In the context of John 1:23, John is also speaking to priests, who have been sent from Jerusalem (1:19). This indicates that as John is “crying out in the wilderness,” the delegation from Jerusalem are counted amongst those whom he is addressing.¹⁷⁶ Therefore, the priests are in some way responsible for delivering John’s message “to the heart of Jerusalem.” As a result, John’s vocation to announce to his hearers their inclusion in the welcoming of *kyrios* does not exclude Jerusalem, but calls on its participation.

4.1.1.4. Irony

The irony which the reader experiences in this passage depends on the delegation being unaware of information disclosed in the prologue. A key element of the irony of this section of the narrative is the contrast between the delegation’s interpretation of the referent of *kyrios* and the interpretation of the reader.

The delegation, as priests and Levites, can be expected to know that the source of the quotation is Isaiah 40:3. However, unlike the reader, they do not have access to the prologue in order to facilitate their interpretation of the quotation. Despite this, as the narrator identifies them as priests and Levites, the reader can expect that they are aware of the broader context of the quotation in Isaiah 40. It is this broader context examined above that would lead the delegation to interpret John’s quotation as an announcement that the God of Israel was returning to his people, as expressed throughout Isaiah 40, including *ἰδοὺ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν. ἰδοὺ κύριος μετὰ ἰσχύος ἔρχεται* (40:9-10).¹⁷⁷ Not only was God returning, however, but was also intending to gather his people (*τῷ βραχίονι αὐτοῦ συναΐξει ἄρνας*, Isa 40:11). In this way, the delegation might also understand John’s quotation as referring to the ingathering of the people of Israel.

In addition to the context of Isaiah 40, knowledge of John’s ministry can also assist the delegation in the interpretation of this quotation. John’s negative confessions only lead to a narrowing of their suppositions regarding who John is (1:21-22). However, it is the statement which John makes during his positive confessions which provides the delegation with evidence

¹⁷⁶ This argument is made by Schuchard, *Scripture within Scripture*, 4-5, who also sees this connection as a key to identifying the “Septuagint” as the source of the quotation in John 1:23

¹⁷⁷ Isaiah 40 uses both *יהוה/θεός* and *יהוה/κύριος* throughout. Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 101: “To the delegation, “the Lord” is simply the God of Israel, but John will soon alert them that someone else is in the picture.”

of how God will come to his people. When John speaks of ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος (1:26-27), he provides the delegation with the same information from which the reader has already benefited (1:15). To identify how this statement might be related to John's vocation, however, the delegation is left without any further guidance, except that the coming one is present, and that they are ignorant of his identity (1:26). As Scholtissek has argued, John's declaration, that they "do not know" Jesus, reflects a dynamic experienced throughout the narrative, when characters see Jesus but do not know his true identity.¹⁷⁸

Unlike the delegation, the reader has benefited from all that the prologue has provided to be able to interpret the use of Isaiah 40:3 in John 1:23. The reader is thus able to identify the cluster of verbal parallels with Isaiah 40, in contrast to the single element of one "coming" which the delegation might identify from John's words in 1:27 and Isaiah 40:11. As examined above, the reader is able to see that the one who is coming (Isa 40:11, John 1:9, 15, 27), and whose glory will be seen (Isa 40:5, John 1:14), according to Isaiah 40 is God, and according to this narrative, is Jesus.¹⁷⁹ Similarly, knowing John's vocation (1:7), the reader is able to infer that, as a reliable character (1:6), his declaration of identity incorporates his witness to Jesus. The reader then must decide if the narrator is indicating that Jesus is coming instead of God, or that Jesus and God are both coming in distinct ways, or that God's coming and Jesus' coming are related in some way.

The narrator provides guidance for the reader in how to understand the relationship between the coming and glory of God and Jesus. In the allusion to the Genesis creation account (John 1:1-5), Jesus is given the name of God (θεός) and undertakes a role in creation which in Genesis is limited to God. Rather than Jesus creating alongside God in distinction to him, it is through him (δι' αὐτοῦ) that God made all things (Gen 1:1, John 1:3). This provides a significant precedent in the narrative for understanding 1:23. It follows that, in 1:23, the reader does not use knowledge of the prologue to exclude God from coming, nor to see Jesus and God as somehow both coming in distinct ways. Rather, the reader understands God's coming as being fulfilled in Jesus.¹⁸⁰ The coming of Jesus, then, is the coming of God, and those who see Jesus' glory have seen the glory of God.

¹⁷⁸ Klaus Scholtissek, "'Mitten unter euch steht er, den ihr nicht kennt' (Joh 1,26): die Messias-Regel des Täufers als johanneische Sinnlinie." *MTZ* 48 (1997): 103-121 (109-111).

¹⁷⁹ Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 43-50, considers the usage of δόξα in the Greek Old Testament as the key background for understanding the Gospel of John. For the use of δόξα in the Greek Old Testament, see Nicole Chibici-Revneanu, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten. Das Verständnis der δόξα im Johannesevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 360-374, and Rainer Schwandt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit. Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 2007), 32-43.

¹⁸⁰ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 80, emphasises fulfillment as a key aspect of the narrative, particularly its second half.

The use of the title *kyrios* gives the reader further guidance in the interpretation of 1:23. In the prologue, the reader has already witnessed that the relationship between God and Jesus is punctuated by them sharing a name (θεός). In 1:23, the reader who has benefited from reading the prologue has again seen something which other characters could not. Namely, in speaking of *kyrios*, John was identifying both God and Jesus with this same title.¹⁸¹ Therefore, the reader is affirmed in believing that the *kyrios* who is going to come is not God alone to the exclusion of Jesus, but rather God coming in the person of Jesus.

The delegation is not wrong in identifying that in 1:23 *kyrios* refers to the God of Israel. Although this identification is not incorrect, it is inadequate. The gulf which stands between the reader and the delegation in respect to their relative levels of understanding was too big for the priests and Levites from Jerusalem to cross. In this way, John declares that the delegation does not know the one who is coming (1:26-27). The priests and Levites, who had a prophetic mandate to deliver good news to Jerusalem in order to prepare the way of the Lord, were not only unaware of John's vocation, they also did not know the identity of the one who was coming.

As the victim of its own ignorance, the delegation provides the reader with guidance regarding the importance of the privileged position gained by reading the prologue. Through the knowledge which the reader shares with the narrator, it is possible for the reader to see what characters do not see, and understand what they cannot grasp, most importantly with reference to the identity of the coming *kyrios*.

4.1.1.5. Point of View

In the first use of *kyrios* in the narrative, two themes are highlighted to extend the reader's understanding of the point of view of the narrator as captured in the σάρξ and δόξα of 1:14.

A significant effect of the irony experienced through the ignorance of the delegation is a reinforcement of the point of view expressed in the prologue. In the case of those who came from Jerusalem, they did not even see the flesh. They hear from John that the one coming is present, that is, in the flesh, but they never "see him coming" as John does in the following

¹⁸¹ Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 95, emphasises the importance of seeing in John's use of *kyrios* a referent to Jesus, but also sees this as excluding a reference to God, and argues that "[u]nter dem Begriff „Herr“ ist hier der joh Jesus und nicht Gott zu verstehen: Der Täufer lenkt die Aufmerksamkeit der Menschen auf die Person Jesu."

section of the narrative. Although the narrative does not provide explicit evidence of the delegation's departure from Bethany and return to Jerusalem, this is implied due to the absence of any reference to the delegation after 1:28. This interpretation is also supported by the earlier dialogue in which those who come from Jerusalem inform John that they intend to return there (1:22). Therefore, the delegation misses a visual encounter with Jesus' flesh. In addition, the delegation does not discern that ἡ δόξα κυρίου is the glory of the one who is among them. For those who have come from Jerusalem, ἡ δόξα κυρίου is ἡ δόξα θεοῦ alone, and without the knowledge the reader has gained from the prologue, they cannot identify whose glory they expect to see. As a result, the messengers cannot take to Jerusalem the good news of the glory of the *kyrios* who has come, as they have neither seen the flesh of Jesus, nor his glory.

The combined testimony of the narrator and John also strengthens the reader's awareness of the flesh-glory framework through which the narrative is read. The key connection established through this section of the narrative is that of the prophetically promised δόξα κυρίου and the glory of Jesus. Through the parallelism between Isaiah 40 and John 1, the reader is able to see that the glory of Jesus which the "we" of the prologue has seen is the same glory which Isaiah 40 predicts "will be seen." In this way, ἡ δόξα Ἰησοῦ is ἡ δόξα κυρίου, because Jesus is the *kyrios* who is coming, whose way John's ministry made straight. It is this glory which can be seen in the coming of the *kyrios*. And by viewing John 1 in light of Isaiah 40, the reader can see that the Lord does come, by becoming flesh. Therefore, it is by seeing the word made flesh that one can behold the glory of the Lord. Throughout the narrative which follows, then, the reader can expect that those who see the glory of Jesus are not only witnessing the glory of a human being. Rather, they are confirming what the prophet Isaiah predicted and the reliable character John has announced – the glory of the *kyrios* is to be found in Jesus, because Jesus is the *kyrios*.

4.1.2. Textual Criticism

There is one textual variant of significance in this passage, being the addition or omission of the article before κυρίου in 1:23.¹⁸² The article is present before κυρίου in 1:23 in 0141, a tenth century majuscule commentary manuscript, and 1243, an eleventh century minuscule.¹⁸³ In

¹⁸² In addition to the variant in 1:23, the first hand of Codex Bezae appears to have been παρὰ κυρίου (written as KY) in 1:6, corrected to ΘΥ. The external evidence is clearly in favour of ΘΥ, as all other collated Greek and versional evidence supports it. In addition, with regard to authorial tendencies, παρὰ θεοῦ is used at least three times in the narrative to describe someone's origin (6:46, 9:16, 33), whereas παρὰ κυρίου is not used. Furthermore, *kyrios* is not used by the narrator to identify the God of Israel, except in Old Testament quotations. The variant appears to be a unique modification made by the scribe of Bezae.

¹⁸³ These two readings are found in Mullen, et al., *The Gospel according to John in the Byzantine tradition*; Mullen, et al., *An Electronic Edition of the Gospel according to John in the Byzantine Tradition*. Descriptions of the

contrast to the support for the inclusion of the article, the external evidence which favours the omission meets Epp's categories of manuscripts of an early date, those of the best quality, which are widely distributed geographically, and that are found in more than one established groups of manuscripts.¹⁸⁴ This results in the external evidence being in favour of the omission.

Intrinsic probabilities for this variant include the use of the article within the Gospel of John and the Old Testament. As outlined in the methodology section, if the author intends to refer to Jesus by using *kyrios*, it will occur with the article, when not used within an Old Testament quotation. As 1:23 consists of an Old Testament quotation which also includes Jesus as its referent, it is a unique situation. Although it might be argued that the author would include the article to indicate more strongly that the referent includes Jesus, given that the use of the article corresponds with the form found in the other Old Testament quotations throughout the Gospel, intrinsic probabilities still favour the anarthrous form.

Analysis of transcriptional probabilities also necessarily considers the use of the article with *kyrios* in the Old Testament and in the Gospel of John. The general tendency in the Greek Old Testament, for *kyrios* to be anarthrous when referring to God, could exert significant influence on scribes. Therefore, if *kyrios* were articular in exemplars that scribes copied, they might have omitted the article in order to conform the text to the usage in the Old Testament. More specifically, this would align the text with patterns of usage throughout Greek Isaiah, and the anarthrous form in Isaiah 40:3. In contrast, considering authorial tendencies, the inclusion of the article would be consistent with the usage of *kyrios* to refer to Jesus. A scribe who encounters an anarthrous form in an exemplar may have sought to make the text more explicit in order to identify Jesus as being included as the referent. However, there are no other clear examples of an anarthrous *kyrios* from an Old Testament quotation in the Gospel which also refer to Jesus, making comparison impossible. Despite this, because scribes are known more generally to make texts more explicit,¹⁸⁵ this scenario is possible, in principle. This might explain why in at least two manuscripts the article occurs. However, this possibility does not tip the scales in favour of establishing the anarthrous form as the more primitive reading. Rather, the tendency to make the text more explicit serves to counterbalance the well-known proclivity of scribes to conform a

manuscripts are from Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, *Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Throughout this study, Greek manuscripts are referred to by Gregory-Aland number, rather than letter, following the preferred method described by David Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts*, 37. In addition, in this study, manuscript names for majuscules and minuscules are always used when available.

¹⁸⁴ Epp, "Canons," 96-104.

¹⁸⁵ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 39, states that "the general tendency of scribes is to make the text more explicit."

New Testament quotation to the form found in the Old Testament. In this way, it renders the transcriptional evidence somewhat inconclusive.

Overall, the shorter reading is preferred due to stronger external and internal support. External evidence overwhelmingly supports the omission of the article. Intrinsic probabilities also favour its omission, considering authorial tendencies in similar cases throughout the Gospel. The two potential tendencies at work in scribal habits serve to balance out the contribution which the transcriptional probabilities might provide. Therefore, the anarthrous form ultimately benefits from greater internal evidence. As a result, the anarthrous κυρίου is the reading which was more likely written by the author, with the addition of the article the result of scribal activity. The longer reading was most likely produced to increase the explicitness of the text with respect to the identification of Jesus as a referent.

4.1.3. Semantics

For the semantic analysis of *kyrios* in 1:23, it is important to consider the meaning of *kyrios* for the delegation and also for the reader.

There are several contextual constraints which act on the characters who hear John use *kyrios*. The linguistic context is what has been said previously and also what follows in the same dialogue. Most importantly for the delegation, *kyrios* appears in the genitive construction τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, and John then informs them of ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος (1:28). As argued above, it is unlikely that the delegation would make the connection to understand that the *kyrios* was standing among them, and that they did not know him. This interpretation is supported by the discourse context. As the word appears in a quotation of prophecy, the context of the original prophecy constrains the delegation to see the *kyrios* as the God of Israel alone. As the delegation does not benefit from the prologue, there is no contextual reason to seek to disambiguate the referent any further. With regard to relationship context, as interrogators of John the delegation is seeking information about his identity, without focusing on the identity of *kyrios*. As John says they do not know the one who is coming, they might dismiss this as a possible connection to the *kyrios* of 1:23, who is the God of Israel, as they obviously know him. These constraints combine to restrict the delegation to see the referent of *kyrios* as the God of Israel, and him alone. This coincides with the domain “Supernatural Beings” for one “who exercises supernatural authority.”¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁶ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

The narrative analysis above has shown that the narrator, the reader and John the Baptist have a shared understanding of the identity of the *kyrios*. The linguistic and discourse constraints combine to provide a web of interlocking verbal parallels which guide the reader to see that the coming of *kyrios* for Isaiah is fulfilled in the coming of Jesus for John. This interpretation is possible due to the cognitive context in which the reader encounters *kyrios*, which is enriched by the relationship between the reader and narrator. The relationship context, established by the sharing of information in the prologue and in comments by the narrator in 1:19-28, allows the reader to understand John's declaration. These contextual constraints guide the reader to see that the referent of *kyrios* is the God of Israel, and at the same time Jesus. One does not exclude the other, as the discourse context of prophecy dictates that the reliable narrator would not seek to nullify a prophecy, but rather describe its fulfilment.¹⁸⁷ Due to this understanding of the prophecy, the most relevant domain to situate *kyrios* in is "supernatural beings," with the corresponding sense of "one who exercises supernatural authority."¹⁸⁸

4.1.4. Summary

This analysis of *kyrios* in John 1:23 concludes that the context of the quotation is key for understanding its narrative function. Due to the verbal parallels of "coming" and "glory" between Isaiah 40 and John 1, the reader is able to see that Jesus fulfils the prophesied coming of the *kyrios*, and that it is through the coming of Jesus that ἡ δόξα κυρίου can be seen. The structural analysis confirms the importance of this quotation in the scene as a whole, indicating that it holds a place of significance in the narrative, due to this scene representing the opening of the narrative proper.

The character analysis showed that John is both a reliable character and one whose vocation is tied to his divine mission as a witness to Jesus. In this way, his testimony is to be trusted, and his vocation-defining quotation of Isaiah 40:3 affirms his role as a witness to Jesus. Due to the ignorance of the delegation, they are victims of irony, unable to see what the reader has seen. Although they had an opportunity to take the good news to Jerusalem that Jesus the *kyrios* is coming, they are relegated to continue in the ignorance in which they came to the wilderness.

¹⁸⁷ For an argument for the reliable narrator in the Gospel of John, see Staley, *The Print's First Kiss*, 116-117.

¹⁸⁸ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

With regard to the point of view of the narrator, the delegation was not even able to see the flesh of Jesus, let alone his glory. The reader, on the other hand, is able to see that, in the flesh of Jesus, the God of Israel comes, and that it is the glory of the God of Israel that is seen in him.

The text of John 1:23 reads εὐθύνετε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου. The addition of the article by some scribes appears to have been as a result of them, as readers, wrestling with the dual-referent of *kyrios* in the passage. The semantic analysis confirmed the narrative analysis, and demonstrated that contextual constraints led the delegation to understand the referent of *kyrios* as exclusively the God of Israel. The reader, on the other hand, is able to see that the use of *kyrios* in this narrative does not only encompass the God of Israel, but also Jesus.

4.2. *Kyrios* in Samaria

4.2.1. Narrative

4.2.1.1. Context

Following the announcement by John the Baptist about one who is coming (1:15), the narrative includes a flurry of positive responses to Jesus. These first days of Jesus' ministry culminate with the manifestation of his glory (2:11) which had been spoken of in 1:14. Following this manifestation, Nicodemus' encounter with Jesus is marked by ambiguity, including both positive and negative indications of the nature of his faith, as he struggles to comprehend both earthly and heavenly realities.¹⁸⁹ As chapter three comes to a close, so does the ministry of John, who concludes his public ministry by saying, with reference to Jesus, ἐκεῖνον δεῖ ἀδοξάνειν, ἐμὲ δὲ ἐλαττοῦσθαι (3:30). The narrator then again refers to Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος (3:31), recalling previous statements by both the narrator and John (1:9, 15). These, in turn, echo the Old Testament context of the opening of John's public ministry in the narrative (John 1:23, Isa 40:10), whereby God's coming is fulfilled in the coming of Jesus. It is fitting that both at the outset and the close of John's ministry these themes are reinforced, highlighting their importance for the reader's understanding of the narrative.

¹⁸⁹ On the resolution of this initial ambiguity, see Gabi Renz, "Nicodemus: An Ambiguous Disciple? A Narrative Sensitive Investigation." in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John* (ed. John Lierman; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 255-283. For a reading of Nicodemus that considers his portrayal throughout the narrative as an example of "how the work of God is done" in bringing people to himself, see Craig R. Koester, "Theological Complexity and the Characterization of Nicodemus in John's Gospel." in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*, (ed. Christopher W. Skinner; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 164-181 (180).

A further consideration with regard to context is the parallel between the Samaritan woman's encounter with Jesus at a well and other encounters at wells in the Old Testament. As Paul Duke has argued, κύριε here may connote marital terminology in a larger narrative context which is designed to recall in the reader's mind other marriage-related meetings at wells from the book of Genesis. If this interpretation is accepted, it has the potential to affect significantly the reader's understanding of the woman's use of κύριε.¹⁹⁰ While acknowledging the potential value of Duke's contribution for the understanding of κύριε in this context, the analysis which follows will not engage with this line of investigation further. As Duke has stated, echoes of betrothal between Jesus and the Samaritan woman do not compete with other interpretations, but serve to render another layer of narrative complexity.¹⁹¹

4.2.1.2. Structure

Within chapter 4, there are two sections of the narrative which contain *kyrios* in the manuscript tradition. The first is the transition-introduction (4:1-6) and the second is the conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan Woman (4:7-26).

The transition-introduction presents the two reasons for Jesus' journey through Samaria (4:1-6).¹⁹² The first is that the success of Jesus' ministry has led to attention from the Pharisees (4:1-3). Because Jesus is aware of this, he departs Judaea, strongly implying that he did not want the attention.¹⁹³ The journey from Judaea to Galilee, which would include a passage through Samaria, is presented as a necessity, without explicit reference to the reason why (4:4). Whether this is a divine necessity, or if it is more a matter of geographic convenience, is not answered explicitly.¹⁹⁴ Due to the propensity for double meaning in the narrative, it might be that the reader is not required to make a choice, but rather allow both interpretations to complement each other.¹⁹⁵ By the end of the introduction, then, the reader knows salient details about Jesus' location, and the reason for him being there.

¹⁹⁰ Another approach to this passage which also consider gender roles is Jerome Neyrey, "What's Wrong With This Picture? John 4, Cultural Stereotypes of Women, and Public and Private Space." *BTB* 24 (1994):77-91.

¹⁹¹ Duke, *Irony*, 101-103.

¹⁹² Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 301, sees 4:1-3 as a transition between chapter 3 and chapter 4. Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 587, emphasises that 4:1-6 is a unified paragraph which connects chapter 3 with chapter 4.

¹⁹³ The important question of whether the narrator refers to Jesus with Ἰησοῦς or Κύριος will be addressed in the text critical analysis below.

¹⁹⁴ C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978), 230: "John's ἔδει probably conveys no more theological significance than Josephus'; he may however intend to suggest also that God willed that Jesus should take this route in order that he might meet the Samaritan woman."

¹⁹⁵ O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 565, sees both "geographical and theological" aspects of the journey through Samaria. It was geographically necessary to pass through on the way to Galilee, and theologically necessary to stay there for

The conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman (4:7-26) can be divided into four parts based on shifts in topic focus.¹⁹⁶ The first part of the conversation, which revolves around water, begins with Jesus' request, in the form of an imperative, δός μοι πειν (4:7), and ends with the Samaritan woman using the same verb to request water, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ (4:15). The second part of the conversation, which briefly focuses on the woman's marital history, begins with Jesus' request for her to call her husband (4:16), and ends with the woman's declaration that Jesus is a prophet (4:19). The topic then shifts again for the third part of the conversation (4:20-24), which focuses on worship. The fourth and final part of the conversation concerns the coming and identity of the Messiah (4:25-26).

The importance of κύριε in the narrative, and Jesus' identity more generally, can be seen in its position in the conversation. Section one and two both conclude with the Samaritan woman addressing Jesus as κύριε. Part four of the conversation, and therefore the conversation as a whole, closes with Jesus' self-identification as the Messiah. Repetition in the conversation also highlights the importance of κύριε, as the term is used three times (4:11,15,19), with the third occurrence also serving as the Samaritan woman's most explicit and developed profession of faith, κύριε, θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σὺ.

4.2.1.3. Character

This analysis focuses on the only character, apart from the narrator, to use *kyrios* in this section of the narrative, the Samaritan woman.

During the scenes in Samaria, Jesus is addressed as κύριε for the first time in the narrative (4:11, 15, 19). Although he has been identified as *kyrios* (1:23), none of the characters who have encountered him until this point of the narrative have used the vocative κύριε. The Samaritan woman is the first to do so. In her dialogue with Jesus, the Samaritan woman's first words establish her as both a character searching for answers, and one for whom ethnic identity looms large. Her status as one seeking answers is demonstrated by the three questions she asks in the first two lines which she speaks, πῶς σὺ...; (4:9), πόθεν...; (4:10), μὴ σὺ...; (4:11). Her concern for ethnicity can be seen when she responds to Jesus' request, δός μοι πειν (4:7), with a question that demarcates her own identity and that of her interlocutor, πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν παρ' ἐμοῦ

ministry.

¹⁹⁶ This structure follows Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 8-9, except that Zumstein's third section, "Die wahre Anbetung," 4:20-26, is here subdivided further to allow for sufficient focus on Jesus' revelation of his identity as the Messiah.

πεῖν αἰτεῖς γυναῖκός Σαμαρίτιδος οὔσης (4:9). Jesus' response to her question shifts the focus of the conversation from ethnicity to his own identity, εἰ ἤδεις...τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι· δός μοι πεῖν, σὺ ἂν ἤτησας αὐτὸν (4:10).

Although at times focused on the complexities of earthly realities which feature in her daily existence (4:11, 15), the Samaritan woman is able to recognise rightly that Jesus possesses supernatural knowledge in her declaration that he is a prophet (4:19).¹⁹⁷ As Jesus had done earlier in the conversation, it is now the Samaritan woman who seeks to turn the conversation, calling on Jesus to respond to her statement regarding right worship (4:20). The significance of the topic indicates that she saw Jesus, a prophet, as a source of revelation on how to worship God.¹⁹⁸

The Samaritan woman's response to Jesus' description of the realities of true worship reveals at the same time her perceptiveness and also her incomplete knowledge. In speaking of the Messiah coming (4:25), she reveals her right concern for God's future action in history. However, she also unknowingly refers to the Messiah who is standing before her. This combination of partial knowledge with perception typifies the conversation until this point. This is crucial for the semantic analysis of her use of κύριε, as she uses the term whilst demonstrating a lack of complete insight into Jesus' claims.

Following Jesus' final messianic claim (4:26), the Samaritan woman's actions speak of her readiness to accept the reality of his words. Having heard Jesus' self-identification that he is the one for whom she was waiting, she departs, leaving with Jesus the jar which she had brought to the well (4:28).¹⁹⁹ Due to the importance of two different types of water in the encounter between the Samaritan woman and Jesus, this water jar can be understood as a symbol of her old life, a vessel which carried the only water she had known, until she met Jesus. It only gave her access to water from the well, not the living water which Jesus offered her. This suggests that she had decided to leave that which she had been grasping in order to pursue the truths of which Jesus had spoken.²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁷ Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:434, argues that the anarthrous προφήτης indicates that the Samaritan woman does not consider Jesus *the* prophet of Deuteronomy 18:15,18.

¹⁹⁸ O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 567: "her inquiry about worship is an act of deepening engagement with Jesus, because she anticipates that the prophet Jesus will be able to speak an authoritative word on the subject."

¹⁹⁹ The reader can infer that she had brought this water jar to the well (4:7, 11).

²⁰⁰ For an evaluation of interpreting this action as "a sign of discipleship," see Mary L. Coloe, "The Woman of Samaria: Her Characterization, Narrative, and Theological Significance." in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*, (ed. Christopher W. Skinner; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 182-196 (192).

Although the reader might wish to see further explicit description of the Samaritan woman, the narrative instead focuses on the results of her testimony, being the harvest that is from her own people (4:41-42).²⁰¹ It is therefore important that the woman's question μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός; (4:29) be understood in light of the pragmatic realities of the declaration. Although prefixed with μήτι, the question does not need to imply that the speaker expected a negative answer. Rather, in this context μή introduces "a suggestion in the most tentative and hesitating way."²⁰² Furthermore, the Samaritan woman's use of μήτι does not need to reflect hesitance in her own faith, but a strategic cautiousness in a public announcement to an audience that might have responded in a hostile manner if she had confidently proclaimed a Jewish Messiah.²⁰³

It has been argued that, because the Samaritans respond positively to her invitation, caution in proclamation is unnecessary.²⁰⁴ However, it is not the invitation to meet Jesus, "a man who told me all that I did," that needs caution. Rather, caution is needed with respect to the designation that Jesus is the Messiah, so that the villagers can enthusiastically respond to the invitation. At the same time, this proclamation does not initially require their commitment to accept Jesus' messianic claims. Therefore, the use of μή in the declaration does not mean the Samaritan woman was uncertain about Jesus' identity, but that she expressed her faith with caution.

The Samaritans, who believe after meeting Jesus and hearing his words, proclaim to her Οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλιὰν πιστεύομεν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου (4:42). The intensive αὐτοὶ and the use of ἀληθῶς suggest that the speakers are affirming that they themselves have now experienced the same faith that she has, in the same way she experienced it, by meeting Jesus.

²⁰¹ On the importance of her testimony for understanding her identity, Raymond F. Collins, *These Things Have Been Written: Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Leuven: Peeters, 1990), 17, sees that she is "a true disciple" because "she is ... given a mission (v. 16)." Further, Hylén, *Imperfect Believers*, 42, clarifies the challenge of interpreting the character of the Samaritan woman because "her testimony to Jesus occurs in the absence of clear belief in him." Bennema, *Encountering*, 169-170, notes that, in the end, the Samaritan woman "acts as a true disciple" and is able to "display true discipleship."

²⁰² James H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (vol. 1 - Prolegomena; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906), 193. Commentators who agree with Moulton's assessment of 4:29 as a hesitant question include Barrett, *John*, 240, and Beasley-Murray, *John*, 57-58. On μή and hesitant questions, see A.T. Robertson, "The New Testament Use of μή with Hesitant Questions in the Indicative Mood." *Expositor* 26 (1923): 129-35, reprinted in A.T. Robertson, *The Minister and His Greek New Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923), 69-76; BDAG, 649; BDF§427.

²⁰³ This argument is made by Robertson, "The New Testament use of μή," 132-3. Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972), 193, understands μή as consistent with "cautious faith." Schnackenburg *John*, 2:444, argues that μή indicates a "cautious opinion." Harold W. Attridge, "The Samaritan Woman: A Woman Transformed." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 268-281 (278-79), proposes that her testimony "may be a way of framing her own belief in a deferential fashion that invites her fellow citizens to share it."

²⁰⁴ Robert G. Maccini, "A Reassessment of the Woman at the Well in John 4 in Light of the Samaritan Context." *JSNT* 16 (1994): 35-46 (44).

4.2.1.4. Irony

The ironic features of this conversation which are relevant to the Samaritan woman's use of κύριε hinge on her relative ignorance in comparison to her professions of knowing.²⁰⁵ Jesus' words highlight this contrast when he first says εἰ ἤδεις τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ λέγων σοι, Δός μοι πεῖν, σὺ ἂν ἤτησας αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἅν σοι ὕδωρ ζῶν (4:10). If the statement is understood as a chiasm, the first element, ἡ δωρεά τοῦ θεοῦ, is paralleled, and therefore identified with, the water which Jesus would give.²⁰⁶ In this case, the reader also benefits from previous statements in the narrative to understand what is being given. The reader has witnessed a close association of water and Spirit, whereby John's water baptism is fulfilled in Jesus' baptism in the Spirit (1:33), and one who has experienced a birth ἐξ ὕδατος must also experience a work of the Spirit so they might be γεννηθῆ ἄνωθεν (3:3, 5). When this association of water and spirit is seen, the identification of the gift as the Spirit can be seen as an echo of the earlier statement that the Spirit is "given" (3:34). This understanding also clarifies a previous ambiguity in the narrative regarding the giver of the Spirit. When the narrator states ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα (3:34), the subject of δίδωσιν is ambiguous, and grammatically could be God or the one sent by him.

The reader who connects Jesus as the giver of the Spirit to God's people is given new insight into the relationship between God and his people. God gives the spirit without measure to the Son, and the Son gives the Spirit to those who ask him. The Samaritan woman, however, is not able to see this, not having access to previous statements in the narrative. The reader identifies the gift as the water symbolising the Spirit, and considers the immediate context, while still recognising verbal and thematic parallels earlier in the narrative to which the woman did not have access. In this, the reader has reached an increased level of understanding with respect to Jesus' identity and role, which the Samaritan woman has not. This leaves the woman at a level of knowledge which is below the reader, who has a strengthened relationship with the narrator as a result.

The woman's response to Jesus' statement provides a second opportunity for her to be the victim of irony. Because the Samaritan woman was not privy to the previous statements in the narrative which allow the reader to connect the living water with the Spirit, she is unable to see

²⁰⁵ Steyn, "Jesus as Κύριος," 148, having interacted with Duke, *Irony*, 102, concludes that "[t]he post-Easter reader is fully aware of the fact that Jesus was not merely a stranger who was addressed politely, but that the woman, from the reader's perspective, ironically addressed him with κύριε, without knowing that this is actually who he really is."

²⁰⁶ Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:426. In addition, the reader knows that the Son is also given. Smith, *John*, 113, considers 3:16 as relevant for the reader's understanding of "gift of God."

what Jesus is referring to by ὕδωρ ζῶν (4:10).²⁰⁷ Her statement confirms that she has understood the water as coming from some natural rather than supernatural source, reflected in her concern for a pail to draw the water, and the depth of the well (4:11). By doing so, she misses the claim that Jesus is making of his divine ability to give the Spirit of God to the one who asks him.

Despite a less-than-complete understanding of Jesus' identity, the first word of the Samaritan woman's confession begins with κύριε (4:11).²⁰⁸ As the reader knows that Jesus is *kyrios*, this statement serves to strengthen the relationship between the reader and the narrator as their shared knowledge in the identity of Jesus is highlighted. In this case, the importance of Jesus' identity as *kyrios* is highlighted by the woman's repeated use of the term.²⁰⁹ In 4:15 and 4:19 she again calls Jesus κύριε from a faith position, which, despite the progressive awakening she may be experiencing during the conversation, is still short of the position which the reader and the narrator share.²¹⁰ The progress, coupled with remaining deficiency, is evident in her call to Jesus to give her the water of which he spoke. As Jesus has spoken of the water leading to "eternal life," at this point the Samaritan woman must in some way recognise this water as supernatural.²¹¹ However, as she associates the lack of thirst that Jesus speaks of with the well to which she has come, it is clear she has still not fully grasped Jesus' references to heavenly things.

4.2.1.5. Point of View

In this section of the narrative, the Samaritan woman's understanding of water reflects the contrasts in the flesh-glory paradigm which is established in 1:14. Throughout her conversation with Jesus, she is unable to see that the water is a symbol for the Spirit.²¹² While focusing on the water which she came to draw from the well, she initially understands Jesus' offer as a promise of more of the same water which she had experienced prior to meeting him. Despite the

²⁰⁷ O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 566: "The Samaritan woman hears only the meaning "running water"... The irony arises because the reader knows the appropriateness of the question on both levels, but the woman is aware only of the first, literal level of meaning."

²⁰⁸ Brodie, *John*, 222, observes that *kyrios* also means "Lord," and argues that the Samaritan woman "seems quite unaware" of its other possible levels of meaning.

²⁰⁹ Gerald L. Borchert, *John* (2 vols.; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996-2002), 1:202, with reference to 4:11, argues that "the evangelist probably saw more in the reference than politeness."

²¹⁰ O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 566, sees that the Samaritan woman "has not yet grasped the radical nature of Jesus' gifts. ... Her request is ironic to the reader, because it is the right request for the wrong reasons."

²¹¹ Thompson, *John*, 107: "on another level it hints that she has accepted Jesus' promise to give her living water that surpasses anything she can draw from Jacob's well."

²¹² For the symbol of water in 4:1-42, see Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, 64-97, and Larry P. Jones, *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John* (London: T&T Clark, 1997), 89-114.

progressive development in her understanding of this water during the conversation, her words do not reveal that she understands Jesus' references to water as a symbol of the Spirit.

It could be argued that her ignorance regarding the symbolic reference to the Spirit was due to her concern for earthly things and her preoccupation with her daily existence of gathering water, a concern for the flesh which ignores the glory. However, the reader is able to see that this is not the reason for her ignorance. Rather, the woman is unable to comprehend these references to the Spirit due to her not having been taken on the same journey as the reader, particularly with reference to the previous statements the narrator has made in the narrative.

The progression which is seen from absolute ignorance of Jesus' glory to nascent faith is reflected in the Samaritan woman's use of *kyrios*. At first her use of *kyrios* reflects her concern for natural water, rather than the Spirit that is symbolised in Jesus' references to water (4:11). She addresses Jesus as κύριε while challenging his use of natural implements to bring her natural water, and does not recognise anything supernatural in his offer.

Her second use of κύριε, however, suggests a greater understanding of Jesus' words (4:15). It is possible that Jesus' statement οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα may be construed to not include symbolic significance (4:14). However, that which follows clarifies the necessarily supernatural nature of Jesus' references to water. When Jesus says that τὸ ὕδωρ ὃ δώσω αὐτῷ γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἀλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, he makes clear that water of which he speaks is supernatural (4:14). Due to the clarity of Jesus' statement, when the woman tells him δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, it must be understood that she is requesting something supernatural which will lead to eternal life (4:15). The Samaritan woman's understanding of the effect of the water, however, suggests she has not yet fully understood the glorious realities, as she believes that the water Jesus provides, which will satisfy her thirst, can be understood as a direct replacement for the well to which she had come.

In her final use of κύριε, by declaring that Jesus is a prophet, and nothing more, her speech reflects an identification of Jesus as someone from "below" rather than "above" (4:19). At the same time, she identifies that the source of Jesus' speech is heavenly by declaring that he is a prophet. That is, although she has not acknowledged that Jesus is heaven-sent, she explicitly acknowledges the heaven-sent nature of Jesus' words.

4.2.2. Textual Criticism

The most important textual question relevant to this section of the narrative is whether the subject of ἔγνω (4:1)²¹³ is ὁ κύριος, ὁ Ἰησοῦς, or left unexpressed.²¹⁴

Externally, there is early and diverse support for both ὁ κύριος and ὁ Ἰησοῦς, with most types of support exhibiting division. Papyri support is divided, with P⁷⁵ reading ὁ κύριος and P^{66*} supporting ὁ Ἰησοῦς. However, P⁶⁶ was corrected to read ὁ κύριος, and due to the fact that the correction was most likely made by the original scribe, this reading has significant weight.²¹⁵ Early majuscules are similarly divided, with Vaticanus (03) and Alexandrinus (02) reading κύριος and Sinaiticus (01), Ephraemi-Rescriptus (04) and Bezae (05) reading ὁ Ἰησοῦς.²¹⁶ The agreement of Sinaiticus and Bezae is not unexpected, due to the fact that the text of Sinaiticus is related to the text of Bezae for the first eight chapters of John.²¹⁷ Similarly, the support of the Latin tradition for Ἰησοῦς is in keeping with the character of Bezae.²¹⁸ In contrast, the Byzantine tradition reads ὁ κύριος, as does f¹³, although f¹ reads ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

Versional evidence is also divided. The importance of the Old Syriac, both for κύριος in the Sinaitic and Ἰησοῦς in the Curetonian, is lessened because “there is much evidence to suggest that in the Old Syriac Gospels it is not right to assume one-to-one equivalence between a proper noun in Greek and a proper noun in Syriac.”²¹⁹ In other words, either reading in the Old Syriac may be a translational decision, rather than reflecting a variant in the underlying Greek text.

²¹³ For an extensive list of Greek New Testaments, translations and commentators in support of Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς, see Van Belle, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?," 173-174.

²¹⁴ For 4:1, two additional variants are recorded in Aland, et al., *Text und Textwert*, 65-66. The two variants are the omission of the article before κύριος in 1071 and before Ἰησοῦς in 31, 483C and 797*. Due to the slimness of the manuscript evidence for these two readings, they are not evaluated in the body of the thesis. In 4:19, κύριε is omitted by the first hand of 01, but included by the corrector. Despite this, the external evidence is substantially in favour of its inclusion. In addition, as outlined above, intrinsically κύριε can be understood as a signal for the closure of the second part of the conversation, as in the first part of the conversation which ended with κύριε, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ (4:15). For transcriptional probabilities, it is unclear why a scribe would add κύριε here and not in other places in the conversation. Overall, the inclusion is preferred, with the omission in 01* a result of accidental omission.

²¹⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, 416-417, concurring with the general consensus on the correctors of P⁶⁶, argues that, with very few exceptions, the corrections of the manuscript are from the original scribe.

²¹⁶ When using the phrase “reads,” I am not distinguishing between nomina sacra or full forms. Aland, et al., *Text und Textwert*, 65, also include 011, 017, 019, 032, 041, 044, 083, 0141, 0211 for κύριος, and 038, 039 and 086 for Ἰησοῦς.

²¹⁷ Gordon D. Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in establishing textual relationships." *NTS* 15 (1968): 23-44.

²¹⁸ Latin manuscripts that support κύριος include f(10), q(13), δ(27) and Codex Carnotensis (33). For transcriptions, see Burton, et al., *Vetus Latina Iohannes*.

²¹⁹ Peter J. Williams, "The Syriac Versions of the New Testament." in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, (eds. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 143-166 (147). For further analysis of the Syriac translation technique for proper names in the Gospels, see Peter J. Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels* (Piscataway: Georgias Press, 2004), 23-46. The Peshitta and Harclean also support Ἰησοῦς and the Harclean Margin κύριος.

However, as κύριος is known in Greek at least as early as \mathfrak{B}^{66} and \mathfrak{B}^{75} , the Sinaitic reading may also reflect a translation of κύριος. As with the Syriac, the Coptic evidence is also divided, with the Sahidic supporting κύριος, and the Bohairic tradition with one exception supporting Ἰησοῦς. Overall, both readings fulfill Epp's categories due to their early date, high quality, wide geographic distribution and diversity amongst groups of manuscripts.²²⁰

The support for the omission of the subject, however, is far less impressive.²²¹ The subject is lacking in a single majuscule, 047, and twenty three minuscules.²²² Overall, this support is much later and less diverse than the external evidence for ὁ κύριος and ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

Overall, the support for both ὁ κύριος and ὁ Ἰησοῦς is extremely diverse and equally ancient, which means that it is difficult to determine which, if either reading, is preferred on external evidence. Ultimately, then, the decision regarding this textual problem must rest with internal evidence.²²³

With regard to internal characteristics of the text of John, the omission is the least preferred of the three variants. As Steven Levinsohn has observed, the Gospel of John exhibits a discourse pattern whereby Jesus is referred to explicitly when he returns to be the focus of the narrative after an absence.²²⁴ As the subjects of the final statements in chapter three are ὁ πιστεύων and ὁ ἀπειθῶν, it is consistent with the discourse features of the narrative for Jesus to return with an explicit reference, rather than to leave the verb without a subject. As a result, the omission is extremely unlikely intrinsically. As a reference is expected, both ὁ κύριος and ὁ Ἰησοῦς are possible.

The fact that ὁ Ἰησοῦς is the most common way to refer to Jesus throughout the narrative is evidence in its favour. If ὁ Ἰησοῦς were preferred, Ἰησοῦς would be used twice in close

²²⁰ Epp, "Canons," 96-104. Van Belle, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?," 160, judges that, overall, the external evidence supports Κύριος.

²²¹ Beyond the omission of the subject of ἔγνω, some scholars have proposed excising larger parts of the verse, including Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 176 and Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 177.

²²² According to Aland, et al., *Text und Textwert*, 66, minuscules 6, 21, 49, 72, 294, 439, 546, 877, 988, 991, 1213, 1285, 1310, 1335, 1407, 2634, 2788, 2813 and 2860 support the omission. Although both longer readings were known at the time 047 was written, there is no indication in the manuscript itself that the scribe intended to signal knowledge of textual variation. The punctuation mark (στυγμὴ μέση) and spacing which follows ἔγνω in 4:1 is used elsewhere in the manuscript before ὅτι, so is not relevant..

²²³ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 176, does not mention external support, implying that the UBS committee also considered internal considerations to be of primary importance.

²²⁴ For the theoretical background for this judgement, see Stephen H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek* (Dallas: SIL International, 2000). Based on the analysis of the use of the article with Ἰησοῦς in John, Levinsohn's system predicts that an anarthrous use of Ἰησοῦς would signal a major shift in the narrative. However, as Levinsohn notes, due to textual variation surrounding the article in John, this judgement is less than certain (*Discourse Features*, 155). For the application of this to 4:1, I am indebted to Stephen Levinsohn in personal communication.

proximity.²²⁵ Stylistically, however, this is not uncommon in John, and an example in 12:1 provides a parallel to 4:1. In both examples the verse is the beginning of a new section of the narrative, and in both verses the actions of Jesus are referred to twice in the same sentence. In 12:1, the referent is Ἰησοῦς in both cases, and both occurrences are text-critically secure: Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν, ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦς. The second explicit reference is not necessary to resolve ambiguity, as the preceding context allows only one subject for ἤγειρεν, which must be transitive due to the preceding accusative pronoun. Therefore, if Ἰησοῦς were considered the most primitive reading in 4:1, it would not be stylistically unique. As a result, it is not discounted for that reason alone.²²⁶

There is reason to expect that the author would employ the title *kyrios* to identify Jesus at this point of the narrative. This is despite the fact that Ἰησοῦς is consistent with usage elsewhere in the narrative, and that the occurrence of κύριος before chapter 20 has been described as “not Johannine.”²²⁷ The primary characteristic of the narrative relevant to this issue is the potential for an intentional narrative connection between the narrator’s use of κύριος and the Samaritan woman’s use of κύριε, as argued by Van Belle.²²⁸ This follows Schenk’s structural proposal connecting the narrator’s use of κύριος and characters’ use of κύριε.²²⁹ Viewed this way, κύριος in 4:1 plays an important stage-setting role in encouraging the reader to recall John’s confession that his witness was to the κύριος (1:23), and that this same κύριος is now entering Samaria. This prepares the reader to see in the Samaritan woman’s use of κύριε (4:11,15,19) far more than the character herself might be expected to see.²³⁰

²²⁵ See Van Belle, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?," 163, for a summary of the stylistic argument for Ἰησοῦς as the harder reading, with a survey of supporting scholarship.

²²⁶ The resultant text may not be as awkward as often argued, if the reader understands ὅτι as recitative, as in Brooke D. Westcott and Fenton J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction and Appendix* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882), Appendix, 76. On recitative ὅτι, see A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 1027-8; BDF§470. J.B. Lightfoot, *The Gospel of John: A Newly Discovered Commentary* (eds. Ben Witherington III and Todd D. Still; vol. 2; Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015), 134, also argues that what follows ὅτι is a direct quotation, based on the use of the present tense verbs ποιεῖ and βαπτίζει. However, Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 458, observes that present tense verbs are used in indirect speech. Therefore, the use of present tense verbs does not determine whether the ὅτι is recitative or declarative.

²²⁷ Brown, *John*, 1:258, explicitly makes this claim on 6:23, when he writes “the use of ‘the Lord’ is not Johannine.” Van Belle, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?," 166-167, provides an extensive list of scholars who see Κύριος as non-Johannine.

²²⁸ Van Belle, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?," 170, writes that “κύριος may point to a conscious compositional ploy on the part of the evangelist.”

²²⁹ Schenk, *Kommentiertes Lexikon*, 244-245. Van Belle, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?," 166, cites Schenk in support of κύριος.

²³⁰ Specifically with relation to 4:1, Andreas Köstenberger, *John*, 165, writes that if κύριος were the most primitive reading, it “could constitute John’s anticipation of the κύριος used by the Samaritan woman in 4:11, 15, 19.”

The reading Ἰησοῦς does not account for the uniqueness of the first character's use of κύριε, nor the preparatory nature of 1:23. Therefore, from the perspective of intrinsic probabilities, there is good reason to give κύριος considerable weight. In this way, it constitutes an example in the narrative by which a reliable character, in this case the narrator, identifies Jesus as *kyrios* to prepare the reader for the use of *kyrios* by a non-reliable character.

If the omission is considered to be the most primitive reading, transcriptional probabilities would support Ἰησοῦς. The addition of ὁ Ἰησοῦς by a scribe serves to disambiguate the referent, and make the text more explicit. The general tendency of scribes to make the text more explicit supports the likelihood of this.²³¹ However, it does not seem likely that κύριος would arise directly from the unexpressed subject, due to its rarity in the Gospel of John. If a scribe were to insert a subject, the more common ὁ Ἰησοῦς is more likely.

If ὁ Ἰησοῦς developed from the omission, however, it is possible that ὁ κύριος is a modification of ὁ Ἰησοῦς. Some scholars have argued that the harder reading is Ἰησοῦς, with the repetition ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς...ὅτι Ἰησοῦς potentially leading scribes to replace the first Ἰησοῦς with κύριος, smoothing out the repetition.²³² However, it seems reasonable that a scribe who was copying Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης would have already written the first Ἰησοῦς before reaching the second, leaving the second Ἰησοῦς a more likely candidate for modification, rather than the first which had already been written.²³³ The omission then appears to explain ὁ Ἰησοῦς quite easily, but not ὁ κύριος.

If ὁ Ἰησοῦς were the most primitive reading, the omission of the subject is not easily attributable to a scribal strategy to reduce the awkwardness of the double reference to Jesus. As argued above, if smoothness were the goal, it seems more likely that a scribe would modify the second Ἰησοῦς. This would retain an unambiguous referent in the first instance, and also avoid the repetition of Ἰησοῦς following ὅτι, as found in manuscript 039, which reads ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ. However, if this were a motivating factor for scribes, it might be expected that the reading of 039 would be more common, as it results in reduced redundancy, and retention of the first expressed subject. If an accidental omission is considered, it is possible that a scribe copying Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ κύριος ὅτι might jump from the article before κύριος to the first omicron of ὅτι, and then continue with τι. The reading ὁ

²³¹ On explicitness, see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 39.

²³² Barrett, *John*, 230; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 176; Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, 135.

²³³ If the second Ἰησοῦς were then modified, *kyrios* would be an unsuitable substitution, however, as this would have the Pharisees calling Jesus *kyrios*.

Ἰησοῦς, therefore, neither explains an intentional omission, nor ὁ κύριος, as discussed above. As a result of these factors, ὁ Ἰησοῦς is not preferred with regard to transcriptional probabilities.

If ὁ κύριος is the most primitive reading, the primary question to be considered is whether a scribe would be capable of modifying a reference to Jesus as κύριος, either by deletion or substitution. In doing so, the scribe could be reducing the highness of the Christology in the verse. It is argued that this is not something that a christologically-sensitive scribe would desire to do.²³⁴ If the omission is unintentional, then it is possible a jump from ὁ before κύριος to ὅτι is possible, as considered above for the omission of Ἰησοῦς. Alternatively, Westcott and Hort argued that κύριος is the harder reading, seeing the Western tradition as a result of a scribe considering ἔγνω ὁ κύριος ... ὅτι Ἰησοῦς to be awkward, resulting in the change to Ἰησοῦς.²³⁵

In addition, if a scribe were concerned with textual cohesion, it is also possible that a scribe might produce a text without κύριος. The omission can be understood as removing a title which has until this point not been used by the narrator to refer to Jesus. Similarly, a change to ὁ Ἰησοῦς also would achieve this, using the most common form of reference to Jesus throughout the Gospel.²³⁶ Furthermore, a change from ὁ κύριος to ὁ Ἰησοῦς would serve to make the text more explicit with respect to the subject of the verb ἔγνω. From this perspective, the change from κύριος to Ἰησοῦς is seen as disambiguating the referent, identifying which κύριος is being referred to.²³⁷ From this perspective, the reading ὁ κύριος can explain the presence of the omission and ὁ Ἰησοῦς in the manuscript tradition, through either accidental or intentional changes, and results in it being preferred transcriptionally.

In summary, with regard to external evidence, the probability that the omission is the most primitive reading is severely mitigated by its limited manuscript support. However, there is not a definitive qualitative difference between the manuscript support for Ἰησοῦς and κύριος to allow a judgement to be made on external evidence. Therefore, due to the somewhat inconclusive nature of the external support, internal considerations must take prominence. Intrinsically, the omission is improbable due to the discourse features of the Gospel of John, and while Ἰησοῦς appears to be consistent with usage throughout the Gospel, κύριος is able to better explain the relationship between κύριος and κύριε in the narrative.

²³⁴ For this argument applied to the unlikelihood of a change from κύριος to Ἰησοῦς, see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 176, Beasley-Murray, *John*, 58, and Michael Theobald, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes: Kapitel 1-12* (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2009), 297.

²³⁵ Westcott and Hort, *Introduction and Appendix*, Appendix, 76. Two other commentators who consider κύριος as awkward are Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 176, and Haenchen, *John*, 1:218.

²³⁶ See Van Belle, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?," 164, for a survey of scholars who have made this argument.

²³⁷ Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 231, raises the interpretative challenge of disambiguating the referent of *kyrios*.

For transcriptional probabilities, none of the three readings is without complications. There is not a strong case for the omission or Ἰησοῦς being the source of the κύριος reading. If κύριος is considered the most primitive reading, and if a scribe were concerned primarily with theology, a deletion or omission is unlikely. However, if the primary concern when copying was textual cohesion, there is good reason to expect κύριος was changed either by deletion or substitution with Ἰησοῦς. In light of the favourable transcriptional probabilities, and the conceivable intrinsic value of κύριος, it is preferred as the most primitive reading.

