RHETORICAL STRATEGIES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

A Thesis submitted to Middlesex University in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

Gregory Manning Hillendahl

Middlesex University

Supervised at London School of Theology

November 2021

Abstract

The author of the Fourth Gospel (FG) has put forth a Gospel that attempts to demonstrate that Jesus is the Christ to fulfill the explicit programmatic "purpose statement" in John 20:30–31. The central question that this thesis attempts to answer is, what are the persuasive rhetorical strategies that the FG employs to accomplish this goal? The scope of this study is limited to identifying two specific strategies and investigating how these strategies function to create a persuasive discourse. The principal methodology consists in using aspects of classical rhetoric as a heuristic lens to examine the rhetorical strategies and features in the FG. The thesis examines, for example, the various rhetorical genres that function in the FG, demonstrating that all three classical rhetorical genres are present in the public ministry, and that deliberative rhetoric is present in the Farewell Discourse(s). The thesis also develops the beginnings of a theory of "narrative rhetoric" in which a rhetorical discourse can propose theses and subsequently demonstrate them through narrated actions. It applies this theory to the FG to show that the Gospel uses narrated actions to demonstrate various theses contained in the FG's Prologue and the narrative itself. It seeks to demonstrate that the FG is rhetorically very similar to the Plutarchan *Life of Pericles*. Both contain a structure consisting of (1) a prologue with propositions, (2) a narrative designed to demonstrate these propositions, and (3) a conclusion. This structure corresponds to Aristotle's rhetorical arrangement better than the arrangement of the Latin handbooks. It explores how this narrative rhetoric functions in the FG to demonstrate the related propositions. This investigation is unique in that it explores rhetorical strategies that for the most part have either not been observed or not examined with the necessary precision to explain adequately the rhetorical purpose of the Gospel.

Acknowledgments

I want to express gratitude to many for help in completing this PhD program. First of all, I owe much thanks and appreciation to John Dennis, my principal supervisor, whose patient and careful guidance was immensely helpful. Thanks also are due to Conrad Gempf and Graham Twelftree of the London School of Theology. Thanks are due to my thesis examiners, Professor Craig Blomberg and Dr. Cornelis Bennema, for their incisive questions and their valuable recommendations that strengthened this work. Next, I would like to thank Stan Porter, a friend and advisor since 1989. He first encouraged me to consider PhD studies in 1997. Further thanks go to Troy Martin, especially for the discussions we had at SBL meetings. I want to thank three experts in Plutarch: Philip Stadter, Christopher Pelling, and above all Timothy Duff for the helpful email exchanges that identified the Plutarchan scholarly literature and for discussing with me my formulations of Plutarch and the Fourth Gospel. Thanks to Ben Witherington III who reviewed my ETS presentation that was an extract from chapter 3. Thanks also to Jörg Frey for several email and in-person SBL conversations. Thanks to David Konstan and Katherine Sakenfeld. Thanks to Zacharias Shoukry of University of Mainz for our many Zoom sessions where we discussed all things Johannine. Nicki Copeland and Ben and Karen Kirkup provided valuable proofreading. Special thanks is due to my wife and loving companion, Lydia, for her patience, encouragement, and prayers during my program. I owe ultimate thanks to God for the opportunity to pursue a study of the Gospel of John and being ever present at every step. He gave me living bread and living water when I was hungry and thirsty (John 6:35).
Soli Deo gloria.

Abbreviations

The journal abbreviations found in *The SBL Handbook of Style* (2nd ed., Atlanta: SBL, 2014), and the following abbreviations will be used:

AS	Ancient Society
BD	Beloved Disciple
CDC	Collection D'Études Classique
CSCT	Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition
CUP	Cambridge University Press
ESEC	Emory Studies in Early Christianity
FD	Farewell Discourse
FG	Fourth Gospel
HBS	Herder Biblische Studien
IVP	InterVarsity Press
JGE	*Journal of General Education*
JMS	Johannine Monograph Series
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
NTM	New Testament Monographs
NTR	New Testament Readings
PCPS	*Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*
Ph&Rh	*Philosophy & Rhetoric*
PM	Public Ministry (mainly chapters 1–12)
QJS	*Quarterly Journal of Speech*
SANt	Studia Aarhusiana Neotestamentica
SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
WBG	Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments .... **iii**