4.2.3. Semantics

For semantic analysis, it is important to consider how an understanding of *kyrios* in 4:1 is dependent upon the discourse and cognitive context. With regard to the type of discourse, as the verse is explicit narration, the reader expects to see in *kyrios* an understanding of Jesus which is in agreement with that presented previously by the narrator. The result of considering discourse context must then be complemented by taking into account cognitive context, constituting the reader's knowledge of the preceding narrative, including the paradigm-setting usage in 1:23 by a reliable character. In that example, it has been shown, *kyrios* was used to refer at once to both the God of Israel and Jesus.

When the reader has reached the end of the long sentence at the beginning of this section of the narrative (4:1-3), there is no doubt that *kyrios* refers to Jesus alone. In keeping with usage throughout the narrative, when *kyrios* refers to Jesus exclusively, it is articular. The use of *kyrios* for Jesus in 4:1 recalls the usage earlier in the narrative, where Jesus is understood as fulfilling prophecy, so that by his coming, God comes. The reader must now consider how this articular usage of *kyrios*, which refers to Jesus alone, might be influenced by previous usage in the narrative. By taking the discourse and cognitive context into account, including Jesus' identity as the one whose glory is the glory of God, and whose coming is the coming of God, the most suitable definition for *kyrios* is semantic category four: "a title for ... Christ" as a "supernatural" being "who exercises supernatural authority."²³⁸

The narrator's use of *kyrios* is in sharp contrast to the Samaritan woman's use of κύριε (4:11, 15, 19). Relevant to understanding these three occurrences is the relationship between the speakers and also the linguistic context. With regard to relationship context, the Samaritan woman's use of κύριε occurs in her expressing unbelief regarding Jesus' ability to get water

²³⁸ L&N 1:139 (12§9)

(4:11), belief that he can give her earthly water (4:15), and belief that he is a prophet (4:19).²³⁹ This could reflect a progression in her understanding of Jesus' identity, which began with her calling him Ἰουδαῖος (4:9).²⁴⁰ The extent to which this progression impacts on the semantic range of κύριε is limited by the linguistic context of each occurrence.

In 4:11, the term may best be explained as a strategy of politeness, which is used to counterbalance the critical questioning which follows. This is in keeping with semantic category three, "a title of respect used in addressing or speaking of a man."²⁴¹ The term, then, reflects the woman's perspective on her interaction with Jesus, as she desires to communicate politeness and respect while questioning the reasonableness of Jesus' claim that he is able to draw water. There is no justification to take the semantic analysis further, due to the woman's ignorance regarding the prior narrative. Because of this, she does not recognise Jesus' claim to be one who can give the Holy Spirit. This confirms her inability to see in his words any claim to a supernatural identity.

In 4:15, the Samaritan woman again demonstrates partial understanding of Jesus' identity. Despite his claim to provide her with water which leads to eternal life (4:14), the woman's response appears to miss the supernatural meaning inherent in Jesus' words (4:15). Therefore, her use of κύριε does not reflect a belief that Jesus is supernatural, which restricts the semantic range of the term in this context. Furthermore, κύριε is used before an imperative, suggesting the term is used as a politeness strategy. As a result, she uses κύριε in the same way as in 4:11, a strategy of "politeness or respect."²⁴²

The final use of κύριε in 4:19 is followed by θεωρῶ ὅτι προφήτης εἶ σύ. The Samaritan woman recognises that Jesus is delivering supernatural speech. However, there does not appear to be explicit evidence in the narrative at this point that she has recognised Jesus to be a supernatural person. As a result, there is no contextual justification to see a shift beyond the semantic range of the two previous uses of κύριε, reflecting the speaker's desire to communicate her respect for

²³⁹ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 58-59, sees all three uses as "honourific," communicating respect for Jesus.

²⁴⁰ Brown, *John*, 2:170; Moloney, *John*, 127; John F. McHugh, *John 1-4: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 270.

²⁴¹ L&N 1:739 (87§53); Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1980), 115, comment that "it would be strange for her to acknowledge him as a prophet if she had already recognized him as 'Lord.'" The context would certainly seem to indicate that such a meaning as 'Sir' is required." For similar conclusions, see Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 231, and Köstenberger, *John*, 150; Hartwig Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 254, sees some progression from 4:11 to 4:15 from politeness to respect.

²⁴² L&N 1:739 (87§53).

her interlocutor.²⁴³ The difference in this case is that there is no need to counterbalance potentially offensive elements of her speech. Rather, this use of κύριε is entirely positive and expresses respect for Jesus, as she recognises that he speaks the words of God.

4.2.4. Summary

Approaching the beginning of chapter four, the reader has just witnessed the end of John's ministry. The narrative contains echoes of the beginning of John's ministry, in which his first positive public declaration was the announcement of the coming of *kyrios* (1:23). The beginning of chapter four then announces that the same *kyrios* is now coming into Samaria. The dialogue between Jesus and the Samaritan woman follows a structure which is driven by shifts in topic and repetition. The importance of *kyrios* in the conversation is confirmed by its appearance at the beginning of the narrative section (4:1), its threefold repetition in the conversation itself, and by it serving as a term of address used to bring the first two parts of the conversation to an end. The importance of the term is highlighted in the context of a conversation which ends with a focus on Jesus' identity.

The Samaritan woman first speaks to Jesus from a place of ignorance regarding his identity and, by the time she speaks her final words in the conversation with Jesus, her understanding has developed. Jesus brings her to the place where she is ready to leave a symbol of her old life behind, and take her understanding of Jesus' person to her own people.

There is not extensive explicit evidence within the conversation itself that the Samaritan woman develops significantly in her understanding of Jesus. However, it is through her subsequent ministry as a proclaimer of Jesus in which the reader sees the fruit of her faith in Jesus. Those whom she calls then experience a faith equal to hers, which, like her faith, was received through personal encounter with Jesus.

The Samaritan woman's speech is punctuated with ironic hints that her addresses to Jesus as κύριε are one or more steps ahead of her present understanding. In this way, the reader who has been privy to 1:23 and 4:1 has paid attention to the use of *kyrios* and sees more in the Samaritan woman's use of κύριε than might be expected from her nascent faith. She is a character who accurately addresses the *kyrios* who came to Samaria, in whom she comes to believe.

²⁴³ L&N 1:739 (87§53).

4.3. *Kyrios* and the Royal Official

4.3.1. Narrative

4.3.1.1. Context

As the narrative transitions away from the scenes in Samaria, Jesus' final destination is again brought into focus (4:43). Galilee is the ultimate goal of his departure from Judaea, and the reader now learns that he once again departs for Galilee. This departure is now the second time that Jesus has set his face to Galilee since the same statement was made at the beginning of the last major narrative division (4:1-3). Although the two statements, ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν (4:1-3) and ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν (4:43), are not verbally identical, the use of synonyms to repeat a concept is expected due to the frequency of the technique throughout the narrative.²⁴⁴

As a result of the echo of the previous statement in the narrative, the reader's attention is drawn to reconsider two features of 4:1-3. First, there is the consideration that the narrator previously identified the one who departed Judaea for Galilee as *kyrios* (4:1). Therefore, this same *kyrios* who set out for Galilee has now arrived at his destination. This allows the reader to again consider how the Samaritan woman's use of *kyrios* was marked by irony, as she spoke more than she knew, and raises the expectation that *kyrios* will continue to be an important thread in the narrative in Jesus' next ministry encounter. Second is the repetition of the idea that the Samaritan ministry was not Jesus' ultimate goal, but consisted of a temporary stop on the primary journey to Galilee. The stay in Samaria is presented as temporary and in response to a request, rather than as a result of Jesus' own volition and intention.²⁴⁵ Despite this, the harvest during the two days there was great. The stay was short, and appeared unplanned, yet the ministry was successful. As a consequence of this, the reader can now consider how much greater the harvest may be from Jesus' ultimate destination, if a temporary stay was so fruitful.

Any hopeful expectations which the reader has are checked when reading 4:44. The reader is informed that Jesus was going to Galilee because it was the best place for Jesus to go to avoid attention (4:44). This again causes the reader to reconsider the statement by the narrator that Jesus left Judaea for Galilee as a result of the public attention his ministry was receiving (4:1-3). Perhaps then, this ultimate destination was not going to even meet the same level of success as

²⁴⁴On variation in the Gospel of John, see Leon Morris, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Devon: Paternoster, 1969), 293-320, and Kenneth L. McKay, "Style and Significance in the Language of John 21:15-17." *NovT* 27 (1985): 319-333.

²⁴⁵For ἔδει as divine necessity, see, for example, Beasley-Murray, *John*, 59, Brown, *John*, 1:169, Köstenberger, *John*, 146.

the stop in Samaria. The reader is now challenged by the contrary expectation of a quiet, uneventful arrival. Although the *kyrios* sees a harvest amongst the Samaritans, this may not be the case amongst those in Galilee.

The reader has had expectations raised, then checked, and now reads that, following the arrival of the *kyrios* in Galilee, he is welcomed (4:45). The narrative provides an explanation immediately. Although those who received him were from Galilee, they brought with them memories of his actions in Jerusalem, and thus their response to Jesus was not in keeping with the expected reception of the general populace ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ πατρίδι (4:44). At the close of the previous section of the narrative (4:42), Jesus was called “the saviour of the world,” and this reception in Galilee now points to the geographic breadth of Jesus’ ministry.

The key to determining contextual expectations, which is the primary indication that the reader expects this journey to be successful, is the emphasis the narrative places on Jesus’ final destination. The narrator informs the reader that Jesus again (πάλιν) came to Cana and that this is Cana τῆς Γαλιλαίας, and also that it is the same Cana in which Jesus “made the water wine” (4:46). These two additions, unnecessary from the perspective of disambiguating the referent of Κανά, serve to prepare the reader for the subsequent narrative. The repetition that this Cana is in Galilee serves to clarify that Jesus’ journey ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας, first mentioned in 4:3, is now complete. Moreover, the narrator’s association of Cana with the first sign raises the reader’s expectations that something miraculous will occur again.²⁴⁶ Although the *kyrios* had sought to avoid attention in Galilee, the emphasis placed on his choice of Cana serves to provide a strong contextual expectation that, like Samaria, this region would also see a harvest.

4.3.1.2. Structure

The next section of the narrative in which *kyrios* appears is 4:43-4:54. This section can further be divided into two subsections: an introduction (4:43-45) and the encounter between Jesus and the royal official (4:46-54).²⁴⁷ As the content of the introduction was the focus of the preceding discussion, the focus of this structural analysis will be 4:46-54.

²⁴⁶ Brown, *John*, and Moloney, *Belief in the Word*, are two key readings of John that recognise the significance of the two miracles at Cana for the opening and closing of this section of the narrative. Also see O’Day, “The Gospel of John,” 575: “The juxtaposition of the reference to the Cana miracle and the new situation of need leads the reader to anticipate another miracle.”

²⁴⁷ These divisions follow Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 9.

The first sentence of this section establishes the location of the encounter (4:46), and as discussed above, this associates the location with a previous miracle. The next line introduces the character who will encounter Jesus, and provides sufficient detail to establish his reason for wanting to encounter Jesus (4:47). The next two verses constitute the dialogue between Jesus and the official. The conversation has three lines, with Jesus speaking first (4:48), followed by one line from the royal official (4:49), with Jesus then speaking the third and final line (4:50a). Prior to the dialogue, the royal official has already spoken, but his words are reported as indirect speech (4:47). The delay of this character's first direct speech heightens its rhetorical prominence and focuses the reader's attention on this speech. Of particular relevance to this study is that the first word the royal official speaks is κύριε. This allows the reader to consider κύριε as an interpretive key to both the dialogue and the nature of faith within the scene as a whole.

4.3.1.3. Character

In studying the royal official as a character, an important issue to consider is the nature of his faith prior to meeting Jesus. The narrator notes that ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἦκει...ἀπῆλθεν (4:47). Absent from this description is any further detail regarding the reason that he went to meet Jesus. However, the narrative outlines that others in Galilee "received" Jesus because they had seen "all the things" (πάντα) that Jesus had done in Jerusalem (4:45). Because this description is immediately prior to the entrance of the royal official, who is also in Galilee, it is important to discuss the nature of "all the things" (πάντα) that they saw. Following from this, it needs to be considered whether there is a relationship between the crowd's motivation for receiving Jesus and the royal official going to him.

The first question to consider is what the Galileans saw in Jerusalem. The only aspect of Jesus' public ministry in Jerusalem described in detail within the narrative is his cleansing of the temple (2:14-16). However, following the description of his time at the Passover, the reader is informed that "many believed in his name when they saw his signs" (2:23). Likewise, Nicodemus can refer to the signs (τὰ σημεῖα) which Jesus does without further comment or description from the narrator (3:2). The narrator does not provide any assistance for understanding the exact form of the signs that Jesus was doing.²⁴⁸ It is possible that the signs could be equated with Jesus' activity in the temple described in 2:14-16. However, following

²⁴⁸ That is, the reader is not informed if τὰ σημεῖα are healing miracles or another form of miracle.

this activity, the *Ioudaioi* ask Jesus what sign he will show them (2:18).²⁴⁹ The implication of this request is that they did not consider the cleansing of the temple a sign, describing it rather as merely “these things” (2:18).²⁵⁰ Without further description from the narrator, the reader is left without clear direction regarding the types of signs done in Jerusalem.

It seems reasonable that the reader equates “all the things” (πάντα) that the Galileans saw when in Jerusalem with τὰ σημεῖα which Jesus had been doing. Furthermore, although there is no explicit description of the royal official’s knowledge of Jesus’ previous ministry, the reader can also infer that he would know what the Galileans knew. In addition, as Jesus had previously been in Capernaum for a few days (οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας 2:12), it can be inferred that the royal official had become aware of Jesus’ ministry since that time. Most importantly, because the entrance of the royal official into the narrative (4:47) immediately follows the description of the Galileans’ signs-based approach to Jesus (4:45), the reader would be justified in initially considering him a Galilean—one whose readiness to approach Jesus is dependent on signs.

This interpretation is confirmed by Jesus’ statement addressed to the royal official linking faith with signs and wonders (4:48). Jesus’ statement that εἰ μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδῃτε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε might best be understood as a challenge to the royal official to demonstrate whether he will follow the pattern of the Galileans who received Jesus πάντα ἑωρακότες ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις (4:45), or if he will be an exception to the rule by believing before seeing signs and wonders.²⁵¹ The reader will learn that his character is demonstrated in his immediate trust in the word of Jesus (4:50).

The question remains regarding the nature of the royal official’s faith throughout the scene. Bultmann argues that the reader must wait until 4:53 for the royal official to exhibit faith “in its

²⁴⁹ Throughout this study, οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is transliterated the *Ioudaioi*. This avoids both the potential implications of translational choices, and the punctuation and grammatical issues of using Greek words in English sentences. The transliteration will always be in the nominative, although only out of convention; the transliterated form represents the lexeme only, not the case.

²⁵⁰ It is possible that this is ironic, so that those questioning Jesus ask for a sign having missed that the cleansing was in fact a sign. Although that is a possibility, the reader is still left without explicit guidance for the characterization of the Galilean crowd and the royal official.

²⁵¹ On Jesus’ statement as a challenge, see Köstenberger, *John*, 170. For a survey of scholarship regarding further examples of the pattern of this dialogue throughout the narrative, see Charles H. Giblin, “Suggestion, Negative Response, and Positive Action in St John’s Portrayal of Jesus.” *NTS* 26 (1980): 197-211. Smith, *John*, 126, considers that Jesus’ statement may not be a challenge or a questioning of the man’s faith, but that Jesus was “simply stating the necessity for signs.” Rather than seeing the man’s response as responding to Jesus’ challenge, Johannes Beutler, *Das Johannesevangelium: Kommentar* (Freiburg: Herder, 2013), 176, reads the man’s continued confidence in Jesus as unaffected by Jesus’ statement because he did not understand what Jesus was saying.

full sense,²⁵² when he “believed, himself and his whole household” (4:53). However, Bultmann also notes that the faith which was exhibited in 4:50, ἐπίστευσεν ... τῷ λόγῳ, was faith that did not rely on visual confirmation of the miracle, and by this, the reader has already witnessed “one aspect of true faith.”²⁵³ Although the royal official might believe in some sense after hearing Jesus’ word, it is important to consider whether there is evidence in the narrative that he believed prior to this.

When considering the faith of the royal official, the reader does not need to rely on an explicit reference to belief to be certain that a character does believe. To illustrate this principle, the explicit references to him as βασιλικός (4:46, 49), ἄνθρωπος (4:50) and πατήρ (4:53) are evidence of different narrative foci regarding his identity, rather than examples of the character developing from one to the other.²⁵⁴ He was a father from the beginning of the narrative, which the reader could infer from him having a son (4:46), however he is not named πατήρ until 4:53. With regard to his faith, the narrator describes him as a man whose son ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν, and that he had come to ask Jesus to heal him. This is not merely a request for healing, but is a father’s plea to keep his son from dying. The emphasis on Jesus’ power over death is further highlighted in Jesus’ own words that the man’s son “lives” (4:50).²⁵⁵ Jesus does not say that his son is healed and that his sickness has left him, but rather that the threat of death is no longer over him, and life is in him. Therefore, from his first appearance in the narrative, this father is a man of faith who believes that Jesus has the power to prevent his son from dying. Whether his faith developed beyond this, however, cannot be answered without reference to the flesh-glory paradigm. As a result, the question of development will be taken up below.

4.3.1.4. Irony

The irony present in this scene becomes evident when the reader’s knowledge of Jesus is compared with that of the royal official. As described above, the man is presented as one who believes that Jesus has power over death. As the first healing miracle in the narrative, not even the reader has been given explicit assurance that Jesus would be able to perform this miracle. This deduction could be expected, of course, from a reader who knows that all humanity was

²⁵² Bultmann, *John*, 208, notes regarding 4:50 that ἐπίστευσεν “does not of course refer to faith in its full sense, for this is not reached till v.53; but inasmuch as the father believes without seeing (20:29), his faith shows one aspect of true faith, which is then followed by the experience of the miracle.”

²⁵³ Bultmann, *John*, 208. Similarly, Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 137, also seeks to synthesise the two instances of believing and writes that the royal official “exemplifies those who believe because of the signs but show themselves ready to believe the words of Jesus.” O’Day, “The Gospel of John,” 575, sees the distinction between 4:50 and 4:53 as a difference between “belief in Jesus’ word” and belief in Jesus himself.

²⁵⁴ The progression in titles in the text is noted by Moloney, *John*, 161.

²⁵⁵ Collins, *These Things*, 20, observes, “Jesus’ word” in this verse is “a life-giving word.”

made through him (1:3), and that in him was life (1:4). With this knowledge, it would be expected that Jesus has the power to prevent humanity from losing life. Although the official does demonstrate significant levels of insight into Jesus' identity, there remain gaps in his understanding which are manifest through his speech.

Both times that the royal official is reported to request Jesus' help (4:47, 49), he asks Jesus to "come down." That this element of his request is repeated serves to highlight its role in the scene and also to highlight the official's ignorance of Jesus' ability. Jesus' presence at the scene of the previous miracle in Cana may be considered the stimulus for the man's desire to have Jesus physically present in Capernaum to heal his son.²⁵⁶ The reader, on the other hand, knows that Jesus is the one through whom all things were created (1:3), so that he does not need to be physically present for a miracle to take place. Rather, he is the one who speaks the words of God (3:34) and has received all things from the Father (3:35). Ignorant of these realities, the royal official repeats his request for Jesus to "come down." Although the man knew that Jesus had come ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας (4:47), he did not know that Jesus had come ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (3:13). His request for Jesus to come down to Capernaum, then, stems ultimately from his ignorance of Jesus' true origin—that he had come down from heaven. Despite this ignorance, however, the man demonstrates his readiness to believe Jesus' word, when in response to Jesus' declaration that his son lives, he believes (4:50).

The reader who watches on as the royal official manifests an imperfect understanding of Jesus' origin is affirmed as having an accurate knowledge of Jesus' true identity. This affirmation is strengthened by the royal official's use of κύριε (4:49). In his only line in the dialogue, in which his words betray the deficiency in his knowledge of Jesus' identity, the royal official calls Jesus κύριε. As witnessed in the speech of the Samaritan woman, again a statement which is rich with irony is introduced with a character identifying Jesus as κύριε. The juxtaposition of a verbally accurate confession followed by a request that is ignorant of Jesus' origin encourages the reader to recall earlier statements that have identified Jesus as *kyrios*. It was *kyrios* who left Judaea to come to Galilee (4:1), and it was *kyrios* whom John the Baptist proclaimed was coming (1:23), of whom the delegation from Jerusalem was ignorant. It is this same *kyrios* who has power over death, and whose word is sufficient to give life. This shared knowledge between the narrator and the reader ensures that the reader is prepared for further use of *kyrios* in the narrative on the lips of characters who encounter Jesus.

²⁵⁶ Léon-Dufour, *Lecture de l'Évangile selon Jean*, 1:408, argues that the man appears to reveal in his request that the physical presence of Jesus is a prerequisite for the miracle to take place.

4.3.1.5. Point of View

The flesh-glory paradigm provides insight into how this portion of the narrative contributes to the reader's understanding of the point of view of the narrator. Unlike the previous miracle at Cana, this section of the narrative does not contain an explicit reference to Jesus' glory. There is no mention that, like at Cana, Jesus ἐφανερώσεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (2:11). Despite the lack of explicit reference, features of this scene suggest that the narrative threads of flesh and glory are picked up again as the royal official encounters Jesus, and that glory is once again tied to Jesus' lordship.

It was argued above that the royal official was particularly concerned with having Jesus physically present to heal his son. When considering this from the perspective of irony, this urgency revealed his ignorance of Jesus' true heavenly origin. By also taking into account the flesh-glory paradigm, it can be seen that this concern for Jesus' physical presence may be an indication that the royal official is manifesting a preoccupation with the flesh that has prevented him from seeing the glory in the flesh. The flesh of Jesus is good, and his presence is good. Even desiring Jesus to be present is good, as can be seen in the request for Jesus to physically remain with others earlier in the narrative by the Samaritans (4:40). The royal official's request for Jesus to come to heal his son is not deficient because he requested Jesus' presence. Rather, its deficiency lies in the assumption that Jesus' ability to heal his son was dependent on his physical presence. Jesus' flesh is the vehicle in which the glory is revealed, and as such, focusing upon Jesus' flesh can lead to revelation. However, in this example, the royal official's concern for Jesus' flesh allows the reader to see that this is a result of him not yet recognising Jesus' divine identity. In this way, when he asks Jesus to "come down" and be present, not only does this show that he did not know that Jesus came down from heaven, but also he demonstrates that he is unaware that Jesus is the one who reveals God's glory.

This encounter between the royal official and Jesus also relates to the flesh-glory paradigm in the royal official's use of κύριε. In the above analysis of 1:23, it was argued that when the narrative first applies *kyrios* to Jesus, this identification is closely connected to the concept of glory. By identifying Jesus as the *kyrios* whom John the Baptist proclaimed, the reader was able to see that as *kyrios*, Jesus reveals the glory of the God of Israel – in fact, Jesus' glory is God's glory. In this scene (4:43), the reader encounters an echo of 4:1-3 which in turn calls on the reader to consider the identification of Jesus as *kyrios*, bringing a string of identifications into view in this scene, beginning with 1:23. Further, as just argued, the reader witnesses the royal

official calling on Jesus as κύριε whilst ignorant of his heavenly origin, and focusing on Jesus' flesh without recognising his glory. Therefore, once again, the reader understands that the identification of Jesus as *kyrios* is intertwined with his glory. Like the Samaritan woman, it was not in the confession of Jesus as *kyrios* that the royal official manifests his awareness of Jesus' glory. Rather, it was in this same confession that his ignorance of this glory is witnessed.

4.3.2. Semantics

Due to the lack of textual variation in this passage, it is now possible to consider the question of semantics. As discussed above, the cognitive context of the official's use of κύριε is complicated by the lack of explicit narrative references to his knowledge. Due to the lack of evidence regarding the extent to which he knew of Jesus' ministry, and also the nature of that ministry, the reader is less than certain regarding the cognitive context in which the official addresses Jesus as κύριε.²⁵⁷ Linguistic context, primarily the immediately-following imperative κατάβηθι, supports an understanding of κύριε as a politeness strategy, in accordance with category one, "a title of respect," counterbalancing the abruptness of the imperative in a desperate plea for help.²⁵⁸ This is further supported by considering the relational context, in which a respected individual, the official, might use a title of respect to make clear to the hearer that he has positioned himself "low" as much as placing the hearer "high."²⁵⁹ By considering the dialogue, therefore, the semantic range of κύριε most likely belongs within the semantic "a title of respect."²⁶⁰

This semantic analysis reflects the fact that the most significant evidence for the man's developing understanding of Jesus' identity appears in the narrative after he addresses Jesus as κύριε. As a result, it is not possible to apply this understanding to his first direct address to

²⁵⁷ Steyn, "Jesus as Κύριος," 149, acknowledges the difficulty of the semantic analysis at this point, and opts for a meaning of *kyrios* which acknowledges Jesus as "an ordinary person with special powers."

²⁵⁸ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 59, sees the use of *kyrios* in 4:49 as an honorific title.

²⁵⁹ In a similar way, Brant argues that the royal official 'acknowledges that he has been lowered to the position of a suppliant' in *Dialogue and Drama*, 91. Likewise, Bennema comments that 'his willingness to come to Jesus in person and submit to his authority illustrates humility' (*Encountering*, 180).

²⁶⁰ L&N 1:739 (87§53). Theobald, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 358, also considers this usage a respectful form of direct address ("mit der achtungsvollen Anrede »Herr«"). Regarding the royal official's confidence to approach Jesus for a healing, Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 277, argues that the official knew of Jesus' cleansing of the temple, and that as this was an act of authority, the official would conclude that Jesus would have the authority to miraculously heal. This suggests that κύριε might not only reflect his desire to address Jesus with respect, but also to acknowledge his authority over sickness, and potentially even death. To affect the semantic analysis of a term of address, however, it must be demonstrated that the man considered that Jesus exercised authority over him personally; that is, that he submitted to Jesus' authority, not only that Jesus had authority over someone or something else.

Jesus. The conclusion of this semantic analysis does not place limits on the faith development of the royal official. It does, however, reflect the desire to pinpoint accurately the man's understanding of Jesus at the time of speaking.

4.3.3. Summary

The reader reaches the encounter between Jesus and the royal official with mixed expectations. The harvest in Samaria and the association with Cana raise expectations that once again Jesus will reveal his glory and those who meet him will believe. Considering Jesus' intention for travelling to Galilee, however, the reader experiences the tension between Jesus' desire to avoid the effects of the attention his ministry had received in Jerusalem, and the fact that his fame in Jerusalem had now spread to Galilee. Then, on learning that the royal official likewise had knowledge of Jesus' previous ministry, the reader meets a man who is confident that Jesus can prevent his son from dying.

Due to shared knowledge with the narrator, the reader knows that Jesus would be able to heal the official's son. This confidence for the reader does not come from knowledge of what Jesus had already done in the narrative, but rather because of who Jesus is, the *kyrios*, who has come down from heaven. Therefore, when the royal official addresses Jesus as *kyrios*, the reader is able to see that the speaker has unknowingly affirmed that Jesus truly is the *kyrios*, and it is for this reason his faith in Jesus was well founded.

Comparing the royal official to the previous character in the narrative who uses κύριε, the Samaritan woman, allows the reader to see a number of parallels. The royal official, like the Samaritan woman, uses κύριε at a point when he is not fully aware of Jesus' identity. Similarly, his encounter with Jesus leads to others believing along with him. Also as in the case of the Samaritan woman, it could be said that initially "(t)he royal official is not interested in Christology."²⁶¹ His desire is for his son to be healed, as hers was to secure the water of which Jesus spoke. Through their encounter with Jesus, however, they both come to trust that Jesus is able to exceed the expectations of those who encounter him. These parallels allow the reader to read the next encounter with the expectation that again κύριε may be used in relative ignorance, though this ignorance might not remain.

²⁶¹ D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 239.

4.4. *Kyrios* and the Man at the Pool

4.4.1. Narrative

4.4.1.1. Context

Jesus' return to Galilee saw the completion of his journey that began and ended in Cana. His return to Jerusalem described in 5:1 marks a shift in the narrative in two ways. First, it signals the beginning of a new section of the narrative that will commence in Jerusalem and end in Jerusalem. That is, the direction of travel in 5:1-10:42 is the reverse of that witnessed in 2:1-4:54.²⁶² Second, this journey will not only reverse the preceding narrative in its direction of travel, but also in the nature of characters' responses to Jesus. In contrast to the increasingly positive reception to Jesus' ministry throughout the Cana to Cana journey, from this point in the narrative there will be increasing hostility towards Jesus and his ministry. The reader of this scene, however, would not at this stage of the narrative be aware of patterns that will emerge over the next five chapters. Whether a shift is beginning to take place could only be discerned from the narrative clues within the scene itself.

4.4.1.2. Structure

An important consideration for analysis of the structural features of this portion of the narrative is comparison of the two scenes in the Gospel which take place at pools in Jerusalem (5:1-18 and 9:1-38). Both scenes share a common structure of a miracle which leads to a dialogue between the recipient of the healing and the authorities regarding an issue of law and the identity of Jesus. The structural similarities between the two scenes, in addition to the similarities of their locations and themes, invite the reader to draw comparisons between them.

Comparison of the two scenes has featured in previous interpretations of the man at the pool. Jeffrey Staley's analysis of this passage depends significantly on comparison. In his analysis, Staley structures his argument regarding the man at the pool around similarities and differences with the man who was born blind.²⁶³ Another example of a study of the character of the man at the pool is the work of Cornelis Bennema, who considers both positive and negative readings of his character and ultimately considers comparison between the two scenes as decisive for drawing his own conclusion.²⁶⁴ The importance of making comparisons of this type is clear.

²⁶² For further observations on the Jerusalem-to-Jerusalem itinerary, including it being the reverse of Cana to Cana, see Stibbe, *John*, 73-74.

²⁶³ Jeffrey L. Staley, "Stumbling in the Dark, Reaching for the Light." *Semeia* 53 (1991): 55-80.

²⁶⁴ Bennema, *Encountering*, 185-200.

However, according to the methodology of this study, the reader is moving sequentially through the narrative, discovering aspects of the story only as they occur in narrative order. Therefore, although comparison of 5:1-18 and 9:1-38 can be undertaken, the reader will not benefit from this comparison until reaching chapter 9, when the similarities and differences between the two scenes can be evaluated.

Although it is not possible at this stage to look forward in the narrative from the perspective of the reader, it is possible to look back. For understanding the structure of this scene, the reader is able to recognise that 5:1-18 shares similarities with the two encounters with Jesus in chapter 4. When the Samaritan woman and the royal official encountered Jesus, he revealed to them an aspect of his identity. For the Samaritan woman, this was supernatural knowledge, and for the royal official, the power to heal. Both of these revelatory experiences were followed by the witness being personally involved in others coming to believe in Jesus. The Samaritan woman testified to her townspeople, who then believed, and the royal official's return to his home was accompanied by his household believing.

As 5:1-18 follows the pattern of encounter followed by revelation of identity, it is significant that the man at the pool is not presented as a witness in the same way as the Samaritan woman and the royal official. Therefore, the way in which this section of the narrative differs from the previous threefold pattern will be instructive for understanding its narrative purpose. This is particularly so with reference to the reader identifying whether a positive-to-negative shift is underway. Therefore, the narrative function of this encounter is more readily highlighted by the response of those who hear the man's proclamation, rather than the character of the healed man himself. When the response of his hearers is contrasted with those to whom the Samaritan woman and the royal official went, the disjunction between chapter 4 and 5 is clear.

4.4.1.3. Character

Although the narrative function of the scene ultimately hinges on those who hear the healed man, his character and role within the scene are critical for understanding his use of κύριε in 5:7. However, some scholars have argued that focusing on the character of the man at the pool is inappropriate.²⁶⁵ In contrast, others who have written about the passage consider his character

²⁶⁵ Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 243: "The reader is clearly not required to pass judgement on the behaviour of the healed man." Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:98, considers attempts to interpret the man's motives as ill-directed, as he does not consider them a concern for the author, in contrast to the role that the man plays in bringing the *Ioudaioi* and Jesus into conflict. Haenchen, *John*, 1:248, also emphasises that "the interest of the Evangelist" is the results of

significant enough to draw conclusions. Those who understand the narrator's portrayal of his character as negative represent the majority position in Johannine scholarship.²⁶⁶ There is, however, a significant minority that has argued that he is best understood in a more positive light.²⁶⁷

The reader first learns of a man (τις ἄνθρωπος) in 5:5, and is immediately informed that he has been sick for thirty-eight years. Previously in the narrative, characters have been initially described by their vocation, βασιλικός (4:46), religious vocation, ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ... ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων (3:1), or their ethnicity, γυνή ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας (4:7). In this scene, the reader might assume the man's ethnicity and religion, due to his location. However, his vocation, and more generally his identity, is directly tied to his physical condition, described by the narrator in the most general terms as ἀσθένεια. His physical condition is the focus of the opening of the narrative, and the initial dialogue between the man and Jesus.

Jesus' first line in the scene asks a question, θέλεις ὑγιῆς γενέσθαι (5:6). The sick man's response, commencing with κύριε, implicitly answers this question affirmatively by informing Jesus of his failed attempts to receive healing previously. Although his desire to be healed is implied, and his response may express a level of desperation that manifests as a complaint, there is sufficient evidence in the narrative to interpret his response.²⁶⁸ Haenchen paraphrases the man's words as follows: "Of course I want to be well. I have continually sought to be healed for many years. But it has always turned out to be impossible."²⁶⁹ In contrast, Culpepper writes that "[i]t is not even clear that the lame man wanted to be healed."²⁷⁰ He describes the man's response as less than clear; however, rather than being confirmed by analysis of his own words, his intent is clarified by observing Jesus' response to him. The immediately following command to rise and walk is best understood as a confirmation that Jesus interpreted the man's response as a confirmation of his desire to be healed. These features of the initial encounter lead the

the man's actions, and that this displaces attempts to characterize him.

²⁶⁶See, for example, Brown, *John*, 1:209; Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 138; Collins, *These Things*, 21-23; Moloney, *John*, 173; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 74; Köstenberger, *John*, 180; Larsen, *Recognizing*, 147; Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 104; J. Ramsey Michaels, "The Invalid at the Pool: The Man Who Merely Got Well." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 337-346; and Bennema, *Encountering*, 197.

²⁶⁷Staley "Stumbling," 55-80; Brodie, *John*, 238; Sjef van Tilborg, *Imaginative Love in John* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), 214-219; O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 9:578-580; John C. Thomas, "'Stop Sinning Lest Something Worse Come Upon You': The Man at the Pool in John 5." *JSNT* 18 (1996): 3-20; David R. Beck, *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 86-91; and Resseguie, *Strange Gospel*, 135-138.

²⁶⁸Michaels, "The Invalid at the Pool," 339, describes the response as "whining."

²⁶⁹Haenchen, *John*, 1:245.

²⁷⁰Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 138.

reader to understand his character as a man who was in a dire state, and was defined by that state, despite his desire to be out of it.

The man's response to Jesus does suggest that he wants to be delivered from his current circumstances, and also reveals three other aspects of his character. First, it is clear at this early stage of the encounter that he does not know who Jesus is, an aspect of his character which will be more fully explored below in the analysis of irony. Second, he does not know that Jesus is able to heal him.²⁷¹ This is implied by his response, because if he did know about Jesus' healing ability, the reader would expect a different response to the one that is given. Third, he does not understand that Jesus is offering to heal him. His response may suggest that he was considering Jesus as a potential helper who might carry him to the pool, and his reason for describing his need for assistance may have been an implicit appeal to Jesus to fulfil this role.²⁷² There is no evidence, however, that he realised that rather than offering to carry him, Jesus was offering to raise him up. The combination of these three observations is that the man's initial encounter with Jesus is also characterised by ignorance of Jesus' identity, ability and intent.

Having confirmed the man's desire to be made well, Jesus says to him, ἔγειρε ἄρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάτει (5:8). In contrast to the thirty-eight years the man had been sick, as a result of Jesus' words he immediately (εὐθέως) becomes well. In obedience to Jesus' command, he carries his mat, and walks (5:9).²⁷³ At the word of Jesus, without hesitation, he obeys.²⁷⁴ Although the significance of his mat carrying comes into focus later in the narrative, it also carries importance in this part of the scene. When the reader learns that the man has been healed from the sickness which he had experienced for thirty-eight years, it might be surprising to see that he would pick up his mat prior to exercising his new-found physical freedom to walk. In doing so, he first exercises obedience to the word of Jesus.

After the man is healed, the *Ioudaioi* inform him that carrying his mat is an unlawful act due to it being a Sabbath day. The man responds by telling his interlocutors that he was commanded to carry the mat by the one who healed him. Those who represent a negative reading of the man's

²⁷¹ Considering the irony inherent in this scene, Moloney, *John*, 5-12, 5, emphasises that, unlike the man at the pool, "[t]he reader knows who Jesus is and what he can do."

²⁷² Moloney, *John*, 5-12, 5: "The man seeks another human being who can see to his physical needs so that the healing might happen."

²⁷³ Although the text is not explicit that he rose (ἠγέρθη), it is implicit that he did this prior to walking.

²⁷⁴ Moloney, *John*, 172, acknowledges the man's obedience as an indicator that he might potentially be another example of "a faith response corresponding to that of the mother of Jesus (cf. 2:5), John the Baptist (3:29-30), the Samaritans (4:42), and the royal official (4:50)." However, in keeping with his negative reading of the scene, Moloney immediately notes that "[t]his initial impression leads nowhere."

character see in his response an act of blaming Jesus for his law-breaking.²⁷⁵ A contrasting approach to the character of the healed man sees that his response represents an exaltation of Jesus' authority in contrast to the authority of the *Ioudaioi*.²⁷⁶ Neither reading is negated by the immediate context, and this is an example in the narrative where an inherent ambiguity is present.²⁷⁷

The *Ioudaioi* respond by calling on the man to identify the one who told him to break the Sabbath. No mention is made of the man answering the question, and the narrator notes that the man had yet to learn of Jesus' identity.²⁷⁸ After meeting Jesus for a second time, Jesus tells the man μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε (5:14). The uniqueness of this command has implications for the reader's understanding of the man's character.²⁷⁹ Due to Jesus' use of μηκέτι, the reader would rightly conclude that the man's disobedience was ongoing. Second, having read that Jesus drew a connection between the man's physical condition and his personal sin, the reader concludes that the man's dire physical condition is in some way attributed to his ongoing sin.

Following his second encounter with Jesus, the man goes and proclaims to the authorities that Jesus is his healer. Representative of those who read this action positively is Brodie's comment that "the man has finally come to mature (repentant) recognition of Jesus, and he is announcing the good news to the Jews."²⁸⁰ Scholars who read the scene negatively see the identification of Jesus as an act of betrayal, either completing the work begun by his initial blame-shifting statement, or as a negative response to Jesus' command that he not sin.²⁸¹ Unconvinced by the interpretation of some that his proclamation is an act of treachery, Brown represents a mediating position between the two extremes of positive or negative and considers the act further evidence of the man's "naïveté."²⁸²

In support of a positive reading of the man's declaration, some scholars have noted that the same verb used in 5:15, ἀνήγγειλεν, also describes the actions of the Messiah (4:25) and the

²⁷⁵See, for example, Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 138. Staley raises both the positive and negative interpretations in "Stumbling," 61.

²⁷⁶Staley "Stumbling," 61.

²⁷⁷For ambiguity in the Gospel of John, see Conway "Speaking through Ambiguity," 324-341, and Hylen, *Imperfect Believers*, 160.

²⁷⁸Staley "Stumbling," 61: "The healed man is not even granted the privilege of speaking the words, 'I don't know,'"

²⁷⁹On the man's sin and his sickness, see Thomas "Stop Sinning," 15-17, and Michaels, "The Invalid at the Pool," 332-334.

²⁸⁰Brodie, *John*, 238.

²⁸¹R. Alan Culpepper, "Un exemple de commentaire fondé sur la critique narrative; Jean 5,1-18." in *La communauté johannique et son histoire*, (eds. Jean-Michel Poffet and Jean Zumstein; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990), (148), sees both the man's first and second response to "the Jews" as negative. Bennema, *Encountering*, 197-198, interprets the first as positive, and then identifies a shift following the man's second encounter with Jesus.

²⁸²Brown, *John*, 1:209.

Holy Spirit (16: 13, 14, 15).²⁸³ It is possible that the reader progressing through the narrative considers 4:25 when interpreting the man's declaration. However, a more relevant parallel is not verbal, but conceptual. As the Samaritan woman proclaimed her developing understanding of Jesus to those around her, so does the man at the pool. Like her, he had not reached a full understanding of Jesus' identity at the time of declaration. Despite this, what he knew, he declared to others: "Jesus is the one who had made him well" (5:15).

With the evidence of the narrative considered, some elements of the man's character are certain, while ambiguity remains regarding his intent and his understanding of Jesus. This is because the man's motivation is not of particular concern for the narrator or the narrative as a whole.²⁸⁴ Rather, the man's "role" has been fulfilled by him ensuring that Jesus and the *Ioudaioi* are now facing each other once again. However, some insight has been gained by the reader. As a character, the man is able to call Jesus κῦριε while ignorant of Jesus' identity, ability and intent to heal him. Despite this, he is obedient to Jesus' command and receives the healing that he desired. He makes two significant public declarations before the *Ioudaioi* regarding Jesus, although the first is continued evidence of his ignorance even after being healed. Jesus' statement regarding the man's sin does affect the reader's understanding of the man, that his plight was not only physical.

Unlike the Samaritan woman, the effect of his declaration is not others coming to believe in Jesus. Rather than leading to a faith response, his identification of Jesus as his healer leads to persecution (5:16). However, even Jesus' own public declaration concerning himself leads to intensification of the persecution (5:18). Therefore, the response from the *Ioudaioi* is best not understood as reflecting negatively on the character and intentions of the man who was made well. In contrast, it signals an important shift in trajectory of the narrative with respect to responses to Jesus.

4.4.1.4. Irony

There are several elements in this section of the narrative that form the basis for irony. In each example the experience of irony is dependent upon the man at the pool making statements that highlight his ignorance of information which the reader has. The reader has access to the information because of explicit statements made by the narrator earlier in the narrative. The key

²⁸³ See, for example, Thomas "Stop Sinning," 18, and Resseguie, *Strange Gospel*, 138.

²⁸⁴ Compare the statements of Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 243; Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:98; Haenchen, *John*, 1:248.

element of the narrative which is both relevant to this study and also leads to irony is the term of address that the man at the pool uses when he talks to Jesus.

The first word that the lame man speaks is κύριε. As outlined in the character analysis above, this word introduces a statement from the man which reveals that he does not know who Jesus is and what he has done before in the narrative. As a result, the man is ignorant of Jesus' ability to heal.²⁸⁵ Not only does he not understand who Jesus is, he also misunderstands Jesus' offer. Previously in the narrative the reader has seen the Samaritan woman address Jesus with κύριε and at the same time be ignorant of his identity and ability whilst also misunderstanding the implicit claims in his speech. The royal official likewise called Jesus κύριε while making a request which revealed key deficiencies in his understanding of Jesus' identity and ability. Now for the third time since the narrator explicitly identified Jesus as *kyrios*, the reader has witnessed the same phenomenon.

Schenk identifies that there is a connection between these three characters' use of κύριε and the narrator's identification of *kyrios* in 4:1.²⁸⁶ Irony provides an opportunity to see how this connection functions on a narrative level. When characters address Jesus as κύριε, they agree verbally with the narrator's characterization of Jesus, and at the same time reveal their ignorance of his identity. The reader, who witnesses the narrator's use in 4:1 as well as the usage of the three characters that follow, is able to evaluate the uses by characters. This occurs in light of the reader's understanding of Jesus' Lordship which has been informed by not only 4:1, but also the identification in 1:23 of Jesus as the *kyrios* who fulfils God's coming, and who reveals his glory.

4.4.1.5. Point of View

In the section of the narrative under examination, 5:1-18, two realities of flesh and glory are illustrated. These serve to further develop the reader's understanding of how the flesh-glory paradigm is witnessed in the narrative. First, the reader is confronted with the frailness of flesh, as seen in the reality of human suffering. Second, the reader again witnesses that, despite the manifestation of Jesus' glory in his flesh, characters who encounter Jesus are ignorant of the glory.

²⁸⁵ Steyn, "Jesus as Κύριος," 150, argues for the importance of irony in the narrative at this point, emphasising the man's ignorance of Jesus' identity and intent.

²⁸⁶ Schenk, *Kommentiertes Lexikon*, 244.

The frailness of flesh has been witnessed in the preceding narrative in Jesus' tiredness and thirst.²⁸⁷ In the fever experienced by the royal official's son, the reader has seen that this frailness can lead to death. As the focus of the narrative draws in on the pool in Jerusalem, this frailness now extends to blindness, lameness, and paralysis (5:3). The reader is thus confronted with the diverse reality of human frailness, and that it is in the flesh of humanity that weakness is manifest. When the coming *kyrios* finally came, he took on this frailness, sharing in the flesh which all humanity has in common. Yet it is also in this flesh that the *kyrios* reveals his glory. In all its weakness and frailness, flesh is the chosen vehicle through which the glory of God is revealed.²⁸⁸

The man at the pool is not able to see the glory of Jesus. His glory is revealed, as surely as it is manifest throughout his ministry, and especially in his other signs, but the man is not aware of it. The narrator tells the reader that Jesus saw the man. However, there is no description that the man saw Jesus. Although he may have seen Jesus in his first encounter with him, he does not recognise his glory. He calls him κύριε, but does not know that the coming *kyrios* reveals his glory in his coming. Jesus hides himself, and the result is that the crowds do not see his flesh, and therefore cannot see his glory. When the man meets Jesus a second time, once again he does not come to Jesus, but Jesus comes to him. In this second coming, again there is an opportunity for the man to see the glory, but there is no indication in the narrative that he does, nor that he believes beyond his acknowledgement that Jesus made him whole. As this section of the narrative ends, Jesus' claim to be equal with God is a key reminder to the reader that Jesus fulfils God's coming and reveals his glory.

4.4.2. Textual Criticism

Textual variation with regard to κύριος is found in 5:4 as part of the phrase ἄγγελος ... κυρίου, within a verse which as a whole is transmitted with significant variation in the manuscript tradition.²⁸⁹ The entire verse is omitted in the two primary papyrus witnesses for the chapter, \mathfrak{P}^{66} and \mathfrak{P}^{75} . In addition, major majuscules that do not include the verse include Sinaiticus (01)

²⁸⁷ Tiredness is seen in 4:6, Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιακῶς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοπορίας ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ. Thirst is implied in Jesus' request, δός μοι πιεῖν, in 4:7 and explicit later in 19:28, when Jesus says διψῶ.

²⁸⁸ Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, 232-233.

²⁸⁹ There is also a variant in 5:17, with regard to the subject of the verb (Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς). According to UBS⁵, the Sinaitic Syriac and Ethiopic of Takla Haymanot support κύριος, and the Palestinian Syriac supports κύριος Ἰησοῦς. Both readings are secondary due to the extremely limited nature of the external evidence and also for internal probabilities. The Sinaitic reading appears to be an attempt to provide an explicit subject where a number of manuscripts read ὁ δὲ ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς. The Palestinian Syriac potentially conflated two pre-existing readings, κύριος and Ἰησοῦς.

and Vaticanus (03), the first hand of Ephraemi-Rescriptus (04*) and Bezae (05). Versional support for the verse's omission includes significant manuscripts of the Old Latin (d, f, l and q), the preferred critical text of the Vulgate, the Curetonian Syriac, the Sahidic Coptic tradition and also some Bohairic manuscripts. In addition, the majority of manuscripts that have verse 4 do not have κυρίου, including Alexandrinus (02) and the Byzantine tradition. The external evidence for the secondary nature of the verse as a whole, and for the inclusion of κύριος in particular, is overwhelming.

The case for omitting the verse is further supported by internal evidence. For transcriptional probabilities, verse 4 serves as an explanatory gloss, and its presence in the manuscript tradition between verse 3 and 5 is perhaps best understood as something that originated as a comment in the margin, and then later was incorporated into the text. With regard to intrinsic probabilities, the verse as a whole contains vocabulary which is not found elsewhere in the Gospel of John.²⁹⁰ However, this observation on its own is not necessarily significant for the evaluation of any variant. It can be relevant if the vocabulary is being used to describe events which are consistently described using different words in other places in the same document. Given the Johannine tendency to utilise more than one term when one event is described more than once throughout the narrative, it is difficult to rule most of the examples out completely based upon their uniqueness alone.²⁹¹ Furthermore, the unique subject matter of the verse necessitates unique vocabulary to at least some degree.

Overall, the overwhelming external evidence in favour of the omission, combined with transcriptional probabilities of the verse functioning as an explanatory gloss, reflect the secondary nature of the verse as a whole, and of κυρίου in particular.

4.4.3. Semantics

With the narrative and textual aspects of this analysis complete, a semantic analysis of κύριε in 5:7 is now possible. The cognitive context of the use of κύριε is important for understanding its

²⁹⁰ In the majority text the verse reads *ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν. Ἄγγελος γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, καὶ ἐτάρασεν τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος, ὑγιῆς ἐγένετο, ᾧ δὴποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι.* Italicised words occur only in this verse in the Gospel of John. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 179, also includes ἐμβαίνω, which he considers unique insofar as it describes someone entering water. However, as this is the only time that someone 'goes down' into water, unlike Peter, who ἔβαλεν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν (21:7), it does not seem appropriate to count this as unique, given that the same verb is used elsewhere for getting into boats (6:17,22,24; 21:3).

²⁹¹ For example, there do not appear to be other examples in the Gospel of John of someone waiting expectantly (ἐκδέχομαι), or the kind of movement suggested by κίνησις and ταραχή, apart from in this immediate context.

potential semantic range on the lips of the sick man. As he is described as not knowing who Jesus is in 5:13, there does not appear to be any warrant for the vocative to have any meaning beyond “title of respect.”²⁹² Although it is possible that the man does understand Jesus as one who possesses authority, if his response to the *Ioudaioi* suggests that he intentionally contrasts Jesus’ word with the contemporary interpretation of the Law, this is post-healing. At the time of speaking, he does not demonstrate any awareness of Jesus’ identity as a person who possessed authority or as a supernatural being. As a result, there is no evidence to support a semantic range beyond respectful address.

4.4.4. Summary

The man at the pool, who is the fifth character in the narrative to use *kyrios*, addresses Jesus using the vocative when in a state of relative ignorance regarding Jesus’ identity. He is also obedient to Jesus’ word, and declares Jesus’ name to others. His example contrasts with that of the Samaritan woman because his proclamation does not lead others to believe, but results in others persecuting Jesus. As has been argued, the negative response of his hearers suggests to the reader the commencement of a new season in Jesus’ ministry. Despite this negative result, and although the narrator comments with respect to Jesus that the man οὐκ ᾔδει τίς ἐστίν (5:13), this healed man is another example of a character who rightly, albeit ignorantly, confesses Jesus’ true identity as the *kyrios*.

4.5. The Bread of the *Kyrios*

4.5.1. Narrative

4.5.1.1. Context

The healing at the pool (5:1-16) is followed by three distinct sections in the narrative which lead up to the next occurrence of *kyrios* (6:23).²⁹³ The first section is a discourse in which Jesus speaks about his identity as the Son who has been sent (5:17-47). This is followed by a description of the feeding of the five thousand (6:1-15). The final section is a travel narrative, during which Jesus meets the disciples on the water (6:16-21). There are several elements in

²⁹² L&N 1:739 (87§53). Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 59: “*kyrie* is purely a word of respect from an inferior to a superior.” Commentators who argue for a similar semantic range or render κύριε as “sir” include Brown, *John*, 1:205; Barrett, *John*, 254; Newman and Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John*, 146; Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:92; Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 243; Borchert, *John*, 2:305; and Brant, *John*, 103.

²⁹³ This is assuming that the longer reading of 6:23 which includes κύριος is preferred. Whether this is the case will be addressed in the text-critical analysis below.

these three sections which contribute to the narrative context for the three occurrences of *kyrios* in 6:23, 34, 68.

In the discourse which follows the healing of the man at the pool (5:17-47), several themes are addressed which reoccur in 6:1-71. The key ones for the purposes of this study are the connected notions of listening to and believing in Jesus and the Father, and the relationship of this to Moses' writings and eternal life. In chapter 6, this cluster of themes is important for the interpretation of characters' understanding of Jesus' identity, and therefore relevant for the focus of this study. Early in the discourse in 5:17-47, Jesus makes a declaration that "the one who listens to my word and believes in the one who sent me has eternal life" (5:24).

This statement is followed by Jesus' negative assessment of his hearers, regarding whom he states, "the one whom [the Father] sent, it is in him that you do not believe" (5:38). The reality of his interlocutors' non-belief is again highlighted as Jesus questions how they would be able to believe (5:44). He then provides further explanation for their lack of belief by saying "if you believed in Moses, you would believe in me, because he wrote about me" (5:46), and "if you do not believe in his writing, how will you believe my words?" (5:47).

The repetition of the importance of belief in Moses as a precursor to belief in Jesus then ends the discourse. The effect of this repetition serving as a conclusion highlights the importance of this parallel for understanding the subsequent narrative. If characters who encounter Jesus demonstrate that they believe in Moses' writings regarding Jesus' coming, the reader expects that this character will also then go on to believe in Jesus himself. This does not require the reader to identify which aspect of the Pentateuch is being referred to. Rather, this acts as a narrative signal to raise the reader's expectations that characters who trust Moses will grow in their understanding of Jesus.

Before considering the relevant contextual features of 6:1-15, it is important to examine the transition from chapter 5, which was centered on Jerusalem, to chapter 6, which describes Jesus as being in Galilee. There are two key reasons why this has caused consternation for some Johannine scholars. First, there is no mention of travel between the two locations. This is striking, as explicit description of Jesus' travel from place to place has been a key feature of the narrative until this point, such as in 4:2-3 from Jerusalem to Galilee, and in 5:1 from Galilee to Jerusalem. Second, 6:1 narrates that "Jesus went away to the other side of the lake," which seems to assume that the reader knew that Jesus had been on the western side of the lake

immediately prior to this verse. However, at the end of chapter 5 Jesus had been in Jerusalem, with the reader left to consider what might have happened between 5:47 and 6:1.

As this study proceeds from the position that the narrative of the Gospel of John is a unity, rearranging the text to address an interpretative challenge is not an option. In contrast, it will be beneficial to seek to understand possible reasons why there might be such a shift following chapter 5, and how this might contribute to the interpretation of chapter 6.

In 6:1, the only form of transition between the narrative of chapter 5 in Jerusalem and the events of chapter 6 in Galilee is the phrase “after these things” (μετὰ ταῦτα). The reader has encountered the phrase three times so far (3:22, 5:1, 5:14), and in each case, Jesus is introduced as being in the same place as he was in the preceding narrative. In 3:22 and 5:1, Jesus departs the place he was in previously in order to go to a new place. This is implied in 3:22 and explicit in 5:1. In the third case, 5:14, the narrative is not explicit with respect to Jesus’ location prior to finding the healed man in the temple. However, there are no indications that immediately prior, when Jesus withdrew from the crowd (ἐξένευσεν), he had left the area completely. This example in 6:1, therefore, constitutes the first usage of “after these things” (μετὰ ταῦτα) to signal a significant shift in time and place.²⁹⁴

The level of disjunction caused by this shift suggests that 6:1 signals the beginning of a new section of the narrative. This concurs with the analysis of chapter 5 above, in which the encounter with the man at the pool is the inaugurating event from which the pendulum of responses to Jesus begins to swing in a new direction. Although the previous responses to Jesus in chapters 1 to 4 have been overwhelmingly positive, this is no longer going to be the case. Chapter 5, then, transitions the reader’s expectations from positive to negative, as the reality of the plans to kill Jesus become evident. Following this transition, the beginning of chapter 6 consists of the first scenes of this new section of the narrative in which the negative responses to Jesus become progressively more overt.

Having entered chapter 6, the reader encounters a number of significant elements which are referenced in the discourse which follows on the next narrative day. With regard to characters, the reader meets the crowd (ὁ ὄχλος) and the disciples (οἱ μαθηταί), two sets of characters whose understanding of Jesus will become more explicit as the narrative continues. The time is

²⁹⁴ The other clear example in the narrative is 21:1, where the narrative again shifts from Jerusalem to Galilee without any description of travel.

established in relation to the nearness of the Passover (τὸ πάσχα), encouraging the reader to consider references to the Passover in the Old Testament, particularly Exodus 12. The miracle of the feeding and the crowd's association of Jesus with the coming prophet continue echoes of the Pentateuch, particularly Exodus 16 and Deuteronomy 18. Although Moses is not named, these elements serve to ensure that the explicit proclamations regarding Moses in chapter 5 remain in view, preparing for the next narrative day.

Following the miraculous feeding, the description of the journey from the western side of the lake contains a development relating to Jesus' identity. This development, which is key for interpreting the next scene, is the focus of the analysis that follows. As the disciples see Jesus "walking on the lake," he declares "I am, do not be afraid" (ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε 6:19-20). That this constitutes a development in the narrative with respect to Jesus' identity is seen by identifying further echoes of the Pentateuch, in addition to those which occurred in the feeding miracle. Given that the reader has, in the scene immediately prior, recalled passages in Exodus and Deuteronomy, the reference to ἐγὼ εἰμι suggests that Exodus 3:14 (ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὄν) is in view.

Although the feeding miracle is rich with Pentateuchal language and imagery, this does not limit the possible parallels to the Pentateuch alone. In fact, by considering the thematic and verbal features of the immediate context, the most important Old Testament parallels which inform the reader are found in Isaiah 40-55. Catrin Williams identifies important thematic parallels between Jesus meeting the disciples on the water and the identification of the God of Israel who comforts his people as they "pass through water," so they do not fear (43:2).²⁹⁵ Further, Williams notes that God is described as making a way in the sea (43:16).²⁹⁶ These important thematic parallels, which reflect the idea of the safe passage through water, provide a rich intertextual context for understanding the scene. At the same time, the appearance of Exodus-related themes reinforces the importance of the Pentateuch for interpreting this part of the narrative.

The thematic parallels between this scene and Isaiah 40-55 are reinforced by further thematic parallels which are presented along with the use of ἐγὼ εἰμι.²⁹⁷ The self-declaration is often found in contexts where God affirms his unparalleled and sovereign nature (41:4, 43:10, 46:9,

²⁹⁵ Catrin H. Williams, *I Am He: The Interpretation of *Ānī Hū* in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 221.

²⁹⁶ Williams, *I Am He*, 221.

²⁹⁷ For ἐγὼ εἰμι in this passage, see especially Ball, *I Am*, 67-79, and Williams, *I Am He*, 214-228.

48:12). It is also tied to the idea that God, as creator, rules over creation, which is also a key feature, seen in 45:8, 18. Furthermore, God as the one who saves is a key theme tied to ἐγώ εἰμι (45:22, 46:4). In addition, God is the one who shows the way, a concept which is explicit in 48:17 in the Greek “I have shown you to find the way in which you should go,” and to a lesser extent in the Hebrew “who teaches you to profit, who leads you in the way you should go.”²⁹⁸ Further important concepts linked to the ἐγώ εἰμι are God comforting those who fear (51:12), and that God’s people know who he is when he speaks to them (52:6). These are striking when considering the importance of a passage in which Jesus demonstrates his power over creation while saving his people, directs them on their way, comforts them when they fear, and reveals himself with his own verbal declaration.

The combination of these parallel elements places the reader in a similar situation to that encountered when reading John 1:23 and the quotation of Isaiah 40:3. Jesus is once again being presented as doing things that Isaiah prophesied the God of Israel does. As with 1:23, the reader must address the question of how this is possible. That is, it must be decided if God and Jesus are both doing these things, if Jesus’ performance of them somehow excludes God’s role as the fulfiller of the prophecies, or if there is another option. When considering these options, the reader’s interpretation of this passage cannot allow God’s unparalleled and sovereign nature to be violated. In fact, it is with the declarations of ἐγώ εἰμι that some of the strongest statements regarding the unique and incomparable greatness of God are made. Therefore, the reader follows the interpretive conclusion from 1:23, which saw the fulfillment of Isaiah’s prophecies regarding God as being fulfilled in Jesus. Accordingly, as the reader saw 40:3 being fulfilled in the coming of Jesus, this scene can also be understood as Jesus fulfilling prophecies which identified God as the agent of their fulfillment.²⁹⁹

4.5.1.2. Structure

The sections of the narrative in which *kyrios* occurs in the manuscript tradition are the movement of the crowd (6:22-24) and the disciples’ response to Jesus’ teaching (6:60-71).³⁰⁰ In the first section, *kyrios* is used to identify the origin of the boats which the crowd took to meet Jesus in Capernaum. The narrative identifies their place of origin as being ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου (6:23). Due to the variation in the manuscript

²⁹⁸ δέδειχά σοι τοῦ εὑρεῖν σε τὴν ὁδὸν ἐν ἣ πορεύσει ἐν αὐτῇ for הָלַכְתָּ בְּדַרְכֵי מְדַרְגֵי לְהוֹצִיאֲךָ מִן הַיָּם. The rendering “who leads you in the way you should go” is common to NET NRSV NKJV ESV.

²⁹⁹ Hays, *Reading Backwards*, 80, stresses that fulfillment is a key theme for understanding the use of the Old Testament in the Gospel of John.

³⁰⁰ For these divisions, see Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 41, 59-60.

tradition for εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου, it will not be assumed in the narrative analysis that this phrase is part of the scene. Rather, the narrative analysis will concentrate on the two occurrences of *kyrios* which are textually certain in the next section, the bread of life discourse (6:25-71). Having completed the narrative and then textual analyses, it will be possible to return to the question of 6:23 in the semantic analysis and conclusion for this section.

4.5.1.3. Character

4.5.1.3.1. The Crowd

The first character in this narrative section to use *kyrios* is the crowd. In sharp contrast to the negative assessment of the *Ioudaioi* presented in chapter 5, this crowd appears at first to provide evidence that they surpassed their Judean counterparts in matters of faith. The crowd's first words, which provide important evidence for character analysis, comprise a statement regarding Jesus that "this is truly the prophet who is coming into the world" (6:14). This recalls Jesus' words that Moses "wrote ... about ... me" (5:46) and Philip's declaration that Jesus is the one about "whom Moses ... wrote." (1:45). It likewise recalls the testimony of John the Baptist when asked the question "are you the prophet?" (1:21). In keeping with the expectation that the narrative cites or alludes to scripture whilst drawing on its context, these references also recall the prophetic prediction that Moses gave to the people of Israel that "the Lord your God will raise up a prophet like me from among your brothers" (Deut 18:15a).³⁰¹ The crowd's assessment of Jesus' identity, therefore, confirms that they have believed in Moses' writings regarding Jesus. It remains to be seen whether they will listen to Jesus and fulfill the second half of the prophecy, also addressed to Israel: "you will listen to him" (Deut 18:15b).³⁰²

These first words provide a promising indication that the crowd might be another example of a character whose encounter with Jesus produces faith. This first statement in the narrative is a positive declaration of Jesus' identity (6:14). By declaring that Jesus is "the prophet," the narrator shows that the crowd has believed in Moses' words regarding Jesus, a topic that Jesus

³⁰¹ This is a translation of προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου. The Greek is essentially a literal translation of what is found in the MT, וְיָקִים לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ, omitting only a direct parallel for מִקִּרְבְּךָ, which may reflect textual traditions rather than translation.

³⁰² The future tense "will listen" literally represents the Greek αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε. The *yiqtol* תִּשְׁמְעוּן here is to be understood as a command or obligation, rather than a prediction, cf. NRSV; JPS; NIV; and for this usage more generally, see Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. (ed. Takamitsu Muraoka; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblio, 2006), 2:344. Although the Greek uses the future ἀκούσεσθε, this is an example of the common feature of using a future form for translating *yiqtol* as obligation or command. For the future as a command in the Greek Old Testament, see F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995), 72, and Muraoka, *A Morphosyntax and Syntax of Septuagint Greek*, 285-287.

himself spoke about whilst in Jerusalem. As noted in the discussion of narrative context, Jesus said to the *Ioudaioi* that “if you believed in Moses, you would believe in me, because he wrote about me” (5:46). This statement, then, provides an expectation that if a character demonstrates belief that Moses’ prediction of a coming prophet is fulfilled in Jesus, the character will then also believe Jesus himself. This expectation however, is quickly checked by the narrator’s commentary on the crowd’s intentions with regard to Jesus. Despite believing Moses’ words, the crowd misunderstands Jesus’ vocation, and attempt to take him by force to make him a king. That this goal was misguided is confirmed by Jesus’ departure, in preparation for him to be revealed in the next scene.

The order of a seemingly positive response being mitigated by what follows continues for the crowd, who then asks Jesus “what do we do so that we can work the works of God?” (6:28), which appears to be a genuine request for guidance. The question which follows, however, resembles a challenge: “what sign will you do so that we can see it and believe in you?” (6:30). This question echoes quite closely the challenge from the *Ioudaioi* in Jerusalem following the cleansing of the temple: “What sign will you show us?” (2:18). This mimicry provides a clue that this crowd is beginning to descend from their initial assessment of Jesus as a prophet, and are beginning to speak like the *Ioudaioi*.

In addition to echoing previously occurring statements by the *Ioudaioi*, this section of the narrative also contains parallels to the encounter between Jesus and the Samaritan women.³⁰³ Like her, the crowd refers to οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. Further, the crowd’s request to Jesus, prefaced with κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον (6:34), echoes the Samaritan woman’s δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ (4:15). Like the Samaritan woman, the crowd also addresses Jesus as κύριε. Their use of the term is also similar to the Samaritan woman in that they use κύριε to address Jesus at a stage of the conversation when they are also unaware of what Jesus had been speaking about. The similarities with the Samaritan woman end, however, when Jesus’ statements become explicit. Unlike the Samaritan woman, who moved closer to Jesus as he revealed his identity more explicitly, the crowd recoils at Jesus’ self-descriptions. That they ultimately do not believe is made explicit when Jesus pronounces that οὐ πιστεύετε (6:36), paralleling Jesus’ assessment of the *Ioudaioi* during his discourse at the Temple (5:38).

³⁰³ On the parallel between the Samaritan woman and the crowd, see, for example, Barrett, *John*, 291.

The next time Jesus' interlocutors are referred to, they are named the *Ioudaioi* (6:41).³⁰⁴ As a result, the reader is required to disambiguate this new referent. Specifically, the reader needs to determine if this is a new group of individuals distinct from the crowd, a subset of the crowd, or whether they are being equated with the crowd. The similarities with Jesus' previous encounter with the *Ioudaioi* which the crowd has exhibited indicate that there is an overlap in identity to some extent. As a character, the crowd has been shown to speak like the *Ioudaioi* and have the same faith response as the *Ioudaioi*. This crowd, then, fails to progress in the way that the Samaritan woman did. The narrative provides explicit evidence regarding the effect which the encounter with Jesus produces: the crowd does not believe.

The reader then learns that the disciples of Jesus "who do not believe" (οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες, 6:64) follow the *Ioudaioi* in both their murmuring, and finally in their complete rejection of Jesus, manifest in their walking away from him. In that way, the hearers of Jesus who were originally designated "the crowd" demonstrate that they are actually the *Ioudaioi*, as do the disciples who abandon Jesus. Although they are described as being "disciples," the narrative includes a clear description of how they differ from the twelve. Despite the fact that they are disciples in the sense that they follow Jesus, their following is merely one of proximity, but not of faith. This difference is made explicit when a contrast is drawn between the disciples that leave, and those that remain (6:66-68).

The crowd thus represents the first character in the narrative to address Jesus as κύριε, and subsequently to be described explicitly as non-believers. The Samaritan woman came to faith, as did the royal official. In addition, it was argued that the man who was made well at the pool exemplifies a period of transition. His faith response is not a focus of the narrative, so that the reader appropriately concludes regarding the description of his encounter with Jesus without a judgement on his faith position. In the case of the crowd, however, this period of transition is over, and the next stage of Jesus' ministry has begun. Unbelief and rejection is to be expected, even by those who call Jesus κύριε.

³⁰⁴ Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 383: "the crowd' is 'the Jews.' They have shown their true colors." In contrast, Cornelis Bennema, "The Crowd: A Faceless, Divided Mass." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 347-355 (348) argues that "(a)lthough 'the Jews' start out as part of the crowd, their emerging from it and their increased hostility demand that they be distinguished from the crowd." Bennema, *The Crowd*, 349, supports his judgement with the likelihood that 6:25-40 and 6:41-59 occur in different places, with the shift of location and character coinciding. However, Edward W. Klink, *John* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016), 334, argues that "there is no evidence of a change of scene or historical situation; in fact, quite the contrary, the dialogue attends to details and issues rooted in its earlier parts. The change in description must be viewed as having a literary (and rhetorical) function for the narrator."

4.5.1.3.2. Peter

The next character to use *kyrios* is Peter. Although the crowd leaves Jesus, Peter, speaking on behalf of the twelve, says that they cannot leave him (6:68). Peter's usage of κύριε is noteworthy for two reasons. First, it is the first time a named character has addressed Jesus as κύριε. Previously the reader has encountered four other characters, the Samaritan woman, the royal official, the man made well, and the crowd. Second, not only is Peter named, he is also a member of the twelve.³⁰⁵ This is the first mention of "the twelve" in the narrative, and although the identities of all of this group's members are not revealed, the method of formation is made explicit in the following conversation. Jesus states that he 'chose' the twelve (6:71), and for this reason Peter is the first one of Jesus' disciples whom he chose who addresses him as κύριε. Previously, the disciples had called Jesus "Rabbi" (1:38, 49; 4:31), a title which the crowd has used (6:25).³⁰⁶ However, as the title *rabbi* is interpreted by the narrator as meaning διδάσκαλε (1:38), it is not as an equivalent for κύριε.

This usage of *kyrios*, then, constitutes a change in the vocabulary of the disciples, and Peter specifically. Although Peter is the one who speaks the word, he is speaking on behalf of the twelve, demonstrated by his use of plural verbs (ἀπελευσόμεθα, πεπιστεύκαμεν, ἐγνώκαμεν) in 6:68-69.³⁰⁷ Unlike the crowd, who followed Jesus as disciples but were actually the *Ioudaioi* who did not believe, these disciples use κύριε in the context of an explicit faith declaration. This also contrasts with other characters that have used κύριε at quite different places on their own journey of faith. All three uses of κύριε (4:11, 15, 19) by the Samaritan woman preceded the more developed demonstrations of her faith (4:28-29), and the royal official likewise called Jesus κύριε (4:49) before the reader was told that he believed (4:50, 53). In the case of Peter and the disciples, however, κύριε accompanies their own declaration of belief, which constitutes the most developed confession of the disciples up until this point in the narrative.

³⁰⁵ Collins, *These Things*, 68-86, notes the infrequent explicit references to the "the twelve" in the Gospel of John and sees that the importance of the group is de-emphasised when compared to the Synoptic Gospels. He acknowledges, however, that they are a distinct group with distinctive character traits (86). The lack of detail for the formation of the twelve is best explained by considering the argument of Smith, *John*, 29, who sees the lack of introduction to the twelve as an indicator that the Gospel of John expects the reader to know "that Jesus had chosen an inner circle of twelve disciples." In addition, Richard Bauckham, "John for Readers of Mark," in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, (ed. Richard Bauckham; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 147-171 (168), in the context of a case for the likelihood that John's audience knew Mark, argues that prior knowledge of the twelve "could probably also be presumed in almost any Christian readers/hearers who knew any version of the Gospel tradition." For an analysis of the twelve as "a collective character," see Bennema, *Encountering*, 213-228.

³⁰⁶ John the Baptist is called *Rabbi* in 3:26.

³⁰⁷ Bennema, *Encountering*, 112: "Peter ... functions as the spokesman of the Twelve, as the use of the plurals in 6:68-69 indicates." Beutler, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 231, likewise emphasises Peter's role as spokesman (Wortführer).

If Peter's use of *kyrios* precedes the most developed statement of faith so far in the narrative, it is important to consider how the disciples' faith has developed until this point. There are four statements which follow Peter's use of κύριε which can inform the reader's understanding of the disciples' faith at this point of the narrative. The first is the statement "to whom shall we go?" (πρὸς τίνα ἀπελευσόμεθα; 6:68). That is, although the other disciples left, they surely have not gone to a better person than Jesus, as there is no one else they could go to that could match who Jesus is and what he gives them. The reader at this point is reminded of statements in Isaiah 40-55 regarding the uniqueness of the God of Israel, as the impossibility of comparing God to any other is presented (40:18, 40:25, 46:5).

With this context in mind, Peter's statement is at least affirming Jesus' uniqueness amongst all other humans, and potentially is associating the uniqueness of Jesus with the uniqueness of the God of Israel. That is, in the same way that God is unique and no other god can be compared to him, Jesus' uniqueness renders any attempted comparison with other people unprofitable.

The second statement is "you have words of eternal life" (ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἔχετε 6:68). This echoes Jesus' statement which he had just spoken to the other disciples that his words are "spirit and life" (6:63).³⁰⁸ In a similar way, in this statement, the twelve are aligning themselves with other statements in this same section of the narrative in which Jesus links eternal life to himself (6:27, 47, 54). Therefore, by making this statement, Peter is affirming his and the twelve's commitment to trust Jesus' own declarations regarding his identity and ministry.

The third statement is "we have believed and we have come to know" (πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν 6:69), which draws a sharp distinction between the twelve and the other disciples who "do not believe" (6:64).³⁰⁹ Peter's confession claims for the twelve a faith position which surpasses the belief of all other characters who have encountered Jesus in chapter 6.

The fourth element of Peter's confession is his identification of Jesus as "the holy one of God" (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ 6:69).³¹⁰ Interpretations range from considering the title inferior to those used

³⁰⁸ Skinner, *John and Thomas*, 92, considers Peter's confession as an echo of elements from the Prologue, including 1:4, which reinforces that his words are understood positively by the reader.

³⁰⁹ Michael Labahn, "Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 151-167, 155, writes with reference to belief and understanding that "both terms are Johannine markers of discipleship." O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 611, understands both verbs as synonyms.

³¹⁰ The external support for this reading is extremely strong, including \mathfrak{B}^{75} & B C* D L W. Other readings appear to be developments of this original reading ο χριστος ο αγιος του θεου, ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου, ο χριστος ο υιος του θεου του ζωντος. Transcriptionally, if ο χριστος ο αγιος του θεου were original, -ος endings might have led to the

by the crowd³¹¹ to seeing that it might reflect the belief that Jesus is “even on a par with God.”³¹² The title occurs here only in the Gospel of John, and is rare elsewhere.³¹³ It perhaps suggests a distinction between the twelve and the crowd, who use other titles for Jesus.³¹⁴ The use of the article appears to emphasize Jesus’ uniqueness again, furthering the implication of the “to whom...?” of 6:68.

This is the first time in the narrative that Jesus has been identified as “holy.”³¹⁵ However, that Jesus is “of God” has been established repeatedly throughout the narrative thus far. He is the lamb of God, the Son of God, the gift of God and the bread of God. The identification of Jesus as ἅγιος and that he is τοῦ θεοῦ appears to provide a dual emphasis for the idea that Peter is associating Jesus with God.³¹⁶

dropping of ο ἅγιος, and the resultant ο χριστος του θεου might then have been expanded with the much more common ο υιος, leading to the other two readings. However, this reconstruction cannot explain how ο ἅγιος του θεου, became such a dominant reading in the early tradition. It is more likely that this rare title was expanded or modified to incorporate titles that were much more common in early Christian discourse (χριστος, υιος). Intrinsically, none of the readings occur in exactly the same form elsewhere in the narrative, and are all possible considering the theological point of view of the narrator. Overall, ο ἅγιος του θεου is to be preferred due to its superior external support, and also transcriptional probabilities.

³¹¹ Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Gospel of John* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 134: “Peter’s remark seems pale when compared with designation of Jesus as ‘prophet’ and ‘king’ in 6:14-15.”

³¹² Bennema, *Encountering*, 114, argues that the use of ἅγιος recalls use of ὁ ἅγιος for the God of Israel in the Old Testament so that it “implies Jesus’ unity with God” and even that Jesus is “perhaps even on a par with God.” It is relevant that the God of Israel is identified with the absolute ὁ ἅγιος within Isaiah 40-55, a section of scripture which is important for understanding Jesus’ identity throughout the Gospel of John. This provides significant scope for the reader to consider the ways that Jesus’ identity as ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ relates to the God of Israel, who is ὁ ἅγιος. For Peter, however, Jesus is not the absolute ὁ ἅγιος (Isa 40:25), but ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, which suggests that Peter does not consider Jesus in some way “on a par with God,” but rather in relationship to him in some way. Léon-Dufour, *Lecture de l’Evangile selon Jean*, 2:189, identifies another possible parallel for ἅγιος with Psalm 16:10 (Greek 15:10), where David is called God’s ὄσιος, a word which has substantial semantic overlap with ἅγιος. Based on this parallel, he also sees the title as an indicator of Jesus’ unity with God. Bradford B. Blaine, *Peter in the Gospel of John: The Making of an Authentic Disciple* (Atlanta: SBL, 2007), 45, sees σὺ εἶ as echoing Jesus’ ἐγὼ εἰμι, affirming the argument of Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:77. Already in the narrative, σὺ εἶ has been used by Nathaniel (1:49) and Nicodemus (3:10) to address Jesus, and even by Jesus himself to address Nathaniel (1:42). However, Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:77, sees its significance in 6:69 as a result of multiple uses of ἐγὼ εἰμι in chapter 6, so that Peter’s confession reflects his experience of meeting Jesus on the water (6:20).

³¹³ Until this point, only the Holy Spirit has been described in that way (ἅγιος 1:33). Having read John 10:36 ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγάσεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, the reader might then be able to further understand the title ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. Outside of the scope of this study is ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ in Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 449, notes the lack of precedent for “Holy One of God” as a messianic title in Jewish tradition. Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:76, identifies a close Old Testament verbal parallel in the description of Aaron as τὸν ἅγιον κυρίου (הַקֹּדֶשׁ שִׁירָה Ps 106:16, Greek 105:16). That occurs in the context of a retelling of Israel’s history, from a believing community, (106:12, Greek 105:12) to a people that “did not believe his word” (οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, 106:24, Greek 105:24). Although this Psalm reflects the importance of belief, a concept also found in John 6, the connection is difficult to establish without the context calling the reader to consider this Psalm, or even Psalms 107-150 in an explicit way earlier in the narrative.

³¹⁴ William R. Domeris, “The Confession of Peter according to John 6:68.” *TynBul* 44 (1993): 155-167 (164).

³¹⁵ Domeris “The Confession of Peter according to John 6:68,” 167: “Jesus, in John 6:69, is the divine agent of God who proceeds from above, and who divides the world with his words of life, into the realms of darkness and of light. As such the title ‘the Holy One of God’ ranks above messiah and prophet, and alongside the definitive titles of Son of God and Son of Man as used by John.” Domeris’ conclusions suggest the kind of insight which the reader of the Gospel has, but not Peter himself. This is further addressed in the semantic analysis below which considers the cognitive context in which Peter makes the confession.

³¹⁶ Neyrey, *The Gospel of John*, 134, notes a comparison with Nicodemus. Drawing on this parallel is helpful, as

The combination of these four elements of Peter's confession provides the reader with considerable insight into the development of the disciples' faith at this point of the narrative. The disciples have come to believe that Jesus is, like the God of Israel, unique. Further, they agree with Jesus and the narrator that eternal life is to be associated with Jesus. Unlike the other disciples, they are people of faith, and they acknowledge that Jesus is rightly associated with God. The impact that these factors have on the reader's understanding of how κύριε is used to preface Peter's confession will be assessed fully in the semantic analysis below.

4.5.1.4. Irony

The irony that is present in this section of the narrative which is related to the use of *kyrios* closely resembles the irony experienced when the Samaritan woman spoke to Jesus (4:11). In 6:34, the crowd says κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον (6:34). In the analysis of irony in 4:11, it was argued that at that point of the conversation the woman's speech exhibited a verbal confession which was in agreement with the narrative's presentation of Jesus as *kyrios*, yet at the same time demonstrated that she was ignorant of what Jesus meant by "water." In a similar way, the crowd confesses rightly that Jesus is *kyrios*, and the reader then becomes aware that they are still ignorant of Jesus' identity.³¹⁷ In the case of the Samaritan woman, her ignorance was demonstrated by her own words which followed her confession, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ μηδὲ διέρχωμαι ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν (4:15). In Galilee, the ignorance of the crowd is confirmed by statements that Jesus makes, as he clarifies that he is the bread (6:35, 41, 48, 60, 51). Although the crowd asked Jesus for the bread about which he was speaking, this request was made without understanding what the bread really was.³¹⁸ The statement includes the implicit assertion that the crowd claims to know what Jesus is talking about. The reader, however, knows that this is not the case, and experiences the dynamic of narrative irony.

In addition to countering the ignorance with this clarification, Jesus also explicitly states that the crowd is not counted amongst those who believe (6:36). Therefore, any apparent agreement that the use of κύριε might have with the narrative's presentation of Jesus as the *kyrios* who comes from heaven is superficial. The crowd does not believe who Jesus is, and does not even

Nicodemus affirms Jesus being "from God," because his ministry was a result of God calling him and sending him. In the same way, Peter affirms God's approval of Jesus' ministry in identifying that Jesus is "of God."

³¹⁷ Steyn, "Jesus as Κύριος," 150-151, sees in the crowd's use of *kyrios* opportunity for the reader to notice misunderstanding and experience the dynamic of irony.

³¹⁸ O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 600: "The crowd's request for bread...reveals that they understand only one level of the conversation."

understand his claim to be from heaven. When addressing Jesus as κύριε, the crowd's ignorance is recognised by the reader, but, at the time of speaking, the crowd is unaware that they do not understand.

4.5.1.5. Point of View

The flesh-glory point of view is particularly relevant for the analysis of the use of *kyrios* in this section of the narrative. Glory is an important feature of Exodus 16, the most important Old Testament passage for understanding the background of the themes of the dialogue between Jesus and the crowd, and flesh is a key theme in the dialogue, particularly in 6:51-56.³¹⁹

In Exodus 16, when the children of Israel hungered for the bread they had been eating in Egypt, they complained to Moses and Aaron, or even complained *about* Moses and Aaron. The result of this murmuring was that they ate bread, and saw the glory of the Lord (Ex 16:2, 7, 10). Of these three events (complaint, eating, seeing), only two are echoed in John 6: complaint and eating. However, in John 6, the order is reversed. The crowd first eat the bread, and then, only after hearing Jesus' declaration of his heavenly origin, do they grumble (6:41). In Exodus, the complaint had a result, both bread and glory. In John 6, there is no positive result stemming from the complaint. The grumbling leads to more grumbling (6:61), which ends only when the crowd, once called the *Ioudaioi*, now called disciples, leaves Jesus (6:66).

The crowd's abandonment of Jesus is tied closely to the inability to accept Jesus' statements about his own flesh (6:51-56). In large measure, this is due to not understanding what Jesus meant when he spoke of the necessity of eating his flesh. Unlike the people of Israel, who not only ate the bread but also saw the glory, this unbelieving crowd did not see the glory which Jesus was revealing in his ministry, and in his signs. The crowd did not recognise the miraculous feeding as a sign (6:31), turned away when Jesus spoke of his flesh, could not see Jesus' revealed glory, and missed the experience their ancestors had in seeing τὴν δόξαν κυρίου (Ex 16:7).

³¹⁹ For a detailed analysis of Old Testament themes in this section of the narrative, see Peder Borgen, *Bread from Heaven. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (Leiden: Brill, 1981), 59-98.

4.5.2. Textual Criticism

The textual variation relevant to the interpretation of this section of the narrative is found in the manuscript tradition following ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον (6:23). The Greek manuscript evidence can be divided into four main groups. First, there are manuscripts which evidence the reading εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου, including ℱ⁷⁵, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Washingtonianus, family 13 and the Byzantine tradition.³²⁰ Second, there are 116 minuscule manuscripts which substitute Ἰησοῦ for κυρίου, including 8, 68 and 105. The third group, which omits the clause as a whole, includes Bezae (05), 091, and minuscule 69 and 788. In addition, there is a fourth group of readings which will be discussed below with regard to scribal tendencies.

Versional evidence does not provide any additional readings, but does clarify the provenance of the readings found in the Greek tradition. In the Old Latin, in addition to Bezae, manuscripts *e* and *a* also support the shorter reading, in contrast to the Vulgate's support of εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.³²¹ For the Syriac tradition, Curetonianus omits the clause, along with Sinaiticus, which also omits most of 6:24.³²² The Peshitta and a marginal reading of Harklensis support Ἰησοῦ.³²³ For the Coptic, the Bohairic and Sahidic both support εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου, with the Proto Bohairic supporting Ἰησοῦ.

The external evidence paints a complex picture. The shorter reading is firmly attested in both the Old Latin and Syriac tradition, indicating that it was well distributed early. However, utilising Epp's guidelines, the external evidence in support of the longer readings is ultimately superior. The best-attested reading is εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου, meeting all of Epp's criteria for external evidence.³²⁴

³²⁰ Alexandrinus has a nomen sacrum at this point. That this reading ΘΥ is confirmed by viewing digital images of provided by the British Library, available at http://bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=royal_ms_1_d_viii_f046v. Dirk Jongkind, in personal communication, confirmed that a K could not fit where the traces of the letter prior to Y remain, leaving Θ as the most likely candidate. ΘΥ is the reading transcribed in Schmid, et al., *An Electronic Version of The New Testament in Greek IV - Vol 2 The Majuscules*. The transcription of Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, available at <http://nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de>, reads KY "so die Editoren, moegl. auch qu.," reflecting the uncertainty surrounding this reading.

³²¹ Following Beuron numbers, Bezae (d) is 5, Codex Vercellensis (a) is 3 and Codex Palatinus (e) is 2. Vercellensis is illegible at this point and its support for the shorter reading is conjectured by the editor, Francis Gasquet, in *Codex Vercellensis* (Rome: F. Pustet, 1914).

³²² The large amount of text omitted in Sinaiticus could be due to homoioteleuton, resulting in a leap from ἄρτον in 6:23 to ἦλθον in 6:24. This provides a possible explanation for how this unique reading was created.

³²³ Syriac support for a substituted name is mitigated by the tendencies in the Syriac tradition evidenced in 4:1, as argued by Williams in "The Syriac Versions of the New Testament," 147, and Williams, *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*, 23-46.

³²⁴ Epp, "Canons," 96-104.

For authorial stylistic tendencies, the longer readings are consistent with patterns elsewhere in the Gospel. There are two other verses in which the narrator describes a location of a miracle following the subordinating conjunction ὅπου (4:46; 12:1). In both instances, the name of the place is followed with a description of Jesus' actions or involvement in the miracle. In 4:46, this is ἦλθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, ὅπου ἐποίησεν τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον, and in 12:1 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἑξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν, ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦς. Both of these examples are evidence against the shorter reading, as it is expected that the author would continue the pattern of using ὅπου with a defining clause that associates Jesus' miracle working with the place. The example of 12:1 is a close parallel, where not only is the recipient of the miracle identified, but also Jesus as the source of the miracle. In addition, the longer readings are in keeping with usage elsewhere in the narrative, when on two other occasions, an anarthrous aorist participle following an aorist main verb describes events where the action described by the participle precedes the action of the main verb (4:54; 21:14). Although this evidence is against the shorter reading, these two examples do not assist with the choice of κυρίου or Ἰησοῦ. As one of the two examples just cited has Ἰησοῦ and the other leaves the agent unexpressed, there is not a discernable pattern which can be identified with regard to authorial tendencies.

Authorial tendencies with regard to the pattern identified by Schenk again become relevant, as in the assessment of κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in 4:1. Chapter 6 is another example of minor characters using κύριε, like in chapter 4. In chapter 11, the narrator uses *kyrios* at the beginning of the new narrative section and during the same section characters use κύριε. Considering this pattern, it is expected that the narrator would identify Jesus as *kyrios* at the beginning of this new section of the narrative, particularly because both characters that use κύριε are part of groups who have not called Jesus κύριε until this point: the *Ioudaioi* and Jesus' twelve disciples.³²⁵ Therefore, the narrator's use of *kyrios* is not an indicator of the secondary nature of the clause.³²⁶ Rather, this occurrence of *kyrios* is a narrative marker which indicates that the reader's attention is drawn to the occurrences of κύριε in chapter 6, as they break new ground in the narrative. The combination of this syntactic feature, the structural feature observed by Schenk, and the evidence of 4:46 and 12:1, confirms that the intrinsic evidence supports εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.

³²⁵ John. H. Bernard, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John* (ed. A. H. McNeile; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1928), 1:55, notes that this is the first time one of the disciples addresses Jesus with *kyrios*.

³²⁶ The text-critical analysis of Marie-Émile Boismard and Arnaud Lamouille, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1965), 3:190, is an important and influential example of seeing the occurrence of *kyrios* as evidence against the authenticity of the final clause of 6:23.

For transcriptional probabilities, the longer reading which includes κύριος could be understood as secondary, being the product of a pious scribe who wanted to enhance the christological content in the passage. However, it is uncertain why this point in the narrative would have been the focus of scribal activity, and not others. If heightened Christology is not a probable reason for the creation of the verse, it is possible that the variant was created to repeat aspects of the language from 6:11 (καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις) which has been described as “almost liturgical” by Brown.³²⁷ At this point the boundary between a scribe and a redactor is blurred; however, the arguments both for and against the potential motivation for adding the verse can be addressed in the same way.

For Brown, the absolute use of εὐχαριστεῖν is key to the association of this passage with church liturgy.³²⁸ However, even in 6:11 εὐχαριστεῖν is used without an explicit object or direct object. As a result, it is unclear why this occurrence would warrant particular criticism. Barrett similarly sees a “precise reference to the Eucharist” in the use of εὐχαριστήσαντος in 6:23.³²⁹ Again, it is not clear why the usage in 6:23 would need to be an addition to the original narrative, but the same verb, used in the same way in 6:11, is not.

Barrett furthers his argument for the secondary nature of the verse by appealing to the singular use of ἄρτον.³³⁰ Schnelle, however, has shown that this usage is also found in 6:31, which shows the singular is not evidence against the verse as a whole.³³¹ Therefore, if 6:11 is accepted as being part of the narrative, there are not convincing arguments for suspecting 6:23 of being the product of a scribe or a redactor.

If the case against a scribal addition of the verse, and the final clause in particular, has been made, it must also be considered how the other variants in the tradition may have been created. In this case, the final clause of 6:23 has been transmitted with substantial variation, and this suggests that some scribes found difficulty with the verse. If, as has been argued so far, εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου, was the earliest reading, this explains the other variations of the clause. In family 1 the reading τοῦ κυρίου εὐχαριστήσαντος may have been produced in order to alert the reader earlier that a switch in agent had taken place since the third personal plural ἔφαγον of the preceding clause. Although the shift in agent is made clear from the singular εὐχαριστήσαντος, this is also changed to εὐχαριστήσαντες in 744 and 1372, indicating that

³²⁷ Brown, *John*, 1:258.

³²⁸ Brown, *John*, 1:258.

³²⁹ Barrett, *John*, 285.

³³⁰ Barrett, *John*, 285.

³³¹ Schnelle, *Antidocetic*, 111.

some scribes expected the verb to continue the description of the actions of the crowd. The resulting εὐχαριστήσαντες τοῦ κυρίου was then understandably changed to εὐχαριστήσαντες τῷ κυρίῳ in 2192, or this may have been a straight change from εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.

The large number of manuscripts that have Ἰησοῦ in place of κυρίου can be explained as increasing the explicitness of the clause, identifying who the κύριος is (Jesus), and also to utilise the overwhelmingly more common title for Jesus when identified by the narrator, rather than the extremely rare κύριος. This change is understandable for a scribe who did not understand the narrative feature involving the use of *kyrios* by the narrator, and the use of κύριε by characters. In addition to understanding these changes, the omission of the entire clause in several manuscripts might be best explained as the action of a scribe who had a tendency to respond freely to perceived difficulties in the text. That scribes found the wording εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου problematic has been demonstrated by the variant forms in which it was transmitted. In the case of 05 and manuscripts that have the same reading, it is possible that one scribe or more encountered a difficult clause, which at the same time did not provide the reader with any greater level of specificity with regard to the location of the miracle, and which could therefore be judged superfluous and excised from the text.

All other readings in the manuscript tradition can therefore be explained as the result of scribes encountering τοῦ κυρίου εὐχαριστήσαντος, which is the earliest recoverable reading, in keeping with its superior external support.

4.5.3. Semantics

There are three occurrences of *kyrios* to be examined to establish their semantic range. In narrative order, the first occurs in the clause εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου (6:23). With regard to the type of discourse, as this is the narrator speaking, it is expected that this usage would allow the reader to recall previous usage of the narrator (4:1), and also with the first reliable character to use the term, John (1:23). This provides a significant precedent for considering the cognitive context for the utterance, as the reader considers that the same *kyrios* that John proclaimed is the same *kyrios* who came through Samaria (4:1) and is now in Galilee (6:23). Another important contextual constraint is the relationship between the narrator and the reader. In this study, it has been argued that the narrator uses *kyrios* to highlight the importance of the term, and to prepare the reader for future uses in the narrative section which follows. With regard to linguistic

context, εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου does not associate Jesus with the miracle in the same way as, for example, the water in Cana (4:46). In fact, Jesus is not directly identified as the one who worked the miracle in the immediate context. Having read εὐχαριστεῖν, however, the reader can recall 6:11, and the miracle narrative more generally. This includes the description of the event as ὁ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον (6:14). Given the combination of these contextual constraints, there does not appear to be any mitigating factors which might affect the expectation that the narrator would continue to use *kyrios* in light of the testimony of John (1:23), and the reader's knowledge of him as the *kyrios* who entered Samaria. Therefore, this suggests that *kyrios* in 6:23 is a reference to Jesus as a supernatural being, in the sense of "a title for God and for Christ."³³²

The crowd is the first character to address Jesus as *kyrios* in chapter 6. When the crowd says κύριε, πάντοτε δὸς ἡμῖν τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον (6:34), this statement is marked by a comprehensive ignorance of Jesus' identity, as has been argued above. Their lack of understanding is so pronounced that there is no contextual justification for seeing the semantic range of κύριε as a supernatural being "who exercises supernatural authority." With regard to the crowd's relationship with Jesus, they have previously considered seizing Jesus to make him king (6:15), searched for him (6:24) and called him rabbi (6:25).³³³ If Jesus were their king, it would be right to understand their use of *kyrios* as acknowledging his authority over them. However, the fact that they themselves planned to seize him (ἀρπάζειν, 6:15), suggests that they sought to impose their will on Jesus, not to submit to his. Furthermore, Jesus rebuffs their seeking and address to him, clarifying the actual reason for them desiring his presence was their full stomachs. Rather than seeking to submit to Jesus' authority, they were attempting to have him meet their needs. As a result, there is no justification for seeing the crowd as acknowledging that Jesus "exercises authority" over them. As a result, the remaining semantic category, which is contextually suitable given that it prefaces a request, is the honorific use of *kyrios* as "a title of respect."³³⁴

³³² L&N 1:139 (12§9).

³³³ L&N 1:739 (87§53). Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 59, argues that *kyrios* here "is more than a low level 'sir', but conveys the idea of 'master.'" Pryor highlights the desire of the crowd to make Jesus king (6:15), and their use of rabbi (6:25) as relevant to making a decision on the meaning of *kyrios* in 6:34, but acknowledges that the crowd is in a "state of regression" (59) and the crowd's use of *kyrios* is "misguided" (60). Jesus' words to the crowd do not appear to signal a shift, but rather reveal that the crowd has had misdirected motives since their first encounter with him. That is, Jesus' pronouncement is retrospective, affecting the reader's understanding of what the crowd has already said and done.

³³⁴ L&N 1:739 (87§53). Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 351, argues that *kyrios* sounds as though it is a respectful form of address, despite the crowd's misdirected desires.

The crowd's use of κύριε is in substantial contrast to that of Peter, who speaks on behalf of the twelve. As established in the character analysis above, in the immediate context of using κύριε, Peter demonstrates that he has believed that Jesus, like the God of Israel, is entirely unique, and as the holy one of God, he has "words of eternal life" (6:68). Immediately after Peter speaks, Jesus states that he is the one who chose the twelve, clarifying further the nature of their relationship. At the same time, Jesus clarifies that Peter speaks on behalf of only ten other disciples, as one of them is a "devil" (6:70). This confirms that for Peter and the other ten disciples, their relationship has developed to one in which Jesus is exercising authority over them, manifest in his authority to choose them.³³⁵ If Jesus' authority over the disciples is established in the narrative, it suggests that the use of κύριε would also reflect this aspect of their relationship which is demonstrated in the immediate context.

It is important to consider at this point whether there is sufficient evidence to understand Peter's statement as reflecting Jesus' identity as a supernatural being "who exercises supernatural authority," as defined by Louw and Nida.³³⁶ Although Jesus' uniqueness is highlighted in the immediate context, this appears to be one of comparison: as the God of Israel is unique, so Jesus is unique. In addition, his identification that Jesus is "of God" associates Jesus with God, and identifies him as one who is sent by God, but not that he has an eternal heavenly origin. Similar usage can be seen in Nicodemus' statement that Jesus is "from God" (3:2). The disciples do at this point appear to be on the cusp of recognising Jesus' identity as a supernatural being, but at the same time there is insufficient evidence from the immediate context to conclude that they have reached the level of understanding shared by the narrator and reader. As a result, the most appropriate semantic category for the disciples' use of κύριε is recognising Jesus as one "who exercises authority," but not as a supernatural being.³³⁷

³³⁵ The immediate context confirms that *kyrios* does not reflect L&N 1:559 (57§12), "one who owns and controls ... servants and slaves." Jesus asks the disciples if they were planning to leave him (6:67), indicating that they were free to leave of their own accord. In addition, Peter's explanation of why the disciples will not leave Jesus is not because he owns or possesses them, but because he has "the words of eternal life" (6:68).

³³⁶ L&N 1:139 (12§9). Köstenberger, *John*, 221: "Lord, which at least means 'Master' and may allude to the name used for God in the LXX." Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 61, argues that "*kyrie* must be given its full weight as in the post-Easter community: Peter addresses Jesus as Lord of the apostolic community for whom he speaks." This evaluation raises the importance of considering a post-resurrection perspective. In the narrative so far, only the reader and the narrator share this. They know that Jesus has revealed his glory, and the reader knows, before reading the narrative, the outline of Jesus' ministry, including his death and resurrection. Peter's use of *kyrios* will affirm a reader who knows of Jesus' resurrection and already confesses that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*. However, within the narrative, Peter is not aware of these realities at this point, so cannot himself manifest a post-resurrection understanding of Jesus. The reader may experience a post-resurrection reading of Peter's words, so that the reader experiences affirmation of the belief that Jesus is the divine and risen *kyrios*. However, the narrative does not call on the reader to impute Peter with this understanding.

³³⁷ L&N 1: 478 (37§51).

This semantic analysis is in keeping with the narrative analysis, from which it can be said that the trajectory of the disciples' journey of recognition is entirely positive.³³⁸ However, it is important to draw a distinction between Peter and John's confessions of chapter 1. In this study, John is seen as a character who from the very beginning of the narrative speaks in unison with the narrator. It is this narrator-level understanding which is evident in the speech of John, but is not evident in the speech of other characters thus far. These cognitive semantic constraints suggest that Peter has not yet recognised Jesus' divine identity. This is due to the lack of evidence in the relationship and cognitive context that Peter understood Jesus in the same terms as John. This is because Peter has not, until this point in the narrative, demonstrated that he believes that Jesus is the *kyrios* in whom the coming of the God of Israel is fulfilled, and in whom the Glory of God is revealed. As a result, his understanding is still distinguished from the reader, the narrator, and John.

4.5.4. Summary

In chapter 6, the beginning of a new period in Jesus' ministry, the narrator (6:23) reminds the reader that the Jesus in the hills of Galilee is the same *kyrios* who entered Samaria (4:1), and the same *kyrios* whom John proclaimed (1:23). This highlights the importance of *kyrios* for the narrative and ensures that the reader pays attention to the usage of *kyrios* in the subsequent narrative. As chapter 6 comes to a close, the reader has followed the complex journey of the crowd that followed Jesus, and whose true identity as the *Ioudaioi* was revealed through their encounters with him. Although identified as disciples, reflecting the fact that they physically followed Jesus, they were not amongst those who believe. Their use of κύριε was superficial, and their speech betrayed their ignorance of who Jesus is. In contrast, the reader was not disappointed to see Peter confess Jesus as κύριε in what serves as the most elevated confession of belief in Jesus at this point in the narrative. This verse, 6:68, also constitutes the first usage of κύριε by a named disciple of Jesus, that is, by one of the twelve. It is right then, that this confession is ascribed to not only Peter, but also the other disciples on whose behalf he speaks. As the reader considers the nature of this confession, with the series (1:23, 4:1, 6:23) of uses that call on their prologue-level understanding of Jesus, there is still a gap between these characters and that which is understood by the narrator. As a result, the reader waits expectantly

³³⁸ Moloney, *John*, 229; Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 63. However, unlike this study, Moloney groups Peter with John (the Baptist).

for the next usage of *kyrios*, and whether further uses indicate an understanding of Jesus equal to that of John (1:23) and the narrator (4:1, 6:23).

4.6. *Kyrios* and the Man Born Blind

4.6.1. Narrative

4.6.1.1. Context

There is a substantial gap in the narrative between the last usage of *kyrios* (6:68) by Peter, and next occurrence of the term, on the lips of the man born blind (9:36). Following the dialogue between Peter and Jesus in Capernaum, the narrative includes Jesus' time in Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles (chapters 7, 8). These two chapters in Jerusalem continue to develop key narrative themes which are relevant for the interpretation of chapter 9, and the use of *kyrios* specifically.

In chapter 7, the reader learns more about the crowd who will be present again in chapter 9. A dynamic that is introduced which hinders belief is that of "fear of the *Ioudaioi*" (7:13). As a result of this fear, "no one spoke openly about" Jesus. In chapter 9, the parents of the man born blind succumb to the same fear (9:22), and, as a result, they seek to avoid being called upon to potentially testify regarding Jesus, and deflect attention from themselves to their son (9:22-23). In contrast to these fear-bound responses, chapter 7 presents Jesus as speaking openly about himself (7:26). In doing so, it becomes clear that despite the cautiousness with which Jesus has conducted his ministry, including avoiding Judaea (7:1), he now acts seemingly without concern for his own safety. The dichotomy between the crowd and Jesus with respect to speaking openly and fear will also be relevant below for the analysis of the character of the man born blind. Specifically, it will need to be established whether he follows the crowd, like his parents, or "follows" Jesus, as one would expect from a disciple, by speaking openly about him.