Abbreviations .... **iv**

Chapter 1. Introduction **1**

1.1 Introduction **1**

1.2 Justification for the Study **3**

1.2.1 Introduction and Rationale 3

1.2.2 Justification for Using Classical Rhetoric 3

1.2.3 Justification for Investigating the Fourth Gospel’s Rhetorical Strategies 6

1.2.3.1 Three-Fold Rhetorical Genre in the First Century CE 7

1.2.3.2 Are Genre Studies Important? 10

1.2.3.3 Advantages of Investigating Genre 12

1.2.3.4 Literature Survey 13

1.2.3.5 Summary 22

1.3 Methodology and Outline **24**

1.3.1 Methodology 24

1.3.2 Outline of the Study 26

Chapter 2. The Rhetorical Genre of the Fourth Gospel **29**

2.1 Introduction **29**

2.2 Rhetorical Genres in the Handbooks **30**

2.3 Overlap and Mixture of Rhetorical Genres **31**

2.4 The Dominant Rhetorical Genre **34**

2.5 Rhetorical Genre in Selected Speeches **34**

2.6 Methodology for Determining the Rhetorical Genre **36**

2.7 The Appeals Associated with Deliberative Rhetoric **37**

2.8 The Fourth Gospel as Deliberative Rhetoric **39**

2.8.1 The Deliberative Appeal to the Συμφέρον (“Advantageous”) 40

2.8.1.1 The Advantages of Believing in Jesus 42

2.8.1.2 The Advantages Contrasted to What Is Disadvantageous 47

2.8.2 The Deliberative Appeal to Honor 52

2.8.3 Future Courses of Action to Perform 56
2.8.4 Summary 58
2.9 The Fourth Gospel as Epideictic Rhetoric 60
2.10 The Fourth Gospel as Judicial Rhetoric 63
2.11 Summary 66
Chapter 3. The Rhetorical Genre of the Farewell Discourse 68
3.1 Introduction 68
3.2 General Approach 69
3.3 The Farewell Discourse as a Literary Genre 69
3.4 Previous Rhetorical Studies Dealing with the Farewell Discourse 71
3.5 Methodology for a Deliberative Rhetorical Analysis 73
3.6 Rhetorical Analysis of the Farewell Discourse 75
3.6.1 Future Courses of Action to Perform 75
3.6.2 The “End”/“Goal” of the Advantageous 77
3.6.3 The Appeal to Honor 78
3.6.4 The Appeal to the Possible 80
3.6.5 The Appeal to Unity 82
3.6.6 The Use of Examples 83
3.7 Conclusion of the Rhetorical Analysis of the Farewell Discourse 84
3.8 Public Ministry and Farewell Discourse Genre Comparison 85
Chapter 4. A Theory of Narrative Rhetoric 91
4.1 Introduction 91
4.2 “Narrative Rhetoric” and Previous Studies 92
4.3 Constructing a Theory of Narrative Rhetoric 95
4.4 Illustrating the Theory 101
4.4.1 The Chronicles 101
4.4.2 Daniel 1 102
4.4.3 Philo’s In Flaccum 103
4.4.4 The Old Testament “Recognition Formula” and the Fourth Gospel 104
4.4.5 Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel 106
4.4.6 Summary of Illustrating the Theory 107
4.5 Summary 108

Chapter 5. Propositions in the Prologue Demonstrated in the Gospel 109
5.1 Introduction 109
5.2 Propositions in the Prologue Demonstrated in the Fourth Gospel 109
5.2.1 Introduction 109
5.2.2 Jesus is God come in the flesh (1:1; 14) 110
5.2.2.1 Jesus' Deity and Preexistence 110
5.2.2.2 Jesus' Divine Dignity 111
5.2.2.3 Jesus' "I Am" Statements 112
5.2.3 The Light Shines in the Darkness, and the Darkness did not Overcome It (1:5) 122
5.2.4 He Gave them the Power to Become Children of God (1:12–13) 124
5.2.5 We Have Seen His Glory (1:14) 127
5.2.5.1 Introduction 127
5.2.5.2 John 2: Turning Water into Wine 129
5.2.5.3 John 4 and 5: Life-Giving Healings 130
5.2.5.4 John 6 and the Feeding of the 5,000 131
5.2.5.5 John 9 and the Healing of the Man Born Blind 131
5.2.5.6 John 11 and the Raising of Lazarus 132
5.2.5.7 Jesus' Crucifixion 134
5.2.6 Conclusion 136
5.3 Summary 138
Chapter 6. The Fourth Gospel as a Rhetorical Discourse 140
6.1 Introduction 140
6.2 Rhetorical Features of the Fourth Gospel 141
6.2.1 People Draw Conclusions about Jesus' Person 141
6.2.2 Narrative Rhetoric in the Fourth Gospel 146
6.2.2.1 Narrative Rhetoric and Jesus' Knowledge of People and Character 146
6.2.2.2 Narrative Rhetoric and Actions that Show Parentage 147
6.2.2.3 "Come and See" Narration 148
6.2.2.4 Narrative Rhetoric and Prophetic Fulfillment 149
6.2.2.5 Narrative Rhetoric and Jesus' Claims 152
6.2.2.5.1 Jesus' Claim to Be the Light of the World 152

6.2.2.5.2 Jesus' Claim to Be the Resurrection and the Life 153
6.2.2.6 Conclusions Regarding the Narrative Rhetorical Functions 154
6.2.3 Reader Evaluation Invited 156
6.2.4 The Prologue Contains Abstractions 156
6.2.5 Conclusion to the Fourth Gospel's Argument in 20:30–31 157
6.2.6 Conclusions Regarding the Fourth Gospel as a Rhetorical Discourse 158
6.3 Plutarch's *Pericles* as a Rhetorical Discourse 158
6.3.1 Introduction 158
6.3.2 All Three Rhetorical Genres in Pericles 163
6.3.3 The Prologue Contains a Proposition to be Demonstrated 167
6.3.4 Demonstration by Narrated Example (Narrative Rhetoric) 167
6.3.5 Reader Evaluation Invited 168
6.3.6 The Conclusion to Plutarch's Argument in Pericles Chapter 39 169
6.3.7 Other Rhetorical Features 169
6.3.8 Synkrisis in Plutarch 170
6.3.9 Pericles's Prologue Contains Abstract Traits as Propositions 170
6.3.10 Conclusion 172
6.4 Comparison of the Fourth Gospel and *Pericles* 172
6.5 The Fourth Gospel and Ancient Biography Genre 174
6.6 Prologues and Ancient Rhetorical Arrangement 176
6.7 Rhetorical Propositions and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel 178
6.7.1 Introduction 178
6.7.2 Necessity of a Prologue 181
6.7.3 Prologue a Summary of the Fourth Gospel? 183
6.7.4 Prologue as the Hermeneutical Key? 184
6.7.5 The Prologue an Introduction? 185
6.7.6 Proponents of Propositions in the Prologue 186
6.7.7 Propositions in the Prologue 189
6.8 Summary 191
Chapter 7. Conclusions and Avenues for Further Study 193
7.1 Summary and Conclusions 193
7.2 Avenues for Further Study 197

7.2.1 Appeals to Examples in Deliberative Rhetoric 197
7.2.2 Other Appeals Associated with Deliberative Rhetoric 198
7.2.3 Φιλοτιμία and Unbelief 199
APPENDIX A. Deliberative Rhetoric in the Old Testament 200
A.1 Deliberative Rhetoric in Domestic and National Affairs.......................... 200
A.2 Choice in Covenant Commitments and Deliberative Rhetoric............... 202
A.3 Summary... 204

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The Fourth Gospel (hereafter FG) has long been recognized as a text that seeks to persuade its readers. The well-known, explicitly stated purpose is formulated as *Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ], ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ· ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύ[σ]ητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ* (20:30–31). Thus, the FG seeks to encourage the audience to believe in order to have life in Jesus' name.[1] But questions immediately emerge. How specifically does the FG attempt to persuade the audience? In what ways does the FG seek to persuade its readers? The question, then, that this thesis attempts to answer is, what are the rhetorical strategies that the FG employs in order to persuade its audience? There is little doubt that the FG utilizes a wide array of rhetorical strategies to promote belief. The scope of this study is such that it will not attempt to provide a comprehensive examination of all these strategies. Rather, the more modest aim here is to identity and explicate two specific rhetorical strategies that seem to be of primary importance. The classical Greek and

---

[1] John 20:31 contains a well-known disputed textual variant. Recent scholarship generally views the present tense form as the preferred reading. Although past scholarship has attempted to argue that the present tense suggests a targeted believing audience, the issue is more complex. The present and aorist tense uses of *πιστεύω* in the FG are not easily categorized into either initial belief or continuous belief. See Chris Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief and Graeco-Roman Devotion. Reshaping Devotion for John's Graeco-Roman Audience*, WUNT 2/528 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 95n4, for a brief discussion. Dodd suggests, moreover, that the present tense could be directed at unbelievers if the author "were thinking not so much of the moment of conversion, as of the continuing union with Christ" (C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge: CUP, 1953], 9). Further, over the past three decades the understanding of the Greek verb in terms of verbal aspect has come to the fore. (On the subject of verbal aspect as it relates to 20:31, see D. A. Carson, "Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20:30–31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 124 [2005]: 693–714). The present study's investigation of the genre of the FG may help to advance the discussion. Further consideration of the intended audience will be taken up after the genre analyses.