A second important theme which the reader encounters in chapters 7 and 8 in preparation for chapter 9 is ignorance of Jesus' identity and origin. The crowd is a key character in these chapters who does not know where Jesus is truly from. Having complained in a similar manner to those in Galilee (7:32), the crowd in Jerusalem is expected by the reader to behave in a similar manner to the *Ioudaioi* in Galilee. Although the crowd asserts that they know where Jesus is from (7:27), Jesus' own words to the crowd serve to check their confidence regarding their own knowledge (7:28).

In chapter 6, the crowd appeared to be a singular character that spoke with one voice. From chapter 7, however, the crowd is not unified. Leading up to chapter 9, the reader learns that the crowd is divided in its opinion of Jesus (7:43). In this sense, it is best to recognise that from this stage in the narrative the crowd is a collective plural, rather than a single character, a view which suited the unified actions of the crowd in Galilee. An example of this division is seen in the fact that some of the crowd are said to believe in Jesus. At the same time, however, despite this “belief,” they are still unaware that Jesus is the Christ, and speak expectantly about the coming of the Christ at some point in the future (7:31). As a part of the crowd, the Pharisees are called out specifically for their ignorance of Jesus’ origin (8:14). Jesus further states that they do not know him or his Father (8:19). That this “knowing” is particularly concerned with Jesus’ identity and origin is confirmed when the crowd boldly asks Jesus “who are you?” (8:25). Jesus informs the crowd that their ignorance of his identity is not a result of him having hidden this from them. Rather, Jesus had been telling them who he was “from the beginning” (8:25).³³⁹ This theme continues in chapter 9, as the identity of Jesus continues to be a dominant theme, and serves as the key question in the interaction between the man born blind and the Pharisees, who were singled out from the crowd during chapter 8.

A third theme in chapters 7 and 8 which occurs again in chapter 9 is glorification. There are three key ideas in this section of the narrative which are important for understanding the narrative structure of the Gospel as a whole. First, Jesus does not seek his own glory, but seeks the glory of his Father (7:18, 8:50a). As a corollary to the idea that Jesus is the one who glorifies the Father, Jesus also teaches in his dialogues with the crowd that it is the Father who glorifies him. This second idea is implied in 8:50b and made explicit in 8:54. Third, there is the importance of Jesus’ future glorification (7:39). This is the first time in the narrative that the reader has learnt that Jesus would be glorified in some way in the future.

The introduction of Jesus’ future glorification is significant for understanding Nielsen’s proposal regarding the narrative structure of the Gospel as a whole.³⁴⁰ Although the narrator can say that Jesus “manifested his glory,” for example, in Cana, there is still some sense in which this manifestation of glory is incomplete, as his future glorification had not “yet” occurred (Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη 7:39). The importance of the adverb “yet” (οὐδέπω) is in establishing the reader’s expectation that the fulfilment of Jesus’ glorification would be

³³⁹ This translation is in keeping with ESV NASB NET and NRSV margin. “Why do I speak to you at all?” is the NRSV main text. For a detailed analysis of the grammatical issues in this verse, see Chrys C. Caragounis, “What Did Jesus Mean by τὴν ἀρχὴν in John 8:25?” *NovT* 49 (2007): 129-147.

³⁴⁰ Nielsen “Narrative Structures,” 343-366.

witnessed during the narrative.³⁴¹ This was already implicit in 1:14, as the “we” of the prologue can say that “we have beheld his glory” (ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ).³⁴² This “beholding” does not appear to have taken place before this point in the narrative. In this way, the “beholding” is something that is yet to come.

Chapter 8 closes with a fourth theme which continues to be important for the narrative as a whole: the absolute “I am” self-declarations of Jesus. In 8:58, Jesus says “πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί.”³⁴³ It is preceded by the ἐγὼ εἰμί of 6:20, which was of significance for interpreting the uses of *kyrios* in chapter 6.³⁴⁴ In chapter 9, the same declaration is again relevant for the interpretation of *kyrios*.

In 8:58, Jesus uses a before-after sequencing to establish who is superior, a concept which has been seen already in the narrative, in the dialogue between John and the delegation from Jerusalem.³⁴⁵ In that context, John argued that because Jesus came before him, Jesus is superior to him (1:15, 1:31). Echoing this rhetorical device serves to highlight the ongoing importance of John’s dialogue with the delegation for understanding who Jesus is. As argued throughout this study, when the dialogue between John and the delegation is highlighted or implicitly referred to, it picks up the narrative thread regarding the identity of Jesus as the *kyrios* (1:23). This includes the idea that it is in the person of Jesus that God “comes” into the world, and it is in Jesus that the glory of God is revealed (Isa 40:5,10; John 1:14, 15, 27, 30).

Jesus’ use of ἐγὼ εἰμί in 8:58 also calls on the reader to consider the relationship between Jesus and the God of Israel. In 6:20, the usage of ἐγὼ εἰμί was a key feature of a cluster of verbal parallels between Isaiah 40-55 and John 6. Now, in 8:58, the usage of ἐγὼ εἰμί again appears to reflect themes which are key to Isaiah 40-55 where God speaks of himself with regard to that which is ancient, and that he is first and last (41:4).³⁴⁶ In addition, that God is “from the beginning” (43:13) similarly parallels Jesus’ own statement regarding his pre-incarnational existence, which in turn also agrees with statements at the beginning of the Gospel (1:1-3).³⁴⁷

³⁴¹ On prolepses in the Gospel of John, see Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 56-74.

³⁴² See Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 380-381, for the “‘we’ of authoritative testimony” in 1:14.

³⁴³ Williams, *I Am He*, 275-283, provides a detailed analysis of 8:58 in light of Isaiah 40-55, and also Exodus 3.

³⁴⁴ Whether ἐγὼ εἰμί in 8:24 and 8:28 should be understood absolutely does not affect the argument presented above.

³⁴⁵ This observation is made by Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 856-857.

³⁴⁶ Williams, *I Am He*, 277, notes the importance of 41:4 for the relationship between God’s “past activity” and “divine self-predications.”

³⁴⁷ Williams, *I Am He*, 277-278, examines the connection to Isa 43:13 and also highlights the possible connection to John 8:25.

4.6.1.2. Structure

Until this point in the narrative, it has been argued that, based on the observations of Schenk, *kyrios* occurs in a recurring pattern whereby the narrator's use of *kyrios* is followed by a cluster of addresses to Jesus using the vocative κύριε.³⁴⁸ In chapter four, this was seen when the narrator introduced Jesus as *kyrios*, and then the Samaritan woman used the same term three times during the same part of the narrative, followed by the royal official using the term once and then the man at the pool once. In a similar way, in chapter 6, the narrator's use in 6:23 is followed by the crowd's address to Jesus as κύριε in 6:34 and Peter's confession in 6:68. In those examples, the narrator's use of *kyrios* serves to highlight the term to encourage the reader to notice its ongoing narrative relevance since the first use by John in 1:23.

That first paradigm-setting example at the beginning of the narrative established *kyrios* as a title which will be used in contexts where at least two other features may be present. First, like 1:23, *kyrios* will be closely related to ignorance, misunderstanding and irony. These three features are closely related to the importance of recognising Jesus. Therefore, when a character uses the term, the reader considers to what extent these features are repeated. Second, there is an opportunity for the narrative context to continue foregrounding the importance of the glory of God, which from 1:23 is understood as the same as the glory of Jesus. God comes in the person of Jesus, and the glory of God is the same glory which is seen in Jesus. When a reader sees the narrator calling Jesus *kyrios*, these narrative features return to the fore, primarily to allow the reader to evaluate character usage of the same term. The question for the reader is whether the character has truly beheld the glory (1:18), or has encountered Jesus with something less than the full understanding of his identity manifest in the words of the narrator (1:1, 14, 18) and John (1:23).

It is important to consider whether this interaction between the narrator's and characters' use of *kyrios* continues to function in chapter 9. The last use of *kyrios* by the narrator was 6:23, and now the reader of chapter 9 encounters another character, the man born blind, using the vocative κύριε in 9:36. The question is whether it is reasonable for this structure to be relied upon for a gap of nearly 200 verses (6:24-9:35). From the perspective of the ideal reader, no gap in the narrative, even if it is several chapters, is so great as to prevent a feature of the narrative being relevant for the interpretation of another section of the narrative. In that sense, a 200 verse span, in and of itself, cannot be called upon to argue against the relevance of 6:23 for the

³⁴⁸ Schenk, *Kommentiertes Lexikon*, 245.

interpretation of 9:36. However, the significance of this gap is amplified not only by the length of the gap, but also the geographic and thematic shifts that have taken place in the narrative. Therefore, the absence of *kyrios* from 6:24-9:35 does challenge Schenk's proposal to some degree.

From the perspective of narrative structure, it appears that the otherwise insightful analysis of Schenk may not be as strong at this point of the narrative as for the clearer clustering found in chapter 4 and chapter 6. Rather than analysing the narrator's uses as necessarily bound to a discrete group or string of vocative uses which follow, an alternative interpretation may be able to maintain the benefits of Schenk's proposal whilst also doing justice to the complexity of the distribution of *kyrios* within the narrative. The observation of Schenk that the narrator's use of *kyrios* is connected to characters' use of κύριε is helpful and will be retained. The discrete grouping of a single absolute usage by the narrator with strings or clusters of vocatives is in need of some modification, however, as a result of the complexities encountered in chapter 9.

Schenk's valuable framework can be modified, so that the uses of *kyrios* by the narrator (4:1, 6:23) are seen as picking up a narrative thread that began with the inaugural usage by John (1:23). Each successive use of the term by the narrator picks the thread up again to ensure it stays in the reader's purview. This appears to happen specifically before a new or unique usage of the term. That is, when the narrator uses *kyrios*, the use of the same term by characters can be distinguished from all previous uses in the narrative. In chapter 4, the reader witnesses the first time a character addresses Jesus as *kyrios*. Therefore, the term was highlighted for the reader in 4:1. This same thread is picked up again in 6:23 before two important groups for the narrative, the *Ioudaioi* and the Twelve, use the term for the first time. In each case the reader considers in full what their usage might reveal about their understanding of Jesus' identity. As a result of this highlighting, the reader is encouraged to look for the ways in which the usage of *kyrios* by characters will be in some way unique when compared to previous uses. As the reader gets further away from the last use of *kyrios*, another use by the narrator refocuses the reader's attention on this important narrative thread to prepare for further unique uses.

An implication of this revised perspective on Schenk's framework is the need to rethink the structural dynamics involved in the use of *kyrios* in 9:36. This is because this verse is separated from the other uses of *kyrios* by narrative time, geography and theme. As a result, the reader does not expect a new category of usage of *kyrios* at this point. The narrator has not highlighted the use in this case, so the reader can expect that this usage will fit one of the other uses

previously in the narrative. Increased focus, attention or interpretive effort is not required, and thus there is no need to signal this to the reader by the narrator's use of *kyrios*. Therefore, at this point, Schenk's framework needs to be modified slightly.

Although 6:23 is followed by a cluster of *kyrios* by characters due to the uniqueness of the context in which it is used, 9:36 is not directly connected to 6:23 in the same way. This is because it breaks the pattern of close clustering of character usage of *kyrios* witnessed in chapters 4 and 6. As a result of these factors, the structural features of the narrative indicate that this occurrence of *kyrios* (9:36) will not break new ground, but will fit within the paradigmatic uses already encountered in the narrative. A study of the character of the man born blind will provide further evidence from the narrative to confirm this analysis.

4.6.1.3. Character

The character of the man born blind is seen in his initial response to Jesus' command, his dialogue with the crowd and the Pharisees, and in his subsequent interaction with Jesus.

There are some similarities, and one key difference between the man born blind in chapter 9 and the man at the pool in chapter 5. The man born blind responds to Jesus' command with obedience and his healing followed his obedience (9:7). This is also witnessed in the description of the man at the pool, who also demonstrated obedience to Jesus' word. Following his healing, the man born blind is not ashamed to identify himself as the one who had been healed (9:9). When asked how he could see, (9:10, 15), he narrates in chronological order the events that led up to his healing, including Jesus' actions (9:11, 15). As with the man at the pool in chapter 5, there does not appear to be sufficient reason within the narrative to suspect the man born blind of ill motive in reporting that it was Jesus himself who performed the healing. Rather, the same order of events is seen. As the healing of the man at pool led to Jesus coming into conflict with the religious authorities, this is also the case with the healing of the man born blind. In contrast to these similarities, a significant difference with the narrative of the man at the pool is that in chapter 9, the man born blind is aware of Jesus' name from the beginning of his interaction with the crowd. However, more important than knowing Jesus' name is knowing who he is, his origin and his identity.

The man's interaction leads some of the Pharisees to recognise that Jesus was the agent involved in the healing (9:16), although they are divided regarding the lawfulness of his actions.

Finally, the unqualified “Pharisees” acknowledge that Jesus is in fact the one who opened his eyes (ἠνέφξεν ... τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς 9:17). The ongoing questioning of the man born blind provides an opportunity for him to identify Jesus publicly as a prophet (9:17). Following this, the man’s initial hesitation to challenge the Pharisees’ accusation that Jesus was a “sinner” (9:25) is overshadowed when he argues that it is impossible for Jesus to be a sinner, and instead declares that, despite the Pharisees’ ignorance regarding Jesus’ origin, he must be “from God” (παρὰ θεοῦ 9:31-33).

In this final declaration, which constitutes the most developed confession of the man during his interaction with the Pharisees, he also highlights the uniqueness of his healing. This suggests he understands that Jesus is likewise unique, owing to the extraordinary nature of his healing power. Even before this point, the man’s hearers could identify him as a disciple of Jesus (9:28), which had been implied by the man’s question to the Pharisees “You do not *also* want to become his disciples, do you?” (9:27). The *also* (μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς) of this question suggests that the man may have been implying that he considered himself Jesus’ disciple at that stage.³⁴⁹ In addition, he never challenges the Pharisees’ labelling him a disciple, and the development of his declarations regarding Jesus following 9:27 suggest that he affirmed what the Pharisees had asserted; he considered himself a follower of Jesus. As a follower of Jesus, he has likewise spoken openly, without the fear that is seen in his parents’ refusal to speak publicly about Jesus.

The next interaction between Jesus and the man born blind is in 9:35-38. Verse 38 has been transmitted with significant variation in the manuscript tradition, and so will not be relied upon in this analysis of the man’s character. The key textual question is whether the description of the man worshiping Jesus is part of the narrative of the Gospel of John. What can be concluded from the dialogue as found in 9:35-37 is that when Jesus asks the man if he believes in the Son of Man, the man is not aware that Jesus is the Son of Man (9:35-36).³⁵⁰ Until this point in the narrative, the reader has been made aware that “the Son of Man” is the one on whom “the angels of heaven” (1:51) will ascend and descend, that he is the one who “has descended from heaven” (3:13; 6:62), who executes judgement (5:27), gives eternal life (6:27, 53), and who will be “lifted up” (3:13; 8:28). The combined effect of these statements is that, unlike the man born blind, the reader is aware that the Son of Man is a title Jesus uses in close association with his heavenly origin and destination, and his mission to both judge and save.

³⁴⁹ Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, 176.

³⁵⁰ For an analysis of 9:35, see Francis J Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man* (Rome: LAS, 1978), 142-159, and Benjamin E. Reynolds, *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 175-189.

In addition to demonstrating his ignorance regarding Jesus' identity as the Son of Man, he also demonstrates that he is ready to believe in the Son of Man, as soon as he is made aware of who he is (9:36). In the undisputed textual tradition, Jesus then responds by informing the man that the one speaking with him is the Son of Man (9:37). Jesus then describes the purpose of his ministry as being that the blind may see (9:39). This appears to be speaking of belief in Jesus, or awareness of one's need to follow Jesus. Jesus' words confirm that the man born blind has come to believe in Jesus, and that he is in fact one of his followers. Whether this understanding of the man's character will be modified by the inclusion of 9:38 will be addressed in the text-critical analysis and summary below.

4.6.1.4. Irony

Irony in this section of the narrative is again tied to the word *kyrios*. As the man born blind confesses that he does not know that Jesus is the Son of Man, he at the same time rightly calls him κύριε.³⁵¹ As surveyed in the character analysis above, the use of Son of Man in the narrative is closely associated with Jesus' heavenly origin. The reader would see then that the use of κύριε here is ironic, knowing that Jesus truly is the *kyrios* who had come into the world from heaven (1:9, 1:23), although the man does not recognise this. That is, in one sentence, the man both confirms his ignorance of Jesus' heavenly origin, yet at the same time addresses him as though he knows of it.

Despite this ignorance, the man does acknowledge that Jesus is *παρὰ θεοῦ* which could indicate that he knew Jesus had, in fact, descended from heaven. In this case, however, the use of “*παρὰ θεοῦ*” by the blind man is not necessarily evidence that the man believed that Jesus had come “from God.” Instead, considering his ignorance of Jesus' heavenly origin as the Son of Man, it is most likely being used in the same way Nicodemus could describe Jesus as *ὑπὸ θεοῦ* (3:2) to affirm that his ministry derived from God's authority, and that his activity in this world had God's approval.

The use of κύριε then is another example in the narrative of a character addressing Jesus correctly as *kyrios* whilst being ignorant of a key aspect of his origin and identity. The reader is

³⁵¹ Steyn, "Jesus as Κύριος," 151, argues for irony of identity in this example, drawing on the case established by Duke, *Irony*, 123.

able to see that again a character uses the right vocabulary, but falls short of the understanding of Jesus as *kyrios* that the narrator has shared from the beginning of the narrative (1:23).

4.6.1.5. Point of View

The key issue of the narrative's flesh-glory paradigm is again relevant to the interpretation of the use of *kyrios* in this scene. Although the words "glory" and "flesh" do not appear in chapter 9, the narrator's point of view regarding Jesus' revelation of his glory in his flesh is evidenced in the interactions between the man born blind and other characters.

When the reader first encounters the man born blind, an obvious corollary to his blindness is that he is unable to see Jesus' flesh. The question then must be addressed as to how he would be able to see Jesus' glory if he cannot see the flesh in which Jesus reveals his glory. This question allows the reader to consider how the "we" of 1:14 beheld Jesus' glory, and to what extent beholding was a function of the eyes. However, whether the man born blind would be able to see Jesus' glory whilst his eyes were still "closed" becomes an obsolete question once his eyes have been opened. This miracle, this sign, of opening the man's eyes provides an opportunity for the reader to consider the flesh-glory paradigm. First, when Jesus opened the man's eyes, the man was able to see Jesus' flesh. This is fulfilled in 9:35, when Jesus finds the man again and enables him to see Jesus face-to-face. Second, opening the man's eyes was a sign, and this was a further opportunity for Jesus' glory to be manifested. However, as the narrative continues, it becomes clear that having eyes that function does not enable someone to see who Jesus truly is.

4.6.2. Textual Criticism

There is one textual variant in chapter 9 which is relevant to the study of *kyrios* in the narrative, the inclusion or exclusion of 9:38, and the first four words of 9:39. In 9:36, Jesus asks the man who had been healed if he believes in the Son of Man. The man replies by asking who the Son of Man is, so that he might "believe in him." Jesus then informs the man that the one speaking to him is the Son of Man. At that point, the following text is omitted from some witnesses: ὁ δὲ ἔφη· πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ. Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. In manuscripts where these words are omitted, Jesus' speech continues in 9:39 with "for judgement I have come into this

world.” This shorter text, then, does not include an explicit resolution to the question of the man’s faith and no explicit account of him believing in Jesus or worshipping him, with no reference to the healed man following Jesus’ declaration that he is the Son of Man.

The external evidence for both the longer and shorter readings includes diverse and early witnesses. Greek manuscripts which include 9:38-39a include \mathfrak{P}^{66} , Vaticanus, the second hand of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Bezae, family 1, family 13 and the Byzantine tradition. Versional support includes the Vulgate Tradition, a number of Old Latin witnesses, the entire Syriac tradition, the majority of Sahidic Manuscripts and the Bohairic tradition. In addition to continuous text manuscripts, Patristic evidence for the longer reading includes Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril and Augustine. Although far less numerous, the support for the omission includes \mathfrak{P}^{75} , the first hand of Sinaiticus, Washingtonius, but with no minuscule or patristic support. Versional evidence is limited to one clear Old Latin witness (b), and a second which has been corrected extensively, but appears to support the shorter reading in its earliest form (l). There are three Coptic manuscripts with the shorter reading: the Lycopolitan, a major Sahidic manuscript (sa¹), and the Middle Egyptian Fayumic.

In viewing this external evidence, based upon Epp’s categories, the longer reading has clearly superior support, exceeding the quality and variety of support in all categories except the Greek Papyri, which are divided between \mathfrak{P}^{75} and \mathfrak{P}^{66} . Both readings appear to have been in circulation early and in a variety of locations, with the longer reading clearly emerging as the dominant form of the text in all languages. Although the support for the longer reading is more diverse in the earliest stages of the manuscript tradition, the strength and diversity of the manuscript evidence for the shorter reading is also impressive.

With respect to transcriptional probabilities, the key question to address is whether it is more likely that scribes would deliberately add 9:38 or remove it, as there does not appear to be any substantive reason for understanding how 9:38-39a could be accidentally omitted. In favour of the verse being deliberately omitted, it has been proposed that some scribes would not have understood how the narrative could coherently present the Son of Man being worshiped.³⁵² Because the title was widely understood as emphasizing the humanity, it would be incongruous that his humanity could be emphasized in the title, immediately followed by his divinity being emphasized when he is worshiped. As a result, it is thought that scribes might remove the

³⁵² Martijn Steegen, "To Worship the Johannine 'Son of Man'. John 9,38 as Refocusing on the Father." *Bib* 91 (2010): 534-554.

description of the healed man's worship of Jesus to restore coherence to a narrative which emphasized Jesus' humanity in the title Son of Man.³⁵³

There are significant challenges to this proposal. First, it is not clear why this instance of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου would have been the focus of scribal activity when other uses throughout the narrative include Jesus receiving other things which are rightly due to deity alone alongside the use of the same title. For example, the Son of Man has "descended out of heaven" (3:13), and is given the right to judge (5:27). In those places, the title and the description of divine actions are intact in the same witnesses which omit the phrase in 9:39. Second, as argued by Calvin Porter, if the worship of Jesus were a reason for scribal activity in this passage, it does not justify the excision of all of 9:38 and 9:39a.³⁵⁴ In ὁ δὲ ἔφη· πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ, it would only have been necessary to omit καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ. As a result, this proposed motivation does not explain the manuscript tradition for 9:35-39. The combination of these factors undermines the proposal that the worship of the Son of Man led to the omission of 9:38-39a.

Another proposal for the omission is presented by Metzger, who argues that scribes may have deleted 9:38-39a in order to bring unity to Jesus' teaching, which is interrupted by the man's confession and act of worship. By doing so, scribes united Jesus' self-identification as the Son of Man and his role as judge, two concepts that have already been connected in the narrative.³⁵⁵ There are two responses to this argument, one positive, and one negative. First, it is true that the resultant text, without the 9:38-39a, does unite Jesus' teaching on the Son of Man as judge, and allows his self-identification to be immediately followed with clarifying statements regarding what it means to be the Son of Man. This observation is particularly important for evaluating the intrinsic probabilities for the shorter text as well. Despite the attractiveness of the resultant text, which connects from 9:37 to 9:39b, there is a significant reason to doubt that this shorter text is the result of scribal activity. Namely, it seems unlikely that a scribe would intentionally remove a significant event in the narrative, particularly when this event is veneration of Jesus, if the goal were merely strengthening the rhetorical impact of Jesus' words.

³⁵³ Steegen, "To Worship," 542-543, proposes that the same motivation led other scribes to modify the title itself, from ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. With "Son of God" being understood as emphasizing Jesus' deity, this change ensured that both 9:35 and 9:38 were in agreement that the divinity of Jesus was being emphasized in this passage. However, this change is more easily understood in the immediate context as scribes completing ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ so that it became a title that was more common in early Christianity. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that a scribe who had not yet copied 9:38 would be influenced by its contents when copying 9:35. It is more likely that the content of 9:35 would affect the scribe's actions when copying the later verse, 9:38.

³⁵⁴ Calvin L. Porter, "John IX. 38, 39a: A Liturgical Addition to the Text." *NTS* 13 (1967): 387-394 (389).

³⁵⁵ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 195.

A stronger case than the one proposed by Metzger is required to support the idea that a scribe, or multiple scribes, would excise this section of the narrative. The reason that a more significant argument is required in this case is that the claim that a scribe would omit something which significantly modifies the narrative is more substantial than textual variation witnessed elsewhere in the narrative thus far. For example, previously in this study, it was argued that part of 6:23 was omitted in part due to it being considered redundant, as the omitted clause repeated something which had elsewhere been described in the narrative (Jesus giving thanks), and the clause provided information which was already made explicitly available in the narrative previously. In the case of 9:38, however, there is never a mention of the man worshipping Jesus, nor explicit confirmation that he believed. Rather, this must be inferred from the narrative which precedes and follows the verse in question. As a result, it seems improbable that a scribe would resort to such drastic measures to establish or restore the unity of Jesus' discourse.

If the case for a scribe excising 9:38-9:39a from the narrative is not convincing, there remains the question of possible reasons for the addition of the verse to the manuscript tradition. The most comprehensive case for the secondary nature of 9:38-39a has been made by Calvin Porter, who built on a historical reconstruction first proposed by Raymond Brown.³⁵⁶ The essence of the proposal is that 9:38-39a was first composed as a result of the liturgical use of John 9 in baptismal contexts. The evidence in favour of Porter's argument is as follows. First, 9:39 started a new section in at least two different lectionary systems.³⁵⁷ Second, that the text was susceptible to expansion in liturgical contexts is demonstrated by lectionary 253. Following verse 37, this lectionary reads "and he said, 'Yes, Lord, I believe that you are the son of God who is coming into the world.'" That this may have been due to the use of the text in liturgical settings for baptism is supported by the use of the story in a text by Ambrose regarding candidates for baptism, and also in early Christian art.³⁵⁸ Other uses of the account of the man born blind in earlier Christian writers demonstrate the wide-spread use of the passage in early Christian discourse.³⁵⁹ The individual pieces of evidence combine to suggest that Porter's proposal is historically plausible.

In response to the case against the longer reading, Metzger raises "the question whether such liturgical influence would have been likely as early" as the earliest external support.³⁶⁰ In this

³⁵⁶ Porter "John IX. 38, 39a," 390-394. Brown, *John*, 1:375.

³⁵⁷ Porter "John IX. 38, 39a," 393.

³⁵⁸ Porter "John IX. 38, 39a," 394.

³⁵⁹ Porter "John IX. 38, 39a," 394.

³⁶⁰ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 195, mentions \mathfrak{P}^{75} at this point, but as \mathfrak{P}^{75} does not include 9:38-39a, it seems his comment is intended to refer to \mathfrak{P}^{66} , which has the longer reading.

regard, if the 9:38-39a is a scribal addition, it would be important to consider whether the liturgical influence proposed by Brown and Porter would have been possible when \mathfrak{B}^{66} was copied. This is an example where the dates for \mathfrak{B}^{66} and \mathfrak{B}^{75} are relevant for evaluating evidence for variant readings. As the dating of both manuscripts is currently an open question in textual criticism, their early dates will not be assumed in the evaluation of this variant. As a result, \mathfrak{B}^{66} might not be the earliest evidence for the longer reading at this point.

For versional support, 9:38-39a is found in the Old Syriac, Old Latin and in the Sahidic tradition, which represent the earliest non-Greek witnesses to the New Testament. Due to this, it is still important to consider the objection which Metzger raises, namely, whether the liturgical factors proposed by Porter could have been active prior to the earliest evidence for the longer reading. The textual evidence which Porter presents suggests that this passage influenced Christian belief about baptism at least in the fourth century with Ambrose. Furthermore, Porter argues that the evidence of catacomb art suggests that the association of this passage of the Gospel of John with baptism goes back to at least the third, and possibly the second century.³⁶¹ This indicates that although the transcriptional probabilities for omitting the text are not convincing, there is a plausible theory for explaining the addition of the passage to the manuscript tradition.

Intrinsic probabilities can now be considered to evaluate the validity of the longer and shorter reading. In this regard, Porter presents two stylistic challenges for the inclusion of 9:38-9:39a.³⁶² First is the use of $\xi\phi\eta$, which elsewhere appears only in 1:23. Although this word is admittedly rare in John, this is not an argument against the authenticity of this verse. The occurrence in 1:23 is undisputed, so 9:38 cannot be ruled out for having a word which was demonstrably within the author's lexical range.

A second stylistic challenge to the authenticity of the verse is the use of the first person singular present indicative active $\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$. Porter argues that this form of the verb is not consistent with the style of the author in the rest of the Gospel.³⁶³ However, methodologically, the expectation that the Gospel must contain the exact form of any verb more than once is unreasonably restrictive, and in this example also proves to be unconvincing in light of the usage of the verb elsewhere in the narrative. The present tense form of $\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ is common in the Gospel of John, and even occurs in personal declarations of faith, when the Samaritans (4:42) and when

³⁶¹ Porter "John IX. 38, 39a," 393.

³⁶² Porter "John IX. 38, 39a," 389-390.

³⁶³ Porter "John IX. 38, 39a," 389-390.

the disciples (16:30) confess their faith in Jesus. With regard to the uniqueness of the form πιστεύω itself, the only other personal declaration by an individual which includes the verb πιστεύειν is Martha's confession of faith in 11:27. In that case, the verb is the perfect πεπίστευκα, the only time that form appears in the Gospel. In the same way πεπίστευκα is not doubted due to its rarity in the Gospel, πιστεύω is not ruled out due to the uniqueness of its form. In fact, of the four other personal confessions using the first person of πιστεύειν, there are two present tense forms (both plurals 4:42, 16:30) and two perfects (6:69 plural, 11:27 singular). Therefore, the case for the present tense form could be considered in keeping with authorial tendencies as much as the perfect.³⁶⁴ On stylistic grounds, there is no valid reason to doubt the authenticity of the verse.

In favour of the inclusion of 9:38-39a is the observation that the use of *kyrios* twice with more than one meaning is consistent with the author's use of double meaning. If 9:38 were included, then the man would preface his confession of ignorance with κύριε, and then preface his confession of belief with the same word.³⁶⁵ However, in the Gospel of John, rather than using a word twice with two clearly distinct senses, the author appears to use different methods to engage with double meanings.³⁶⁶ The first is when two different words that semantically overlap are used in close proximity, such as the use of ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν in 21:15-17.³⁶⁷ The second is when a single word has multiple senses. In this case, it can be used ambiguously, so that the characters and even the reader are not certain which is the intended sense. This occurs, for example, when Jesus uses ἄνωθεν with Nicodemus (3:3, 7). In the case of 9:36, 38, however, there is a single word with two distinct senses, without ambiguity or confusion for the characters or reader. Instead, the immediate context provides sufficient evidence for the reader to distinguish between the first and second use without difficulty.

³⁶⁴ It could even be argued that the present tense form is more appropriate in this case than the perfect, as there the man's confession does not evidence development, as can be seen in other characters. This is because his confession appears to be a faith response to Jesus' immediately preceding self-identification as the Son of Man. As a result, there is no need to reflect perfective aspect at this point, as would be included in a perfect tense form. Rather, an imperfective-only tense form is more appropriate given the immediate context. For this understanding of the aspect, see Nicholas Ellis, et al., "The Greek Verbal System and Aspectual Prominence: Revising our Taxonomy and Nomenclature." *JETS* 59 (2016): 33-62.

³⁶⁵ Andy M. Reimer, "The Man Born Blind: True Disciple of Jesus." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 428-438 (434) refers to the "double entendre" relevant to understanding the two occurrences of *kyrios* in 9:36 and 9:38 as "a respectful address ... becomes a theologically rich confession." However, not all are convinced that *kyrios* is used strategically in 9:38. Theobald, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes: Kapitel 1-12*, 655, argues that *kyrios* is merely a title of respect, concurring with the assessment of Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:254, who argued that the title has "no Christological significance."

³⁶⁶ Wead, *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*, 30: "The author uses words with two meanings both of which may be applicable. He probably did not intend to present an either/or situation wherein commentators and Christians must make a choice of one meaning. He intended a unique situation where both meanings of the word apply."

³⁶⁷ For a recent article that seeks to solve this long-standing "puzzle," see John A. L. Lee, "The Puzzle of John 21:15-17." *NovT* 59 (2017): 27-30.

Another consideration is how the scenes that precede and follow 9:38 are affected by the omission or inclusion of the verse. In this regard, Larsen questions how Jesus' statement regarding sight for those who do not see (9:39) can be understood if the man born blind does not worship Jesus in 9:38.³⁶⁸ It is true that the man's worship of Jesus would provide explicit evidence for a second layer of meaning of Jesus' ministry, namely that "those who do not see may see."³⁶⁹ However, this does not mean that 9:38 is a necessary component of the narrative. In contrast, by focusing on the faith of the blind man, the reader's attention could be drawn away from a key narrative thread in chapters 8-10. As Michael Theophilos argues, without 9:38, the importance of the controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees, raised in chapter 8, and continued in chapter 10, appropriately remains in focus, rather than the man's faith.³⁷⁰

An important question is whether the man's actions constitute worship. If so, προσκυνεῖν is used to acknowledge that Jesus is divine. Some commentators do not see the man's actions as constituting worship of Jesus.³⁷¹ However, the combination of the use of *kyrios* with προσκυνεῖν in 9:38 suggests that the man's actions are being directed at an individual whom he believes is divine.³⁷² Although προσκυνεῖν can be used in multiple ways, in the Gospel of John, it is exclusively used with reference to God, and when used without an explicit object, God is the implied object (4:21, 22, 23, 24; 12:20).³⁷³ Support for this understanding is found in Brown's observation that the man's actions parallel the standard response to a theophany in the Old Testament.³⁷⁴ If 9:38 does portray the man as honouring Jesus as a divine being, the next question to consider is whether this fits within the narrative structure.

³⁶⁸ Larsen, *Recognizing*, 159.

³⁶⁹ Smith, *John*, 200: "Jesus giving sight to this one blind person symbolizes his role as the giver of light and sight to all who believe."

³⁷⁰ Michael P. Theophilos, "An Assessment of the Authenticity of John 9:38-39a." *AEJT* 19 (2012): 73-85 (79).

³⁷¹ For example, Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:254, understands that the action is conceivable within the narrative, and argues that it does not constitute worship, but expresses "honour due to the God-sent bringer of salvation." Further, he does not consider the use of *kyrios* in 9:38 as noteworthy, but considers it "a simple form of address with no Christological significance."

³⁷² Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 339, argues that προσκυνεῖν "here denotes ... homage and reverence ... paid to the 'Son of Man' as a divine figure." Haenchen, *John*, 2:42: "The man who was healed responds with a confession of faith in the Lord and an act of worship: he prostrates himself before Jesus and worships him." Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 129, argues that "the man bows down before Jesus in an act of worship and acceptance of Jesus."

³⁷³ Porter "John IX. 38, 39a," 390, notes that the collocation of προσκυνεῖν with Jesus as its object is unique in the Gospel. Larsen, *Recognising the Stranger*, 159, hints at this problem by noting that the man's reaction to Jesus' revelation is "not typically Johannine." However, although προσκυνεῖν is elsewhere used with God (the Father) as the object, this does not preclude the presentation of a character worshipping Jesus. In fact, due to the patterns observed in the narrative thus far whereby Jesus does things that the Father does, the reader might even expect that Jesus would receive worship at some point. However, the worship of Jesus at this stage of the narrative is unexpected. In this case, the problem is not *that* the worship of Jesus takes place, but *when* it takes place.

³⁷⁴ Brown, *John*, 1:376: "This is the standard OT reaction to a theophany (Gen xvii 3)." Bennema, *Encountering*, 254, argues that *kyrios* means "Lord," and that the man's physical response to Jesus' revelation is "an act of worship." Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 63, also sees this as "worship of God in and through the person of Jesus." Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 2:437, is emphatic: "Because this is an expression of belief in the divinity of Jesus, the meaning intended is surely 'Lord' in the religious sense."

With respect to 9:38 in the narrative structure, Theophilus considers the development of the narrative sequentially, particularly with regard to characters' understanding of Jesus. His argument against the authenticity of 9:38 is convincing, because it identifies incongruity between the trajectory of the whole narrative and this scene in particular. This also concurs with Nielsen's, Culpepper's and Smith's understanding of the narrative structure of the Gospel of John.³⁷⁵ Their perspective, and that of this thesis, is that the resurrection is a key turning point in the narrative before which no one truly sees Jesus' glory. That is, no one reaches a fullness of understanding regarding his divine identity until he has appeared to them after the resurrection. In a similar way, Theophilus views the confession of Thomas (20:28) as a climax in the narrative towards which the reader has been journeying.³⁷⁶ He identifies that it is after the resurrection that full awareness of Jesus' identity is witnessed. Therefore, the account of someone worshiping Jesus at this early point in the narrative appears out of place, interrupting the pattern of incomplete understanding manifested by all other characters until this point.³⁷⁷

The modified version of Schenk's framework used in this thesis is also relevant for evaluating the intrinsic probabilities of 9:38. As there is no use of *kyrios* by the narrator in chapter 9, the reader does not expect a character to use the vocative in a new way. If 9:38 were part of the Gospel, then *kyrios* would be used in a new way, as a character uses the vocative whilst acknowledging that Jesus is divine for the first time in the narrative. Therefore, because of the patterns established in chapter 4 and 6, the use of *kyrios* in a new way in 9:38 is improbable.

With the external and internal evidence evaluated, it is now possible to draw together the above evidence to make a decision on this variant. With regard to external support, strong, early and diverse manuscripts demonstrate that 9:38 was wide spread at an early stage in the manuscript tradition. The external support for the omission is less impressive, but due to the range of manuscripts which evidence the omission, a final decision must take into account internal evidence in favour of the longer or shorter reading. In this regard, there is no reason to suspect that the verse was omitted accidentally, and proposals for the deliberate omission of the verse are not convincing. However, a plausible historical reconstruction provides a conceivable

³⁷⁵ Nielsen "Narrative Structures," 363; Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 83; Smith, *John*, 223.

³⁷⁶ Theophilus, "An Assessment," 79.

³⁷⁷ Theophilus, "An Assessment," 79. Smith, *John*, 199, sees that, in 9:38, "Jesus is recognized for who he truly is. In effect, we suddenly shift to a postresurrection perspective." Smith's observation is significant, and supports the case that 9:38 does not "fit" in the pre-resurrection narrative. The impact that accepting 9:38 has on the narrative structure is highlighted when considering the interpretation of Lincoln, *Saint John*, 287, and Udo Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2016), 225, who both see the man in 9:38 as demonstrating a recognition comparable to that of Thomas in 20:28. This results in a flattening of the narrative structure, whereby the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus lead to the same level of recognition witnessed in the pre-resurrection narrative.

context in which 9:38-9:39a might have been added to the manuscript tradition. Further strengthening the case for the shorter text is the significant weight of the narrative structure of the Gospel of John. It is this final argument which suggests most convincingly that the verse is not part of the narrative. Combined with the early and diverse external support, and transcriptional probabilities, the shorter reading is preferred.

4.6.3. Semantics

With the text-critical analysis complete, there is one use of *kyrios* that is in need of semantic analysis, the vocative κύριε of 9:36. As in previous semantic analyses, the relationship context will be of considerable importance for identifying the semantic range of the term at this point of the narrative. In the character analysis above, it was argued that the man progressively revealed that he had become a follower of Jesus, believing that Jesus' unique healing power was evidence that he was sent by God and ministered in God's authority. His implicit affirmation that he is a disciple suggests that the man also believed Jesus exercised this authority over him specifically.³⁷⁸

To analyse further the meaning of κύριε in 9:36, it is necessary to consider the linguistic context. This consists of the words spoken before and after κύριε, in the immediate context of the utterance. The use of κύριε in this immediate context, as argued above, introduces the man's unknowing admission of his ignorance regarding Jesus' true identity. In fact, his request for further information appears to be decidedly not about Jesus at all, but rather a request to identify who the "Son of Man" is, that he might believe in him. Despite this, the man is ready to trust Jesus' word, and his readiness to follow Jesus' directions and believe in the Son of Man is a further development of his identity as a disciple who is ready to submit to Jesus' authority.³⁷⁹ There is, however, no evidence in this context that the man considered Jesus a supernatural being. Rather, the fact that he did not know that Jesus is the Son of Man who came from heaven is further evidence that he was ignorant of Jesus' true supernatural identity. Therefore, considering both the relationship context and the linguistic context, the most appropriate semantic category for the use of κύριε in 9:36 is one "who rules or exercises authority."³⁸⁰

³⁷⁸ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 60: "it is certainly more than an honorific 'sir', for the man has cast in his lot with Jesus."

³⁷⁹ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 60, argues that the man "is certainly open to whatever he might have to say." Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, 350: "The respectful sir (cf. 4.19) is the attitude of the disciple, ready to receive the master's teaching."

³⁸⁰ L&N 1:478 (37§51). Brown, *John*, 1:191 mentions that "*kyrios* means both 'sir' and 'lord'; perhaps the latter is meant here."

4.6.4. Summary

The reader of the encounter between Jesus and the man born blind cannot but consider its similarities with the scenes at the pool in chapter 5. Two men, whose lives had been affected greatly by their respective infirmities, encountered Jesus, who made them both whole. Both men, in different ways, identify that Jesus is the one who made them well, and both men call Jesus κύριε in a way that reveals that their understanding of Jesus' identity is incomplete.

Unlike the man at the pool, however, the man born blind makes explicit declarations regarding Jesus' identity, acknowledging that he exercises a unique authority as one who ministers with God's approval. Unashamed to be associated with Jesus, even as a disciple, he follows his master in speaking boldly, and demonstrates that he was given sight in more ways than one.

Although the narrative does not include an explicit description of his response to Jesus' self-identification as the Son of Man, the reader is able to depend on Jesus' testimony, a testimony which cannot be surpassed. If the reader requires confirmation regarding how the man's faith in Jesus developed, Jesus' declaration is unambiguous: he was blind, and he now sees. The distance from the previous uses of *kyrios* by the narrator indicates that this use of κύριε does not break new ground, and does not establish a new category in the narrative. Like the Samaritan woman, the royal official and Peter, this man is another character who has used κύριε to address Jesus with incomplete knowledge of his identity, while being affirmed within the narrative as one who believes.

4.7. Kyrios Gives Life

4.7.1. Narrative

4.7.1.1. Context

Leading up to chapter 11, Jesus emphasises his role as the giver of life (10:28). This emphasis picks up a narrative thread that started in the prologue, where Jesus is described as the one in whom life is (1:4). The same theme is encountered in Jerusalem, following the healing of the man at the pool (5:21) and also in the discourse in Galilee (6:33). As chapter 11 is a demonstration of Jesus' identity as the giver of life, this section of the narrative is important for the reader's understanding of Jesus' identity.

The reader has benefited from a number of clarifying statements regarding Jesus' identity as the life-giver. At the beginning of the narrative, the reader learns that life was in the Word prior to his incarnation (1:4). That is, the fact that Jesus has "life in himself" (5:26) is not a development since his incarnation, nor something which awaits fulfilment, but was a feature of his identity before he was sent. Second, the reader has learnt that Jesus has drawn a comparison between his role as life-giver now, and in the future (5:25). Third, Jesus' role as life-giver is closely related to his unity with the Father. In 1:1, this is expressed by him sharing the title θεός with the Father. In 5:21, Jesus' ability to give life is linked to him doing what his Father, God, does. In 6:32-33, the importance of him coming from the Father in heaven is emphasised. In 10:28, his self-identification as the giver of eternal life is followed by him explicitly declaring his unity with the Father, which leads to the charge of blasphemy (10:30, 33). From this, the reader knows that "the life that Jesus brings is 'eternal' in the sense that it is a quality belonging only to God."³⁸¹ As a result, the reader and the narrator share the understanding that Jesus' role is due to his unity with the Father.

For the purposes of this study, it is significant that the three characters who address Jesus as *kyrios* in chapter 11 all reveal in different ways their confidence in Jesus' ability to raise the dead in the present. That is, they demonstrate their understanding of both Jesus' identity as the life-giver, and the nature of his ministry. As a result, the importance of Jesus' identity as the life-giver will serve as an important indicator for evaluating the use of *kyrios* with respect to Jesus' identity and characters' understanding of him.

4.7.1.2. Structure

The account of the raising of Lazarus can be divided into five subsections, followed by a conclusion (43-54).³⁸² In all five subsections, *kyrios* occurs in the manuscript tradition at least once. The introduction (11:1-5) includes one use of *kyrios* by the narrator (11:2). Also within the introduction is the first vocative, used when Mary and Martha call on Jesus to come to Bethany because their brother is ill (11:3). The next subsection, which includes a dialogue between Jesus and the disciples (11:6-16), includes one use of the vocative by the disciples, who speak as a collective (11:12). During the encounter between Jesus and Martha which follows

³⁸¹ Hylen, *Imperfect Believers*, 80.

³⁸² The structure presented here follows Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 10-11.

(11:17-27), there is one occurrence in the manuscript tradition (11:21) which will not be relied upon in the narrative analysis due to textual variation.³⁸³ Also during Martha's dialogue with Jesus, Martha addresses Jesus as *kyrios* (11:27) preceding a significant christological confession. In the next subsection (11:28-37), Mary addresses Jesus as *kyrios* (11:32) and an unidentified group addresses Jesus with the vocative in 11:34. In the final and climactic subsection of the account, during which Lazarus is raised from the dead (11:38-44), there is one occurrence of *kyrios* which requires further textual analysis to determine its authenticity (11:39). It precedes Martha's statement that Lazarus had been in the tomb for four days before Jesus had come. Every character who speaks to Jesus in the chapter addresses him as *kyrios*, and this ensures that the importance of this thread is not lost as the reader moves through this portion of the narrative.

As a result of considering the structure of chapter 11, it can be seen that *kyrios* is a feature throughout this section of narrative. Importantly, the narrator's use of *kyrios* at the beginning of the chapter continues the pattern witnessed in chapter 4 and 6. Being positioned at the beginning of this section, it ensures that the importance of *kyrios* is highlighted. Due to this highlighting, the narrative thread of *kyrios* is once again picked up following a whole chapter (10) which did not contain a reference to Jesus as *kyrios*.³⁸⁴ When the narrator uses *kyrios*, this signals that the reader pays particular attention to the use of the term by characters in this section of the narrative. In chapter 11, this is due to *kyrios* being used for the first time by named characters outside of the Twelve.

4.7.1.3. Character

4.7.1.3.1. The Disciples

The disciples are the first characters to call Jesus *kyrios* in chapter 11. They have appeared only briefly in the narrative since Peter called Jesus *kyrios* in 6:68, addressing Jesus as *rabbi* in 9:2. In chapter 11, they again call Jesus *rabbi*, questioning Jesus' decision to return to Judaea, with an overt concern for Jesus' safety. Their next contribution to the conversation also appears to be out of concern for Jesus' safety. Addressing him as *kyrios*, they attempt to give a reason why Jesus did not need to go into dangerous territory (11:12).³⁸⁵

³⁸³ An analysis of its authenticity will be undertaken in the text-critical section below, and the results of that analysis will be incorporated into the semantic analysis and also the concluding summary for this section of the study.

³⁸⁴ This structural feature is relevant when considering arguments against the authenticity of 11:2, an issue which is outside the scope of this study.

³⁸⁵ O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 689: "The disciples do not understand why Jesus would risk his life by returning to Judea if Lazarus is only 'asleep.'"

Thomas' comment in 11:16 shows a resignation that Jesus was going to go to Judaea, and a readiness to be his disciple to the point of death.³⁸⁶ His pronouncement is addressed to his fellow disciples, as he was calling them to join him. Whether they joined Thomas is not made explicit. Despite this, the reader might assume that they accompanied Jesus to both Bethany and the tomb. However, the disciples are not mentioned throughout the narrative in Bethany, and they are not mentioned explicitly in the narrative until after the scenes in Bethany (11:54). As a result, Thomas' willingness to give up his life to follow Jesus cannot be attributed with certainty to the other disciples. The two statements in 11:8 and 11:12, however, explicitly contain the disciples (οἱ μαθηταί) as the subject, as they speak as a collective whole.

4.7.1.3.2. Mary and Martha³⁸⁷

Two other characters who address Jesus as *kyrios* are both introduced in the first sentence of this section of the narrative (11:1). Mary's name appears first, and the reader's knowledge of Martha's identity is connected to Mary. The justification for this is found in the next verse where Mary's anointing of Jesus is recalled (11:2). This suggests assumed knowledge of the reader, in keeping with the methodological understanding of the reader addressed at the beginning of this study. The reader is at least aware of the outline of the story of Jesus' life, death and resurrection, and this comment by the narrator indicates that this outline included his anointing by Mary.³⁸⁸

In the narrative, Mary and Martha share a number of characteristics.³⁸⁹ Starting from their first words (11:3), both sisters speak in unison to call on Jesus. In addition, Martha's unqualified use of "the teacher" (ὁ διδάσκαλος) to refer to Jesus when calling Mary also indicates that they are both part of the same sociolinguistic community which acknowledged Jesus as their teacher

³⁸⁶ Thomas Popp, "Thomas: Question Marks and Exclamation Marks." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 504-529 (509): "Thomas ... embodies a recognition of the present reality and a willingness to courageously follow as a disciple, even if this means giving up his own life." Popp also notes the unknowing depth with which Thomas spoke, as he "was not aware of the deeper Christological meaning of his words" (512). O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 687, and Thompson, *John*, 243, both note the inherent irony in Thomas's statement. Skinner, *John and Thomas*, 61, argues that Thomas focuses only on death, and appears unaware of the reality of Jesus' resurrection.

³⁸⁷ The decision to analyse these two characters together is due to the important similarities between them. In addition, by considering them together, it is possible to contrast key differences that highlight narrative emphases.

³⁸⁸ O'Day, *John*, 685: "The Fourth Evangelist assumes that his readers are familiar with these characters from their place in Christian tradition." Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 186: "The introduction of Mary and Martha by means of reference to the anointing suggests that this story was well known in Christian communities." With reference to the description of the anointing in 11:2, Barrett, *John*, 390, argues that the author "is able to presuppose that his readers were already familiar with it."

³⁸⁹ Dorothy A. Lee, "Martha and Mary: Levels of Characterization in Luke and John." in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*, (ed. Christopher W. Skinner; London: Bloomsbury, 2013), 197-220 (206-207): "the sisters are presented harmoniously, their response to Jesus differing in some respects, while united in reproach of Jesus, without any hint of competition or resentment."

(11:28).³⁹⁰ Furthermore, they confess identical statements regarding Jesus' ability to prevent their brother's death (11:21, 32), which is the clearest indicator of the shared understanding of Jesus which the sisters have. They both believe that Jesus has power over sickness, and could have healed their brother if he had come earlier.

In addition to these similarities, a key difference between the sisters is the way the reader learns about their commitment to Jesus. For the reader, Mary's actions provide significant guidance for understanding what she believes about Jesus.³⁹¹ In 11:2, in the reference to Mary anointing Jesus, the reader learns of her devotion to Jesus.³⁹² At the same time, this encourages the reader to expect more detail to come about this character who is introduced so vividly.³⁹³ Later in the narrative, the reader's expectations are met as again the narrator describes Mary's commitment to Jesus through her actions. Having heard that Jesus was calling her, "she quickly rose and went to him" (11:29). This readiness to obey, and promptness of response, further clarifies for the reader Mary's commitment as a disciple to Jesus. When she comes to Jesus, her falling at his feet encourages the reader to once again consider the importance of her anointing Jesus' feet, and her devotion to him.³⁹⁴

In contrast to Mary's physical demonstrations of commitment to Jesus, Martha's words provide the reader with the primary evidence of what she believes about Jesus.³⁹⁵ When Martha meets Jesus for the first time in the narrative, she declares that, if Jesus had been present, her brother would not have died (11:21). In this, she agrees with Mary's later declaration, which repeats Martha's word for word (11:32). The difference between the two confessions is that Mary's is accompanied by action, and Martha's by further verbal statement. Unlike Mary, Martha continues speaking, and expresses her confidence that Jesus is heard by God when he makes requests (11:22).³⁹⁶ O'Day identifies that there are similarities between Martha's words and a lament Psalm, as she moves from a complaint to confidence.³⁹⁷ This is a demonstration that, despite the reality of her brother's death, she continues to trust in Jesus as one whom God hears.