Roman rhetorical tradition that preceded and was in part contemporaneous with the FG would seem to be an important and relevant source of theory from which to examine the FG's persuasive strategies. This rich tradition offered a conceptualization of rhetoric that embodied key strategies and topics that were useful in both public and private settings. The aim is to investigate two specific strategies and tailor them for analyzing the rhetorical strategies of the FG. Yet we will discover that this rhetorical tradition had one main deficiency regarding narrative texts like the FG in that classical rhetoric did not have a theory of how a narrative discourse could be persuasive. Thus, our study will need to address this deficiency by developing a theory of narrative rhetoric and then using this theory to explain the persuasive force of the FG's narrative.

A related question to the persuasive strategies of the FG is the relationship of the Prologue to the rest of the FG. The literature on this subject is immense, and this study will not be able to canvas this literature to any significant degree. Recent studies, however, have encapsulated the current dominant views regarding the relationship of the Prologue to the rest of the Gospel, and some suggest that a consensus has emerged that understands the Prologue as a "prelude" or "overture" to the Gospel that introduces major characters and themes.[2] One aim of this study, however, is to question this consensus and to present a more adequate view of the rhetorical function of the Prologue vis-à-vis the rest of the Gospel. The view commended here is not new, but one that has not been considered in recent scholarship. The view that we will argue in this thesis is that the Prologue contains claims or rhetorical propositions that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. This study will rehabilitate this view by revising and enhancing it in light of (1) a better appreciation for the rhetorical nature of the FG's narrative, and (2) recent understandings of the nature of the Gospels as ancient biographies. As a result, this study will be able to place this earlier view on a firmer theoretical foundation and trace out the ramifications more sufficiently.

---

[2] Alicia D. Myers, *Characterizing Jesus: A Rhetorical Analysis on the Fourth Gospel's Use of Scripture in Its Presentation of Jesus*, LNTS 458 (London: Bloomsbury, 2012), 40. For a recent catalogue of the views, see Ruth Sheridan, "John's Prologue as Exegetical Narrative," in *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic*, edited by Kasper Bro Larsen, SANt 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 172n4.

This introductory chapter consists of two main sections. The first provides a justification for this study, and the second describes the methodology and plan to be used.

1.2 Justification for the Study

1.2.1 Introduction and Rationale

Justification for this study is needed for two principal reasons: First, to ensure that the methodology that this study intends to use is applicable to the FG, and second, to identify areas in FG rhetorical studies where further study can fruitfully extend the discussion. The two specific areas that this study intends to examine are the FG's rhetorical genre and how the narrative functions rhetorically.

Since the aim of the study is to utilize concepts from classical rhetoric to investigate the rhetorical strategies of the FG, a justification for using classical rhetoric as a heuristic lens for the FG needs to be provided. This justification concerns the application of classical rhetoric to biblical studies in general, and specifically to a narrative text such as the FG. Justification is needed to show that investigating certain specific rhetorical strategies is important and relevant, and, moreover, that there is a gap or deficiencies in previous studies. The two principal rhetorical strategies of the FG that will be examined are (1) the FG's rhetorical genre, and (2) its narrative rhetorical nature. Justifying an investigation of the rhetorical genre will be performed through four steps below that will underscore the need and significance of such an investigation. Justifying a study of the narrative rhetorical nature of the FG is needed because some interpreters have explicitly denied that an examination of the rhetorical nature of the FG's narrative is possible.

1.2.2 Justification for Using Classical Rhetoric

Most studies that utilize classical rhetoric to analyze NT texts seek to provide some justification for using classical rhetoric as an interpretive tool, with most relying to a certain extent on the rhetorical treatise by George Kennedy.[3] At the beginning of his treatise on rhetorical criticism and the NT, Kennedy observes that the NT writings had a persuasive intention embedded in them. He states, “The writers of the books of the New Testament had a message to convey and sought to persuade an audience to believe it or to believe it more profoundly. As such they are rhetorical, and their methods can be studied by the discipline of rhetoric.”[4] Burton Mack writes, “From the beginning it was taken for granted that the writings produced by early Christians were to be read as rhetorical compositions.”[5] Concerning the FG itself, it is widely recognized that this Gospel is a rhetorical text that seeks to persuade its audience regarding Jesus. Beth Sheppard points out that the FG’s purpose statement in 20:31 shows that the Gospel has a persuasive intention, and concludes, “if classical rhetoric sought ‘to persuade’ and the Gospel of John has a fixed point that it seeks to move its audience to accept, it is *de facto* rhetorical in nature and may evidence points of kinship with those techniques and rhetorical procedures mentioned in the classical handbooks.”[6] Teresa Okure similarly affirms that the FG is essentially rhetorical and persuasive.[7] Ben Witherington points out that the FG has a persuasive aim that is common to many ancient biographies.[8] We can provide more specific justification as follows. Kennedy begins his justification by posing the question, “How legitimate is it to approach the New Testament in terms of Greek ideas of rhetoric?”[9] He asks this question because one might wonder whether using classical rhetoric should be used on the NT. Kennedy doubtless understands that the Bible contains different literary genres, and some texts are more amenable to a rhetorical understanding than others. He goes on to provide both a historical and a philosophical justification for utilizing classical rhetoric for analyzing NT texts.

---

[3] George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984). See John Carlson Stube, *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse*, LNTS 309 (London: T&T Clark, 2006), 35–52; Myers, *Characterizing*, 2–5;

Alan Richard Odiam, “The Rhetoric of the Fourth Gospel: A Key to Preaching” (PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989), 5, 58; Beth M. Sheppard, “The Gospel of John: A Roman Legal and Rhetorical Perspective” (PhD diss., The University of Sheffield, 1999), 11–33. Stube has perhaps provided the most extensive justification, engaging several scholars such as Kennedy, C. Clifton Black, Burton Mack, and others. The justification below will utilize some thoughts from Stube, but it will extend it in various ways.

[4] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 3.

[5] Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 10.

[6] Sheppard, “John,” 27. See also Martin Warner, “The Fourth Gospel’s Art of Rational Persuasion,” in *The Bible as Rhetoric*, edited by Martin Warner (London: Routledge, 1990), 153.

[7] Teresa Okure, *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1–42*, WUNT 2/31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 39.

[8] Ben Witherington III, *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 30.

[9] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 8.

Historically, Near Eastern culture had been increasingly influenced by Greek culture for three hundred years. Kennedy suggests that it is not necessary to assume that the Evangelists (or Paul) had formally studied Greek rhetoric to account for its presence and influence in their writings.

> [Paul] and the evangelists as well would, indeed, have been hard put to escape an awareness of rhetoric as practiced in the culture around them, for the rhetorical theory of the schools found its immediate application in almost every form of written communication: in official documents in public letters, in private correspondence, in the law courts and assemblies, in speeches at festivals and commemorations, and in literary composition in both prose and verse.[10]

Kennedy argues that using classical rhetoric to study the NT is also justified philosophically by explaining that when Aristotle wrote his treatise, he was not conceptualizing a specifically Greek form of rhetoric but a "universal facet of human communication."[11] Classical rhetorical theory is, in Kennedy's thinking, a structured system using Greek terms to describe a universal phenomenon.[12] Kennedy notes that, although the early Jews did not conceptualize rhetoric to any significant degree, the OT is suffused with examples of rhetorical speeches,[13] and he suggests that the techniques for composing these speeches were learned by imitation.[14] Black writes that it is impossible but also needless to demonstrate that Jesus or the NT authors received formal rhetorical education. "Indisputably they lived in a culture whose everyday modes of oral and written discourse were saturated with a rhetorical tradition, mediated by such practitioners and theoreticians as Caecilius (a Sicilian Jew of the late first century BCE), Cicero (106–43 BCE) and Quintilian (ca. 40–95 CE)."[15] Based on

---

[10] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 10.

[11] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 10.

[12] Some have objected to Kennedy's assertion that Greek rhetoric is so universal. Kennedy's claim to the universality of classical rhetoric probably needs some nuancing.

[13] See Appendix A for a survey of various OT discourses that illustrate Kennedy's remarks.

[14] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 11.

[15] C. Clifton Black, *The Rhetoric of the Gospel: Theological Artistry in the Gospels and Acts*, 2nd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2013), 3. Quintilian himself thinks that formal oratorial training was at times not a requirement. He notes that those without training in rhetoric can produce a successful oration: "Even an illiterate rural litigant will plead his own Cause better than an orator who does not know what is in dispute" (*Inst.* 2.21.16 [Russell, LCL]). He further observes, "there are nomadic peoples even today who have no cities or laws, and yet people born among them act as ambassadors, prosecute and defend, and, indeed, think that some people are better speakers than others" (*Inst.* 3.2.4 [Russell,

Kennedy's and Black's remarks, it seems clear that at least by the time of the first century CE, the NT authors had some interaction with a culture that had embraced classical rhetoric. Kennedy is actually rather modest in his claim regarding the use of classical rhetoric: "we may initially claim no more than to be examining the rhetoric of the evangelists and seeking to see how the chapters work within an understanding of classical rhetoric."[16]