³⁹⁰ Bennema, *Encountering*, 259: "Martha's addressing Jesus as "Teacher" (11:28) and "Lord" (11:21) reflects the teacher-disciple relationship mentioned in 13:13, showing that she probably considers herself a disciple of Jesus."

³⁹¹ Lee, "Mary and Martha," 209-210.

³⁹² Bennema, *Encountering*, 272: "in an extraordinary act of devotion, she expresses her affection for and allegiance to Jesus."

³⁹³ Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 156: "A gap has been created in the narrative, as the reader seeks further information about a woman named Mary and an anointing of Jesus."

³⁹⁴ O'Day, *John*, 690, notes that the description of Mary falling at Jesus' feet "seems intended to draw the anointing of 12:1-8 into this story once again."

³⁹⁵ Lee, "Mary and Martha," 209-210.

³⁹⁶ This echoes the statement made by the man born blind, who said that Jesus' miracle working was a result of God listening to him, a man who did the will of God (9:31).

³⁹⁷ Gail. R. O'Day, "Martha: Seeing the Glory of God." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt,

Following her declaration of confidence in Jesus to work miracles, Martha also affirms that she believes that Jesus is the resurrection and the life (11:27). This affirmation follows her declaration that her brother will rise again “on the last day” (11:24). The combination of these two statements suggests that Martha has accepted a role for the Messiah in the “resurrection on the last day.”³⁹⁸ That is, she believes that Jesus will raise the dead, but not now. She has demonstrated that, in faith, she accepts Jesus’ own self-declaration that he will raise the dead. However, she has neither heard the words of the narrator nor the explicit teaching of Jesus that clarified Jesus’ eternal role as life-giver. As a result, her present confidence in Jesus is still future-focused, with faithful expectation that Jesus will raise her brother on the last day.

In her confession, Martha makes three statements about Jesus that are in keeping with contemporary messianic expectations of characters in the narrative.³⁹⁹ First, she declares that Jesus is the Messiah, echoing the earlier confession of Andrew (1:41), possibly the Samaritan Woman (4:29) and some of the people in Jerusalem (7:41), agreeing that Jesus is the chosen and anointed one. Second, her identification of Jesus as the Son of God also echoes the same identification made earlier in the narrative. When Nathaniel first met Jesus, he called Jesus “the Son of God ... the King of Israel” (1:49).⁴⁰⁰ Third, she identifies Jesus as the one “coming into the world,” which parallels a statement made by the crowd (6:14), who at that time had identified Jesus as “the prophet who is to come into the world.”⁴⁰¹

In these three statements, Martha’s confession also agrees with the narrator, who has identified Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God, and as the one coming into the world (1:9, 14, 17).⁴⁰² This

et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 487-503 (498-499), sees this parallel as extending from Martha’s words in 11:3 through to 11:27, progressing from complaint (11:3,21) to confession (11:27). Although there are some elements of Martha’s statements which find parallels in the Psalms, not all fit clearly into the structure of a lament Psalm. For example, that Martha’s confidence in Jesus’ ability (11:21) is in fact a “petition,” as O’Day argues, although possible, is not clear. Susan Hylen, *Imperfect Believers*, 79, sees the value of the parallel to the Psalms as highlighting Mary’s ongoing faith in Jesus.

³⁹⁸ For the relevance of 4Q521 for understanding the role of the Messiah in raising the dead, see James D. Tabor and Michael O. Wise, “4Q521 ‘On Resurrection’ and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study.” *JSP* 5 (1992): 149-162.

³⁹⁹ Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 162: “Martha ... states her faith in an expression of first-century Jewish messianic expectation.” In a later article, Moloney “Can Everyone be Wrong? A Reading of John 11.1–12.8.” *NTS* 49 (2003): 505-527 (514), similarly states that Martha “affirms her long-held view that Jesus fulfills her messianic expectations.”

⁴⁰⁰ Brown, *John*, 1:425, notes these parallels. On the “Son of God” and “King of Israel,” see Bauckham, “Messianism According to the Gospel of John,” 57-60.

⁴⁰¹ Brown, *John*, 1:425.

⁴⁰² Bennema, *Encountering*, 262: “Martha’s response that she believes Jesus is “the Messiah, the Son of God” echoes the purpose of John’s Gospel in 20:31. The significance being that Martha produces the intended belief-response John has in mind.” In this study, however, the reader does not yet have knowledge of 20:31. As a result, the reader’s immediate experience of Mary’s confession, and any possible evaluation of it, is influenced only by what has come

raises expectations for a reader who has been witnessing the interaction of the use of *kyrios* by the narrator and the use of κύριε by characters. The reader considers whether Martha's confession agrees with the narrator in content as well as form. Other characters who have addressed Jesus as κύριε have also agreed verbally with the narrator in the use of *kyrios*, but they have not yet understood that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*. However, Martha's confession not only agrees with the narrator that Jesus is *kyrios*, but also affirms his messianic identity, his divine sonship, and that he has been sent by God. This raises the reader's expectations in a similar way to Peter's confession in 6:68-69, and even more, as Martha's confession has so much in common with the affirmations of the narrator.⁴⁰³ At this point, the reader wonders if Martha is the first character to identify Jesus as the divine *kyrios*.

As Martha and Jesus arrive at the tomb, Martha again demonstrates her belief that Jesus' role as life-giver will not be revealed until some point in the future. After Jesus calls for the stone to be removed from the tomb, Martha expresses her concern that her brother had been dead for four days (11:39).⁴⁰⁴ This statement confirms for the reader that Martha had not expected that Jesus would raise Lazarus at that time. Although she has demonstrated insight into who Jesus is, she is not aware of "the fullness of Jesus' identity and gifts."⁴⁰⁵ This fullness is Jesus' divine identity, of which the reader is aware. The life that Jesus will give is not only exhibited in a future messianic role, but is a result of him always having life in him (1:4), and this is true as Jesus stands at the tomb.⁴⁰⁶ As a result, the reader suspects that Martha "has not fully understood what she confessed" in 11:27.⁴⁰⁷ This is because Martha's eschatology has prevented her from understanding that Jesus' claims are reflective of his divine identity.⁴⁰⁸ Full understanding is not yet possible, because she "lacks ... an awareness of Jesus as the ἐγώ εἰμι."⁴⁰⁹ Although the reader still waits expectantly for a character to acknowledge the divine identity of Jesus, in Martha, the reader has witnessed the fullest and most developed expression of belief in Jesus in the narrative thus far.

before in the narrative, not what lies ahead. Despite this, 20:31 is relevant for the reader who reaches the end of the narrative, and encourages reflection upon earlier confessions that used the same title.

⁴⁰³ That Mary's confession is comparable to Peter's in 6:68-69 is argued by Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 633.

⁴⁰⁴ See Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 848, for the departure of the soul from the body after three days.

⁴⁰⁵ O'Day, *John*, 691. O'Day also states that "Martha's attempt to stop Jesus from opening Lazarus's tomb (v. 39) shows that the full impact of that eschatological claim is beyond her comprehension" (694). Hulen, *Imperfect Believers*, 80, clarifies in this regard that "Martha's words are incomplete, but not incorrect."

⁴⁰⁶ Hulen, *Imperfect Believers*, 80: "the expectation of both resurrection and life are available in the present through Jesus."

⁴⁰⁷ Thompson, *John*, 249.

⁴⁰⁸ Lee, "Mary and Martha," 203.

⁴⁰⁹ Lee, "Mary and Martha," 203-204, states that "Martha's faith...is developing but incomplete. Her Christology, up to a point, is insightful and believing in Johannine terms; what remains incomplete is her eschatology."

Although Mary may not yet have reached the level of understanding shared between the reader and the narrator, the reader is still able to identify with her confessions. As with the interpretation of Peter's confession in 6:68, the same interpretive challenges are present. A distinction needs to be drawn between how readers may have been affected by reading a confession which they agree with, and how the character in the narrative understands the same confession.⁴¹⁰ Readers who believe that Jesus is the divine *kyrios* and divine Son are affirmed in their belief by witnessing Mary confess her belief in Jesus using identical titles. As with Peter in 6:68, however, the reader's understanding is not imputed to Martha.

4.7.1.4. Irony

One text-critically secure example of *kyrios* which is used ironically with respect to Jesus' identity in this section of the narrative is in 11:32, where Mary says, "Κύριε, if you were here, my brother would not have died." This encounter reflects a similar dynamic of irony to when the royal official called on Jesus to come to his house. In that example, the royal official's request for Jesus to "come down" reminded the reader that Jesus had already "come down" from heaven. Because of Jesus' divine identity and heavenly origin, he did not need to "come down" to the man's house. The one in whom was life was able to give life without needing to be in the same location. The royal official was not aware of these aspects of Jesus' identity and mission. At the same time, the royal official's request emphasised the importance of Jesus' flesh. He rightly sought the person of Jesus as the locus of life, so that this life might be given to his son.

As Mary addresses Jesus as *kyrios*, she connects Jesus' presence with his ability to prevent Lazarus from dying. Like the royal official, she identifies Jesus as the one who would be able to heal. In addition, in a similar way to the royal official, Mary understands Jesus' ability to heal as dependent on him being present. As when reading about the royal official, the reader again reflects on statements earlier in the narrative about Jesus' identity. From the beginning of the narrative, the reader has known that Jesus has life in him and that this life was not limited, but related to all of humanity (1:4). This truth is emphasised again in Jesus' declaration to Martha that he is the life (11:25). For specific confirmation that Jesus does not need to be present to heal, the reader also can recall the healing of the royal official's son. Although Jesus did not

⁴¹⁰ When interpreting Martha's use of *kyrios*, Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 62, considers the readers of the Gospel: "The Johannine community looks upon Martha's confession as a paradigm and a prototype—as they address Jesus as Lord and confess him as Christ and Son of God, so did she before them. *Kyrie* here bears the full impact for John of the acknowledgement of divine authority." It is not clear whether Pryor maintains the distinction outlined above, or whether the understanding which the narrator and reader have affects his interpretation of Martha's character.

“come down” to the boy, because he had “come down” from heaven, he was able to heal him. Unlike the reader, Mary does not have knowledge of these aspects of Jesus’ identity. As she addresses Jesus as *kyrios*, the reader experiences the dynamic of irony, and the importance of Jesus’ role as the divine *kyrios* who has power over sickness and death is highlighted.⁴¹¹

4.7.1.5. Point of View

The point of view of the narrator which is again revisited in this section of the narrative is summarised in 1:14. The glory of Jesus is revealed, and it is revealed in his flesh. The “glory” of Jesus in this study is understood as Jesus’ divine identity. When Jesus reveals his glory, he reveals his divine identity, that he is the divine *kyrios*. Therefore, if characters see his glory, they recognise that he is the divine *kyrios*. In 11:40, as Martha and Jesus stand at the tomb, Jesus reminds Martha that if she believed, she would see the glory of God.⁴¹² The reader, then, is waiting expectantly for a confirmation that Martha has beheld the glory of Jesus, and seen that he is divine.⁴¹³

Having witnessed Lazarus coming out of the tomb, the reader is not given further narrative clues regarding Martha’s experience of the miracle. Also at the tomb are the *Ioudaioi*, who believe in Jesus as a result of seeing the miracle (11:45). Their experience, however, is the reverse of what Jesus promised. Having seen the miracle, they believed. This is comparable to the experience of the disciples in Cana (2:11). In contrast to this, Jesus’ promise to Martha was not that revelation of glory would lead to belief, but that belief would allow Martha to see the glory. In a similar way to the description of the Samaritan woman and the man born blind, the result of Martha’s encounter with Jesus is not narrated explicitly. Having heard the other Samaritans, the reader concludes that the Samaritan woman has believed in Jesus. For the man born blind, confirmation came through Jesus’ discourse which followed. There was insufficient evidence, however, for the reader to infer that either character recognised Jesus’ divine identity.

The lack of explicit confirmation of whether Martha saw the glory of Jesus is not unique in the narrative. The reader has not encountered a description of any character, including the

⁴¹¹ Klink, *John*, 505: “It was not Jesus’ *presence* that was the issue, as if had he been there this would not have happened. No, what was important was his *position* of authority over life and death, a position not confined by distance (a journey to Bethany) or time (four days in the tomb).” Klink’s interpretation is actually about Martha’s identical statement, but is equally applicable to Mary’s.

⁴¹² The reader has not encountered this statement so far, but can assume that it was part of the conversation between Martha and Jesus before arriving at the tomb.

⁴¹³ The reader also infers that Mary and the other disciples are also at the tomb. However, as Martha is the only named speaker, and Jesus explicitly links her experience to the glory of God, she is the focus of this part of the narrative analysis.

Samaritan woman and the man born blind, seeing the glory of Jesus. In 1:14, the “we” confesses to beholding Jesus’ glory. Since then, the reader has waited expectantly that a character will experience what the “we” did, but this expectation has not yet been met. This is because Jesus has not yet been glorified. In the narrative structure of the Gospel of John, Martha is encountering Jesus before his glorification. As a result, Martha, like other characters who have met Jesus so far in the narrative, is not yet able to see that Jesus is the divine *kyrios* who reveals the glory of God. However, this is not primarily a reflection of the characters who meet Jesus, but a consequence of the timing of their encounters. Therefore, it is not only eschatology which affects Martha’s understanding of Jesus. More importantly, “until Jesus’ hour has come and he has been glorified, he cannot be fully comprehended, although those who are willing can acknowledge him as the one sent by God. Martha has gone about as far as anyone can go.”⁴¹⁴

4.7.2. Textual Criticism

There are two textual variants in this section of the narrative relevant to a study of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John.⁴¹⁵ In 11:21 and 11:39, there is variation with respect to the vocative κύριε, each of which will be addressed in turn.

In 11:21, the longer text reads εἶπεν οὖν ἡ Μάρθα πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός μου. The shorter text, without κύριε, is found only in Vaticanus and the Sinaitic Syriac, and would require significant internal support to be considered the earliest recoverable reading.

Transcriptional probabilities do not provide clear support for either the longer or shorter reading. When considering an accidental omission, it does not appear that word endings would lead a scribe to omit. It is possible, however, that a scribe may have omitted κύριε due to it being grammatically unnecessary. It is not necessary to accompany this proposal with speculation regarding intentions, as κύριε could have been omitted with or without a conscious decision. Metzger’s summary of it being the result of “transcriptional oversight” is possible, though it is also possible it was omitted deliberately.⁴¹⁶ The question that arises for proposals of scribal omission is why it was omitted in this verse, and not in, for example, 11:27, 32, 34.

⁴¹⁴ Smith, *John*, 223.

⁴¹⁵ The authenticity of 11:2 has been questioned by scholars such as Brown, *John*, 1:423 and Bultmann, *John*, 396. However, scholars who question the verse do not present manuscript evidence which indicates that it was ever not part of the Gospel of John. As a result, the cases for and against its authenticity are not within the bounds of this study.

⁴¹⁶ Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 199.

Similarly, it is unclear why a scribe would add κύριε specifically at this place, although it could be considered as harmonising to the tendency of characters throughout the Gospel of John to address Jesus as *kyrios*. Overall, then, neither the case for the omission or the addition is strong, with transcriptional probabilities not contributing significantly to the evaluation of the longer and shorter reading.

There are five factors to consider regarding intrinsic probabilities for the addition or omission of κύριε in 11:21. First, κύριε as a term of address is common in this section of the narrative, with 11:3, 12, 27, 32, 34 as textually certain examples. Therefore, it is in keeping with authorial tendencies that Martha would use κύριε to address Jesus during chapter 11. Second, when Mary repeats Martha's statement verbatim in 11:32, she addresses Jesus as κύριε. The word-for-word repetition from 11:21 to 11:32 suggests that the preceding κύριε would be expected in both verses, supporting the inclusion of κύριε in 11:21. Third, Mary's statement is ironic. Given the narrative dynamics experienced in the Gospel thus far, it would be in keeping with previous authorial tendencies to preface an ironic statement to Jesus with κύριε. Fourth, because Martha's statement challenges the appropriateness of Jesus' decision to delay his coming, the reader could expect a respectful term of address to be used. This would then counteract the potential challenge to Jesus' honour which Martha's statement implies. Fifth, there is one consideration which challenges the inclusion of κύριε from an intrinsic perspective. If the longer reading is accepted, it would be the only place in the narrative where the vocative κύριε immediately follows the name of Jesus. In other places in the Gospel of John where Jesus is addressed with κύριε, the word which immediately precedes κύριε is either the speaker in the nominative, or a pronoun to refer to Jesus. Although this particular characteristic would mean that the longer reading in 11:21 would be unique in one way, overall the longer reading would be in keeping with authorial tendencies.

The decision regarding the omission or addition of κύριε in 11:21 is in large measure dependent on the overwhelming external evidence in favour of the longer reading. Transcriptional probabilities acknowledge the possibility of the omission, but are on balance inconclusive. Intrinsic probabilities suggest that, overall, the longer reading is in keeping with other uses of *kyrios* and is not unexpected at this point of the Gospel. As a result, the longer reading is preferred, so that Martha addresses Jesus as κύριε in 11:21.

The second variant with regard to *kyrios* in chapter 11 is Martha's use of the vocative in 11:39. In that verse, the longer text reads κύριε, ἥδη ὄζει, τεταρταῖος γὰρ ἐστίν. There is one Greek

manuscript which does not have the vocative, κύριε, at this point, \mathfrak{B}^{66} . The external support, therefore, is again strongly in favour of the longer reading.

Internal probabilities provide marginal support for the longer reading. Transcriptionally, there is no feature of the text in the immediate context which might have led to the accidental omission of the term. As with 11:21, it may have been omitted due to it being superfluous grammatically. In addition, the tendency of the scribe of \mathfrak{B}^{66} to omit supports the proposal that the shorter reading is the result of omission.⁴¹⁷ In contrast, there is no clear reason why κύριε would have been added here and not in other places where characters address Jesus in chapter 11.

Martha's statement challenges Jesus' decision to have the stone removed, in the same way her statement in 11:21 challenged Jesus' decision to delay his journey to Bethany. Similar pragmatic dynamics are at work, then, in this dialogue. Furthermore, her statement reveals her incomplete knowledge of the significance of Jesus' identity as life-giver, and the kind of irony which is experienced at this point is often prefaced by κύριε in the narrative. As a result, the addition of the respectful term of address is coherent in this immediate context. Therefore, the longer reading is justifiable intrinsically.

The combination of strong external evidence for the longer reading and internal evidence which is also marginally in favour leads to the conclusion that the longer reading is preferred in this case. As a result, Martha addresses Jesus as κύριε in 11:39.

4.7.3. Semantics

The first occurrence of *kyrios* which requires semantic analysis is the narrator's use in 11:2. The key contextual constraint to consider when examining this usage is the relationship between the narrator and the reader. On encountering the narrator's use of *kyrios* at this point, the reader is able to recall other times in the narrative until this point where Jesus has been identified in the same way. The previous uses in 6:23, 4:1 and back to the first usage in 1:23 are all in view at this point. From the beginning of the narrative, the narrator's usage of *kyrios* for Jesus associated him with the God of Israel, to the extent that Jesus does what the God of Israel does.

⁴¹⁷ Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, 544: "The scribe has a very slight tendency to omit more often than he adds, but his additions and omissions are usually rather short."

From that point on, the reader rightly understands the narrator's use of *kyrios* as an indicator of Jesus' divine identity. Accordingly, the semantic category which considers *kyrios* to be used in the same way to emphasise supernatural authority is the most appropriate.⁴¹⁸

The next occurrence of *kyrios* is in 11:3, when the sisters speak in unison as they address Jesus. Until this point in the narrative, there has been very little detail regarding their relationship with Jesus, or the purpose of their communication with Jesus. Later, in both of their interactions with Jesus, it is made clear that they hoped that Jesus had come to Bethany in order to heal Lazarus (11:21, 32). In addition, Martha is able to refer to Jesus as "the teacher" (11:28), when speaking to Mary. When Mary then hears that Jesus was calling her, she responds by obeying his call immediately. The combination of the shared language of "teacher," and the obedience of Mary, indicate that both sisters are followers of Jesus. Accordingly, they would acknowledge that he is one who exercised authority over them. As a result, the most appropriate semantic category is "one who rules or exercises authority over others."⁴¹⁹

When the disciples address Jesus as *kyrios* in 11:12, they use a title which they previously used in 6:68. At that point, their relationship with Jesus exhibited a submission to Jesus' authority as one who exercises authority over them. Taking into account this evidence, the relationship between the disciples and Jesus provides a strong contextual constraint for semantic analysis. As a result, "one who rules or exercises authority over others" is the starting point from which this analysis begins. The immediate linguistic context does not provide evidence to move away from this analysis. As has been argued above, the disciples' words in 11:12 continue to express their concern for Jesus' safety, first demonstrated in 11:8. This is in keeping with their devotion to him as committed disciples, a status revealed following their previous use of *kyrios* in 6:68-69. Therefore, the most suitable semantic range for this use of *kyrios* in 11:12, as for the use of *kyrios* in 6:68, is "one who rules or exercises authority over others."⁴²⁰

During her first dialogue with Jesus, Martha addresses Jesus as *kyrios* twice (11:21, 27). As with the analysis of the disciples' use of *kyrios*, the most appropriate starting place for the analysis of Martha's use of the term is the conclusions for her use of *kyrios* in 11:3. The narrative analysis above has confirmed that Martha has not yet recognised that Jesus is divine. Therefore, "one who rules or exercises authority over others" continues to be the best semantic category for

⁴¹⁸ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

⁴¹⁹ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

⁴²⁰ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

kyrios as spoken by Martha, in the absence of evidence that she believed Jesus exercises “supernatural authority” as a supernatural being.⁴²¹

Mary addresses Jesus on her own in 11:32, and this constitutes the first and only time that she addresses Jesus as *kyrios* by herself. As for the analysis of Martha’s use of *kyrios*, the most appropriate starting point is “one who rules or exercises authority over others,” which was the semantic range of her previous use of *kyrios* in 11:3. Furthermore, as Mary’s words replicate the statement of Martha in 11:21, this supports the conclusion that the semantic range is again consistent with previous uses. Mary’s actions also confirm her ongoing devotion to Jesus and commitment to him as a disciple. At the same time, there are no further contextual constraints which suggest her awareness of Jesus’ divine identity. Therefore, as with Martha and the disciples, Mary uses *kyrios* to acknowledge that Jesus is “one who rules or exercises authority over others.”⁴²²

The use of *kyrios* in 11:34 is attributed in the narrative to an unidentified group.⁴²³ In this context, Jesus asks “Where have you laid [Lazarus]?” to which they respond by calling Jesus *kyrios* and telling him to “come and see” (11:34). Because the semantic analysis depends to some extent on the relationship between Jesus and the speakers, the first issue to be addressed is their identity. There are two possible solutions. First, by considering only the immediate context, the speakers might appear to be Mary and the *Ioudaioi* who had accompanied her to the tomb.⁴²⁴ This is because they are the only characters explicitly identified prior to Jesus’ question in 11:32-33. The second solution considers not only the immediate context, but what took place prior to this scene. By taking this broader context into account, it seems more likely that the speakers are Mary and Martha. Jesus’ question, “where have you laid him? (11:34), suggests that his hearers were responsible for Lazarus’ burial, and this is more likely to be his immediate family than a group of mourners.⁴²⁵ In addition, Mary and Martha are already in dialogue with Jesus prior to this scene, and it would be expected that he would address people he already had been interacting with, rather than a group whom he had not spoken to until that point. Furthermore, the sisters have already addressed Jesus with κύριε in unison (11:3) in this section of the narrative. Therefore, it seems reasonable to conclude that the characters who say κύριε in 11:34 are Mary and Martha.

⁴²¹ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

⁴²² L&N 1:478 (37§51).

⁴²³ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 60, attributes this use of *kyrios* to the *Ioudaioi*, but does not argue for this identification.

⁴²⁴ Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 168.

⁴²⁵ Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 639.

If Mary and Martha are the speakers who address Jesus as *kyrios* in 11:34, their relationship with Jesus until this point in the narrative is a key factor to consider for the semantic analysis. Previously in the narrative, when the sisters addressed Jesus as κύριε, either individually or in unison, the semantic range has been the same. It has consistently reflected their identity as disciples of Jesus who acknowledge his authority over them by using κύριε. The linguistic and discourse context does not provide further evidence which is inconsistent with this. These factors suggest that the most suitable semantic category for κύριε is again “one who rules or exercises authority over others.”⁴²⁶

Martha is the final character to address Jesus as *kyrios* in this section of the narrative. In 11:39, she prefaces her statement to Jesus with κύριε. The narrative analysis above demonstrated that Martha’s words at the tomb confirm that her understanding of Jesus has not yet extended to awareness of his divine identity. Therefore, “one who rules or exercises authority over others” continues to be the most appropriate semantic range for her use of κύριε.⁴²⁷

4.7.4. Summary

The term *kyrios* occurs nine times throughout this section of the narrative (11:2, 3, 12, 21, 27, 32, 34, 39). All characters who speak to Jesus directly use the vocative κύριε at least once when addressing him. The use of *kyrios* in chapter 11 has allowed the reader to consider two new ways the term is being used in the narrative.

First, *kyrios* has been used by two named disciples who are not part of the twelve. Chapter 6 saw the first usage of *kyrios* by the twelve, and this continues in chapter 11. Mary and Martha, however, are the first named characters outside of this group to address Jesus as *kyrios*. They also are individuals who were disciples of Jesus before the time when they interact with him within the narrative. This suggests that the reader considers *kyrios* a title which Jesus’ disciples more generally use to address him. This indicates that the disciples’ identification of Jesus as *kyrios* is a feature which the reader expects to continue in the sections of the narrative to come.

The second new feature of the use of *kyrios* in this section of the narrative is the use of the term in the context of Jesus being the giver of life. This theme in the narrative has not until this point been associated with the term *kyrios*. During chapter 11, due to the importance of this aspect of

⁴²⁶ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

⁴²⁷ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

Jesus' identity being in focus, it becomes associated with *kyrios* from this point. When *kyrios* has been used by disciples, they have at the same time revealed they have not yet reached a full understanding of Jesus' role as life-giver, a role which is based in his divine identity as the one in whom is life (1:4).

Because *kyrios* is used in new ways, this section of the narrative includes one use of *kyrios* by the narrator (11:2), in keeping with the modified framework of Schenk being used in this study. The narrative thread is again highlighted, as the reader approaches the final scenes of Jesus' public ministry in chapter 12.

4.8. *Kyrios* in Jerusalem

4.8.1. Narrative

4.8.1.1. Context

There are three Old Testament passages which are relevant for understanding the use of *kyrios* in chapter 12. First, Psalm 118 includes one occurrence of *kyrios*. Second, Isaiah 53 contains another reference to *kyrios* in the portion cited in chapter 12. Third, Isaiah 6 is also relevant, despite the fact that the verse cited in John 12 (6:10) does not contain *kyrios*. This is because the context of the quotation is crucial for understanding the portion cited, particularly with reference to the narrator's comment in John 12:41 that Isaiah saw Jesus' glory.

As Jesus enters Jerusalem, the crowd (12:13) proclaims εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, which reflects the wording of the Greek of Psalm 117:26 (Hebrew 118:26).⁴²⁸ There are two aspects of this quotation which echo earlier statements in the narrative. The first is the identification of Jesus as “the coming one.” This recalls a number of statements in the narrative, the first of which are those by the narrator (1:9) and John the Baptist (1:15, 27) that Jesus is the coming one.⁴²⁹ These references are particularly relevant to this study as their identification of Jesus as the coming one was key to understanding that both Jesus and the God of Israel are

⁴²⁸ “Hosanna” (ὡσαννά, 12:13) is not reflective of the translation of הוֹשַׁעֲנָה found in the Greek Psalm 117:25 (σῶσον). This is relevant to the methodology of this study, that the reader needs non-Greek terms translated. As all other non-Greek words are translated for the reader, this could be seen as evidence that Hosanna was, by the time the Gospel of John was published, being used as an exclamation of praise in Greek-speaking communities. This sociolinguistic factor would mean that it would not be possible to translate it literally, as there is no literal Greek equivalent. This was not the case when the first Greek translations of the Hebrew were made with the rendering σῶσον. It also suggests that the term may have been known to the intended readers of the narrative, as no explanation is provided.

⁴²⁹ See Köstenberger, *John*, 370, for the idea of “coming” in the narrative. Others that identify Jesus as “coming” include the narrator (3:31), the crowd (6:14) and Martha (11:27).

referred to as *kyrios*. The second aspect of the quotation ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, reflects the importance of Jesus acting in the name of God. It most closely resembles Jesus' statement that he had come in his Father's name (5:43).⁴³⁰ This context confirms that the crowd was right in making this proclamation, agreeing with Jesus that he came in God's name. At the same time, it confirms that *kyrios* in this context refers not to Jesus, but to the Father in whose name he came.

When Isaiah 53 is quoted in this chapter, the reader is reminded of the importance of Isaiah 40-55 in the narrative so far. As with the quotation of Psalm 118, the encounter between John and the delegation from Jerusalem is again relevant (1:19-28). In that place, the reader became aware that, due to the interaction between John and the delegation and also the narrative context, Jesus and God were both referred to as *kyrios*. In the context of Isaiah 53 in Greek, the verses quoted include two occurrences of *kyrios* (53:1).

The first *kyrios* in Isaiah 53 which is cited in John 12:38 is the vocative κύριε in 53:1. It has no equivalent in Hebrew and this is further evidence that the narrative implies a reader who is aware of the Old Testament in Greek. The use of the vocative is significant because this is the first time this form has been used to address the God of Israel in the Gospel of John. This new usage in 12:38 demonstrates that κύριε can and does refer to the God of Israel. This confirms the approach to the analysis of *kyrios* in this study, whereby a sharp line is not drawn between the vocative and other forms. Rather, they are merely seen as different cases of the same word. This contributes to the perspective of this study that, when Jesus is addressed with κύριε, it is understood in the broader patterns of usage for *kyrios*, including references to the God of Israel as *kyrios*.⁴³¹

Also in Isaiah 53, as cited in John 12:38 and in the Greek translation of Isaiah 53:1, is the clause ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη. In the context of Isaiah 53, *kyrios* acts powerfully by his "arm" and this *kyrios* is the God of Israel.⁴³² In John 12:38, ὁ βραχίων κυρίου could similarly refer to the power of God, which was manifest in the ministry of Jesus, specifically in his signs. Relevant for this study is whether this phrase could refer not only to the ministry of Jesus, but to Jesus himself.

⁴³⁰ Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 868, makes this identification. On the difference between the understanding of the Hebrew of Psalm 118:26 and the Greek cited in John 12:13, see Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 432.

⁴³¹ For the Gospel of Luke, Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 214, has argued for the christological importance of the pattern of usage of the vocative, and sees that "Luke exploits the full range of the vocative scale."

⁴³² Köstenberger, *John*, 391, specifically connects God's "arm" with his power. Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 196: "In the words of Isaiah, 'our message' looks to the teaching of Jesus, while 'the arm of the Lord' refers to his deeds."

There are three reasons that support the proposal that the *kyrios* of 12:38 includes reference to Jesus. First, in the narrative so far, the use of *kyrios* from Isaiah 40-55 has been closely linked to the question of the identity of Jesus and his relationship to the God of Israel. This was established in John 1:23 when Isaiah 40:3 was used simultaneously to refer to the God of Israel and Jesus, highlighting their unity expressed in their sharing the title *kyrios*. This again highlights the importance of those two verses for understanding *kyrios* in the narrative.

A second factor to consider is the close relationship between “arm” and “*kyrios*” in the immediate context within Isaiah 40. A key reference to identifying Jesus as *kyrios* in John 1:23 is Isaiah 40:10, where *kyrios* comes and his “arm is with authority” (ὁ βραχίον μετὰ κυριείας).⁴³³ In the narrative, this *kyrios* refers to Jesus, but not to the exclusion of the God of Israel. In the citation of Isaiah 53:1 in John 12:38, *kyrios* also has a mighty arm. This suggests that the *kyrios* of ὁ βραχίον κυρίου in John 12:38 could be identified as Jesus. In a similar way to John 1:23 and Isaiah 40:3, this identification does not exclude the possibility that this reference also includes the God of Israel.

The third reason which suggests that Jesus is the *kyrios* of 12:38 is that the narrative has already described Jesus and the Father working in unison in a similar way. In 10:28-30, Jesus speaks of his Father’s hand and his own hand as performing the same function: the protection of the sheep. Immediately following this description of unity in action, Jesus states “I and the Father, we are one.” This provides a precedent in the narrative for seeing descriptions of Jesus’ and the Father’s actions as not excluding each other, but rather being a manifestation of their unity. In John 12:38, the citation of Isaiah 53:1 allows this unity to be understood in terms of their joint identity as *kyrios*.

The next Old Testament passage relevant to the study of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John is Isaiah 6:10, cited in John 12:40.⁴³⁴ For the purposes of this study, the importance of Isaiah 6:10 is the

⁴³³ The Hebrew of Isaiah 40:10 has a participle in the same clause וְזָרְעוּ מִשְׁקֵלָהּ לוֹ. In the Greek, a prepositional phrase μετὰ κυριείας is used.

⁴³⁴ The differences between Greek Translations of Isaiah 6:10 and the text of John 12:40 are numerous. For an analysis, see Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*, 82-88, and Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form* (Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 99-122. Although the citation in 12:40 does not reflect any other known Greek translation of Isaiah 6:10, the use of the Greek Old Testament throughout the narrative continues to support the use of the Greek when interpreting the use of an Old Testament passage. On the relevance of the Targum of Isaiah, Catrin H. Williams, "(Not) Seeing God in the Prologue and the Body of John's Gospel." in *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological and Philosophical Contexts. Papers read at the Colloquium Ioanneum 2013* (eds. Jan G. van der Watt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 79-98 (93), sees that “John 12:41 may share the targumic emphasis upon ‘Glory.’” This shared interpretive trajectory does not require either document to be dependent on the other, however.

relevance of its context in Isaiah 6.⁴³⁵ Immediately following the citation of Isaiah 6:10, John 12:41 reads ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἡσαΐας ὅτι εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ. In this verse, the immediately occurring referent for αὐτοῦ is Jesus, confirmed by the next verse which also refers to Jesus as “him” (12:42).⁴³⁶ This calls on the reader to consider the context of Isaiah 6:10 in order to understand how the narrator’s comment will be understood. There are three key issues that need to be explored in order to understand the relevance of these verses for the interpretation of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John.

The first feature of Isaiah 6 which is relevant to a study of *kyrios* is the statement in Isaiah 6:1 εἶδον τὸν κύριον. This is the first time whilst reading the narrative that the reader has been called upon to consider the use of articular *kyrios* to refer to the God of Israel in its Old Testament context.⁴³⁷ This highlights the importance of articular references to Jesus as *kyrios* in John 4:1, 6:23 and 11:2. This, in turn, confirms the referential ambiguity of articular *kyrios* in the narrative. It can refer to the God of Israel, and can refer to Jesus. In the context of Isaiah 6, *kyrios* is the God of Israel. In the context of John 12, however, the *kyrios* whose glory Isaiah saw is Jesus (12:41).⁴³⁸ This example clarifies that the presence or absence of the article is not a decisive factor for making the identification.⁴³⁹

The second factor in Isaiah 6 relevant to *kyrios* is the use of glory, linking to the statement in John 12:41 that Isaiah saw “his glory.” In the Greek of Isaiah 6, the noun δόξα first appears in 6:1 πλήρης ὁ οἶκος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. This reference is significant as it echoes a statement which the reader has just encountered in 12:3. In both places, a house is said to be filled. In Isaiah 6:1 the house is full of glory, and in John 12:3 it is the aroma of the myrrh with which Mary anointed Jesus’ feet. This anointing was previously mentioned in John 11:2, when Jesus was identified by the narrator as *kyrios*. This connection provides another opportunity to consider again that Jesus is *kyrios* in a context which is rich in both the language and concept of glory.

⁴³⁵ Smith, *John*, 243-244, sees 12:41 as “a reference not to the text explicitly cited, but to its larger context, that is, the vision of Isa 6:1-10 in which Isaiah sees the Lord (6:1,5) and hears that the whole earth is full of his glory.”

⁴³⁶ Catrin H. Williams, "Seeing the Glory: The Reception of Isaiah's Call-Vision in Jn 12.41." in *Judaism, Jewish Identities and the Gospel Tradition: essays in Honour of Maurice Casey*, (ed. James G. Crossley; London: Equinox, 2010), 186-206 (189): “The enthroned figure whose glory Isaiah is said to have seen must be Jesus, because he is consistently the referent of the pronoun αὐτός in the surrounding comments.” The reason for textual variation is presented by Brown, *John*, 1:484: “Evidently these two pronouns have the same antecedent and the second one can logically refer only to Jesus. Because of the difficulty of the statement that Isaiah saw Jesus’ glory, some Greek witnesses have corrected ‘his’ to ‘God’s.’” The reading δόξαν θεοῦ is found in 038 and Family 13. Versional support includes one Old Latin witness (l), the Harklensis, Sahidic and Bohairic. Bezae has θεοῦ αὐτοῦ.

⁴³⁷ In 6:1 the articular form is used to translate יהוה. In other places in the passage, the anarthrous form is used to represent יהוה. For example, in 6:3 κύριος σαβαωθ represents יהוה צבאות and in 6:5, τὸν βασιλέα κύριον σαβαωθ εἶδον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου represents אֵינִי רֹאֶה צְבָאוֹת יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ.

⁴³⁸ The identification of this *kyrios* as Jesus is clarified by an earlier statement in the narrative. The reader knows that “no one has ever seen God (1:18).” As Isaiah saw τὸν κύριον, then this confirms that this *kyrios* cannot be the Father. Rather, it must be the Son who “has made him known” (1:18).

⁴³⁹ It remains the case that anarthrous *kyrios* is only used in the narrative to refer to the God of Israel.

A third feature of Isaiah 6 is that of being lifted up. The first verse of the chapter again is key for seeing a connection to John 12. In 6:1, God is described as being ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἐπηρμένου. As the *kyrios* that Isaiah saw is identified in John 12:41 as being Jesus, it is significant that Jesus also says that he will be lifted up (ὑψωθῶ) in 12:32.⁴⁴⁰ This supports the interpretation that Jesus is not only referring to the physical lifting of his body during crucifixion, but that it is through his crucifixion that he will be returned to the position which he had prior to his incarnation. It is through this that he will manifest the glory in a way comparable to his pre-incarnate manifestation of glory. Accordingly, the narrator and Jesus himself can describe his glorification as still future (12:16, 23). These factors clarify that the *kyrios* who was lifted up (Isa 6:1) will be lifted up once more (John 12:32) and, as a result, will manifest the same glory he had previously (12:16, 23).

Although Isaiah 6 plays a key role in understanding how Isaiah saw Jesus' glory, Isaiah 53 is also relevant for understanding John 12:41. The word chosen to refer back to the prophecies, "these things" (ταῦτα), allows for this dual referent. In addition, there is evidence to support the inclusion of Isaiah 53 in the referent of "these things." This is because Isaiah 53 is alluded to in the verses before the quotation, highlighting its importance for the reader for what follows. In 12:28, the Father's voice is heard saying "I have glorified and will glorify it again (ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω)" and Jesus says "when I am lifted up from the earth (ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς)" (12:32).⁴⁴¹ In Isaiah 52-53, the same two verbs, to be lifted up and to be glorified, both appear in Isaiah 52:13, as the servant will be "lifted up (ὑψωθήσεται) and glorified (δοξασθήσεται)."⁴⁴² These allusions ensure that the reader has Isaiah 53 in mind when considering the referent of "these things" (12:41).

Johannine style supports the conclusion that Isaiah 6 and Isaiah 53 are both in focus when the narrator says that Isaiah saw Jesus' glory (12:41).⁴⁴³ C.K. Barrett raised this same issue in his study of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel when evaluating the reasons for deciding on one or another verse as the background for an allusion to the Old Testament in John. He argued that the reader knows the author's "habit of playing upon the double meaning of a Greek word,

⁴⁴⁰ Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 36; Jonathan Lett, "The Divine Identity of Jesus as the Reason for Israel's Unbelief in John 12:36–43." *JBL* 135 (2016): 159-173 (169).

⁴⁴¹ Lett "The Divine Identity of Jesus as the Reason for Israel's Unbelief in John 12:36–43," 169.

⁴⁴² ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα (Isa 52:13).

⁴⁴³ Lett "The Divine Identity of Jesus as the Reason for Israel's Unbelief in John 12:36–43," 170. Daniel J. Brendsel, *"Isaiah Saw His Glory": The Use of Isaiah 52-53 in John 12* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), acknowledges that Isaiah 6 is important for understanding John 12, but argues that the broader context of Isaiah 53 is the most important Old Testament context for understanding John 12:41. Jörg Frey, "... dass sie meine Herrlichkeit schauen" (Joh 17.24) Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der δόξα Jesu." *NTS* 54 (2008): 375-397 (385), notes that the connection between Isaiah 6:1 and 52:13 is a feature of the Greek translation of Isaiah itself, due to the use of δόξα and δοξασθήσεται.

and there is no reason why he should not have made a double (or even more complicated) allusion to the O.T.”⁴⁴⁴ Therefore, rather than needing to decide if this is a reference to the pre-incarnate Christ’s glory or the glorification which he will experience through the crucifixion, both realities can be considered to be in view.⁴⁴⁵ Neither background overshadows the other, but both make important contributions to understanding 12:41.

In the citations from Psalm 118, Isaiah 53 and Isaiah 6, the reader has been able to make a number of observations. First, *kyrios* is used in such a way that its Old Testament context calls on the reader to consider that it in some way refers to the God of Israel. This is true of all three citations. Second, the narrative context in which the citations from Isaiah 53 and 6 occur suggests that *kyrios* is Jesus. The combination of these two observations highlights the complexity and ambiguity which has been a feature of the *kyrios* in the narrative since its first usage in John 1:23. The third observation which the reader has now made is that the God of Israel is addressed as κύριε. This also adds weight to the importance of vocatives to refer to Jesus throughout the narrative in understanding *kyrios* as a narrative thread. Fourth, articular *kyrios* has also been used to refer to the God of Israel. This highlights the importance of the articular references to Jesus for furthering the ambiguity in the use of *kyrios* in the narrative so far. Fifth, *kyrios* has again been associated with glory. In this context, the reader has for the first time considered how Jesus’ pre-incarnate glory is to be compared to the glory which he will manifest as a result of being lifted up in his crucifixion.

4.8.1.2. Structure

Chapter 12 can be understood as containing four narrative subdivisions.⁴⁴⁶ The chapter begins with an introductory section in Bethany, at the house of Mary, Martha and Lazarus (12:1-11). This subsection of the narrative does not contain the word *kyrios*. However, it contains the important scene of Mary anointing Jesus’ feet, which is mentioned previously in 11:2 when Jesus is identified as *kyrios*. The introduction also provides key language and imagery for the reader to interpret Old Testament citations later in the chapter. Specifically, that the house was

⁴⁴⁴ C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in The Fourth Gospel." *JTS* 48 (1947): 155-169 (157).

⁴⁴⁵ Dom Jacques Dupont, *Essais sur la Christologie de Saint Jean. Le Christ, Parole, Lumière et Vie. La Gloire du Christ* (Bruges: Editions de l'Abbaye de Saint André, 1951), 269-273, sees the concept of Jesus’ “day” (Joh 8:56), as a key for understanding Joh 12:41, and argues that even the vision of Isaiah 6 can be understood as a prophetic vision of Jesus’ messianic ministry. Williams, "(Not) Seeing God in the Prologue and the Body of John's Gospel," 94: "Isaiah’s prophetic testimony (Isaiah 53:1; 6:10) results from his vision of Jesus as the embodiment of God’s glory, a vision that also embraces Jesus’ future glory."

⁴⁴⁶ The subdivisions used here follow Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 439-473.

filled with the aroma of myrrh serves to prepare the reader for the fourth section, which includes a reference to Isaiah 6.

The next three subsections all include important features which further the reader's understanding of *kyrios* as a narrative thread. Jesus' entry to Jerusalem (12:12-19) includes the identification of God as *kyrios* (12:13), and also that Jesus' glorification was still to come (12:16). The subsection which follows (12:20-36) includes characters addressing someone other than Jesus with κύριε for the first time in the narrative. The final subsection of this chapter (12:37-50) also serves as the final section of Jesus' public ministry, and the first half of the narrative. In this important subsection, there are several key uses of *kyrios* both in the narrative itself and in the context of Old Testament citations from Isaiah 53 and Isaiah 6. Another key feature of this closing section is the importance of glory, and the way this relates to both Jesus' pre-incarnate state, and also his glorification through crucifixion.

The three key narrative features which the reader encounters in the final subsection of chapter 12 were first encountered in the opening scene of the narrative proper (1:19-28). First, Jesus' identity as *kyrios* is affirmed. Raymond Collins notes that the public ministry of Jesus begins with him being called *kyrios* in 1:23 and closes with the same affirmation in 12:13.⁴⁴⁷ This serves to highlight the importance of Jesus' identity as *kyrios* throughout his entire public ministry. Second, Collins notes that these two references to Jesus as *kyrios* are supported by citations from Isaiah 40-55.⁴⁴⁸ This confirms the importance of Isaianic testimony for questions regarding Jesus' identity.⁴⁴⁹ Third, this Old Testament background ensures that Jesus' identity as *kyrios* is understood in the context of his manifestation of glory. In 1:19-28, this manifestation occurs through Jesus' coming in flesh. In 12:37-50, the reader considers Jesus' pre-incarnate and post-crucifixion glory. This serves to highlight these three narrative features, ensuring that they are in focus as the second half of the Gospel begins. As chapter 13 begins, the reader expects that Isaiah will continue to serve as a key witness to Jesus' identity as the *kyrios* who manifests his own glory.

⁴⁴⁷ Raymond F. Collins, "'You Call Me Teacher and Lord – and You Are Right. For That Is What I Am' (John 13,13)." in *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology: Festschrift Gilbert Van Belle*, (eds. Joseph Verheyden, et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 327-348 (342).

⁴⁴⁸ Collins, "You Call Me Teacher and Lord," 342. See also Lincoln, *Saint John*, 357.

⁴⁴⁹ In his analysis of 12:37-50, Jörg Frey, "dass sie meine Herrlichkeit schauen," 384, argues that the use of Isaiah 6 and 53 at the end of the first section of the narrative highlights the importance of Isaianic testimony for the narrative as a whole. Klink, *John*, 130, notes how Isaiah's witness in 1:23 and 12:38-41 functions as "a thematic *inclusio* that locates the public ministry of Jesus within the eschatological promises of the prophet Isaiah."

4.8.1.3. Character

4.8.1.3.1. The Crowd

The first character to use *kyrios* in chapter 12 is the crowd. Previously in this study, the analysis of the crowd demonstrated that, after its first use of *kyrios* in chapter 6, the crowd ceased to be a unified character and revealed its composite nature in chapters 7 and 9. A key interpretive challenge in chapter 12 is again related to the composition of the crowd. There are potentially five references to the crowd which uses *kyrios* in 12:13 (11:55, 12:9, 12, 17, 18). However, it is uncertain whether these five references include different crowds, five references to the same crowd, or if there is a less definite relationship between referent and reference.

Leading up to the use of *kyrios* in 12:13, it is not clear what the relationship is between the group mentioned in 11:55, and the two uses of ὄχλος in 12:9 and 12:12. Apart from the text-critical challenges, it does not appear that the narrative contains strong guidance for the reader in identifying the three crowds.⁴⁵⁰ Whether there is a relationship of identity, separateness or some less specific amount of overlap, is uncertain. The emphasis in the narrative is not on the exact relationship between them, but on the large numbers of people who are all seeking Jesus.⁴⁵¹ Even each individual group is not overtly uniform, and the description prior to 12:12 is in keeping with the composite, diverse nature of crowds described earlier in the narrative. As a result of this ambiguity and implicit diversity, when interpreting the use of *kyrios* in 12:13, the reader cannot rely on the crowd's desire to seek Jesus in 11:44 nor the faith of the crowd in 12:9. That is, the crowd of 12:12 cannot be imputed with these characteristics. Rather, the evidence of 12:12 and that which follows is the most relevant information for understanding the character of the crowd, and its use of *kyrios*.

The immediate context of *kyrios* in 12:13 indicates that the crowd of 12:12 does not share the same understanding of Jesus as the narrator and the reader. It has been argued above that the narrator and the reader share the understanding that the *kyrios* in the crowd's declaration in 12:13 is the Father. In addition, the reader recognises that when Jesus is identified as "the coming one," this recalls previous identifications of Jesus as the coming one. These two factors serve to highlight the narrative dynamic surrounding the use of *kyrios* whereby both the Father and Jesus are *kyrios*. In the crowd's use of *kyrios* in this quotation, however, there is no indication that there is any understanding of Jesus' identity as the *kyrios*. In fact, the crowd's

⁴⁵⁰ For the textual variation in 12:9 and 12:17, see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 201-202.

⁴⁵¹ Thompson, John, 263, notes the challenge in identification of the crowd(s), and emphasises that Jesus "increasingly attracts crowds" and his "ever-increasing notoriety."

declaration seems to manifest their ignorance that Jesus is the coming one in the sense that was laid out in the prologue, namely that he comes from heaven. In addition, their positioning of Jesus alongside *kyrios* reflects the same understanding that the delegation from Jerusalem manifested. In that case, the delegation believed that the God of Israel is *kyrios*, but was not able to see that Jesus is also *kyrios*. Despite the crowd's ignorance in this, the affirmation that Jesus comes in the name of God does reflect the crowd's spiritual insight, as this reflects Jesus' own statements earlier in the narrative (5:43).

The use of "King of Israel" by the crowd (12:13) repeats the messianic expectations reflected in the speech of Nathaniel (1:49) and Martha (11:27) earlier in the narrative. Unlike the crowd in Galilee, who also had messianic expectations of Jesus' kingship (6:15), this crowd does not cause Jesus to leave. However, Jesus does challenge any potential nationalistic implications of the crowd's declaration of his kingship.⁴⁵² By fulfilling the prophecy of Zechariah, Jesus demonstrates the nature of his kingship.⁴⁵³ This indicates that while they rightfully recognised that Jesus' coming was significant, they had not understood the nature of his coming, nor his mission.

An analysis of the "crowd" with respect to *kyrios* leads the reader to conclude two things. First, chapter 12 describes a number of groups of people seeking Jesus in the midst of increasing interest in his ministry. Some of these believe, others want to see the results of Jesus' signs, and others recognise Jesus' royal messianic role. The second observation is that in the context of the people's interest in Jesus and proclamations regarding his identity, there remains a latent ignorance regarding Jesus' identity as *kyrios*. To the crowd of 12:12, the God of Israel is *kyrios*. The reader and the narrator agree with this conviction. Unlike the reader and the narrator, however, the crowd does not yet understand that Jesus himself is also rightfully *kyrios*.

⁴⁵² Because the crowd welcomes Jesus with the branches of palm trees (βάβα), there is good reason to see their aspirations as nationalistic. Moloney, *Signs and Shadows*, 184, references 1 Macc. to support the conclusion that "[t]he use of palm fronds is closely associated with Maccabean nationalism." In 1 Macc. 13:51, the use of the branches of palm trees was in celebration of the victory over their enemy (ὅτι συνετριβη ἐχθρὸς μέγας ἐξ Ἰσραηλ).

⁴⁵³ Bennema, *The Crowd*, 350: "While the crowd expects Jesus to be a political messianic leader who would liberate them from Roman oppression, Jesus' action in 12:14-15 serves to correct their misunderstanding." Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and Johannine Epistles* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2005), 192, sees that Jesus' prophecy of drawing πάντας to himself (12:32) confirms his challenge to "the crowd's nationalism."

4.8.1.3.2. The Greeks

The Greeks (Ἕλληνες) of 12:20-21 are unique in the Gospel of John for a number of reasons. First, this is the only time that Greeks appear in the narrative as characters.⁴⁵⁴ Second, this is the only time that anyone addresses someone other than the God of Israel and Jesus as *kyrios*. Third, this is the only time in the narrative someone seeks Jesus and does not appear to encounter him. Of these three unique features, the second is most significant for the focus of this study. Accordingly, it will receive the most attention in this analysis of the character of the Greeks.

There are several similarities between the Greeks and the crowds described between 11:55 and 12:19. First, the Greeks are in Jerusalem in order to participate in the Passover celebrations. Also like the crowds that have been described before, they desire to see Jesus. In addition, the Greeks have a key similarity with the crowd of 12:12: they use *kyrios* to address a character other than Jesus. In the case of the crowd who welcomed Jesus, *kyrios* was used to refer to the God of Israel. The Greeks, on the other hand, use *kyrios* to address Philip in 12:20 (κύριε, θέλομεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδεῖν). It is this occurrence of *kyrios* which requires further analysis, due to the uniqueness of its usage in this context, and for the way it may affect the reader's understanding of the role of *kyrios* in the narrative.

It has been argued until this point that *kyrios* serves as a key narrative thread which allows the reader to recognise important aspects of Jesus' identity. As a result, the use of *kyrios* to refer to a character other than Jesus or God requires a justification which is in keeping with the overall usage of *kyrios* in the narrative.⁴⁵⁵ If *kyrios* plays a key role in understanding who Jesus is, then this usage could represent a distraction to the reader. Or, it might weaken the reader's confidence in the identification of a consistent narrative pattern with respect to *kyrios*. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate how the Greeks' use of *kyrios* to address Philip affects the reader's understanding of the narrative as a whole.

The reader might understand the Greeks' use of *kyrios* in 12:20 within the broader sociolinguistic usage of *kyrios* outside of the Gospel of John. Because *kyrios* was commonly used in the vocative as a respectful form of address in Greek-speaking communities, its usage

⁴⁵⁴ The same word (Ἕλληνες) is also used in 7:35, but this usage does not refer to characters who appear in the narrative.

⁴⁵⁵ Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 211, considered the use of κύριε to address Philip as proof that all uses of the vocative to address Jesus have no connection to the use of *kyrios* as a christological title. However, like *kyrios*, θεός is also used in the narrative to refer to a character other than Jesus and the God of Israel (10:34). For both titles, their significance in the narrative is determined by patterns of use throughout the narrative.

here can be viewed primarily with that context in mind.⁴⁵⁶ Approaching *kyrios* in this way, the reader would not necessarily need to consider the narrative patterns that have been observed so far. However, although the broader sociolinguistic factors cannot be ignored, it seems unreasonable to overlook the inclusion of *kyrios* at this point from a narrative perspective. The careful placement of *kyrios* throughout the narrative until this point in descriptions by the narrator combined with key uses by characters demonstrates that the use of *kyrios* is anything but accidental. The reader, then, not only takes the broader sociolinguistic context into account, but also considers how this usage reflects the character of the Greeks within the narrative.

When the reader considers the narrative dynamics for interpreting the Greeks' use of *kyrios* in 12:21, comparison with the crowd is again relevant. When the crowd welcomed Jesus whilst calling the God of Israel *kyrios*, the reader could infer that the crowd had not recognised that Jesus himself is *kyrios*. Based on the premise that the usage of *kyrios* in 12:20 is not inconsequential, the Greeks could also be revealing their own understanding of Jesus' identity at this point. Rather than asking to see the *kyrios*, they address Philip as *kyrios* and ask to see "Jesus." Although this seeking behaviour could be commended, and is symbolically important in the narrative, the Greeks also reveal that they have not yet understood that Jesus is *kyrios*.⁴⁵⁷

4.8.1.4. Irony

The irony which is witnessed in chapter 12 with reference to *kyrios* serves to confirm and strengthen the reader's understanding of ironic uses of *kyrios* thus far. Until this point in the narrative, characters have addressed Jesus as *kyrios* without understanding that this same term rightly reflects Jesus' divine identity. The same pattern is seen in chapter 12, with one key difference. In this chapter, the characters who use *kyrios* do not address Jesus.

Both the crowd (12:13) and the Greeks (12:21) use *kyrios* when talking about Jesus. As they do, the reader is able to experience once again the narrative dynamic of irony. The reader knows that the one riding into Jerusalem, whom the crowd is welcoming, is the divine *kyrios*. Yet when the crowd welcomes him, the referent of *kyrios* is the God of Israel.⁴⁵⁸ In the same way, when the Greeks ask to see Jesus, they also use *kyrios*, but not to refer to Jesus. In their case, they

⁴⁵⁶ On the increasing use of κύριε towards the end of the first century, see Dickey, "Κύριε, Δέσποτα, Domine," 6.

⁴⁵⁷ On the importance of the Greeks in the narrative, see Johannes Beutler, "Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12,20f)." *Bib* 71 (1990): 333-347.

⁴⁵⁸ Thompson, *John*, 265: "This is one of the rare instances in John where "Lord" refers to God, not Jesus."

address Philip, but the effect on the reader is the same. The reader experiences the narrative dynamic of irony. In both examples, the reader's knowledge that Jesus is the divine *kyrios* is contrasted with the characters that use *kyrios* in close proximity to Jesus, but without acknowledging that he is *kyrios*. This affirms the reader in the knowledge which has been shared with the narrator since 1:23, when the coming *kyrios* was identified as both Jesus and the God of Israel.

4.8.1.5. Point of View

The details of chapter 12 help the reader to understand when the statement "we have beheld his glory" will be fulfilled (1:14). This issue allows the reader to consider again the narrator's point of view, in seeking to understand how Jesus reveals his glory in his flesh. On the timing of Jesus' revelation of his glory, Nielsen argues that Jesus does not fully reveal his glory until after the resurrection.⁴⁵⁹ Strong evidence for Nielsen's proposal is found in chapter 12, where the narrative indicates that not only has Jesus been glorified in some way, but that his glorification is still in some sense future.

In this study, Jesus' glory is understood as his "divine identity." The significance of the divine identity of Jesus for understanding 12:37-50 has been convincingly established by Jonathan Lett.⁴⁶⁰ In his study, Lett argues for the importance of both Isaiah 53 and Isaiah 6 for understanding John 12:37-50. He demonstrates that the reader is challenged to consider that through the crucifixion Jesus manifests both his identity as the suffering servant (Isa 53) and also the exalted Lord (Isa 6). Lett concludes that this challenges the reader's understanding of divine glory, as it is through the suffering of the crucifixion that the glorious identity of God is displayed. The characters in the narrative are ignorant of divine identity, and as a consequence, are not aware that their understanding of God and his glory is inadequate.

In the public ministry of Jesus, characters' knowledge or ignorance of Jesus' divine identity has been tied to their use of *kyrios*. Lett has shown that ignorance of the divine identity and glory of Jesus is highlighted at the close of Jesus' public ministry. In addition, this study demonstrates that the people are also ignorant of Jesus' identity as *kyrios*.⁴⁶¹ John 12 is unique in the narrative so far, in that although characters use *kyrios*, no one uses it to address Jesus. This suggests that

⁴⁵⁹ Nielsen "Narrative Structures," 352.

⁴⁶⁰ Lett "The Divine Identity of Jesus as the Reason for Israel's Unbelief in John 12:36-43," 159-173.

⁴⁶¹ Lett "The Divine Identity of Jesus as the Reason for Israel's Unbelief in John 12:36-43," 165: "Throughout John 12, the crowds and the disciples do not recognize Jesus's true identity."

the people do not consider Jesus *kyrios* in the way that the narrator and the reader understand the title, as referring to Jesus' divine identity.

Nielsen's proposal appears to contrast with Lett's analysis of 12:37-50. Although Nielsen argues that it is through the resurrection that Jesus reveals his full glory, Lett affirms that it is in the crucifixion itself that Jesus' glory is manifest. However, the difference in their conclusions is the result of different areas of focus. Lett is concerned primarily with the nature of the glory which Jesus reveals. In that respect, the timing of his glorification is crucial, as it is in the crucifixion that the true nature of God most directly challenges human understanding of glory and divinity.⁴⁶² In contrast to Lett's focus on the nature of Jesus' glory, Nielsen focuses on the recognition of Jesus' glory. The crucifixion is the point at which Jesus begins his return to the Father. It is through the crucifixion, on his return to the Father, that Jesus regains his pre-incarnate glory. It is not, however, until after the resurrection, when this glorification is acknowledged by those who encounter Jesus.⁴⁶³ Thus, both Lett and Nielsen affirm the centrality of the cross for Jesus' glorification, and Nielsen also considers when this glory is witnessed. In narrative time, both agree that the glorification of Jesus is still future, or in some sense incomplete. It is this future glorification that the narrator affirms in chapter 12.

The future glorification of Jesus is laid out explicitly in chapter 12. First, the narrator explains that the ignorance of the disciples was only temporary; when "Jesus was glorified," then they would understand (12:16). This statement can be compared with a similar comment by the narrator earlier in the narrative (2:22).⁴⁶⁴ The difference between the two comments is that earlier in the narrative, Jesus' resurrection was the point at which the disciples' ignorance was lifted. However, in 12:16, it is his glorification. This further supports Nielsen's case that it is after not only the crucifixion, but also the resurrection, that Jesus' glorification leads to the disciples seeing his glory. It is not until the resurrection, when Jesus is vindicated, that the disciples understand who Jesus is.

⁴⁶² Bauckham, *Jesus and the God of Israel*, 48, argues for the importance of 8:28 as securing the crucifixion as central to Jesus' glorification. At the same time, Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 54, does not exclude the resurrection, but sees "John's remarkable and distinctive way of speaking of the exaltation ("lifting up") and glorification of Jesus as taking place through his humiliating death as well as his subsequent resurrection." He contends that "[t]o this manifestation of God's glory, the ultimate such revelation in the flesh on earth, the resurrection is essential, but so is the cross" (*Gospel of Glory*, 60).

⁴⁶³ Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 345, clarifies that the importance of Jesus' return to the Father "does not mean that the cross is merely the first stage on the way to the real exaltation, however, since the cross itself is the glorification of Jesus."

⁴⁶⁴ Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 434, identifies this parallel and argues that "Jesus' death marked the turning point. It was part of the movement that led on to his resurrection and exaltation."

4.8.2. Semantics

Due to the lack of textual variation with respect to *kyrios*, it is now possible to analyse the semantic range of the four uses of *kyrios* in chapter 12.

The first time *kyrios* is used, it is spoken by the crowd (12:13), citing Psalm 118:27 (Greek 117:27). In this instance, the first question to be addressed is the referent of the term. It was argued above that the crowd used *kyrios* to refer to the God of Israel. Having identified the referent, the semantic range is by necessity also determined, as there is only one semantic category for the God of Israel, namely a “supernatural being ... who exercises supernatural authority.”⁴⁶⁵

In 12:21, the Greeks address Philip with the vocative κύριε. Considering contextual constraints, there is no indication in the narrative that the Greeks considered Philip to be a supernatural being. Similarly, there is no evidence in the brief interaction that they considered Philip to exercise authority over them. It is possible, however, that due to Philip’s position as a disciple of Jesus, the Greeks considered him worthy of respect, suggesting that relationship context is relevant. A second relevant factor is the type of discourse. As the Greeks are requesting Philip’s help, calling on him to do them a favour, this is an appropriate context for an honorific form of address. This is particularly true as there is no indication that the Greeks would have considered Philip to be socially inferior to them in this context. The combination of these factors means that “a title of respect” is the most suitable semantic range to select.⁴⁶⁶ This is in keeping with the strong conventional constraints which contribute to the semantic analysis of *kyrios* in 12:21. These constraints consist of the sociolinguistic context in which the Gospel of John was written. This context, in which κύριε was a widely-used form of respectful address, supports the analysis that *kyrios* is used as “a title of respect.”⁴⁶⁷

As with the first usage of *kyrios* (12:16), the third usage (κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν, 12:38) depends on the identification of the referent to determine the semantic range. That is, if it can be decided who this *kyrios* is, then the semantic range will be known. In the context of Isaiah 53:1, the *kyrios* who is addressed is the God of Israel. In the citation of Isaiah 53:1 in John 12:38, there does not appear to be any contextual constraint which would affect that

⁴⁶⁵ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

⁴⁶⁶ For *kyrios* being rendered “sir,” see, for example, Barrett, *John*, 422.

⁴⁶⁷ L&N 1:739 (87§53).

assessment. Therefore, as the God of Israel is referred to, the only semantic category to choose is a “supernatural being ... who exercises supernatural authority.”⁴⁶⁸

The final use of *kyrios* in this section of the narrative is also in 12:38 (ὁ βραχίων κυρίου). In the analysis of narrative context above, it was argued that this was an example where there was ambiguity of referent. As at the beginning of the narrative, when *kyrios* was used to refer to Jesus and the God of Israel at the same time (1:23), the same appears to be the case at the end of the public ministry of Jesus (12:38). Although in the context of Isaiah 52:13-53:12 this *kyrios* is the God of Israel, the narrative context suggests that it also includes reference to Jesus, within the context of Jesus’ public ministry. There is inherent ambiguity, and it is not necessary to make a choice between one and the other. Rather, both Jesus and the God of Israel are in view. Given the cognitive context of this usage, namely the shared knowledge between the narrator and the reader, this usage fits the only semantic range which is able to include both Jesus and the God of Israel at the same time. Therefore, the most appropriate choice is a supernatural being “who exercises supernatural authority.”⁴⁶⁹

4.8.3. Summary

The final scenes in the first half of the narrative are key for understanding how *kyrios* is used within the narrative. By reading chapter 12 with the internal narrative context and Old Testament context in mind, four things have been affirmed. First, Isaiah, glory and *kyrios* are intertwined narrative threads which have bracketed the public ministry of Jesus. The importance which these three interrelated narrative features hold in the first half of the narrative ensure that the reader is attentive to them reappearing in the second half. The second affirmation in chapter twelve and its Old Testament context is that, no matter the morphological and syntactic category, the key term *kyrios* remains in view. This has been demonstrated by the use of the vocative and the articular form for the God of Israel. The third affirmation is that Jesus’ glorification is going to be fulfilled in the second half of the narrative. The reader waits for this to take place, and is ready to rely on the threefold intertwined threads of Isaiah, glory and *kyrios* as the narrative progresses.

⁴⁶⁸ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

⁴⁶⁹ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

4.9. *Kyrios* and his Disciples

4.9.1. Narrative

4.9.1.1. Context

In the first half of the Gospel, the title *kyrios* has been closely linked to glory. There have been two key developments with respect to the reader's understanding of glory. The first is that when the reader considers the glory of God, Jesus must be included. When the glory of God is manifest, it is manifest in Jesus. When the reader reads of the glory of God, this same glory is the glory of Jesus. In this way, the referent of glory has been expanded. The second development is related to the definition of glory. In 12:37-50, the reader is presented with a new definition of glory, so that the true nature of glory can only be understood in the crucifixion of Jesus. From that point in the narrative, glory must be viewed through both the humiliation and exaltation of Jesus.

It is important to consider how the reader's understanding of glory is related to the reader's understanding of *kyrios*. The first development in the narrative related to glory was an expansion of referent, so that reader understands that seeing God's glory is seeing Jesus' glory. The second development for the reader's understanding of glory was with respect to definition. The glory of God is not incompatible with the crucifixion, but is truly manifest when Jesus is exalted on the cross. With regard to *kyrios*, the reader has also been challenged to rethink the referent in the first half of the narrative, and has also been challenged to accept that *kyrios* includes reference to Jesus. However, until this point in the narrative, the reader has not been significantly challenged to reconsider the definition of *kyrios*. That is, the reader has had to rethink who *kyrios* is, but has not yet been challenged with regard to what *kyrios* is like.⁴⁷⁰ Approaching chapter 13 with a clear understanding of the identity of the *kyrios*, the reader now awaits clarification of the nature and character of *kyrios*.

4.9.1.2. Structure

The structure of chapters 13-17 is an issue that has received significant scholarly attention.⁴⁷¹ Many of the proposals for the structure of these chapters are concerned with the processes through which the text came to be in its present form, an issue which is outside of the scope of

⁴⁷⁰ In a general sense, all that Jesus says and does challenges the reader to reconsider what is meant by *kyrios*. A key example is Jesus riding the donkey in 12:15. However, in the narrative so far, there has not been a direct challenge connected to explicit use of the title *kyrios*.

⁴⁷¹ For a chronological survey of approaches, see Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse*, 10-78.

this study. In contrast to a focus on development, the primary issue to consider in this study is the structure of the text as we have it. The divisions identified here are commonly selected due to shifts in topic, and in most cases align with traditional chapter divisions. In chapters 13-17, *kyrios* occurs between 13:6 and 15:20. As a result, the analysis of structure will focus on chapters 13 to 15.

There are four key divisions to consider: 13:1-20, 13:21-30, 13:31-14:31 and 15:1-16:33.⁴⁷² The first major division (13:1-20) includes a number of occurrences of *kyrios* in the manuscript tradition. In this first section, *kyrios* occurs when Jesus washes the disciples' feet and in Jesus' affirmation of his own identity as *kyrios*. Following this, during the discussion of the identity of Jesus' betrayer, the disciple whom Jesus loved addresses Jesus as *kyrios* once (13:25). In the second major division (13:31-14:31), four disciples address Jesus as *kyrios*: Peter, Thomas, Philip and Judas. In the third division, chapters 15-16, Jesus uses *kyrios*, once to identify the disciples as friends (15:15) and once (15:20) to remind the disciples of an earlier statement from 13:16. The distribution of *kyrios* through each major division challenges the reader again to consider its importance when reading chapters 13-17.

4.9.1.3. Character

4.9.1.3.1. Peter

The first character to use *kyrios* in chapter 13 is Peter. He was last mentioned by name in the narrative in 6:68, when he addressed Jesus as *kyrios* and spoke on behalf of the other disciples. Although he has not been identified explicitly since then, the reader has inferred his presence in references to the disciples (11:1-16, 15; 12:16). With regard to character development, in Bethany (11:1-16) and Jerusalem (12:16), the narrative emphasises the disciples' lack of understanding of Jesus' ministry. In chapter 13, Peter demonstrates that, like all of the disciples, he struggles to understand who Jesus is and what he is going to do.

In chapter 13, Peter demonstrates his lack of understanding of Jesus' identity and ministry.⁴⁷³

This is made explicit in the narrative when Jesus informs Peter that his ignorance would end

⁴⁷² This major fourfold division follows the structure widely accepted by commentators, including Brown, *John*, 2:545-547, and Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 11-12.

⁴⁷³ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 62, argues with reference to Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loves (13:6,9,25,36,37) that "[a]ll five occasions when *kyrie* is used are in situations where these two disciples reveal themselves to be as yet ignorant ... or overconfident." Skinner, "Misunderstanding, Christology, and Johannine Characterization," 121, importantly clarifies that reader "cannot doubt Peter's sincerity, but is beginning to doubt his spiritual insight." That is, Peter continues to be portrayed as a disciple who desires to interact with his *kyrios* faithfully; however, he does

(13:7). Jesus' statement echoes the narrator's earlier assessment of the disciples in 12:7. In that place, it is Jesus' glorification which is a prerequisite for the lifting of ignorance. In 13:7, Jesus informs Peter that he will understand "after these things" (μετὰ ταῦτα). Rather than accepting Jesus' action and assessment of his ignorance at this time, Peter continues to demonstrate that he does not understand, by explicitly refusing Jesus' offer (13:8).⁴⁷⁴ Following Jesus' clarification of the importance of the foot washing, Peter sets forth a new proposal which highlights again his lack of understanding (13:8). Of the three times Peter addresses Jesus, Peter uses *kyrios* in the vocative at least once, prefacing his initial questioning of Jesus' actions.⁴⁷⁵ This opening statement and the dialogue as a whole follow the pattern of ignorance being tied to Jesus' identity as *kyrios*.

The next time Peter uses *kyrios* in 13:36, he again reveals that he not only does not understand Jesus' present actions, but that he is also ignorant of Jesus' future.⁴⁷⁶ Having been affirmed in his use of *kyrios* by Jesus himself (13:13-14), Peter continues to use the title when he next addresses Jesus (13:36). As in 13:6, Peter poses a question, this time explicitly declaring his ignorance of where Jesus is going (13:36). As in the previous interaction between Peter and his *kyrios*, Jesus promises that Peter's ignorance will be temporary (13:36). Peter's attempt to protest against this delay is again met by a soft rebuke from Jesus and a prediction that Peter's self-assessment is inadequate (13:37-38). In this dialogue, Peter continues to show that he is unaware of not only his own future, but also that of his *kyrios*.

Despite this, in chapter 13, Peter also reveals his desire to honour Jesus as his *kyrios*.⁴⁷⁷ This concern results in Peter challenging Jesus' decision to wash his feet (13:8). In a similar way, the disciples earlier challenged Jesus' decision to go to Bethany out of their concern for his safety (11:8). In 13:6, 8, Peter is no longer concerned about Jesus' safety, but his honour. His objection to Jesus' actions indicates that he considered this a reversal of roles, as Jesus, the *kyrios*, was

not yet have the revelation to be able to do what he desires. D. Francois Tolmie, *Jesus' Farewell to the Disciples: John 13:1-17* (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 137, refers to this as "his inability to understand."

⁴⁷⁴ Labahn, "Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career," 156: "Peter is presented as the disciple who acknowledges Jesus' role as master but does not accept Christ in the Johannine way." Skinner, *John and Thomas*, 98, clarifies that in Peter's responses to Jesus, the reader sees "a progression in Peter's speech from surprise to outright objection."

⁴⁷⁵ The use of *kyrios* before Peter's third line in the dialogue will be addressed in the text-critical analysis due to textual variation, so is not relied upon here.

⁴⁷⁶ In 13:37, *kyrios* appears in the manuscript tradition. The authenticity of the word will be judged in the text-critical analysis below.

⁴⁷⁷ Labahn, "Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career," 151-167 (157): "Peter ironically violates the very rules of honor and shame on which his objection is based: the disciple criticizes his master for not behaving as a master should ... This reasoning, however, is not in line with the larger message of the Johannine foot-washing story."

washing the disciples' feet.⁴⁷⁸ Despite this, Peter does not counter Jesus by proposing to wash Jesus' or the other disciples' feet. Rather, he at first refuses to have his *kyrios* perform the act.

4.9.1.3.2. Jesus

Chapter 13 is the first time that Jesus uses the word *kyrios* in the narrative. Because of this, none of the character analyses until this point have focused on the character of Jesus himself. While Jesus has implicitly accepted the title *kyrios* when other characters have addressed him using the term, he has not yet explicitly approved of its use. Although the reader may have inferred that, because Jesus speaks in unison with the narrator, he would accept the title, chapter 13 is the first time this approval is made explicit. What follows is not an attempt to provide an analysis of Jesus' character throughout the narrative, but is much more focused in scope. From the four text-critically secure examples of Jesus' use of *kyrios* (13:13, 14; 15:15, 20), Jesus' own point of view with respect to *kyrios* will be considered.⁴⁷⁹

In 13:13, when Jesus first uses *kyrios*, he addresses the disciples as a whole (ὁμεῖς φωνεῖτέ με· ὁ διδάσκαλος, καὶ ὁ κύριος).⁴⁸⁰ Although only Peter has called Jesus *kyrios* in this scene, Jesus' use of the second person plural acknowledges the use of the term by the other disciples as well. The narrative is silent on the number of disciples who are with him at the supper. Given the knowledge of the Jesus story by the reader, however, the presence of the twelve can be safely assumed. The twelve as a collective have called Jesus *kyrios* previously in Galilee (6:68), when Peter spoke on their behalf, and also prior to the scenes in Bethany (11:12). It is best to understand the use of the present tense form as referring to the habitual and ongoing use of the title by the disciples. Understood this way, Jesus' statement indicates that the disciples' use of the title ὁ κύριος for Jesus was common.

⁴⁷⁸ The placement of the genitive pronoun in and of itself (σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας) is probably not emphatic (cf. BDF§473). Robertson, *Grammar*, 418-419, is cautious about seeing emphasis in the placement of the pronouns in this verse: "There may be some contrast ... [b]ut the personal enclitic pronouns have a tendency to come early in the sentence without emphasis." It seems as though the emphasis is suggested from not only the fronting of pronouns, but the combination which results. The presence of σύ is grammatically unnecessary, and this could be in order to put emphasis on Jesus. The fronting of σύ also is not necessarily significant, but the resultant positioning of σύ and μου together suggests that there is an emphasis on contrast in 13:6. In 13:8, emphasis is achieved through other means. There is no emphatic nominative pronoun (οὐ μὴ νίψης μου τοὺς πόδας εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), but again there is a combination of factors which suggest emphasis. The use of the double negative οὐ μὴ with εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα results in a redundancy of expression which confirms the heightened tension in Peter's expression as he tries to prevent what he considers unimaginable.

⁴⁷⁹ There is one other use of *kyrios* in 13:16 which will be the subject of a text-critical analysis below.

⁴⁸⁰ Beasley-Murray, *John*, 229, provides details of Aramaic equivalents for the two titles, based on Strack, Hermann Leberecht and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (6 vols.; Munich: Beck, 1922-1961), 2:558.

Jesus makes four key affirmations in relation to his identity as *kyrios* in 13:13-16. First, he commends the disciples' ongoing use of *kyrios* to address him, because he is, in fact, *kyrios* (13:13). Taking this statement into account, the reader is able to see that the use of *kyrios* to address Jesus in the narrative is not accidental, or merely a reflection of sociolinguistic norms, but that it reflects his true identity. Second, Jesus' reversal of the disciples' ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος to ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος serves to prioritize the importance of Jesus' identity as *kyrios* (13:13-14).⁴⁸¹ This suggests that, although Jesus' identity as ὁ διδάσκαλος is important, the reader will pay particular attention to the use of *kyrios*. Third, Jesus establishes his role as example, so that the disciples should do as he did, not being greater than him (13:15-16). It is not only the fact that Jesus gives an example which is significant for this study, but the nature of the example which affects the reader in a substantial way.

The example which Jesus gives of washing the disciples' feet challenges the reader's assumptions regarding the definition of *kyrios*. Although the narrative has clearly defined Jesus as the rightful recipient of the title *kyrios*, the reader has until this point not been challenged to reconsider what *kyrios* might mean, beyond implications of Jesus' divine identity. Throughout the narrative so far, *kyrios* has been used to refer to the God of Israel as a supernatural being, to Jesus as one who has authority over others, and also as a term of respect. At times the reader has inferred that Jesus' identity as a supernatural being is implied by the use of *kyrios*. On encountering the scene of Jesus washing Peter's feet, however, the reader has for the first time been challenged to think about what Jesus, as *kyrios*, is like.

In the same way that the reader is challenged to rethink the meaning of glory in chapter 12, the reader now has to rethink *kyrios*. In chapter 12, glory was radically redefined as not only being associated with the high and lofty exaltation of Isaiah 6, but also the humiliation and debasement of Isaiah 53. Now, in chapter 13, the reader is forced to reckon with the image of the *kyrios* who washes his own disciples' feet. According to the conventional semantic constraints used in this study, speakers use *kyrios* to acknowledge the authority a person has over them, or the respect they have for the person. In this example, Jesus does not appear to be exercising authority as it would be understood in this sociolinguistic context, and his actions appear to reverse the roles of respect giver and recipient. This allows the reader to develop an understanding of *kyrios* which is radically redefined by Jesus' actions. This *kyrios*, who exercises authority over those who respect him, is not prevented from serving his disciples, but serves them in order to demonstrate the nature of his authority.

⁴⁸¹ Collins, "You Call Me Teacher and Lord," 342-343.

Jesus' next reference to *kyrios* in 15:15 is in the context of Jesus' statement that he will no longer call his disciples slaves (οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους).⁴⁸² The title which he will now use for the disciples is “friends” (φίλοι). The only other time in the narrative the title “slaves” is associated with the disciples is in 13:16, where Jesus uses an analogy to clarify that the foot-washing is an example to follow. As Jesus washes the disciples' feet, the reader witnesses a radical presentation of how Jesus, as *kyrios*, relates to his disciples. In 15:15, the nature of this relationship is further refined in a proposition to complement Jesus' actions. Now, Jesus' disciples are friends of the *kyrios*. As well as redefining the nature of the relationship between Jesus and his disciples, this statement also reflects significantly on the disciples themselves. As friends of the *kyrios*, they have access to him in ways that again challenge the reader's previous understanding of a relationship between a *kyrios* and those over whom he has authority.

In Jesus' prophecy about the disciples' future persecution in 15:20, he refers to himself as *kyrios* and also to the disciples as δοῦλοι. The use of both titles suggests that not only is Jesus' identity as *kyrios* ongoing, but also the disciples' identity as δοῦλοι.⁴⁸³ Even when Jesus introduces the language of friendship, it is presented in the context of obedience (15:14). Therefore, “it is not as though the master—servant relationship is now entirely superseded.”⁴⁸⁴ Although Jesus says he will no longer call the disciples slaves, he does not say “you are no longer slaves.” His use of a new title in 15:15 (φίλοι) does not annul the reality of the *kyrios*-δοῦλος relationship, but acknowledges a development in the relationship. Their new status as friends remains predicated on their relationship with their *kyrios*.

4.9.1.3.3. The Other Disciples

⁴⁸² The use of *kyrios* in 13:16 will be discussed in the analysis of textual variation below. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*, 212, writes with reference to 15:15 and related references that, within the “Johannine literary circle,” because Jesus' disciples are now called friends, they “reject the predicate of servants of Christ for themselves and for this reason apparently also avoid the title κύριος.” Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1179, describes Bousset's view as “utterly inadequate ... especially in view of the abundant postresurrection use” of *kyrios* in the narrative. Although “friend” is a reciprocal title, Murray J. Harris, *John* (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015), 270, importantly notes that Jesus never encourages the disciples to call him friend; they are only affirmed in their use of *kyrios* and teacher to address him (13:13). Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 206, understands that “Jesus clarifies his rejection of the prevailing norms of social standing. First the foot washing does not mean that Jesus is not to be honored as teacher and Lord. Second, because the disciples honor him as their teacher, they are to follow his teaching and example by serving others.”

⁴⁸³ O'Day, “The Gospel of John,” 763: “Jesus' words here may at first seem to contradict 15:15 ... but they actually complement them. Jesus reminds the disciples that friendship does not preclude the demands of service.” It is not inconceivable that someone could be a friend and a slave of God. These two identities are not mutually exclusive, as in T.Ab. B 13:1, when God says, with respect to Abraham, Οὐ μὴ τολμήσῃ θάνατος ἐγγίσει τοῦ ἐξενεγκεῖν τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ δούλου μου, ὅτι φίλος μου ἐστίν.

⁴⁸⁴ Lincoln, *Saint John*, 406.

Four other named disciples use *kyrios* following Jesus' commendation of the disciples' use of the title (13:13-14). All four, the disciple whom Jesus loved, Thomas, Philip and Judas (not Iscariot), use the vocative to preface a question to Jesus (13:25, 14:5, 8, 22). These four questions represent the only addresses to Jesus following 13:13-14. This consistent use of *kyrios* implies their desire to continue using the title of which their *kyrios* approved. It also ensures that this aspect of their relationship with Jesus, his identity as *kyrios*, remains highlighted throughout chapter 14 between Jesus' uses in 13:13 and 15:15. At the same time, their questions reveal their state of ignorance with regard to Jesus' identity and mission, and this aspect of their characters will be the focus of the following analysis of irony.⁴⁸⁵

4.9.1.4. Irony

The disciples who address Jesus as *kyrios* through chapters 13 and 14 do so whilst revealing their ignorance of Jesus' mission.⁴⁸⁶ The reader, on the other hand, is able to understand what the disciples do not, as the narrative dynamic of irony is again tied to the use of *kyrios*. The first time a disciple calls Jesus *kyrios*, Peter demonstrates that he is unaware of the way Jesus is redefining their relationship (13:6). Then, when the disciple whom Jesus loved leans on Jesus and calls him *kyrios*, he is explicitly ignorant of the identity of Jesus' betrayer (13:25). Following this, Thomas addresses Jesus as *kyrios* as he expresses ignorance about "the way" on behalf of the disciples as a whole (κύριε, οὐκ οἶδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις· πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι; 14:5).⁴⁸⁷ The next disciple to address Jesus as *kyrios*, Philip (14:8), does not ask a question, but his request to see the Father is met with Jesus' explicit confirmation that he did not know Jesus (οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με 14:9).⁴⁸⁸ The final character to use *kyrios*, Judas, raises the question of "the world" not being able to see Jesus (14:22). Judas' question reveals that he does not yet understand the nature of Jesus' future revelation of himself to the disciples.⁴⁸⁹

In all four examples, the disciples contribute to the continuation of a pattern witnessed throughout the narrative so far. When characters address Jesus as *kyrios*, it is an opportunity for

⁴⁸⁵ Catrin H. Williams, "Judas (not Iscariot): What's in a Name?" in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 550-553 (551), notes both the disciples' use of *kyrios* and their misunderstanding. Williams references Tolmie, who emphasises the disciples' "inability to understand" (*Jesus' Farewell*, 135-136).

⁴⁸⁶ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 62-63: "Thomas, Philip and Judas (not Iscariot) all address Jesus as 'Lord' in situations of puzzlement and enquiry concerning his coming departure."

⁴⁸⁷ Popp, "Thomas: Question Marks and Exclamation Marks," 512: "The fact that Jesus himself *is* the way has not yet occurred to him." On Thomas as a representative for the others, see Köstenberger, *John*, 428.

⁴⁸⁸ O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 743: "Philip does not understand the nature of Jesus' self-revelation, that the incarnation is the ultimate revelation of God."

⁴⁸⁹ Catrin H. Williams, "Judas (not Iscariot)," 550: "Judas appears to envisage an event that will be visible to all."

the reader's knowledge to be contrasted with that of the ignorance of characters in the scene. Unlike Peter, the reader is not concerned to challenge Jesus' decision to wash the disciples' feet. Having read 13:1, the reader knows that Jesus is acting with knowledge of not only the present, but also the future. That is, his actions are part of the journey which he is on to return to the Father. The disciple whom Jesus loved does not have access to the insight the narrator shares with the reader regarding the devil's activity and Judas' destiny as the betrayer. Although Thomas is unaware that Jesus is the way, the reader knows that Jesus has been associated with "the way" in the sense that "the way" is not a geographical designator.⁴⁹⁰ In the same way that "the way" or "coming" of *kyrios* is fulfilled in Jesus (1:23), "the way" used in an absolute sense (14:3) also cannot be understood apart from him.⁴⁹¹ In contrast to Philip, the reader knows that Jesus has been revealing his divine identity, his glory, throughout his ministry. Judas' question highlights for the reader the importance of knowing that the resurrection will follow the crucifixion. In all of these cases when *kyrios* is used, by witnessing the ignorance of the characters, the reader's own knowledge, shared with the narrator, is highlighted and affirmed.

4.9.1.5. Point of View

Chapters 13-16 present the reader with key ideas relevant to the consideration of the narrator's point of view. In this study of *kyrios*, the importance of Jesus' return to the Father is key for understanding when his disciples recognise his divine identity. In addition, it is through the glorification of Jesus, after which he reveals his glory fully to his disciples, that this recognition will be complete. Only then will the disciples, in addition to the narrator, be able to use *kyrios* in a way that acknowledges Jesus' divine identity. As a result, the two connected themes of Jesus' return to the Father and his glorification will assist the reader in understanding when Jesus' glory is truly beheld (1:14).

This section of the narrative is rich with language and themes that highlight Jesus' return to the Father. At the beginning of chapter 13, the narrator establishes the context of Jesus' time with the disciples. In some sense, Jesus' journey to the Father had begun (*πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει* 13:3). Following the end of his public ministry, Jesus' trajectory is now clear: he is going to his Father (14:12).⁴⁹² Jesus clarifies that his going is actually a return. He is returning to the one

⁴⁹⁰ Köstenberger, *John*, 428: "Thomas ... is looking for a literal road map, complete with specific directions that would enable him to know how to get to where Jesus is going."

⁴⁹¹ Although the reader might associate "the way" with Jesus, Skinner, *John and Thomas*, 61, emphasises that not only Thomas, but the other disciples and even the reader do not have a full understanding of "the way," until Jesus expounds that "the way" is the way "to the Father."

⁴⁹² The idea of "going" permeates chapters 14 and 16, being found explicitly, with *ὑπάγω* or *πορεύομαι*, in 14:2, 3, 4,

who sent him (16:5). Following this explicit declaration of Jesus' heavenly origin, the disciples claim to believe that Jesus does come from God (16:30).⁴⁹³ If the disciples' assessment of their own faith is accurate, the reader can conclude that they have now, finally, acknowledged in some way Jesus' divine identity. Jesus quickly challenges the reality of their belief, however, leaving the reader without confidence in them (16:31). As throughout the narrative so far, only the narrator and Jesus himself truly understand who Jesus is.

Chapter 13 provides significant support for the reader's understanding of Jesus' glorification. In the previous chapter, the narrative emphasised that Jesus' glorification was in some sense still future. Following the end of Jesus' public ministry, as the reader enters the second half of the narrative, Jesus' glorification is described as something taking place "now" and "immediately" (νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ ... καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν 13:31-32).⁴⁹⁴ Due to the use of the aorist ἐδοξάσθη with "now," this can be understood as referring to the commencement of the glorification.⁴⁹⁵ This fits well with the context of 13:31. As Judas has left, Jesus' journey to the cross through betrayal has begun. As a result, Jesus' glorification, which takes place through his crucifixion, likewise has now "begun."⁴⁹⁶ Although Jesus' glorification has begun, as the disciples claim that they have finally recognised Jesus is met with a challenge from Jesus (16:30-31), the reader has still not yet witnessed anyone who has "beheld" the glory (1:14).⁴⁹⁷ That is, no one in the narrative has demonstrated knowledge of Jesus' divine identity.⁴⁹⁸

4.9.2. Textual Criticism

The first variant in chapter 13 is κύριε in 13:9. It is absent in the first hand of Codex Sinaiticus, and was added by a corrector. This represents the totality of known variation for κύριε in 13:9. Internally, there are no textual features in the immediate context that would have made the

12, 28; 16:5,10, 28.

⁴⁹³ Tolmie, *Jesus' Farewell*, 135-136, connects irony with the disciples' own positive assessment of their faith.

⁴⁹⁴ The absence or presence of εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ at the beginning of 13:32 does not affect the analysis here. Although printed in NA²⁸, the square brackets indicate the uncertainty of the committee, caused by the strength of the external evidence for the shorter reading in contrast to the strong internal evidence for the longer reading (cf. Metzger, *Commentary*, 205-206).

⁴⁹⁵ See the function of νῦν, as explained in BDAG, 681: "in the aor., mostly in contrast to the past, denoting that an action or condition is beginning in the present."

⁴⁹⁶ See the translation of 13:31, taking into account νῦν with the aorist, in BDAG, 681: "now the glorification of the Human One has begun."

⁴⁹⁷ Two other references to glorification are 14:13 and 15:8, both referring to the glorification of the Father.

⁴⁹⁸ With the exception of the narrator, the reader and John. As discussed in the analysis of 1:23, John is a reliable character who is unique in the narrative, speaking in unison with the narrator, and sharing with the narrator and reader an understanding of Jesus' divine identity.

omission likely. Given the strength of the external evidence, overall, it seems more likely to posit a single instance of accidental omission, so that the longer reading is preferred.⁴⁹⁹

The second variant in the speech of Peter is in 13:37. Like 13:9, κύριε is again omitted by Sinaiticus and inserted by a corrector. In addition, it is omitted by two minuscules, 33 and 565, one Old Latin manuscript (aur), the Vulgate tradition, the Sinaitic Syriac, one Sahidic manuscript, the Proto-Bohairic and Bohairic. This represents a significant difference from the variant in 13:9. The external support for the longer reading is stronger than that for the omission. However, the fact that κύριε is absent in all three of the earliest versions, and in two of the traditions as a whole, renders the external support significant.

With respect to scribal habits, it is more likely that κύριε was omitted than added. The vocative may have been omitted accidentally, or may have been judged superfluous, as it has just appeared in Peter's address to Jesus in 13:36.⁵⁰⁰ Although it seems unlikely that an omission could have occurred independently to affect such a diverse range of manuscripts, the case for the omission is perhaps even less likely. Despite the possibility that scribes were influenced by the κύριε of 13:36 and added it in 13:37 as well, it seems extremely difficult to posit the circumstances required for an intentional addition to occur in such a wide range of diverse manuscripts.⁵⁰¹ As a result, transcriptionally, the longer reading is marginally preferred.

Further support for the longer reading is found with intrinsic probabilities. There are two reasons which suggest that the shorter text is unlikely. First, Peter appears to have already learned that addressing Jesus without a title of respect is undesirable. Prior to 13:37, Peter did not use κύριε in the second of his earlier addresses to Jesus (13:6, 8, 9), when he said that Jesus would never wash his feet (13:8). Following Jesus' response, however, Peter returned to using the title (13:9). This suggests that Peter's abrupt directive to Jesus in 13:8 was made without sufficient consideration of honorifics, an awareness which returns in 13:9.⁵⁰² A second reason is that, by 13:37, Peter has just heard Jesus affirm the disciples' use of the title *kyrios* (13:13). Following this affirmation, all other addresses to Jesus, the disciples, including Peter, use *kyrios* (13:25, 36; 14:5, 8, 22). If the shorter reading were preferred, this would stand out as a singular

⁴⁹⁹ This is the only singular reading analysed in the text-critical sections of this study. An exception is made in this case due to the relationship between the variant in 13:9 and the more complex variant in 13:37.

⁵⁰⁰ Metzger, *Commentary*, 206.

⁵⁰¹ Metzger, *Commentary*, 206, raises the possibility of assimilation to 13:36.

⁵⁰² Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 765, however, argues that the shorter reading "is plausible because Peter is just as emphatic and excited here as he was" in 13:8. Michaels ultimately prefers the longer reading, primarily due to its strong external support.

omission of the very title Jesus has just affirmed. It seems reasonable, then, to expect Peter to continue using the title, not only after the soft rebuke of Jesus in 13:8, but also as a result of the positive affirmation in 13:13. Therefore, in light of these strong intrinsic probabilities, as well as the weightier external evidence and marginally superior transcriptional probabilities, the longer reading is preferred in 13:37, so that Peter addresses Jesus as κύριε.

The only textual variant in the words of Jesus is the omission or inclusion of μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος in 13:16. The shorter reading that results from the omission, found in Coridethianus (038) and supported by the Bohairic, is οὐκ ἔστιν δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν. The longer text, found in all other collated Greek manuscripts and versions, is οὐκ ἔστιν δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν. The external evidence clearly supports the longer reading, and in this case, there also appear to be compelling transcriptional probabilities. The omission appears to be the result of a leap from the first to the second μείζων. This is more likely than the text being the result of addition for the purpose of harmonising with 15:20. Overall, the longer reading is preferred on both external and internal grounds.

4.9.3. Semantics

In 13:13 and 14, Jesus affirms the disciples' use of *kyrios* for him by confirming that he is actually the *kyrios*. As the disciples have addressed Jesus as *kyrios* previously in the narrative, the semantic analyses of previous uses are relevant here. Until this point, *kyrios* has been used to acknowledge Jesus' authority over the disciples. In this new context, however, Jesus' actions radically challenge the disciples' understanding of the *kyrios*-disciple relationship. Jesus' authority over the disciples is not incompatible with service. In fact, to the dismay of the disciples, and particularly Peter, his authority over them is being demonstrated in service.

As has been argued in the narrative analysis above, Jesus' actions constitute a radical redefinition of *kyrios* for both the disciples and the reader. This does not, however, annul the authority inherent in Jesus' relationship with the disciples. Considering the linguistic context, Jesus' words to the disciples continue to demonstrate that they are to submit to his will, as he determines how they should behave, and what they should do. Jesus' use of *kyrios* in 13:13, 14 continues to reflect his authority over the disciples. As a result, the most suitable semantic category is "one who rules or has authority over others."⁵⁰³

⁵⁰³ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

In three places in this section of the narrative, Jesus uses *kyrios* and δοῦλος in the same context. In 13:16, and again in 15:20, Jesus states that a slave is not greater than his *kyrios* (οὐκ ἔστιν δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ). In 15:15, Jesus states that “a slave does not know what his *kyrios* does” (ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ οἶδεν τί ποιῆι αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος). These examples represent the first time in the narrative that *kyrios* has been used in connection with δοῦλος.⁵⁰⁴ This is also the first time in the narrative that the disciples have been identified as slaves. Until this point, Jesus’ identity as *kyrios* has been connected to the twelve’s identity as disciples. However, in each case, the use of *kyrios* is generic, as is appropriate for an aphorism.⁵⁰⁵ Although Jesus applies an aspect of the aphorisms to the relationship between himself and the disciples, the aphorisms themselves are general statements about slaves and their masters.

Because the aphorisms in John 13:16, 15:15 and 15:20 are by definition general statements, the referent of *kyrios* is also general. By considering the aphorisms as self-contained statements, the most relevant context for understanding *kyrios* is the immediate linguistic context within the aphorism. As a result, the juxtaposition of *kyrios* with δοῦλος is the most important evidence for semantic analysis. Considering the four semantic categories of Louw and Nida, there is only one which is used for a *kyrios* who has slaves. Therefore, in 13:16, 15:15 and 15:20, *kyrios* means “one who owns and controls property, including especially servants and slaves.”⁵⁰⁶

Conclusions about the meaning of *kyrios* in the general statements of 13:16, 15:15 and 15:20 do not have a direct effect on the semantic analysis of other uses of *kyrios* in the narrative. This is because the aphorisms are used to construct an argument of analogy. Only the aspects of the analogy which are utilised by Jesus are relevant for the disciples and their *kyrios*. Therefore, the semantic range of *kyrios* in the general statements in 13:16, 15:15 and 15:20 does not affect other uses of *kyrios* which exclusively refer to Jesus.

The disciples who use *kyrios* in chapter 13 and 14 are Peter (13:6, 9, 36, 37), the disciple whom Jesus loved (13:25), Thomas (14:5), Philip (14:8) and Judas (14:22).⁵⁰⁷ In each instance, the

⁵⁰⁴ In the narrative so far, δοῦλος has only occurred twice, in 8:34,35.

⁵⁰⁵ For 13:16 as an aphorism, see Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 468.

⁵⁰⁶ L&N 1:559 (57§12), cite 13:16 as an example of this category. George D. Kilpatrick, "Κυριος in the Gospels." in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism* (ed. J.K. Elliott; Leuven: Peeters, 1990), 207-212 (210), concludes that *kyrios* means “Master, owner” in 13:16, 15:15 and 15:20.

⁵⁰⁷ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 62, considers the use of *kyrie* by Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loves as “an address of high christology.” Following this statement, Pryor argues that “the resurrection does make a difference in their assessment of Jesus.” However, he then references John 21 to support the view that addresses to Jesus “in the ministry is of equal Christological potency” to post-resurrection uses of *kyrios*. This appears to present a retrospective role for the post-resurrection appearances that the narrative does not support. Until this point, the disciples have not yet demonstrated that they believe Jesus is divine, that he is a supernatural being. If the reader knows that characters in the narrative do have further revelation after the resurrection, this does not impact the reader’s understanding of the characters’ use of κύριε when speaking before the resurrection. As with 6:68 and

disciples use the vocative κύριε. Although the disciples have been called “friends” and “slaves” to highlight aspects of their unique relationship with Jesus, the dominant title in this section of the narrative is “disciples” (13:5, 22, 23, 35; 15:8; 16:17, 29). Therefore, this semantic analysis must consider the broader relationship context in which the speakers have been identified as disciples. This includes not only the preceding narrative context, but also the immediate context in which Jesus has affirmed the disciples’ use of *kyrios*. In the absence of evidence that the disciples now understand Jesus as a supernatural being, it is expected that the disciples will use *kyrios* in agreement with their understanding of the title in the first half of the narrative. In addition, the reader expects the disciples to use *kyrios* with the same semantic range as Jesus’ affirmation in 13:13 and 13:14. As a result, in this context, the most appropriate semantic range for all of the disciples’ uses is that which acknowledges Jesus as someone “who rules or exercises authority over others.”⁵⁰⁸

4.9.4. Summary

In chapter 12, the reader sees that the glory of Jesus is defined and revealed through his crucifixion, and also sees again that Jesus’ identity as *kyrios* is tied to that glory. From chapter 13, the narrative allows the reader to see how Jesus’ identity as *kyrios* is also defined by Jesus’ actions. In the washing of the disciples’ feet, Jesus reveals a *kyrios*-disciple relationship which challenges assumptions and expectations that conventional semantic constraints would have brought to the interpretation of the word *kyrios*. The reader also experiences for the first time the use of *kyrios* to refer to one who owns slaves. However, Jesus is not only to be served, but in his serving the disciples, he gives an example for them to follow. Furthermore, by identifying his disciples as friends, he further transforms the reader’s understanding of the relationship between followers of Jesus and their *kyrios*. They are friends because of what Jesus reveals to them. The reader now waits expectantly to see how Jesus will reveal his glory, that is, his divine identity, to his disciples.

11:34, the reader’s understanding of Jesus and the characters’ understanding of Jesus need to be distinguished in order to correctly interpret the use of κύριε at the time of speaking.

⁵⁰⁸ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

4.10. The Risen *Kyrios*

4.10.1. Narrative

4.10.1.1. Context

The reader who approaches chapter 20 has just witnessed the trial, crucifixion and burial of Jesus. Through these sections of the narrative, the reader has not encountered the word *kyrios*.⁵⁰⁹ As *kyrios* is used by those who respect Jesus or recognise his authority over him, this absence is understandable.⁵¹⁰ The reader might also infer that, because of the nature of Jesus' kingdom (18:36), he does not exercise his authority over those who put him on trial and crucify him, but has submitted to the will of his Father.⁵¹¹ As such, his identity as *kyrios*, one who exercises authority, is veiled from those who encounter him.

There are several key themes in the narrative so far which are relevant for understanding the use of *kyrios* in chapter 20. First, the very beginning of the Gospel (1:1), which identifies Jesus as θεός, will be important for understanding Thomas' use of the same title for Jesus in 20:28. As Thomas' confession couples θεός with *kyrios*, the first use of *kyrios* in 1:23 will also again be key for interpreting the use of the title. Second, the declarations regarding Jesus' future glorification (12:23, 12:31) remain significant for understanding the resurrection narratives.⁵¹² Although the use of Isaiah 53 in 12:38-39 called on the reader to see the crucifixion as the locus of Jesus' glorification, there is no mention of glorification throughout the passion narrative. The reader rightly asks at this point whether the full revelation of his glory has taken place, and if so, whether it was recognised by anyone around him.

Isaiah 6 is also relevant for understanding the resurrection narratives, and specifically Mary's encounter with Jesus in the garden (20:11-18). Although Isaiah 6 has not been cited or referred to since 12:40-41, there is evidence in the narrative that it is relevant for interpreting 20:11-18. In this regard, Jonathan Draper argues that there are parallels between Isaiah 6 and John 20:11-

⁵⁰⁹ It is also absent from John 17, when Jesus prays, as Jesus does not call the Father *kyrios*.