Some interpreters have even suggested that an awareness of rhetoric is indispensable for study of the FG. Kennedy writes that classical rhetoric is not just useful—there is a requirement for some knowledge of rhetoric when studying the NT.[17] In her conclusion, Okure states that her study has uncovered "the essentially rhetorical character of the Gospel [of John]." She believes that this discovery has broad implications both for her study and for the interpretation of the FG itself. It may even be "the long sought key to the mystery of John's Gospel," but even if not, she suggests that it is still one that "no Johannine exegete can afford to continue to ignore."[18] In his conclusion, Kennedy states, "an awareness of classical rhetoric, if properly used, may become a tool to penetrate those features of the text which are cultural-specific and to allow those which are universally valid to stand forth with greater clarity."[19]

In sum, the justification for using classical rhetoric to analyze the rhetorical nature of the FG rests on several reasons, but primarily on recognizing the rhetorical culture of the first century and the fact that the FG is a rhetorical discourse as many observe.

1.2.3 Justification for Investigating the Fourth Gospel's Rhetorical Strategies

The purpose of this section is to justify investigating the two rhetorical strategies. Justifying the study of the rhetorical genre will be performed below. Justifying the study of the rhetoric of the narrative is more involved and will be dealt with in two parts. The first part is to recognize, through the literature review below, that classical rhetoric did

---

LCL]). Philodemus writes that "heroes—although they were nonprofessionals—not having learned rhetoric, became capable of speaking rhetorically." Rachel Ahern Knudsen, *Homeric Speech and the Origins of Rhetoric* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), 27–28. Citing Περὶ Ῥητορικῆς II fr. VIII Sudh. Her translation.

[16] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 39.

[17] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 160.

[18] Okure, *Approach*. See 306 for the three above citations.

[19] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 160.

not provide a theory of narrative rhetoric. Consequently, the second part entails constructing a theory of narrative rhetoric, which will be performed in chapter 4.

The investigation of the Gospel's rhetorical genre will use the three-part classical rhetorical genre scheme or typology as originally conceived and systematized by Aristotle but transmitted into the early centuries CE. The four steps to justify this three-part genre scheme are the following. The first is to present evidence that the classical rhetorical genre triad consisting of the deliberative, judicial, and epideictic genres was active and valid for the time of the FG's composition. The second is a critique of some modern studies that suggest that a genre analysis is not important for a rhetorical analysis of a NT text. The third highlights the advantages of performing a classical rhetorical genre analysis. The fourth surveys previous studies that have performed rhetorical investigations on the FG to show that some areas remain that require investigation in order to arrive at an adequate understanding of the rhetorical nature of the FG. Cumulatively, these steps will suggest that this study is important and warranted.

1.2.3.1 Three-Fold Rhetorical Genre in the First Century CE

This three-fold rhetorical genre scheme was active and valid during the period that encompasses this study, which is the composition date of the FG.[20] This triad genre typology was used throughout the Greco-Roman period until at least the third century CE. Cristina Pepe's comprehensive seminal study of rhetorical genre in this period is particularly relevant and will in part inform our study.[21] It must be pointed out that classical rhetoric was not a monolithic system.[22] It was differently conceived by various theoreticians, and even among the theorists their thought evolved.[23] This study, however, will utilize a few rhetorical concepts that did not vary appreciably from the time of Aristotle to the third century CE.[24] One of these concepts is the tripart rhetorical genre scheme, which although it experienced some variation that will be pointed out below, remained valid into the Imperial period. As Pepe observes in her study, Aristotle was the first to advocate a three-part typology that included the epideictic genre as a separate genre.[25] Although the three-part division of genre was originally codified by Aristotle, it underwent some evolution. Nevertheless, this three-part system was "enormously successful and the model of Aristotelean classification was still considered valid for describing and cataloguing the forms of discourse" in the Roman Imperial era.[26] The Roman rhetorical treatises incorporated the genre triad. These included the pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (*Rhet. Her*. 3.8.15),[27] and those of Cicero (*Inv*. 1.5.7; 2.4.12)[28] and Quintilian. Quintilian explains that "almost all the writers who are most authoritative among the ancients followed Aristotle … and were happy with that division" (*Inst*. 3.4.1 [Russell, LCL]), and that he thought that "the safest course for us is to follow the majority" (*Inst*. 3.4.1 [Russell, LCL]). The theory of three genres also surfaces in the *progymnasmata*, about which, interestingly, Theon notes that the encomiastic is called epideictic by "the Aristotelians" (*Prog*. 61.20–24 [Kennedy]).[29] Especially noteworthy is the reference in the Jewish writer

---

[20] Generally held to be in the 90s of the first century CE. Concerning the latest studies on manuscript dating, see Brent Nongbri, "The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel," *HTR* 98 (2005): 23–48. Nongbri argues that any possible dates for p52 must include the later second and early third centuries. Brown, in his study of the latest plausible date of the FG, states, "it is clear that John circulated in many copies in Egypt in the period 140–200" (R. E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, AB 29/29a [New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970], 1:lxxxiii).