⁵¹⁰ The disciples do not speak to Jesus during the trial and crucifixion. In fact, the only disciple to speak, Peter, only speaks to deny his relationship to Jesus (18:17, 25, 27). When Jesus speaks to the disciple whom he loved (19:26), the disciple is silent.

⁵¹¹ On Jesus' submission to the Father's will, see 5:30 and 6:38.

⁵¹² Frédéric Manns, "Eléments de christologie johannique." *BeO* 40 (1998): 169-192 (180-181), notes other parallels between chapter 1 and 20. He considers one parallel to relate to ignorance. In chapter 1, John declares that those standing there do not know who Jesus is (1:26), and in chapter 20, the disciples do not know where Jesus is. He also compares the confessions of Nathaniel and Thomas. In chapter 1, Nathaniel declares that Jesus is the Son of God (1:49), and Thomas declares he is Lord and God (20:28). Popp, "Thomas: Question Marks and Exclamation Marks," 520, argues that the confessions of chapter 1 and Thomas' own confession of 20:28 "form an *inclusion* which encompasses the whole Gospel"

18 which encourage the reader to consider the temple vision when interpreting the appearance of Jesus to Mary.⁵¹³ The most relevant feature of Isaiah 6 for this study is that heavenly beings, seraphim, are described as surrounding the *kyrios* who reveals his glory.⁵¹⁴ Similarly, in John 20:12, two angels are seated where Jesus had been. Therefore, the reader of the Gospel of John can expect that this new appearance of heavenly creatures surrounding the *kyrios* suggests that the glory of the *kyrios* will be revealed.

In addition to the narrative context experienced by the reader so far, there is additional external context from Exodus 19. Louise-Marie Antoniotti demonstrates that echoes of the theophany of Exodus 19 encourage the reader to consider the theophanic nature of the appearance of Jesus to Mary.⁵¹⁵ The three verbal echoes she identifies strongly suggest that Exodus 19 is directly relevant to a reading of John 20.

The first echo is the importance of the third day.⁵¹⁶ Since 2:19, the reader has known that Jesus would rise on the third day. It is also likely that the third-day resurrection is part of the assumed knowledge the reader is expected to bring to the narrative. Exodus 19 also includes multiple references to the third day as the time when God would reveal himself to the people (19:11, 15, 16).

The second verbal echo is the idea of ascending to God.⁵¹⁷ Jesus tells Mary, “I am ascending to ... my God” (20:17), and Exodus 19 contains the same idea, with reference to going up the mountain to God. At the beginning of the chapter, Moses’ ascent is described (ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος τοῦ θεοῦ, 19:3). The extant Greek translations of this verse do not communicate the starkness of the Hebrew of the same verse (עָלָה אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל) which describes Moses’ ascent as being to God himself. However, the collocation of ascent and God is found in the Greek of 19:24, in the context of a warning to not allow the people to ascend (μὴ βιαζέσθωσαν ἀναβῆναι πρὸς τὸν θεόν for אֶל־יְהוָה לָעֹלָת לְעַלֹּתוֹ). The total number of references to ascent, including also 19:3, 12, 13, 18, 20, 24, demonstrates the importance of ascent to God in this passage.

⁵¹³ Jonathan A. Draper, “What did Isaiah see? Angelic theophany in the tomb in John 20: 11-18.” *Neot* 36 (2002): 63-76.

⁵¹⁴ Draper, “What did Isaiah see?,” 73, makes several arguments for this parallel which require the reader of the Gospel of John to know Hebrew and/or Aramaic. These and other similar arguments in his article are not utilised here, as they do not fit within the definition of the reader used in this study.

⁵¹⁵ Louise-Marie Antoniotti, “L'apparition de Jésus à Marie de Magdala.” *Revue Thomiste* 96 (1996): 302-311.

⁵¹⁶ Antoniotti, “L'apparition,” 306.

⁵¹⁷ Antoniotti, “L'apparition,” 307.

The third idea found in both John 20 and Exodus 19 is the prohibition to touch.⁵¹⁸ Jesus tells Mary μή μου ἅπτου (20:17), and in Exodus 19, the people are prohibited from touching the mountain (19:12, 13).⁵¹⁹ The combination of these three echoes for the reader is that the encounter between Jesus and Mary is viewed as a theophany. In the same way God was revealed on the third day, Jesus was revealed on the third day. As the people, and particularly Moses, went up to God, Jesus is going up to God. And as the people were prohibited from touching the mountain according to their own volition, but only by the permission of God, Jesus also decides when he will be touched, and by whom.

4.10.1.2. Structure

There are two key components of the narrative structure of the Gospel of John which are relevant for the interpretation of *kyrios* in chapter 20. The first is the turning point, which the reader witnessed in the crucifixion of Jesus, and the second is the recognition of Jesus in the resurrection narratives. Jesper Nielsen's study of these narrative features has demonstrated convincingly that the separation of the turning point and the recognition is a key feature of the Gospel of John.⁵²⁰ It is the separation which clarifies that, despite the promise of glorification through the crucifixion, the passion narrative ends without an explicit recognition of Jesus' glory. With the narrative-structural feature of 'recognition' in mind, the reader's expectation for the resurrection narratives is heightened.

Chapter 20 can be read as containing two major divisions (20:1-18, 19-29) and a conclusion (20:30-31).⁵²¹ The first and second divisions are based on the location of the narrative events. The first section, 20:1-18 contains activity at the tomb. It is here that Mary uses *kyrios* three times, twice to talk about Jesus' body (20:2, 13), and once to address him in ignorance (20:15). The final verse of this section acts as a transition, as Mary declares to the disciples that she has seen the *kyrios* (20:18).

For the second section, 20:19-29, the reader can infer that the events take place in a house, based upon references to locked doors (20:19), and the disciples being "inside" (20:26). In this section, the narrator identifies Jesus as *kyrios* for the first time since chapter 11. Following the

⁵¹⁸ Antoniotti, "L'apparition," 307.

⁵¹⁹ The parallel does not depend on the sense of ἅπτω, whether touching or clinging, as the same lexeme occurs in both contexts. The second reference to touching in Exodus 19:12 (ὁ ἀψάμενος) uses the same lexeme as in John 20:17 (μή μου ἅπτου), which occurs again in Exodus 19:13 (οὐχ ἅψεται αὐτοῦ χεῖρ).

⁵²⁰ Nielsen "Narrative Structures," 352.

⁵²¹ For this commonly accepted structure, see, for example, Moloney, *Glory Not Dishonor*, 154-155.

revised version of Schenk's framework used in this study, this usage signals to the reader that *kyrios* is being used by characters in a new way in this part of the narrative. The uniqueness of their use of *kyrios* will be discussed below. In the house, the disciples testify to Thomas that they have seen *kyrios* (20:25). At the end of this section, the reader witnesses Thomas himself confessing that Jesus is *kyrios*.

In this chapter, the emphasis on Jesus' identity as *kyrios* is confirmed not only by the frequency of its occurrences and their significance in the immediate context. Significantly, for the first time in a new narrative section, a character identifies Jesus as *kyrios* before the narrator. Rather than preparing the reader, then, the narrator's usage acts to affirm the reader's interpretation of Mary's usage.

Schenk considers that chapter 20 continues the pattern of the narrator's use of *kyrios* followed by characters' use of the vocative.⁵²² He groups the narrator's use of *kyrios* in 20:20 with Thomas's nominative-for-vocative usage in 20:28. However, as can be seen from the brief overview of the use of *kyrios* in chapter 20, the pattern of usage in chapter 20 is significantly different from the pre-resurrection narrative. The first shift is that a character uses *kyrios* multiple times (20:2, 13, 15, 18) to refer to Jesus in a new section of the narrative before the narrator uses the title (20:20). Since the highlighting of *kyrios* in multiple ways in chapter 12 to highlight its importance for understanding Jesus' identity, and the redefinition of *kyrios* in chapter 13, the narrator no longer prompts the reader to notice the use of the title. Following the non-usage of *kyrios* through chapters 16-19, Mary's multiple uses of the title provide sufficient narrative evidence that the reader expects that *kyrios* will be used in a new way.

4.10.1.3. Character

4.10.1.3.1. Mary Magdalene

Mary is the character that uses *kyrios* most often during this chapter (20:2, 13, 15, 18), and her use of the term provides a significant opportunity to consider her understanding of Jesus' identity. First, in 20:2, and again in 20:13, Mary believes that Jesus is still dead. She identifies Jesus as *kyrios*, but at the same time is looking for his body, not knowing where it is.⁵²³ Her words demonstrate that while still considering Jesus to be the one that had authority over her,

⁵²² Schenk, *Kommentiertes Lexikon*, 245.

⁵²³ Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 85, observes that "[r]ecognizing where Jesus had gone is as important in John as recognizing where he had come from."

she did not know, or did not understand, how Jesus would see his disciples again (14:19, 16:16). She did not believe that he would rise from the dead at this time. The reader continues to witness Mary's less-than-full knowledge in 20:15, when she addresses Jesus with κύριε, yet does not know that she is speaking to Jesus. The irony of this declaration will be discussed below, in the analysis of narrative irony. Finally, when Mary uses *kyrios* for the fourth time (20:18), she proclaims that she has seen him (alive). This last use is crucial for understanding not only Mary's character, but also the use of *kyrios* in the narrative as a whole.

Having met Jesus, Mary returns to the disciples and testifies that she has seen the *kyrios* (ἐώρακα τὸν κύριον, 20:18). Mary is the first character, other than Jesus and the narrator, to use *kyrios* in a case other than vocative. In this study, it has been argued that, when *kyrios* occurs in a different case, the reader does not draw a hard distinction based on morphology. It is true that there is a general shift in chapter 20, whereby characters use *kyrios* in cases other than the vocative. However, this is because characters now testify about Jesus as *kyrios*, acting as witnesses, in addition to their previous direct addresses to him using the same title. This morphological shift, then, fits the pragmatic realities of the narrative. The grammatical categories in and of themselves do not reveal the meaning of the word, nor its narrative significance.⁵²⁴ The clearest demonstration of this is that, prior to meeting Jesus, when Mary was looking for his body, she used the accusative on two occasions (20:2, 13). The reader, then, continues to interpret uses of *kyrios* based upon features of the narrative, rather than case.

When Mary tells the disciples that she has seen the *kyrios* (20:18), her testimony is presented in the first person (ἐώρακα τὸν κύριον).⁵²⁵ Although commentators agree that the use of the first person highlights the importance of her testimony, the key interpretive issue about which Johannine scholars do not agree is the meaning of Mary's words within the narrative.⁵²⁶

⁵²⁴ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 65, points out that 11:28 is the place in the pre-resurrection narrative where Jesus is referred to by disciples with a title. In that place, Martha calls Jesus διδάσκαλος.

⁵²⁵ Two secondary readings are found in the manuscript tradition at this point. The first is a change of the first person singular (ἐώρακα) to the third person singular (ἐώρακεν), so that all that comes after ὅτι is reported speech. It has a range of external support, including Alexandrinus, Bezae, Family 1 and 13, the Majority Text, the Old Latin tradition, the Philoxenian Syriac, some Sahidic manuscripts, and one Bohairic. It is clearly an early and widespread variant. The manuscript evidence for the first person singular is equally early, and includes significant diversity, including P⁶⁶, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, the Vulgate tradition, the Sinaitic Syriac, the Subakhmimic and Proto-Bohairic and the Bohairic tradition. The third-person singular is clearly secondary on internal grounds, as the change alleviates the shift which would be seen as awkward from direct to reported speech. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John*, 689, addresses the issue of the direct/indirect shift, and notes the work of C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1922), 113, who proposed the first-person verb came from a misreading of a supposed Aramaic original. In addition to the first-to-third-person change, another variant is a change to first person plural (ἐωράκαμεν) in 038 and 33, which harmonises with 20:2, where Mary speaks on behalf of a group, whose composition is known from the Synoptics (οὐκ οἶδαμεν ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν).

⁵²⁶ Morris, *John*, 744, observes that "This has the effect of highlighting the significant words and putting emphasis on Mary's experience." Martin Ebner, "Wer liebt mehr? Die liebende Jüngerin und der geliebte Jünger nach Joh 20,1–

Specifically, the reader at this point of the narrative is challenged to decide whether Mary's confession continues to use *kyrios* in the same way as in 20:2, or if this occasion represents a new development. The minimal position sees Mary as using *kyrios* in the same way as the other disciples and herself until this point in the narrative.⁵²⁷ The maximal position understands Mary's confession as a climax, and even equal to that of Thomas (20:28).⁵²⁸ The decision as to how to interpret Mary's words depends most significantly on the narrative context, and particularly the intertextual significance of Isaiah 6, which will now be addressed.

The presentation of Mary's words as direct discourse, in the first person (ἐώρακα τὸν κύριον), is an echo of Isaiah 6:1. The use of a first-person tense form of ὁράω with τὸν κύριον allows the reader to consider the use of the same combination in Isaiah 6:1, where Isaiah says εἶδον τὸν κύριον. The importance of this first-person confession in Isaiah 6 is further emphasised by the use of the first person in the Greek of Isaiah 6:5, τὸν βασιλέα κύριον σαβαωθ εἶδον τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου.⁵²⁹ The last time Isaiah 6 was alluded to in the narrative, following a direct citation from the same passage and also Isaiah 53, the narrator informed the reader that Isaiah saw Jesus' glory (12:41). Now, as Mary confesses "I have seen," the reader considers that this echo of Isaiah's own words implies that Mary's use of *kyrios* does differ from previous uses in the narrative. Not only is she using *kyrios* to acknowledge Jesus' authority, but also to confess that, like Isaiah, she has seen his glory. Her use of the perfect tense (ἐώρακα), in contrast to Isaiah's aorist (εἶδον), suggests that she considers that the effects of her vision are in some sense still being experienced.⁵³⁰ Seeing Jesus' glory is an acknowledgement of his divine identity, as it was for Isaiah. Mary's confession also implies that she has now demonstrated that she believes that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*.

18." *BZ* 42 (1998): 39-55 (49, 51), compares the significance of the first person, and specifically the first person perfect ἐώρακα to John the Baptist's confession in chapter 1:34, and Jesus' declaration in 8:38.

⁵²⁷ Carson, *John*, 645, writes that Mary's words "still do not constitute a confession akin to that of Thomas" and that she "she spoke better than she knew" (*John*, 646).

⁵²⁸ Moloney, *John*, 527, writes with regard to Mary's use of *kyrios* that "[t]he meaning of this term is transformed as she is the first to tell the disciples of Jesus' resurrection ... She now announces that she has seen the risen Lord." Larsen, *Recognizing*, 205, is hesitant, but considers the potential fullness of her confession "Or has she by now reached a new level of understanding so that she is formulating a Christological confession? If so, Mary's testimony contains the scene's second climax by implying a "full" anagnorisis, which shows that Jesus' correction of her partial recognition has developed into true belief. And true reaction: Her seeing leads to telling." Lincoln, *Saint John*, 494, sees the connection between Mary's and the other disciples' confessions, and states that Mary's "announcement will also later be that of the disciples ... and has links with Thomas' climactic confession." Bultmann, *John*, 689, is more explicit, and argues that 20:18 is "for the first time in Jn. The κύριος -title has its genuine pathos. It is wholly suitably for the Risen One and meets us so in vv. 20, 25, 28."

⁵²⁹ This is in contrast to the Hebrew of the same verse, where Isaiah's eyes see (אֵת הַמֶּלֶךְ יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת רָאָה עֵינָי).

⁵³⁰ On the semantics of the Greek perfect, see Robert Crellin, "The Semantics of the Perfect in the Greek of the New Testament." in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*, (eds. Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch; Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2016), 430-457. The aorist in the Greek of Isaiah 6:1 is understandable given the same tense is used earlier in the sentence (καὶ ἐγένετο τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ οὗ ἀπέθανεν Οὐζίας ὁ βασιλεὺς) leading up to εἶδον. Furthermore, it is not surprising that a translator would choose a simpler verb form (aorist) over a more complex form (perfect) when translating אֵרָאָה.

Mary's confession constitutes the first time in the narrative that a character agrees with the narrator in using *kyrios* to acknowledge Jesus' glory as the revelation of his divine identity. In previous uses of *kyrios*, the reader was uncertain whether Jesus had actually revealed his glory, or whether a character beheld that glory. In the case of Mary's encounter with Jesus in the garden, neither of these two uncertainties is present. Rather, the narrative provides sufficient evidence for the reader to rejoice with Mary that she has recognised who Jesus is. This evidence is in the words of Jesus, the words and actions of Mary, the words of the narrator, and the context of the narrative.

Jesus tells Mary μή μου ἄπτου (20:17), and this statement encourages the reader to recall the theophany of Exodus 19.⁵³¹ This is taken together with the emphasis on ascending to God in the same verse, and the reader's knowledge that this is taking place on the third day. As a result, the reader considers this encounter to be one in which God is revealing himself to one of his people. This prepares the reader for the first recognition scene in which Jesus' divine identity is revealed, and recognized by the one who sees him.

When Jesus calls Mary by name, she recognises that the man standing before her is Jesus. Having recognised who he is, she addresses him as "Rabbouni" and holds onto him.⁵³² Both the title used and the action of holding onto Jesus represent Mary's understanding of Jesus' presence. She appears to believe that Jesus' return from the grave is a return of the life that he shared with the disciples before the crucifixion.⁵³³ In response to this, Jesus informs Mary, and instructs her to tell the disciples, that he is ascending to the Father (12:17). Jesus' reference to his ascension confirms for Mary that Jesus' physical presence with the disciples would be

⁵³¹Collins, *These Things*, 35, argues Mary did not know that "Jesus' resurrection, unlike that of Lazarus, does not mean that he has returned to his former mode of life; rather it means that he is to ascend to the Father."

⁵³²For the grammatical and semantic challenges of interpreting this verse, see Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 642-645. There are also text-critical issues in this verse. In 20:16, Codex Bezae reads Ῥαββουνι ὁ λέγεται κύριε Διδάσκαλε, adding κύριε, a reading supported also by Bezae's Latin (dne magister). Three Old Latin manuscripts, ear¹, support reading κύριε by itself (a reads domine, ar¹ reads dne). The first hand of ff² supports Διδάσκαλε κύριε (magister dne), with a corrector then deleting the nomen sacrum (dne). No further support for κύριε is found outside of the Old Latin tradition. These variants, found with limited external support, are best explained as scribal attempts to heighten Mary's confession, and to distinguish between the meaning of Ῥαββουνι and the narrator's earlier use of ῥαββί, which was translated as Διδάσκαλε (1:38). There is other variation at the beginning of the verse, where Mary "turns." Tjitze Baarda, "'She Recognised Him': Concerning the Origin of a peculiar Textual Variation in John 20,16 Sy^s." in *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*, (eds. Tjitze Baarda, et al.; Kampen: Kok, 1988), 24-38, considers the reception history of 20:16, particularly the importance of Mary's recognition of Jesus, in understanding this textual variation.

⁵³³Robert Crotty, "The Two Magdalene Reports on the Risen Jesus in John 20." *Pacifica* 12 (1999): 156-168 (165): "The basic point of the narrative is that Mary must give up any notion of a resuscitation of an earthly Jesus, of a return to the conditions of the temporal ministry. The only proper relationship is with the ascended and exalted Jesus."

temporary.⁵³⁴ His words also signal for the reader that his return to the Father is in process. It is following this revelation to Mary that her newfound understanding leads to her becoming a witness to the risen *kyrios*.⁵³⁵

As a result of this revelation to Mary, the reader again considers Jesus' association of this return with his pre-incarnate glory (17:5). This constitutes a significant indicator in the narrative that this scene is the first time that Jesus has revealed his glory in the way of which he spoke prior to the crucifixion (12:23; 13:31). Although Jesus' glory was manifest in his life and ministry prior to the resurrection, it is not until his resurrection that this glorification was complete. Having been lifted up, exalted, on the cross, the glorification which resulted is now revealed.

Unlike other characters who have encountered Jesus, Mary does not question nor challenge his statement. Until this point in the narrative, other characters, including Mary herself, have used *kyrios* yet also demonstrate that they had not yet understood Jesus, as there still remained some aspect of Jesus' identity or ministry of which they were ignorant. In these cases, the reader's hopes have been raised, only to realise that each successive encounter continued to fall short in some way. Hope remained, however, through to chapter 20. In this scene, there is no such indication that the reader's hopes are checked. After Jesus' reveals to Mary that he is ascending to the Father, she does not delay in obeying him, not even by speaking to him further. Following Jesus' revelation of his destination, the Father, her actions and faithfulness to report to the disciples, without questioning or challenge, confirm that her experience parallels that of Isaiah. Like Isaiah, Mary now sees the *kyrios*, beholding the glory of the one who has been lifted up and glorified exceedingly (Isa 52:13).⁵³⁶

The narrator's words also confirm that Mary is using *kyrios* in a new way. Just after 20:18, the narrator informs the reader that the disciples had seen the *kyrios* (ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν κύριον, 20:20). As mentioned above, this is the first time that the narrator's usage of *kyrios* is not only forward looking, to prepare the reader for the use of *kyrios* by the disciples in 20:25, but it also looks back, to Mary's confession. This confirms for the reader that Mary's

⁵³⁴ Jörg Frey, "'Ich habe den Herrn gesehen' (20, 18): Entstehung, Inhalt und Vermittlung des Osterglaubens nach Johannes 20." in *Studien zu Matthäus und Johannes: Festschrift für Jean Zumstein zu seinem 65.*, (eds. Andreas Dettwiler and Uta Poplutz; Zürich: TVZ, 2009), 267-284 (278), sees this as an opportunity for Mary to receive the same teaching which the disciples had earlier received from Jesus in chapters 14-16.

⁵³⁵ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 66: "And after Jesus instructs her of his destiny as ascended and exalted one, she can then truly be a witness to the resurrected Jesus, for she now has her Christology straightened out." Dorothy A. Lee, "Partnership in Easter Faith: The Role of Mary Magdalene and Thomas in John 20." *JSNT* 58 (1995): 37-49 (45): "The Good Shepherd reveals himself to her and she responds with faith and understanding."

⁵³⁶ Collins, *These Things*, 35: "Mary can be counted among those who are truly believers and disciples for she can announce, 'I have seen the Lord.'"

confession in 20:18 is new, that her use of *kyrios* does not continue the pattern in 20:2, 13 and 15, which revealed less-than-full understanding. The narrator echoes Mary's confession and this signifies that Mary's experience and the disciples' experience are of the same kind. Both Mary and the disciples have seen the risen *kyrios*, and the narrator's comment confirms that she not only knows that Jesus is alive, but also that he is the divine *kyrios*.

The narrative context of this recognition scene also assists the reader in interpreting the significance of Mary's use of *kyrios*. Mary is sent by Jesus to proclaim that Jesus is going to the Father. Earlier in the narrative, the reader encounters John, who is sent by God to proclaim that Jesus is coming.⁵³⁷ The parallels which the reader can draw between these two characters give further evidence that Mary has entered into an understanding of Jesus which until this point equals that of the narrator and the reader. John, as a reliable character, agrees with the narrator and reader that Jesus is the divine *kyrios* whose coming into the world revealed the glory of God. Now Mary, like John, is sent as a witness to the revelation of God in Jesus, the divine *kyrios*.

4.10.1.3.2. The Disciples

Following Mary's testimony that she had seen the *kyrios*, the disciples echo her testimony, and also function as witnesses as they testify to Thomas (20:25). Prior to their own testimony, the narrator informed the reader that they were joyful as a result of seeing Jesus, the *kyrios* (ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν κύριον, 20:20). In this comment, the narrator prepares the reader, raising the expectation that the disciples might also testify like Mary, and like Isaiah, that they have seen the *kyrios*. Like Mary, they use the first person (ἐωράκαμεν τὸν κύριον), with both the plural and the perfect necessitated by context. The repetition of the same post-resurrection formula confirms what the reader had been expecting. By taking on the Isaianic testimony (Isa 6:1), the disciples have likewise beheld Jesus' glory, knowing that his identity as *kyrios* rightly signifies his divine identity. As he has come from the Father, he is now returning to the Father, and in this return, they recognise that he reveals the glory of God. There is no longer hesitation or doubt for the reader. The circle of witnesses has now grown, so that Mary is joined by the disciples in her testimony of seeing the *kyrios*. That more than one has now beheld the glory will be significant for the analysis of the narrator's point of view below.

⁵³⁷ Klink, *John*, 849: "Mary should be viewed no differently than John the Baptist, both of whom were sent by God and therefore function as part of his self-witness... Just as the Baptist preceded the start of Jesus's public ministry and heralded his arrival in the flesh ... so also Mary preceded the conclusion of Jesus' public ministry and heralded his arrival in and by the Spirit."

4.10.1.3.3. Thomas

Thomas' testimony is the first and only time in the Gospel that a character addresses Jesus as θεός (ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου, 20:28).⁵³⁸ Having seen evidence that Jesus' bore marks of the crucifixion, and that he now stood before him, Thomas addresses him as his own *kyrios*.⁵³⁹ Although his testimony does not explicitly follow the pattern of the Isaianic testimony (Isa 6:1), Thomas' use of θεός allows the reader to see again, as for Mary and the other disciples, that a character recognises that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*.⁵⁴⁰ In addition to the immediate context, the reader can benefit from a comparison of the opening of the narrative with this final scene before the epilogue. The Gospel begins with Jesus being identified as θεός (1:1), and the narrative-proper begins with him being identified as *kyrios* (1:23). Now, at the end of the narrative, having been already identified as *kyrios* (20:18, 25, 20:28), in agreement with the narrator, Jesus is now also identified as θεός (20:28). This provides further confirmation for the reader that, when Mary and the disciples use *kyrios*, it is in agreement with the narrator's use of *kyrios* to acknowledge Jesus' divine identity. For this reason, although Thomas' testimony is unique in its use of θεός, his testimony is not somehow "higher" than Mary and the other disciples. Thomas' confession signals for the reader that he has now joined the group of witnesses who acknowledge that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*.

4.10.1.4. Irony

In 20:15, the reader again is able to see that a character in the narrative has not yet recognised Jesus. From the beginning of the narrative, *kyrios* became a signal for the knowledge that the reader and narrator share regarding the divine identity of Jesus, so that the reader experiences

⁵³⁸ Skinner, *John and Thomas*, 70, emphasises the importance of the title κύριος ὁ θεός (יהוה אלהים) in the Old Testament for understanding Thomas' confession. Relevant for this study is the usage specifically in Isaiah 40-55, where κύριος ὁ θεός occurs 22 times, often when the Hebrew simply has יהוה. In Isaiah 40-55, κύριος ὁ θεός also occasionally is an equivalent of יהוה אלהים, following the pattern which Skinner identifies as common throughout the Old Testament.

⁵³⁹ With reference to Thomas seeking evidence, Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 60-61, writes that "it is also a way of indicating that the degradation and the death of Jesus are not superseded by the resurrection. It is the degradation and the death, in the light of the resurrection, that constitute the ultimate manifestation of God's glory to the world."

⁵⁴⁰ Although Jesus' use of ὄραω to describe Thomas' experience (ἐώρακάς με πεπίστευκας), allows a connection to be drawn between Mary and the disciples' testimonies and Thomas, the uniqueness of Thomas' confession, however, is in his use of θεός. Koester, *Word of Life*, 25, 127, argues that in addition to being the climax of the Gospel, Thomas' use of possessive pronouns signifies that the confession is now Thomas's, as well as the disciples'. With reference to the narrator's use of *kyrios* in 20:20, Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 1009, writes that "the writer is deliberately echoing in his own words Mary's announcement...in order to anticipate the disciples' announcement." Popp, "Thomas: Question Marks and Exclamation Marks," (512-513), also sees Thomas' confession of the same type as Mary's, and writes that "[t]he final chapter portrays Johannine characters coming to faith in a consecutive, chain-like manner. Mary Magdalene stands at the beginning of this chain." Popp draws support for this conclusion from Ebner "Wer liebt mehr?," 50, who sees the chain as paralleling the seeing-then-witnessing chain of chapter 1. Popp, *Thomas*, 521, also argues that the use of *kyrios* by Thomas is crucial for this connection, so that Mary, the disciples and Thomas all identify Jesus with the same title.

the narrative dynamic of irony. When this has occurred, it has affirmed the reader's correct knowledge, and allowed the reader to see that characters still had not yet beheld the glory fully. Now nearing the end of the narrative, the reader's expectation that characters are finally going to recognise Jesus has reached a peak. However, at this moment, the reader is left with conflicting expectations.

As this scene occurs post-glorification, the reader expects the ignorance of characters to end upon meeting Jesus. In contrast to this positive expectation, the use of *kyrios* leads the reader to recall the scenes of non-recognition throughout the Gospel, and the irony that has been associated with *kyrios*. With negative and positive expectations, the reader again witnesses a character calling Jesus *kyrios*. As Mary addresses Jesus (κύριε, 20:15), the narrator informs the reader that she did not know it was Jesus (οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστίν, 20:14). Without knowing, Mary correctly addresses Jesus as *kyrios*, but she is unable to recognise that he is the divine *kyrios*, as she does not know to whom she is speaking. The irony which the reader experiences in this exchange heightens the tension in the narrative in 20:15, as Mary is on the cusp of recognising the one who is standing before her.⁵⁴¹

4.10.1.5. Point of View

The point of view of the narrator reaches a resolution in chapter 20, as, for the first time in the narrative, characters behold the glory of Jesus, and recognise Jesus' divine identity.⁵⁴² Throughout the Gospel, as characters have encountered Jesus, a key question the reader has considered is whether they will behold Jesus' glory, and therefore recognise that he is divine. Although this was spoken of as a past event in 1:14, the reader has waited expectantly for the statement's fulfilment in the narrative. This was not possible prior to the resurrection, however, as those who met Jesus could not recognise his divine identity until Jesus had been glorified, and appeared to them. Now, in chapter 20, the reader sees that, Mary, the other disciples and Thomas behold the glory of Jesus.

Those who encounter Jesus and see his glory, see his glory in the flesh. In addition to providing strong evidence that the disciples have now beheld Jesus' glory, there is also a significant

⁵⁴¹ O'Day, "The Gospel of John," 842: "Mary's response to 'the gardener' is also a supreme example of Johannine misunderstanding and irony." Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, 999: "Ironically, she addresses the stranger she believes to be 'the gardener' as 'Sir,' the same word she might have used had she known who he was."

⁵⁴² Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 64, importantly identifies the connection between Jesus' identity as the divine Son, and his identity as the divine *kyrios*: "When ... one comes to a conviction that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the natural outcome of that will be to acknowledge him as *kyrios*." Pryor sees 20:29 as the link between Thomas' confession that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*, and the narrator's focus on Jesus as divine Son (20:31).

emphasis on the fact of his flesh. As Jesus appears to the disciples, he demonstrates that his body is the very same body that was crucified. The disciples confirm that the same *kyrios* who was nailed to the cross is the one standing before them. After Jesus greets the disciples, the narrator describes how Jesus showed them his hands and his side (20:20). This is the action which immediately precedes the narrator's comment that the disciples were joyful because they had seen the *kyrios* (20:20).⁵⁴³ In the same way, Jesus' offer to Thomas to touch his wounds precedes Thomas' own declaration that Jesus is *kyrios*.⁵⁴⁴ In both cases, confirming Jesus' identity as the crucified one, and seeing his glory as the divine *kyrios*, is closely related to seeing that his flesh was the same flesh that they had seen prior to his resurrection.⁵⁴⁵ This confirms the connection inherent in the narrator's point of view, that Jesus' glory is revealed in his flesh.

Although it has been argued that the disciples do see Jesus' glory, the word *glory* does not appear with reference to Jesus in any of the resurrection narratives. Despite this, Johannine scholars have identified that the second half of the Gospel is concerned with the glory of Jesus. If the word *glory* does not occur, however, and if no character is described as beholding glory, how can the reader be certain that 1:14 has been fulfilled in the narrative? In the analysis of character recognition of Jesus above, this conclusion came from the characters adopting the Isaianic testimony (6:1). The narrator informs the reader that Isaiah saw Jesus' glory when Isaiah only testifies in the first-person that he saw the *kyrios*, and then provides a description of the glory of that vision. The implication for this narrative is that when the characters confess along with Isaiah that they have seen the *kyrios*, the reader can be sure that they have also seen Jesus' glory.

⁵⁴³ The relationship between the two sentences cannot be assumed by the use of οὐν alone. Given the use of sentence connectors throughout the Gospel, the relationship needs to be established on the content of the sentences and their context, rather than the conjunction. For analysis of sentence connectors in John, see Vern S. Poythress, "The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions De, Oun, Kai, and Asyndeton in the Gospel of John." *NovT* 26 (1984): 312-340 and Randall Buth, "Οὐν, Δέ, Καί, and Asyndeton in John's Gospel." in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*, (ed. David A. Black; Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992), 144-161.

⁵⁴⁴ Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 243, argues that the difference in attitude to physical contact in Mary's encounter with Jesus (20:17) and Thomas' encounter a week later (20:27) is not because of a difference in Jesus, as though he had changed. Rather, Jesus approaches each person as an individual, and responds to them according to their own individual needs. Mary needed to overcome her dependence on Jesus' physical presence by being commissioned as a witness, and Thomas needed to overcome his doubts by encountering Jesus' physical presence.

⁵⁴⁵ Nielsen "Narrative Structures," 348, discusses Aristotle's categorisation of recognition scenes that turn when characters see "signs," including physical features, such as scars or marks on the body.

4.10.2. Semantics

With the narrative analysis now complete, and due to the lack of significant textual variation with respect to *kyrios*, the semantic analysis can commence. There are seven uses of *kyrios* in chapter 20. Mary uses the word four times (20:2, 13, 15, 18), and the narrator (20:20), the other disciples (20:25) and Thomas (20:28) all use *kyrios* once.

Prior to recognising Jesus, Mary uses *kyrios* twice to refer to him, in 20:3 (Ἔβραν τὸν κύριον) and 20:13 (ἔβραν τὸν κύριόν μου). The immediate linguistic context and relationship context both assist in the semantic analysis of these two uses of *kyrios*. When talking to the disciples in 20:3, she uses the absolute *kyrios*, without a possessive pronoun, as for Mary and the other disciples, there is only one *kyrios*. Therefore, her speech is sufficiently explicit for the other disciples. However, when speaking to the angels, who are not part of the sociolinguistic community of the disciples, she specifies that Jesus is her *kyrios* (20:13).⁵⁴⁶ In both verses, *kyrios* has the same meaning. Mary uses the word to affirm that she is a disciple of Jesus, and that he has authority over her, even after his death. There is no indication at this point that she considers Jesus to be a supernatural being, or that he exercises supernatural authority. In contrast, there is evidence against this proposal, as Mary's search for the body of Jesus implies that she still did not believe he was a supernatural being who could overcome death.⁵⁴⁷ As a result, the most appropriate semantic category is "one who rules or exercises authority over others."⁵⁴⁸

When Mary speaks to Jesus in 20:15, her use of the vocative κύριε is affected by the irony inherent in the scene. Although Mary, a disciple of Jesus, addresses him as *kyrios*, she does not know to whom she is speaking. As a result, to consider relationship context rightly, it is important to take into account Mary's view of the relationship between herself and her interlocutor. From this perspective, Mary is speaking to a male with whom she has had no previous contact. Her supposition that he was a gardener is also relevant, as this does not entail any notions of authority that would be inherent in the disciple-*kyrios* relationship. Given Mary's perspective, the most appropriate semantic range for this use of *kyrios* is "a title of respect used in addressing or speaking of a man."⁵⁴⁹

⁵⁴⁶ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 65, sees Mary's use of "my" as the result of her speaking "before strangers who do not share the same faith commitment,"

⁵⁴⁷ von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:839: "It would make little sense for Mary to refer to Jesus as exalted "Lord" and at the same time to think that he had not risen but that he was still dead and the body stolen."

⁵⁴⁸ L&N 1:478 (37§51).

⁵⁴⁹ L&N 1:739 (87§53).

When Mary recognises Jesus, she testifies to the disciples that she has seen the *kyrios* (20:18). The narrative analysis above has presented evidence that Mary's use of *kyrios* is an acknowledgement of Jesus' divine identity. This interpretation is possible because of the knowledge which the reader has of the narrative context, both external Old Testament context (Isa 6:1), and internal context consisting of a comment by the narrator (John 12:41). This is also affirmed by the actions of Mary and the words of the narrator. It is this context which affects the semantic analysis of *kyrios* in 20:18. As Mary acknowledges Jesus' divinity, the most appropriate semantic category is a supernatural being "who exercises supernatural authority."⁵⁵⁰ This represents the first time in the semantic analyses that this category has been used by a character in the narrative.

The next use of *kyrios* is found in a comment by the narrator (ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν κύριον, 20:20). All semantic analyses of the narrator's use of *kyrios* in the narrative in this study have attributed the narrator with the same understanding of *kyrios*. From the first use in 1:23, to the three uses in 4:1, 6:23 and 11:2, the cognitive context of the narrator has not changed. Jesus is the divine *kyrios*, and is a supernatural being "who exercises supernatural authority."⁵⁵¹ The use in 20:20 continues this pattern, as the narrator's understanding of Jesus continues to confirm his divine identity.

In 20:25, the disciples as a group testify to Thomas that they have seen the *kyrios*. The narrative analysis above has shown that this usage parallels the first-person testimony of Mary (20:18).⁵⁵² The cognitive context, which takes into account the knowledge which the reader has of both external and internal narrative context, supports the same semantic analysis for both Mary and the disciples. The disciples, like Mary, not only acknowledge Jesus' authority over them, but also that he is divine. In this context, then, *kyrios* refers to a supernatural being, Jesus, who "who exercises supernatural authority."⁵⁵³

Thomas is the final character in chapter 20 to use *kyrios* (20:28). His address to Jesus, ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου, is unique. He is the only character in the Gospel to address Jesus using *kyrios* in a case other than the vocative. Commentators consider the nominative case as

⁵⁵⁰ L&N 1:139 (12§9). Concurring with this analysis is von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, 2:841, who argues that "*kyrios* has the religious meaning of "Lord" and represents the fully adequate post-Resurrection title for Jesus."

⁵⁵¹ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

⁵⁵² Beutler, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 528, sees Mary's words as inspiring the disciples' use of the same confession.

⁵⁵³ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

functioning for an address to Jesus, not a statement about Jesus.⁵⁵⁴ The immediate context confirms that Thomas was speaking to Jesus (εἶπεν αὐτῷ, 20:28). The reason for the nominative, rather than a vocative, is less clear however.⁵⁵⁵ Some scholars have proposed that the vocative would potentially obscure the distinction between this usage and other uses of the vocative in the category which were “a title of respect used in addressing ... a man.” Although this is possible, the narrative itself has confirmed the vocative κύριε can be used to address God (12:38), so the reader would not be misled by the use of κύριε here. In addition, the fact that Thomas then addresses Jesus with θεός leaves little room for misunderstanding the meaning of *kyrios* in the immediate context. As a result, the semantic range of ὁ κύριός μου is certain. It is used to address Jesus, a supernatural being, “who exercises supernatural authority.”⁵⁵⁶

4.10.3. Summary

The book of glory ends with the revelation and recognition of Jesus’ glory. Having waited since 1:14 for this to occur, the reader knows that this has finally happened by considering the narrative context. Like Isaiah, the disciples see Jesus’ glory, recognising him for who he truly is. Following Jesus’ glorification, they agree with the narrator that *kyrios* is rightly used to acknowledge Jesus’ divine identity. His glory is the manifestation of this divine identity, and the reader concludes that the disciples have now finally beheld Jesus’ glory and acknowledged who he truly is: the divine *kyrios*.

4.11. It is the *Kyrios*

4.11.1. Narrative

4.11.1.1. Context

Chapter 21 functions as an epilogue to the narrative, providing balance for the prologue which begins the Gospel.⁵⁵⁷ The narrative proper (1:19-20:31) concludes the major themes of the Gospel, and the narrator’s point of view is brought to a concluding resolution. Other themes and unresolved questions, however, return in the epilogue, so that the reader experiences closure in

⁵⁵⁴ For a survey of the arguments for the nominative as vocative, and references to supporting scholarship, see Murray J. Harris, *Jesus as God: The New Testament use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 110-111. In his analysis of the Nominative for Vocative, Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 58, notes that “[i]n all but two instances in the NT (both in the same verse, Matt 27:46), God is addressed with the nom.”

⁵⁵⁵ The nominative is not necessitated by the use of a possessive pronoun. In addition to a number of Old Testament uses, Rev 7:14 has the one use of κύριέ μου in the New Testament. Less common, though still possible, is Θεέ μου, found in the New Testament twice in Mat 24:27.

⁵⁵⁶ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

⁵⁵⁷ For the language of Epilogue, see Brown, *Introduction to the Gospel of John*, 298, and Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 773.

those areas as well.⁵⁵⁸ A key example which will be addressed below is the identity of the disciple whom Jesus loved.

4.11.1.2. Structure

Chapter 21 can be read in three sections.⁵⁵⁹ The first section, 21:1-14, consists of an introduction and the account of the disciples first fishing, and then recognising the *kyrios*, Jesus (21:1-14). Following this, Jesus asks Peter about his love for him, and commissions him (21:15-19), as Peter addresses Jesus as *kyrios*. The final section of the chapter (21:20-25) returns to the identity of the disciple whom Jesus loved, as Peter again uses *kyrios*, and this section ends with a return to the “we” of 1:14 (21:24).⁵⁶⁰ The chapter begins, then, with the importance of Jesus’ identity as *kyrios*, and this is reinforced in the two sections that follow.

An important structural feature of the first section of chapter 21 is repetition. The same clause, ὁ κύριός ἐστιν, is repeated verbatim, twice by the narrator (21:7, 12), and once by the disciple whom Jesus loved (21:7). The disciple’s agreement with the narrator is not only verbal, but comes from the disciple being identified as the narrator (21:24). The repetition is striking, and serves to confirm, at the very end of this narrative, that Jesus’ identity as the *kyrios* is not a marginal narrative theme, but that as the reader finishes the text, its importance remains. The first words of the disciple whom Jesus loved in this epilogue are his announcement to Peter, ὁ κύριός ἐστιν (21:7). The narrator then echoes the disciple (ὁ κύριός ἐστιν), using the same words, in the same order (21:7). As the disciples sit with Jesus, the narrator again repeats the words of the disciple (ὁ κύριός ἐστιν, 21:12).

A structural feature of the Gospel of John is the narrator’s use of *kyrios* to signal to the reader that a section of the narrative contains a development with respect to the usage of this title. The model used so far predicts that this only happens if *kyrios* is somehow used in a new way, so that the category of usage expands the reader’s understanding of the term’s usage. In chapter 21, for the first and only time in the Gospel, the narrator uses *kyrios* twice in a single section. This repetition confirms that the reader expects that *kyrios* is used in a new way.

⁵⁵⁸ Minear, "The Original Functions of John 21," 91-94.

⁵⁵⁹ The threefold structure used here is from Köstenberger, *John*, vii.

⁵⁶⁰ See Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 379-380, for the “‘we’ of authoritative testimony” in 21:24.

In chapter 21, this new usage of *kyrios* is found in Simon Peter's addresses to Jesus. When Mary and the other disciples finally recognised Jesus, they testified about Jesus, and referred to him as *kyrios*, but did not address Jesus as *kyrios* (20:18, 20:25). When Thomas spoke to Jesus, he identified him as *kyrios*, but did not use the vocative (20:28). In chapter 21, Peter addresses Jesus, using the vocative κύριε four times (21:15, 16, 17, 21). This is the first time that someone who knows that Jesus is the divine *kyrios* has addressed him as κύριε. This confirms the reader's interpretation of chapters 4-15, whereby the vocatives serve as crucial clusters, highlighted by the narrator's use of *kyrios*. No longer do characters use κύριε in a way that contrasts with the narrator. Rather, characters now use κύριε in agreement with the narrator. That is, this is the first time that a character has addressed Jesus using κύριε to acknowledge his divine identity.

4.11.1.3. Character

4.11.1.3.1. The Disciple whom Jesus Loved

The disciple whom Jesus loved is the first character to use *kyrios* in chapter 21. He uses *kyrios* once within the narrative time that is covered in this chapter (21:7). In addition, his use of *kyrios* at the supper with Jesus is reported by the narrator (21:20). It is the first use of *kyrios* in 21:7 which is new for the reader, and provides an opportunity to learn more about the character of the disciple whom Jesus loved.

When this disciple uses *kyrios*, there are several contextual features which affect the reader. One feature of the disciple's use of *kyrios* is that he speaks alone, representing his own knowledge. This is unlike Peter, who spoke on behalf of the disciples in Galilee when making a significant declaration regarding Jesus' identity (6:68). This is also unlike the disciples in chapter 20, who speak in unison, testifying to Thomas that they all had seen the Lord (20:28). In addition, he is not only the disciple who identifies that Jesus is *kyrios*; he is also the only disciple to speak during this scene.⁵⁶¹ The effect of these factors on the reader is that the disciple is singled out as his unique role amongst the disciples is highlighted.

Another feature of this disciple's speech is that his identification of Jesus precedes the narrator. In this case, the narrator repeats what is said by the character, rather than the character following

⁵⁶¹ James L Resseguie, "The Beloved Disciple: The Ideal Point of View." in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (eds. Steven A. Hunt, et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 537-549 (546), describes him as "one who sees what others do not see. His is the ideal point of view of the narrative, for he is able to interpret who the person is behind the miracle."

the narrator. This continues the pattern seen in chapter 20, where Mary's confession that Jesus is the divine *kyrios* preceded the narrator's identification of Jesus as *kyrios*. A difference between chapter 20 and 21 is that the narrator's words repeat verbatim the confession of the disciple (ὁ κύριός ἐστιν). This provides a clue that the disciple has a unique relationship with the narrator. Later, in 21:24, when the reader learns that in fact the narrator is the disciple whom Jesus loved, the reason behind the uniqueness of his speech and his ability to pre-empt and also speak in unison with the narrator is made clear; they are not two characters, but one.⁵⁶²

4.11.1.3.2. Peter

Peter's use of *kyrios* in chapter 21 is again in the context of a radical redefinition of the *kyrios*-disciple relationship. He last called Jesus *kyrios* when Jesus both demonstrated and explained his paradigmatic self-sacrificial love for the disciples (13:6, 9).⁵⁶³ Now, at the end of the narrative, Peter again calls Jesus *kyrios*, and, once again, Jesus challenges Peter's and the reader's understanding of the *kyrios*-disciple relationship.

The first aspect of the relationship between Jesus and Peter is love-based restoration.⁵⁶⁴ Jesus asks Peter three times whether he loves him, and Peter prefaces his threefold affirmation that Jesus knows that Peter loves him with κύριε (21:15, 16, 17). These affirmations echo Jesus' own statements which connected the disciples' love for him and their obedience (14:15, 24). Jesus' threefold question symbolises that Peter is restored following his threefold disobedience. The *kyrios* is one who calls his disciples to obedience, yet restores those who have disobeyed. His love is manifest in his forgiveness and restoration. Although the disciples' love for Jesus is manifest in their obedience, their disobedience does not destroy the *kyrios*-disciple relationship. Jesus' keeps his disciples, and not even their disobedience can affect this.⁵⁶⁵ Although as *kyrios* Jesus has authority over the disciples, this authority is exercised in love.

The second feature which the dialogue between Peter and Jesus emphasises is the ongoing role of the disciples in the *kyrios*-disciple relationship. Peter, the disciple, is charged with feeding

⁵⁶² Richard Bauckham, "The Fourth Gospel as the Testimony of the Beloved Disciple." in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, (eds. Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 120-142 (131-134), identifies an "*inclusio* of eyewitness testimony" which confirms for the reader the relationship between the disciple whom Jesus loves and the Gospel of John.

⁵⁶³ That is, the last time that Peter spoke alone, not in unison with the other disciples, as implied by 20:25.

⁵⁶⁴ Labahn, *Simon Peter*, 166: "Jesus' address to Peter is a rehabilitation of Peter, a restoration that represents a forgiveness of the sin of denial."

⁵⁶⁵ See Jesus' words to the disciples in 6:37-39.

and caring for Jesus' sheep. This means that Peter takes on the role that the *kyrios* has had whilst present with them. As Jesus called the disciples to follow his example in the washing of each other's feet, he now calls Peter to follow his example as the shepherd of the sheep. This does not redefine the relationship radically, but provides further detail for the reader to understand how a disciple's role continues when the *kyrios* is absent.⁵⁶⁶

4.11.1.4. Irony

The use of *kyrios* has been associated with irony throughout the Gospel of John. Between the first occurrence of the title in 1:23 until Mary's recognition of Jesus' divine identity (20:18), characters who have addressed Jesus as *kyrios* have revealed to the reader that they had not yet recognised Jesus as the divine *kyrios*. In the epilogue, however, this is no longer the case. The reader is aware that there is no longer a gap separating the knowledge which the characters have, and that which has been shared between the reader and the narrator and no longer needs to hope that characters will "speak better than they know."⁵⁶⁷ Now, the characters' use of *kyrios* and knowledge of Jesus are in unison: in unison with each other, and also in unison with the narrator and the reader.

In chapter 21, *kyrios* is associated with unknowing during a narrative flashback when the narrator reports the speech of the disciple whom Jesus loved, when he had asked Jesus who was going to betray him, addressing him as κύριε (21:20).⁵⁶⁸ This flashback reminds the reader that the disciples were addressing Jesus as *kyrios* before his glorification, whilst in a state of incomplete knowledge regarding his divine identity. The starkness of the usage is seen when the reader encounters the next line in the dialogue, where Peter, knowingly, addresses Jesus as κύριε. The dramatic irony which results highlights for the reader the tension which has been felt throughout the narrative as the reader's knowledge is contrasted with that of the disciples. In this case, however, the ignorance is only in the past, and the present is characterised by revelation and knowing. As a result, this provides an opportunity for the reader to rejoice with the disciples that they now know that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*.⁵⁶⁹

⁵⁶⁶ Although the focus of this dialogue is Peter, his question, κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τί, shifts the focus to the disciple whom Jesus loves.

⁵⁶⁷ Carson, *The Gospel According to John*, 636.

⁵⁶⁸ In narrative-critical terminology, "analepsis."

⁵⁶⁹ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 67-68, sees the use of *kyrios* in the flashback of 21:20 and then by Peter in 21:21 as reminding the reader that Jesus was "glorified Lord ... even in his incarnate ministry."

4.11.1.5. Point of View

Having read chapter 20, the reader knows that the disciples have beheld the glory in the flesh. They not only saw Jesus, but saw his glory as well. Now that the narrator's point of view is no longer an area of unfulfilled expectation, the reader is assured that the identification of Jesus as *kyrios* continues to be an acknowledgement of seeing his glory. Following the association of seeing the *kyrios* and seeing his glory in chapter 20, the identity of Jesus as *kyrios* features again in chapter 21 in the words of the disciple whom Jesus loved, the narrator, and Peter.

4.11.2. Semantics

Due to the lack of significant textual variation with respect to *kyrios*, the semantic analysis of the use of *kyrios* by Peter, the disciple whom Jesus loved and also the narrator is possible.⁵⁷⁰

The disciple whom Jesus loved uses *kyrios* twice in chapter 21. The cognitive context relevant to the first occurrence, in 21:7, is chapter 20. The reader knows that, in chapter 20, the disciple recognised Jesus' divine identity, and this significantly influences the semantic analysis of 21:7. As the confession in 20:25 acknowledged that Jesus is a supernatural being, this suggests that the absolute use of *kyrios* in 21:7 reflects the same understanding. This also reflects the change in the relationship between the disciples and Jesus that took place in chapter 20. They are still Jesus' disciples; however, they now recognise that he is their divine *kyrios*. The immediate linguistic context does not provide further evidence that affects this reading, as *kyrios* occurs in a simple sentence (ὁ κύριός ἐστιν), and the disciple says nothing further to clarify his use of the word. The physical context, however, potentially is relevant, as the disciple's declaration occurs immediately after the catch of fish is described. This suggests that the disciple's use of *kyrios* in some way reflects Jesus' involvement in the catch. However, as Jesus has performed miraculous signs throughout the narrative, this is not strong evidence for deciding which semantic range is the most appropriate. It is, however, consistent with the disciple's understanding in chapter 20 that Jesus is a supernatural being "who exercises supernatural authority."⁵⁷¹ Jesus exercises his supernatural authority not only over the disciples, but over all of creation, which was made through him (1:3).