[21] Cristina Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

[22] See Wilhelm Wuellner, "Rhetorical Criticism and Its Theory in Culture-Critical Perspective: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11," in *Text and Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 172; Thomas H. Olbricht, "Wilhelm Wuellner and the Promise of Rhetoric," in *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence*, edited by James D. Hester and J. David Hester (Amador), ESEC 9 (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 89.

---

[23] See, for instance, how Cicero modified his rhetorical ideas over time, as briefly documented in Malcolm Heath, "Codifications of Rhetoric," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, edited by Erik Gunderson (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 64–69. See also Catherine Steel, "Divisions of Speech," in *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, edited by Erik Gunderson (Cambridge: CUP, 2009), 82.

[24] George A. Kennedy (*On Rhetoric*, trans. George A. Kennedy [New York: Oxford University Press, 1991], 301) gives a range of 360 to about 334 BCE for the date of the *Rhetoric*.

[25] Pepe, *Genres*, 144; Laurent Pernot (*Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise* [Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015], 3) points out that before Aristotle Isocrates in his *On the Peace* (27) differentiates between accusation, praise, and advice (κατηγορῆσαι, ἐπαινέσαι, συμβουλεῦσαι), although these were not yet separate types of discourse. Pernot (*Epideictic*, 3) dates *On the Peace* to 356 BCE.

[26] Pepe, *Genres*, 257.

[27] See Pepe, *Genres*, 258n5. Harry Caplan suggests that it is best to attribute this work to an unknown author (*Rhet. Her*., ix, LCL).

[28] Cf. *Part. or*. 3.10; *Top*. 24.91.

[29] For other references to the three genres in the *progymnasmata*, see Nicolaus the Sophist, *Prog*. 3.16; 47.12–16; 49.8–9, where the "end" of each genre is specified, and which cohere with the Aristotelian "ends"; 54–57. He also thinks that the genres were attributed to Aristotle (55.10). See further 58.11–16; 70.7–8 ("There being three kinds of rhetoric,… judicial and panegyrical and deliberative"). See Pepe, *Genres*, 258n8.

Philo to the three genres: “speeches delivered in the law courts, in the senate, in laudations” (*Spec. Laws* 1.342.4 [Colson, LCL]),[30] which shows the geographical and cultural diversity of the triad. The triad occurs in a late first-century BCE work of Dionysius of Halicarnasis[31] and the third-century CE rhetorical treatise of Menander Rhetor.[32] Pepe points to a number of other works outside the sphere of rhetoric in which the tripart division figures, including philosophers, intellectuals, and scholars, and as such the triad “became a notion that was deeply rooted in the minds of the ancients and in their cultural heritage,”[33] and “there can be no doubt about the diffusion of the doctrine of genres contained in Aristotle’s treatise.”[34]

Although the three-part rhetorical genre scheme remained valid into the Imperial age, some variation was inevitable. This stems partly from the fact that Aristotle’s typology was not perfect. His desire for a theoretical system that avoided confusion of the genres coupled with a preference for symmetry (three different ends, three temporal dimensions) led to a “forcing and simplification,”[35] which led to difficulty in subsuming all discourse under his typology. Nevertheless, even Aristotle recognized the need and explicitly provided for an overlap among the genres in his scheme. He uses the lexeme *συμπαραλαμβάνω* twice in his discussion of the genres to “include” features of the other genres (*Rhet.* 1.3.5 1358b24, 27 [Freese and Striker, LCL]). Thus, “‘monotelism’ does not mean the exclusion of the other values.”[36] Regarding the Roman reception of Aristotle’s typology, Cicero’s and Quintilian’s treatment of genre was not completely coextensive with Aristotle’s. Although their understanding of Aristotle’s conception was perhaps erroneous,[37] their treatment shows that Aristotle’s classification was not accepted uncritically among Roman rhetoricians but underwent some innovation.[38] For example, Cicero preferred honor [*honestas*] to advantage [*utilitas*] in deliberative rhetoric (*De or.* 2.334),[39] and Quintilian, while accepting the three types of rhetoric, saw considerable overlap (*Inst*. 3.4.16 and 3.7.28).