⁵⁷⁰ One difference in the manuscript tradition is found in 21:7 in Bezae, which reads ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἐστιν.

⁵⁷¹ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

The second use of *kyrios* by the same disciple is during a narrative flashback, described in 21:20. The narrator describes the disciple as the one who said to Jesus, κύριε, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παραδιδούς σε; (21:20). The semantic analysis of this occurrence does not depend on the contextual features of chapter 21, but on the context in which it was spoken (13:25). The contextual constraints which affected the original use in 13:25 resulted in the conclusion that the disciple used the title to acknowledge Jesus' authority, but not his supernatural authority. Despite the quotation occurring in the narrative again, after Jesus' glorification, the previous analysis is still valid, as the contextual constraints are based on the time of first speaking, not on the context of the quotation. Accordingly, the most appropriate definition remains "one who rules or exercises authority over others."

The narrator uses *kyrios* twice in this chapter (21:7, 12). In both cases, the usage reflects the knowledge which the reader has of the way the narrator has used the title earlier in the narrative. In the most recent occurrence, in 20:18, the narrator continued to affirm Jesus' identity as a supernatural being. The same is true for both of the uses in chapter 21. The narrator's consistent use of the term throughout the narrative continues in the epilogue, as Jesus' identity as the divine *kyrios* is again presented. The most suitable definition is, therefore, "one who exercises supernatural authority."⁵⁷²

Peter uses *kyrios* four times in chapter 21. The first three uses are in his dialogue with Jesus, where the vocative precedes his addresses to Jesus each time (21:15, 16, 17). The cognitive and relationship context are the same for the use of *kyrios* by Peter and the disciple whom Jesus loved. Peter, as one of the disciples, believes that Jesus is his divine *kyrios*. It follows that his use of *kyrios* in chapter 21 will continue to reflect his understanding of Jesus.⁵⁷³ There is additional support for the analysis in the immediate linguistic context as well. Peter says that Jesus knows "all things" (πάντα, 21:17). And this is consistent with the conclusion that Peter acknowledges that Jesus is a supernatural being in these three uses.⁵⁷⁴ Taking into account the relationship and cognitive contexts, Peter's use of *kyrios* reflects his belief that Jesus is a supernatural being "who exercises supernatural authority."⁵⁷⁵ There is no indication of a shift in

⁵⁷² L&N 1:139 (12§9).

⁵⁷³ Pryor, "Jesus as Lord," 67, draws on Old Testament parallels to establish the semantic range of *kyrios* in 21:15-17. Specifically, he sees Jesus' use of "my flock" as echoing God's own use of the term in Ezekiel 34:6 and other references, so that Jesus' statement is in accordance with his identity as "Lord of the covenant people" (67). Because of this, he sees that "*kyrie* here must have all the force that it can possible have" (67).

⁵⁷⁴ However, Jesus knowledge of "all things" is affirmed earlier in the narrative (16:30), and does not necessarily refer to absolute divine omniscience. It is consistent with, but does not distinguish, a *kyrios* confession that acknowledges Jesus' divine identity.

⁵⁷⁵ L&N 1:139 (12§9).

the immediate context for these constraints following the dialogue. As a result, the same category is also the most appropriate for Peter's fourth use of the vocative in 21:20.

4.11.3. Summary

The epilogue to the Gospel of John affirms for the reader the importance of the identity of Jesus as *kyrios*. Three times the reader encounters the same affirmation: ὁ κύριός ἐστιν (21:7, 12). The disciple whom Jesus loved and the narrator speak in unison in affirming that Jesus is *kyrios*. The reader infers that the unity which the disciple and the narrator share suggests a unique relationship. This inference is confirmed when the “we” of 21:24 reveals that the disciple is the narrator. In addition to this revelation, the reader encounters a new dimension of the *kyrios*-disciple relationship, through the interaction between Peter and Jesus. Jesus, the *kyrios*, does not lose any of his disciples, but restores Peter in love, and Peter addresses him three times as *kyrios* demonstrates. This restoration is also a commission, as Jesus now calls the disciple to do the work of the *kyrios*.

5. Conclusion

5.1. Summary of Findings

5.1.1. Narrative

5.1.1.1. What is the narrative function of *kyrios*?

In the Gospel of John, *kyrios* functions as a narrative thread. Beginning in 1:23, the reader witnesses how the term is used to highlight the difference between characters' understanding of Jesus, and that of the narrator. This thread connects the narrator's presentation of Jesus as the divine *kyrios*, with the characters' use of the vocative throughout chapters 1-15. The thread is not picked up throughout the trial and crucifixion. It re-emerges, however, in the resurrection narratives, when the gap between the narrator and the characters in the narrative closes. From 20:18 onwards, the use of *kyrios* by characters is in unison with the narrator: it signals that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*.

5.1.1.2. How does a narrative understanding of *kyrios* relate to the narrative as a whole?

The title *kyrios* is closely related to four narrative features of the Gospel of John: the structure of the narrative, the narrator's point of view, the testimony of the prophet Isaiah, and narrative irony.

The use of *kyrios* follows a pattern throughout the narrative whereby the narrator uses *kyrios* to signal that characters are using *kyrios* in a new way. In 4:1, the use of *kyrios* precedes the first character's use of *kyrios* to address Jesus (4:11, 15, 19). In 6:23, the narrator's use of *kyrios* comes before the first named disciple's use of the title to speak to Jesus on behalf of the disciples (6:68). In 11:2, the narrator's identification of Jesus as *kyrios* provides a context for the use of the same title by disciples who were not part of the twelve (11: 21, 27, 32, 34, 39). In 20:20, the narrator's use of *kyrios* confirms Mary's and the disciples' recognition of Jesus as the divine *kyrios* (20:18, 20:25), and looks forward to Thomas' confession using the same title (20:28). In 21:7 and 21:12 the narrator echoes the disciple whom Jesus loved in affirming Jesus' identity as *kyrios*. The repetition at the end of the narrative provides confirmation for the reader that this aspect of Jesus' identity is key for the narrative as a whole.

The narrator's point of view is represented in the flesh-glory paradigm in 1:14. As the reader progresses through the narrative, a key issue is whether characters who encounter Jesus' flesh have beheld his glory. The first use of *kyrios* in 1:23 allows the reader to understand that Jesus' coming is the coming of God, and the glory which he reveals is the glory of God. Therefore, seeing Jesus' glory is knowledge that his glory is the glory of God, and that he is therefore divine. Throughout the narrative, although many characters believe in Jesus, no one beholds his glory prior to the resurrection. Following his glorification, as Jesus' journey is now towards his Father, characters who address Jesus as *kyrios* do so to acknowledge that they have beheld his glory (20:18, 25, 28). This transition is signalled by Jesus' statement that he is returning to his Father (20:17). The second half of the Gospel (13-20) is rightly associated with glory. In the final chapter of the narrative proper, the disciples behold Jesus' glory. This conclusion depends significantly on the use of Isaiah in the narrative.

The use of *kyrios* depends on the testimony of the prophet Isaiah. In 1:23 and 12:38, *kyrios* occurs in quotations from Isaiah 40-55 (40:3, 53:1). In addition, 12:41 refers to Isaiah's vision, in which he sees the glory of *kyrios*, the God of Israel (Isa 6:1, 3, 5), and his prophecy of the glorification of the Messiah (Isa 52:13). At the beginning and the end of the first half of the Gospel, *kyrios* is connected to the prophecy of Isaiah, and the revelation of the glory of God. After Jesus' glorification, as Jesus is returning to the Father, when the disciples testify in the first person that they have seen the *kyrios*, their testimonies remind the reader of Isaiah's same testimony in the temple vision (Isa 6:1, 5). As Isaiah saw the *kyrios* revealing his glory, and the narrator informs the reader that this was Jesus' glory (John 12:41), so also the disciples see Jesus, the *kyrios*, reveal his glory. The reader knows that their recognition of Jesus is complete, as when they echo Isaiah's testimony, they are acknowledging that they have shared in his vision of the glory of the *kyrios*.

Irony is a prominent feature throughout the Gospel of John. This study has shown that the use of *kyrios* facilitates the reader's experience of narrative irony. From the first usage of *kyrios* in 1:23, *kyrios* occurs in contexts where characters demonstrate that they have an incomplete understanding of Jesus' identity. At the same time, between the first usage in 1:23 and 20:18, characters who use *kyrios* verbally agree with the narrator that Jesus is *kyrios*, yet at the same time demonstrate that they do not yet understand who Jesus is. In this way, the reader experiences the dynamic of narrative irony, as the characters' words contrast with their understanding. Throughout the narrative, this irony heightens the reader's awareness of the characters' recognition journeys as the reader hopes and expects that those who meet Jesus will

no longer use *kyrios* without knowing that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*. This hope is fulfilled after the resurrection, as first Mary, then the other disciples, use *kyrios* with the same understanding that is shared by the reader and the narrator. This, therefore, is the end of irony with respect to *kyrios*, as the narrator, the reader and the characters agree that Jesus is the divine *kyrios*.

5.1.2. Textual Criticism

5.1.2.1. Where is *kyrios* the earliest recoverable reading in the manuscript tradition?

In ten places, variants were discussed in the body of the thesis.⁵⁷⁶ In one place (1:23), the anarthrous form was chosen over the articular form. In seven places, the longer reading which included *kyrios* was preferred over the shorter reading which omitted the title (4:1, 6:23, 11:21, 11:39, 13:9, 13:16, 13:37). In two places, the shorter reading, without *kyrios*, was preferred (5:4, 9:38-9a). Of these conclusions, two differ with NA²⁸ (4:1, 9:38-39a).

5.1.2.2. What are the implications of utilising narrative theory to understand intrinsic probabilities?

In this study, before attempting analysis of textual variants, the first goal was to establish an accurate understanding of the narrative features of *kyrios*, based upon uses of the term that occur without textual variation. By applying this broader understanding to the individual variants, the benefits of narrative criticism were applied to textual criticism. This allowed the analysis of intrinsic probabilities to be informed by the narrative as a whole, which assists in answering the question of what the author is most likely to have written. In a number of places, such as 4:1, 6:23 and 9:38-39a, this narrative understanding provided decisive evidence for making a textual decision.

This approach has been used by Christopher Skinner, and the continued testing of this method throughout this study has shown that moving from narrative to text-critical conclusions, rather than the other way around, provides valuable insight into authorial tendencies. This is because

⁵⁷⁶ Other *kyrios* variants with minimal external support were only discussed in footnotes. On one occasion, previous text-critical studies were relied upon, and a new analysis was not undertaken (8:11).

intrinsic probabilities are not limited to grammatical and lexical characteristics of the author, but broader tendencies that can only be detected at the narrative level.

5.1.3. Semantics

5.1.3.1. What does *kyrios* mean in each of its occurrences in the earliest recoverable text?

The semantic analyses can be summarised as follows. First, the narrator consistently uses *kyrios* for Jesus to acknowledge he is a supernatural being “who exercises supernatural authority.” Before the resurrection, no character uses *kyrios* in this way. All disciples who address Jesus as *kyrios* do so to acknowledge his authority over them. Others who address Jesus as *kyrios* communicate their respect for him. Jesus uses *kyrios* three times in general statements to refer to one who owns slaves. After the resurrection, and Jesus’ declaration that he is returning to his Father (20:17), all characters who address Jesus as *kyrios* do so in agreement with the narrator that he is a “supernatural being who exercises supernatural authority.”

Verse	Form	Speaker	Referent	Semantic Category ⁵⁷⁷
1:23	κυρίου	Isaiah (John)	God/Jesus	Lord
4:1	ὁ κύριος	Narrator	Jesus	Lord
4:11	κύριε	Samaritan Woman	Jesus	Sir
4:15	κύριε	Samaritan Woman	Jesus	Sir
4:19	κύριε	Samaritan Woman	Jesus	Sir
4:49	κύριε	Royal official	Jesus	Sir
5:7	κύριε	Man at the pool	Jesus	Sir
6:23	τοῦ κυρίου	Narrator	Jesus	Lord
6:34	κύριε	Crowd	Jesus	Sir

⁵⁷⁷ “Sir” is L&N 1:739 (87§53), “a title of respect used in addressing or speaking of a man.” “Master” is L&N 1:478 (37§51), “one who rules or exercises authority over others.” “Owner” is L&N 1:559 (57§12), “one who owns and controls property, including especially servants and slaves.” “Lord” is L&N 1:139 (12§9), a supernatural being “who exercises supernatural authority.”

6:68	κύριε	Peter ⁵⁷⁸	Jesus	Master
9:36	κύριε	Man born blind	Jesus	Master
11:02	τὸν κύριον	Narrator	Jesus	Lord
11:03	κύριε	Mary and Martha	Jesus	Master
11:12	κύριε	The Disciples	Jesus	Master
11:21	κύριε	Martha	Jesus	Master
11:27	κύριε	Martha	Jesus	Master
11:32	κύριε	Mary of Bethany	Jesus	Master
11:34	κύριε	Mary and Martha ⁵⁷⁹	Jesus	Master
11:39	κύριε	Martha	Jesus	Master
12:13	κυρίου	Psalmist (Crowd)	God	Lord
12:21	κύριε	The Greeks	Philip	Sir
12:38	κύριε	Isaiah (Narrator)	God	Lord
12:38	κυρίου	Isaiah (Narrator)	Jesus/God	Lord
13:06	κύριε	Peter	Jesus	Master
13:09	κύριε	Peter	Jesus	Master
13:13	ὁ κύριος	Jesus	Jesus	Master
13:14	ὁ κύριος	Jesus	Jesus	Master
13:16	τοῦ κυρίου	Jesus	Unspecified	Owner
13:25	κύριε	The disciple whom Jesus loved	Jesus	Master
13:36	κύριε	Peter	Jesus	Master
13:37	κύριε	Peter	Jesus	Master

⁵⁷⁸ Peter speaks on behalf of the disciples.

⁵⁷⁹ There is no explicit subject. The context suggests Mary and Martha as the most suitable subject.

14:5	κύριε	Thomas	Jesus	Master
14:8	κύριε	Philip	Jesus	Master
14:22	κύριε	Judas (not Iscaiot)	Jesus	Master
15:15	ὁ κύριος	Jesus	Unspecified	Owner
15:20	τοῦ κυρίου	Jesus	Unspecified	Owner
20:2	τὸν κύριον	Mary Magdalene	Jesus	Master
20:13	τὸν κύριον	Mary Magdalene	Jesus	Master
20:15	κύριε	Mary Magdalene	Jesus	Sir
20:18	τὸν κύριον	Mary Magdalene	Jesus	Lord
20:20	τὸν κύριον	Narrator	Jesus	Lord
20:25	τὸν κύριον	Disciples	Jesus	Lord
20:28	ὁ κύριος	Thomas	Jesus	Lord
21:7	ὁ κύριος	The disciple whom Jesus loved	Jesus	Lord
21:7	ὁ κύριος	Narrator	Jesus	Lord
21:12	ὁ κύριος	Narrator	Jesus	Lord
21:15	κύριε	Peter	Jesus	Lord
21:16	κύριε	Peter	Jesus	Lord
21:17	κύριε	Peter	Jesus	Lord
21:20	κύριε	The disciple whom Jesus loved	Jesus	Lord
21:21	κύριε	Peter	Jesus	Lord

5.1.3.2. In what ways does a narrative critical reading facilitate semantic analysis?

Narrative critical conclusions were important for the semantic analysis in two ways. First, they provided valuable input for considering the relationship context, both between characters and also between the narrator and reader. Second, narrative understanding was important for deciding on the content of cognitive context of the reader and characters. A narrative reading allowed the development of the reader's understanding of the narrative to be taken into account so that the semantic analysis considered not only the meaning for the characters within the narrative, but also for the reader who experienced the narrative.

5.2. Contributions of this Study

5.2.1. Narrative

This is the first narrative-critical study of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John which proceeds from chapter 1 through to chapter 21. Overall, it has demonstrated the importance of *kyrios* for understanding the narrative as a whole, the identity of Jesus, and all characters that use the term. In addition, there are four contributions which relate to this narrative understanding.

First, the framework of Schenk has been adopted and modified so that the narrator's use of *kyrios* is seen as highlighting for the reader that characters are using *kyrios* in a new way.

Second, Mary experiences the first recognition of Jesus as divine in 20:18. Jesus' return to the Father is signalled in 20:17 and Mary's confession, "I have seen the *kyrios*," follows immediately.

Third, the reader is sure about the significance of Mary's confession, and the disciples' confession that follows (20:20), because they echo Isaiah's "I saw the *kyrios*" (Isa 6:1).

Fourth, although "glory" does not appear in the narrative after the crucifixion with reference to Jesus, the second half of the Gospel of John is still rightly associated with glory because the reader knows that, like Isaiah, the disciples see Jesus' glory after the resurrection.

5.2.2. Textual Criticism

Methodologically, using narrative criticism to inform textual criticism has been tested extensively. Following Christopher Skinner's pioneering work, this study has shown that narrative criticism can be a necessary prerequisite for being able to understand intrinsic probabilities in textual variants in the Gospels.

A detailed case was put forth for reading ὁ κύριός in 4:1. In the case of 4:1, this counters the conclusion of the UBS committee, and the conclusion of a significant number of Johannine scholars. The case in this study extends the arguments put forward by Van Belle.

In addition to traditional internal and external criteria, the case for including the clause εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου (6:23) relied on the narrative dynamics of *kyrios*. Although the final clause of 6:23 is printed in NA²⁸, its authenticity has been questioned by a number of Johannine scholars. This analysis relied on the narrative understanding of *kyrios* established through the modified version of Schenk's framework.

Narrative-critical conclusions informed to a large degree the weighing of internal probabilities for the variant in 9:38-39a. Extending the arguments of Porter and Theophilus, a detailed case was presented for the shorter reading, so that the man born blind does not address Jesus as *kyrios* a second time, nor worship him.

5.2.3. Semantics

Methodologically, this study used the dynamic construal approach for a comprehensive analysis of a single term in one book. Although dynamic construal has been used in Biblical Studies previously, there were two features of this study which were innovative.

First, this study used Louw and Nida's sense categories as the basis for contextual constraints. This procedure allowed the focus of this study to be on contextual features related to the Gospel of John, rather than the broader use of *kyrios* in Koine Greek.

Second, contextual constraints were informed to a large extent by narrative-critical conclusions. The very nature of contextual constraints, as defined by Cruse, allows for the seamless integration of the two approaches.

A specific conclusion which was argued for at length is that the use of the vocative (κύριε) is not semantically separated from other forms in the Gospel of John. This case has been made by C. Kavin Rowe for the Gospel of Luke already. This is most clearly demonstrated in the use of the vocative for the God of Israel in chapter 12, and also the use of the vocative to acknowledge Jesus' divine identity in chapter 21.

5.3. Avenues for Further Study

5.3.1. Narrative

This study provides a model for the integration of narrative theory with both textual criticism and semantics in the Gospels, and by extension, the Book of Acts, by virtue of it being a narrative. The conclusions of a close reading of the text are valuable for making both text-critical decisions and undertaking semantic analysis.

The narrative-critical approach used in this study did not consider the relationship between the narrative and historical issues. Therefore, there is scope to use the conclusions from this study for undertaking fresh research into the historical questions of the world behind the text. Potential areas related to *kyrios* include the origins of the use of *kyrios* as a christological title, the relationship between the use of *kyrios* in John and the Synoptics, Historical Jesus studies and *kyrios*, the place of *kyrios* in the composition of the Gospel of John, and the ways that other texts external to the narrative may relate to the use of *kyrios* in the Gospel of John.

The title *kyrios* has been an important part of Empire studies, particularly in the Pauline corpus. This study provides a cohesive framework for understanding *kyrios* in John with respect to the Old Testament, but has not interacted with imperial themes. These results can be used for a renewed engagement with studies of John and Empire, with a focus on the title *kyrios*.

5.3.2. Textual Criticism

The order of operations in this study was to start with narrative criticism, and then to move to textual criticism. This has proven a valuable procedure which allows narrative conclusions to inform the evaluation of intrinsic probabilities. There is scope for this procedure to be further used in text-critical studies for the text of the Gospel of John, the Synoptic Gospels, and Acts.

5.3.3. Semantics

The dynamic construal approach is a valuable framework for undertaking semantic analysis for New Testament studies. By utilising the important work of Louw and Nida for conventional constraints, contextual constraints can retain their rightful place at the centre of semantic analysis. In semantic studies of the Gospels and Acts, narrative criticism provides an additional valuable input for analysis.

5.4. Final Words

I began this study to better understand the meaning of one word in the Gospel of John. That goal has been achieved, and the summary of the semantic analyses above capture my understanding of the meaning of *kyrios*. Some of the conclusions were in keeping with how I had previously understood the use of *kyrios* in the Gospel. However, some aspects of the procedure and results of this study were unexpected. With regard to procedure, I now better understand the significance of narrative for the interpretation of any aspect of the Gospel, whether it be semantic, text critical, or something else. I also now recognise the importance of the Old Testament for understanding not only quotations in the Gospel, but its narrative whole and parts. With regard to outcomes, the key discovery for me was the way that these two factors—narrative and the use of the Old Testament—led to the identification of the point in the narrative when a character recognised who Jesus truly is, the divine *kyrios*.

Bibliography

- Aland, Kurt, Kurt Aland, and Klaus Wachtel eds. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments V. Das Johannesevangelium: Teststellenkollation der Kapitel 1-10*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005.
- Antoniotti, Louise-Marie, "L'apparition de Jésus à Marie de Magdala." *Revue Thomiste* 96, no. 2 (1996): 302-311.
- Attridge, Harold W., "The Samaritan Woman: A Woman Transformed." Pages 268-281 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Aune, David E., *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- Baarda, Tjitze "'She Recognised Him': Concerning the Origin of a peculiar Textual Variation in John 20,16 Sy^s." Pages 24-38 in *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*. Edited by Tjitze Baarda, Anthony Hilhorst, Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, and Adam S. van der Woude. Kampen: Kok, 1988.
- Ball, David M., *I Am in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Barrett, C. K., "The Old Testament in The Fourth Gospel." *JTS* 48 (1947): 155-169.
- Barrett, C. K., *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1978.
- Bauckham, Richard, "John for Readers of Mark." Pages 147-171 in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Bauckham, Richard, "Messianism According to the Gospel of John." Pages 34-68 in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*. Edited by John Lierman. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Bauckham, Richard, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Bauckham, Richard, "The Fourth Gospel as the Testimony of the Beloved Disciple." Pages 120-142 in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*. Edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Bauckham, Richard, *Jesus and the God of Israel*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2008.
- Bauckham, Richard, *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015.
- Bauckham, Richard, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.
- Beasley-Murray, G. R., *John*. 2nd ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999.

- Beck, David R., *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel* Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Bennema, Cornelis, "The Crowd: A Faceless, Divided Mass." Pages 347-355 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Bennema, Cornelis, *A Theory of Character in New Testament Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.
- Bennema, Cornelis, *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.
- Bernard, John. H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John*. Edited by A. H. McNeile. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1928.
- Bernier, Jonathan, *Aposynagōgos and the Historical Jesus in John*. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Beutler, Johannes, "Greeks Come to See Jesus (John 12,20f)." *Bib* 71 (1990): 333-347.
- Beutler, Johannes, *Das Johannesevangelium: Kommentar*. Freiburg: Herder, 2013.
- Black, David Alan and Jacob N. Cerone eds. *The Pericope of the Adulteress in Contemporary Research*. London: T&T Clark, 2016.
- Blaine, Bradford B., *Peter in the Gospel of John: The Making of an Authentic Disciple*. Atlanta: SBL, 2007.
- Boismard, Marie-Émile and Arnaud Lamouille, *Synopse des quatre Évangiles en français*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1965.
- Borchert, Gerald L., *John*. 2 vols. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996-2002.
- Borgen, Peder, *Bread from Heaven. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo*. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Botha, J. Eugene, "The Case of Johannine Irony Reopened I: The Problematic Current Situation." *Neot* 25 (1991): 209-220.
- Botha, J. Eugene, "The Case of Johannine Irony Reopened II: Suggestions, Alternative Approaches." *Neot* 25 (1991): 221-232.
- Bousset, Wilhelm, *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.
- Brant, Jo-Ann A., *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Brant, Jo-Ann A., *John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Brendsel, Daniel J., *"Isaiah Saw His Glory": The Use of Isaiah 52-53 in John 12*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.

- Brodie, Thomas L., *The Quest for the Origin of John's Gospel: A Source-Oriented Approach* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Brodie, Thomas L., *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Brown, Raymond E., *The Gospel According to John: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1966-70.
- Brown, Raymond E., *The Community of the Beloved Disciple: The Life, Loves and Hates of an Individual Church in New Testament Times*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Brown, Raymond E., *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Brown, Raymond E., *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Francis J. Moloney. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- Brown, Sherri, "John the Baptist: Witness and Embodiment of the Prologue in the Gospel of John." Pages 147-164 in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Bultmann, Rudolf K., *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. Translated by George. R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
- Burney, C. F., *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1922.
- Burridge, Richard A., *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Burton, Peter H., Jon Balsarak, Hugh A.G. Houghton, and David C. Parker. *Vetus Latina Iohannes*. 2015. Available from <http://iohannes.com/vetuslatina/index.html>.
- Buth, Randall, "Ὅν, Δέ, Καί, and Asyndeton in John's Gospel." Pages 144-161 in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Discourse Analysis*. Edited by David A. Black. Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992.
- Bynum, Wm. Randolph, *The Fourth Gospel and the Scriptures: Illuminating the Form and Meaning of Scriptural Citation in John 19:37*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Caragounis, Chrys C., "What Did Jesus Mean by τὴν ἀρχὴν in John 8:25?" *NovT* 49 (2007): 129-147.
- Carson, D. A., *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Cassidy, Richard J., *John's Gospel in New Perspective: Christology and the Realities of Roman Power*. Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 1992.
- Chibici-Revneanu, Nicole, *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten. Das Verständnis der δόξα im Johannesevangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

- Collins, Raymond F., *These Things Have Been Written: Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.
- Collins, Raymond F., "'You Call Me Teacher and Lord – and You Are Right. For That Is What I Am' (John 13,13)." Pages 327-348 in *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology: Festschrift Gilbert Van Belle*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden, Geert Van Oyen, Michael Labahn, and Reimund Bieringer. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Coloe, Mary L., "The Woman of Samaria: Her Characterization, Narrative, and Theological Significance." Pages 182-196 in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Colwell, Ernest C., *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.
- Conway, Colleen, "Speaking through Ambiguity: Minor Characters in the Fourth Gospel." *BibInt* 10 (2002): 324-341.
- Conybeare, F. C and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995.
- Crellin, Robert, "The Semantics of the Perfect in the Greek of the New Testament." Pages 430-457 in *The Greek Verb Revisited: A Fresh Approach for Biblical Exegesis*. Edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch. Bellingham: Lexham Press, 2016.
- Croft, William and D. Alan Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Crotty, Robert, "The Two Magdalene Reports on the Risen Jesus in John 20." *Pacifica* 12 (1999): 156-168.
- Cruse, D. Alan, *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Cruse, D. Alan, *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, "Un exemple de commentaire fondé sur la critique narrative; Jean 5,1-18." in *La communauté johannique et son histoire*. Edited by Jean-Michel Poffet and Jean Zumstein. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1990.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, "The Plot of John's Story of Jesus." *Int* 49, no. 4 (1995): 347-358.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, "Reading Johannine Irony." Pages 193-207 in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- Culpepper, R. Alan, *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998.

- Culpepper, R. Alan, "Designs for the Church in the Imagery of John 21:1-14." Pages 369-402 in *Imagery in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Danker, Frederick W., *The Concise Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.
- de Blois, Reinier, "Semantic Domains for Biblical Greek: Louw and Nida's Framework Evaluated from a Cognitive Perspective." Pages 265-278 in *Foundations for Syriac Lexicography III*. Edited by Janet Dyk and Wido van Peursen. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- de Boer, Martinus C., "The Original Prologue to the Gospel of John." *NTS* 61, no. 4 (2015): 448-467.
- de Jonge, Marinus, "Jewish Expectations about the 'Messiah' according to the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 19, no. 3 (1973): 246-270.
- Dettwiler, Andreas, *Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten. Eine exegetische Studie zu den johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Joh 13:1-16:33) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Relekturcharakters*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1995.
- Dickey, Eleanor, *Greek Forms of Address: From Herodotus to Lucian*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Dickey, Eleanor, "Κύριε, Δέσποτα, Domine: Greek Politeness in the Roman Empire." *JHS* 121 (2001): 1-11.
- Dickey, Eleanor, "The Greek Address System of the Roman Period and Its Relationship to Latin." *CIQ* 54, no. 2 (2004): 494-527.
- Dickey, Eleanor, "Literal and Extended use of Kinship Terms in Documentary Papyri." *Mnemosyne* 57, no. 2 (2004): 131-176.
- Dodd, C. H., *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Domeris, William R., "The Confession of Peter according to John 6:68." *TynBul* 44 (1993): 155-167.
- Draper, Jonathan A. "What did Isaiah see? Angelic theophany in the tomb in John 20: 11-18." *Neot* 36 (2002): 63-76.
- Duke, Paul D., *Irony in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.
- Dupont, Dom Jacques, *Essais sur la Christologie de Saint Jean. Le Christ, Parole, Lumière et Vie. La Gloire du Christ*. Bruges: Editions de l'Abbaye de Saint André, 1951.
- Ebner, Martin, "Wer liebt mehr? Die liebende Jüngerin und der geliebte Jünger nach Joh 20,1-18." *BZ* 42 (1998): 39-55.
- Edwards, Ruth B., *Discovering John: Content, Interpretation, Reception*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

- Elliott, William. J. and David C. Parker eds. *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John, Volume 1, The Papyri*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Ellis, Nicholas, Michael Aubrey, and Mark Dubis, "The Greek Verbal System and Aspectual Prominence: Revising our Taxonomy and Nomenclature." *JETS* 59, no. 1 (2016): 33-62.
- Epp, Eldon J., "Traditional 'Canons' of New Testament Textual Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability—or Lack Thereof." Pages 79-128 in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*. Edited by Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Fantin, Joseph D., *The Lord of the Entire World: Lord Jesus, a Challenge to Lord Caesar?* Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011.
- Farely, Nicolas, *The Disciples in the Fourth Gospel: A Narrative Analysis of Their Faith and Understanding*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Fee, Gordon D., "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in establishing textual relationships." *NTS* 15, no. 1 (1968): 23-44.
- Flink, Timo, *Textual Dilemma: Studies in the Second-Century Text of the New Testament*. Joensuu: University of Joensuu, 2009.
- Freed, Edwin D., *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Frey, Jörg, "'... dass sie meine Herrlichkeit schauen' (Joh 17.24) Zu Hintergrund, Sinn und Funktion der johanneischen Rede von der δόξα Jesu." *NTS* 54 (2008): 375-397.
- Frey, Jörg, "'Ich habe den Herrn gesehen' (20, 18): Entstehung, Inhalt und Vermittlung des Osterglaubens nach Johannes 20." Pages 267-284 in *Studien zu Matthäus und Johannes: Festschrift für Jean Zumstein zu seinem 65*. Edited by Andreas Dettwiler and Uta Poplutz. Zürich: TVZ, 2009.
- Gasquet, Francis A., *Codex Vercellensis*. Rome: F. Pustet, 1914.
- Giblin, Charles H., "Suggestion, Negative Response, and Positive Action in St John's Portrayal of Jesus." *NTS* 26, no. 2 (1980): 197-211.
- Goodwin, Charles, "How Did John Treat His Sources?" *JBL* 73, no. 2 (1954): 61-75.
- Griffiths, David R., "Deutero-Isaiah and the Fourth Gospel: Some Points of Comparison." *ExpTim* 65 (1954): 355-360.
- Haenchen, Ernst, *John: A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Hägerland, Tobias, "John's Gospel: A Two-Level Drama?" *JSNT* 25 (2003): 309-22.
- Hamid-Khani, Saeed, *Revelation and Concealment of Christ: A Theological Inquiry into the Elusive Language of the Fourth Gospel*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

- Hamilton, James, "The Influence of Isaiah on the Gospel of John." *Perichoresis* 5 (2007): 139-162.
- Harris, Elizabeth, *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Harris, Murray J., *Jesus as God: The New Testament use of Theos in Reference to Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.
- Harris, Murray J., *John*. Nashville: B&H Academic, 2015.
- Hays, Richard B., *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- Hays, Richard B., *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016.
- Head, Peter M., "Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, especially on the Scribal Habits!" *Bib* 71, no. 2 (1990): 240-247.
- Head, Peter M., "Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John: Some Observations on the Habits of New Testament Copyists." *Bib* 85, no. 3 (2004): 399–408.
- Hernández Jr., Juan, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Hitchcock, F. R. Montgomery, "Is the Fourth Gospel a Drama?" *Theology* 7 (1923): 307-17.
- Hunt, Steven A., D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann eds. *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Hurtado, Larry W., *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Hulen, Susan, *Imperfect Believers: Ambiguous Characters in the Gospel of John*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2009.
- Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, *Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*. 2016. Available from <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/liste/>.
- Jones, Larry P., *The Symbol of Water in the Gospel of John*. London: T&T Clark, 1997.
- Jongkind, Dirk, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007.
- Joüon, Paul, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2 vols. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblio, 2006.
- Keener, Craig S., *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Kellum, L. Scott, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33*. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Keith, Chris, *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- Kilpatrick, George D., "Κυριος in the Gospels." Pages 207-212 in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by J.K. Elliott. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.
- Klink, Edward W., *The Sheep of the Fold: The Audience and Origin of the Gospel of John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Klink, Edward W., *John*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2016.
- Koester, Craig R., "Theological Complexity and the Characterization of Nicodemus in John's Gospel." Pages 164-181 in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J., *John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004.
- Labahn, Michael, "Simon Peter: An Ambiguous Character and His Narrative Career." Pages 151-167 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Lamb, David A., *Text, Context and the Johannine Community: A Sociolinguistic Analysis of the Johannine Writings*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Larsen, Kasper Bro, *Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Lee, Dorothy A., *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel*. London: T&T Clark, 1994.
- Lee, Dorothy A., "Partnership in Easter Faith: The Role of Mary Magdalene and Thomas in John 20." *JSNT* 58 (1995): 37-49.
- Lee, Dorothy A., *Flesh and Glory: Symbol, Gender and Theology in the Gospel of John*. New York: Crossroad, 2002.
- Lee, Dorothy A., "Martha and Mary: Levels of Characterization in Luke and John." Pages 197-220 in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Lee, John A. L., "The Puzzle of John 21:15-17." *NovT* 59 (2017): 27-30.
- Léon-Dufour, Xavier, *Lecture de l'Évangile selon Jean*. 4 vols. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1988-1996.
- Lett, Jonathan, "The Divine Identity of Jesus as the Reason for Israel's Unbelief in John 12:36-43." *JBL* 135 (2016): 159-173.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H., *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Dallas: SIL International, 2000.
- Lightfoot, J.B., *The Gospel of John: A Newly Discovered Commentary*. Edited by Ben Witherington III and Todd D. Still. Vol. 2. Downers Grove: IVP Academic, 2015.
- Lincoln, Andrew T., *The Gospel According to Saint John*. London: Continuum, 2005.
- Lindars, Barnabas, *The Gospel of John*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1972.

- Loader, William, *Jesus in John's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- Maccini, Robert G., "A Reassessment of the Woman at the Well in John 4 in Light of the Samaritan Context." *JSNT* 16, no. 53 (1994): 35-46.
- MacFarlane, John, "Aristotle's Definition of Anagnorisis." *AJP* 121, no. 3 (2000): 367-383.
- MacRae, George W. , "Theology and Irony in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 83-96 in *The Word in the World: Essays in Honor of Frederick L. Moriarty, S.J.* Edited by Richard J. Clifford and George W. MacRae. Weston: Weston College Press, 1973.
- Manns, Frédéric, "Eléments de christologie johannique." *BeO* 40 (1998): 169-192.
- Martyn, J. Louis, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel*. 3rd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.
- McHugh, John F., *John 1-4: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- McKay, Kenneth L., "Style and Significance in the Language of John 21:15-17." *NovT* 27 (1985): 319-333.
- Menken, Maarten J. J., "The Quotation from Isa 40,3 in John 1,23." *Bib* 66, no. 2 (1985): 190-205.
- Menken, Maarten J. J., *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.
- Metzger, Bruce M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Metzger, Bruce M. and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey, *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey, "The Invalid at the Pool: The Man Who Merely Got Well." Pages 337-346 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Minear, Paul S., "The Original Functions of John 21." *JBL* 102 (1983): 85-98.
- Mink, Gerd, "Contamination, Coherence, and Coincidence in Textual Transmission." Pages 141-216 in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*. Edited by Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Mlakuzhyil, George, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd ed. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011.
- Moloney, Francis J., *The Johannine Son of Man*. 2nd ed. Rome: LAS, 1978.

- Moloney, Francis J., "The Reader in/of the Fourth Gospel." *ABR* 40 (1992): 20-33.
- Moloney, Francis J., *Belief in the Word: Reading John 1-4*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Moloney, Francis J., *Signs and Shadows: Reading John 5-12*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Moloney, Francis J., *The Gospel of John*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998.
- Moloney, Francis J., *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13-21*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Moloney, Francis J., "Can Everyone be Wrong? A Reading of John 11.1–12.8." *NTS* 49 (2003): 505-527.
- Moloney, Francis J., "Recent Johannine Studies: Part One: Commentaries." *ExpTim* 123 (2012): 313-322.
- Moloney, Francis J., *Love in the Gospel of John: An Exegetical, Theological and Literary Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.
- Montanari, Franco, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Montanaro, Andrew, "The Use of Memory in the Old Testament Quotations in John's Gospel." *NovT* 59 (2017): 147-70.
- Morris, Leon, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Devon: Paternoster, 1969.
- Morris, Leon, *The Gospel according to John*. Rev. ed. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Moulton, James H., *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 1 - Prolegomena. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1906.
- Mullen, Roderic L., Simon Crisp, and David C. Parker. *An Electronic Edition of the Gospel according to John in the Byzantine Tradition*. 2007. Available from <http://www.iohannes.com/byzantine/index.html>.
- Mullen, Roderic L., Simon Crisp, and David C. Parker eds. *The Gospel according to John in the Byzantine tradition*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu, *A Morphosyntax and Syntax of Septuagint Greek*. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.
- Myers, Alicia D., "The Ambiguous Character of Johannine Characterization: An Overview of Recent Contributions and a Proposal." *PRSt* 39 (2012): 289-298.
- Newman, Barclay M. and Eugene A. Nida, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John*. New York: United Bible Societies, 1980.
- Newman, Barclay M., *A Greek-English Dictionary of the New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010.
- Neyrey, Jerome, H., *The Gospel of John*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

- Jerome Neyrey, "What's Wrong With This Picture? John 4, Cultural Stereotypes of Women, and Public and Private Space." *BTB* 24 (1994):77-91.
- Nida, Eugene A. and Johannes P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Nielsen, Jesper T., "Resurrection, Recognition, Reassuring. The Function of Jesus' Resurrection in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 177-208 in *The Resurrection of Jesus in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Craig R. Koester and Reimund Bieringer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Nielsen, Jesper T., "The Narrative Structures of Glory and Glorification in the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 56 (2010): 343-366.
- Nongbri, Brent, "The Limits of Palaeographic Dating of Literary Papyri: Some Observations on the Date and Provenance of P.Bodmer II (P66)." *MH* 71 (2014): 1-35.
- Nongbri, Brent, "Reconsidering the Place of Papyrus Bodmer XIV–XV (P75) in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament." *JBL* 135 (2016): 405-437.
- O'Day, Gail R., "Narrative Mode and Theological Claim: A Study in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 105 (1986): 657-668.
- O'Day, Gail R., *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- O'Day, Gail R., "The Gospel of John." Pages 9:491-866 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- O'Day, Gail R., "Martha: Seeing the Glory of God." Pages 487-503 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Orsini, Pasquale and Willy Clarysse, "Early New Testament Manuscripts and Their Dates: A Critique of Theological Palaeography." *ETL* 88 (2012): 443-474.
- Orsini, Pasquale, "I papiri Bodmer: scritture e libri." *Adamantius* 21 (2015): 60-78.
- Parker, David C., *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- Pietersma, Albert, "Kyrios or Tetragram: A renewed Quest for the Original LXX." Pages 85-101 in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Claude E. Cox. Mississauga: Benben Publications, 1984.
- Popp, Thomas, "Thomas: Question Marks and Exclamation Marks." Pages 504-529 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Porter, Calvin L., "John IX. 38, 39a: A Liturgical Addition to the Text." *NTS* 13 (1967): 387-394.

- Porter, Stanley E. and Jeffrey T. Reed, "Philippians as a Macro-Chiasm and its Exegetical Significance." *NTS* 44 (1998): 213-231.
- Porter, Stanley E., *John, His Gospel, and Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.
- Powell, Mark A., *What Is Narrative Criticism?* London: SPCK, 1993.
- Poythress, Vern S., "The Use of the Intersentence Conjunctions De, Oun, Kai, and Asyndeton in the Gospel of John." *NovT* 26, no. 4 (1984): 312-340.
- Pryor, John, "Jesus as Lord: A Neglected Factor in Johannine Christology." Pages 57-78 in *In the Fullness of Time: Biblical Studies in Honour of Archbishop Donald Robinson*. Edited by David Petersen and John Pryor. Homebush West: Lancer, 1992.
- Rabinowitz, Peter J., "Showing Vs. Telling." Pages 530-531 in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. Edited by David Herman, Manfred Jahn, and Marie-Laure Ryan. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Reimer, Andy M., "The Man Born Blind: True Disciple of Jesus." Pages 428-438 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Renz, Gabi, "Nicodemus: An Ambiguous Disciple? A Narrative Sensitive Investigation." Pages 255-83 in *Challenging Perspectives on the Gospel of John*. Edited by John Lierman. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Resseguie, James L., "The Beloved Disciple: The Ideal Point of View." Pages 537-549 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Resseguie, James L., *The Strange Gospel: Narrative Design and Point of View in John*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Resseguie, James L., *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Reynolds, Benjamin E., *The Apocalyptic Son of Man in the Gospel of John*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Richey, Lance B., *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John*. Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007.
- Robbins, Vernon K., *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Robertson, A.T., "The New Testament Use of μή with Hesitant Questions in the Indicative Mood." *Expositor* 26 (1923): 129-35.
- Robertson, A.T., *The Minister and His Greek New Testament*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923.
- Robertson, A.T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.

- Rösel, Martin, "The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch." *JSOT* 31, no. 4 (2007): 411-428.
- Rowe, C. Kavin, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006.
- Royse, James R., *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Ruckstuhl, Eugen and Peter Dschulnigg, *Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage im Johannesevangelium: Die johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des Neuen Testaments und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag, 1991.
- Sarlow, Kevin W., *Ironic Authority: A Rhetorical Critical Analysis of the Stability of Irony in the Fourth Gospel Passion Narrative*. PhD diss., Flinders University, 2017.
- Schenk, Wolfgang, *Kommentiertes Lexikon Zum Vierten Evangelium: Seine Textkonstituenten in Ihren Syntagmen und Wortfeldern*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.
- Schmid, Ulrich B., William J. Elliott, and David C. Parker eds. *The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel According to St. John, Volume 2, The Majuscules*. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Schmid, Ulrich B., William J. Elliott, and David C. Parker. *An Electronic Version of The New Testament in Greek IV - Vol 2 The Majuscules*. 2013. Available from <http://iohannes.com/IGNTPtranscripts>.
- Schmid, Wolf, "Implied Reader." Pages 301-309 in *Handbook of Narratology*. Edited by Peter Hühn, Jan C. Meister, John Pier, and Wolf Schmid. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 vols. New York: Crossroad, 1982.
- Schnelle, Udo, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Schnelle, Udo, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. 5th ed. Leipzig: Evangelischer Verlagsanstalt, 2016.
- Scholtissek, Klaus, "'Mitten unter euch steht er, den ihr nicht kennt' (Joh 1,26) : die Messias-Regel des Täufers als johanneische Sinnlinie." *MTZ* 48 (1997): 103-121.
- Scholtissek, Klaus, "Ironie und Rollenwechsel im Johannesevangelium." *ZNW* 89 (1998): 235-255.
- Scholtissek, Klaus, *In ihm sein und bleiben: die Sprache der Immanenz in den johanneischen Schriften*. Freiburg: Herder, 2000.
- Scholtissek, Klaus, "Relecture und réécriture: Neue Paradigmen zur Methode und Inhalt." *TP* 75 (2000): 1-29.
- Schuchard, Bruce G., *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

- Schuchard, Bruce G., "Form versus Function: Citation Technique and Authorial Intention in the Gospel of John." Pages 23-46 in *Abiding Words The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Schwindt, Rainer, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit. Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie*. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.
- Shedd, Richard E., "Expressions of Double Meaning and their Function in the Gospel of John." *NTS* 31 (1985): 96-112.
- Sheridan, Ruth, *Retelling Scripture: 'The Jews' and the Scriptural Citations in John 1:19-12:15*. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Skinner, Christopher W., "'Whom He Also Named Apostles': A Textual Problem in Mark 3:14." *BibSac* 161 (2004): 322-329.
- Skinner, Christopher W., *John and Thomas—Gospels in Conflict? Johannine Characterization and the Thomas question*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2009.
- Skinner, Christopher W., "Misunderstanding, Christology, and Johannine Characterization: Reading John's Characters through the Lens of the Prologue." Pages 111-128 in *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. Edited by Christopher W. Skinner. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Skinner, Christopher W. ed. *Characters and Characterization in the Gospel of John*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Skinner, Christopher W., "John's Gospel and The Roman Imperial Context: An Evaluation of Recent Proposals." Pages 116-129 in *Jesus Is Lord, Caesar is Not: Evaluating Empire in New Testament Studies*. Edited by Joseph B. Modica and Scot McKnight. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2013.
- Skinner, Christopher W., "'Son of God' or 'God's Chosen One'? A Text-Critical Problem and Its Narrative-Critical Solution (John 1:34)." *BBR* 25 (2015): 341-57.
- Smith, D. Moody, *John*. Nashville: Abingden Press, 1999.
- Staley, Jeffrey L., *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel*. Atlanta: SBL, 1985.
- Staley, Jeffrey L., "Stumbling in the Dark, Reaching for the Light." *Semeia* 53 (1991): 55-80.
- Steege, Martijn, "To Worship the Johannine 'Son of Man'. John 9,38 as Refocusing on the Father." *Bib* 91 (2010): 534-554.
- Steyn, Gert H., "Misunderstanding, Irony and Mistaken Identity in References to Jesus as Κύριος in John's Gospel." Pages 141-160 in *Miracles and Imagery in Luke and John: Festschrift Ulrich Busse*. Edited by Jozef Verheyden, Gilbert Van Belle, and Jan G. van der Watt. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- Stibbe, Mark W. G., *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- Stibbe, Mark W. G., *John: A Readings New Biblical Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- Stibbe, Mark W. G., *John's Gospel*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Strack, Hermann Leberecht and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. 6 vols. Munich: Beck, 1922-1961.
- Strutwolf, Holger, "Scribal Practices and the Transmission of the Biblical Texts: New Insights from the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method." Pages 123-138 in *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg and Judith H. Newman. Atlanta: SBL, 2012.
- Tabor, James D. and Michael O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study." *JSP* 5 (1992): 149-162.
- Talbert, Charles H., *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and Johannine Epistles*. 2nd ed. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2005.
- Thatcher, Tom, *Greater than Caesar: Christology and Empire in the Fourth Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- Theobald, Michael, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes: Kapitel 1-12*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2009.
- Theophilus, Michael P., "An Assessment of the Authenticity of John 9:38-39a." *AEJT* 19 (2012): 73-85.
- Thomas, John C., "'Stop Sinning Lest Something Worse Come Upon You': The Man at the Pool in John 5." *JSNT* 18 (1996): 3-20.
- Thompson, Marianne M., *John: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015.
- Thyen, Hartwig, *Das Johannesevangelium*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Tolmie, D. Francois, *Jesus' Farewell to the Disciples: John 13:1-17.*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Tov, Emanuel and Frank Polak, *The Revised CATSS Hebrew-Greek Parallel Text*. Philadelphia: CATSS; BibleWorks, 2004.
- Tregelles, Samuel P., *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*. London: Bagster, 1854.
- Van Belle, Gilbert, "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4,1?" Pages 159-174 in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- van der Watt, Jan G., "Double entendre in the Gospel According to John." Pages 463-482 in *Theology and Christology in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Gilbert van Belle, Jan G. van der Watt, and Petrus Mauritz. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.

- van Tilborg, Sjef, *Imaginative Love in John*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- von Wahlde, Urban C., *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Wachtel, Klaus and Michael W. Holmes eds. *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- Wallace, Daniel B., *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wasserman, Tommy, "Criteria for Evaluating Readings." Pages 579-612 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Wead, David W., *The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Kommissionsverlag, 1970.
- Westcott, Brooke D. and Fenton J.A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction and Appendix*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882.
- Wevers, John W., "The Rendering of the Tetragram in the Psalter and Pentateuch: A Comparative Study." Pages 21-35 in *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*. Edited by Robert J.V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Williams, Catrin H., *I Am He: The Interpretation of ἄνῆ Ἡὺ in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Williams, Catrin H., "Isaiah in John's Gospel." Pages 101-116 in *Isaiah in the New Testament*. Edited by Steve Moyise and M. J. J. Menken. New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Williams, Catrin H., "Isaiah and Johannine Christology." Pages 107-124 in *"As Those Who Are Taught": The Reception of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL*. Edited by Claire M. McGinnis and Patricia K. Tull. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2006.
- Williams, Catrin H., "Seeing the Glory: The Reception of Isaiah's Call-Vision in Jn 12.41." Pages 186-206 in *Judaism, Jewish Identities and the Gospel Tradition: essays in Honour of Maurice Casey*. Edited by James G. Crossley. London: Equinox, 2010.
- Williams, Catrin H., "John (the Baptist): The Witness on the Threshold." Pages 46-60 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Williams, Catrin H., "Judas (not Iscariot): What's in a Name?" Pages 550-553 in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Steven A. Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Williams, Catrin H., "(Not) Seeing God in the Prologue and the Body of John's Gospel." Pages 79-98 in *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological and Philosophical Contexts. Papers read at the Colloquium Ioanneum 2013*. Edited by Jan G. van der Watt, R. Alan Culpepper, and Udo Schnelle. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

- Williams, Peter J., *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*. Piscataway: Georgias Press, 2004.
- Williams, Peter J., "Not the Prologue of John." *JSNT* 33, no. 4 (2011): 375-386.
- Williams, Peter J., "The Syriac Versions of the New Testament." Pages 143-166 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Wright, N. T., *Jesus and the Victory of God*. London: SPCK, 1996.
- Ziegler, Joseph, *Isaias: Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983.
- Zumstein, Jean, "Der Prozess der Relecture in der johanneischen Literatur." *NTS* 42 (1996): 394-411.
- Zumstein, Jean, "Intratextuality and Intertextuality in the Gospel of John." Pages 121-135 in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. Edited by Tom Thatcher and Stephen D. Moore. Atlanta: SBL, 2008.
- Zumstein, Jean, *Das Johannesevangelium*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.