---

[30] Philo, *Spec. Laws* 1.342.4: *δικανικῶν συμβουλευτικῶν ἐγκωμιαστικῶν*. See Pepe, *Genres*, 259.

[31] See *Lys*. 16.

[32] See 1.331.1.

[33] Pepe, *Genres*, 260. See Pepe (*Genres*, 258–61) for a discussion of the relevant literature.

[34] Pepe, *Genres*, 261.

[35] Pepe, *Genres*, 137–38.

[36] Pepe, *Genres*, 172.

[37] Pepe, *Genres*, 287–88.

[38] Pepe, *Genres*, 288.

David Aune has expressed caution with respect to using classical rhetorical handbooks. He presents six concerns in his section "The use and abuse of handbooks" in his article on rhetorical handbooks. The first three basically concern not considering the development of rhetorical theory through the ancient period and the need to engage the rhetorical treatises directly and not simply rely on their modern syntheses.[40] The discussion above has attempted to address in part the first three of Aune's concerns. Rhetorical genre seems to be one aspect of rhetorical theory that did not change appreciably during the Greco-Roman period of our study.[41] Thus, despite some inevitable variation, we can reasonably conclude that these genres were active and valid when the FG was composed.

1.2.3.2 Are Genre Studies Important?

The second step of justifying an investigation of the rhetorical genres of the FG consists in critiquing those studies that have suggested that a study of a text's rhetorical genre is not important for understanding the text's rhetorical import. One of George Kennedy's statements has been misunderstood by scholars in this regard. Kennedy writes, "In general, identification of genre is not a crucial factor in understanding how rhetoric actually works in units of the New Testament."[42] David Aune is one scholar who misunderstands and misapplies this statement. In his discussion of Kennedy's six-step methodology, Aune explicitly links rhetorical genre to Kennedy's statement: "It should be noted that in the preceding series of steps, Kennedy does not emphasize the identification of the rhetorical genre," and he then proceeds to cite Kennedy's sentence.[43] An attentive reading of Kennedy in context, however, shows that this statement is not directed at *rhetorical* genres, but *literary* genres. That is, Kennedy's statement is in the context of his discussion of literary genres, such as oratory, historiography, the philosophical dialogue, (ancient) biography, letter form, and diatribe, and here he is not referring to the classical rhetorical species or genres.[44] Therefore, Kennedy's statement that genre identification is not crucial applies only to literary genres, and not to the three classical rhetorical genres. Later in the same treatise Kennedy develops a methodology for examining the rhetorical features of NT documents, and one of the steps of this methodology is to determine the rhetorical species.[45] He can even state that "Determination of the species, as the discussion of Galatians in Chapter 7 below reveals, can be crucial to understanding the unit."[46] Thus, Aune both misunderstands Kennedy's statement and takes it out of context.

---

[39] See Quint., *Inst*. 3.8.1–2. See Pepe, *Genres*, 287.

[40] See David E. Aune, "Rhetorical handbooks," in *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 421.

[41] For a full response to Aune's concerns, see Margaret M. Mitchell, "Rhetorical Handbooks in Service of Biblical Exegesis: Eustathius of Antioch Takes Origen Back to School," in *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*, edited by John Fotopoulos (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 350–52. Her treatment of Aune's last three concerns would seem to apply also to this study.

[42] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 33.

[43] David E. Aune, "Rhetorical criticism," in *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 417.

Kennedy's statement above about the benefit of identifying the rhetorical genre ("species") for understanding a Pauline letter might seemingly provide general support for identifying a text's rhetorical genre. Kennedy's view toward identifying genre in the Gospels, however, is different. In his chapter on the rhetoric of the Gospels, Kennedy states frankly that an investigation of the genre of the Gospels "is irrelevant."[47] In response, while this perhaps holds true for the Synoptic Gospels, it does not seem to apply to the FG. One of the aims of this study is to demonstrate that the FG shows evidence of all three classical rhetorical genres: judicial, in terms of showing that Jesus is innocent of all charges and is in fact the divine Son of God, epideictic, in terms of his honorable character, and deliberative, in terms of inviting the audience in the narrative world and the readers of the text to choose to embrace the Johannine Jesus as divine Messiah and to perform the many and significant actions commensurate with that choice to obtain the benefit of eternal life.

---

[44] In email correspondences on March 23, 2021 and March 24, 2021, two eminent NT scholars, Stanley Porter and Troy Martin, confirmed this understanding of Kennedy's statement (*Interpretation*, 33).

[45] Kennedy uses the term "species" to refer to the three classical rhetorical genres. This study will use the term "genre" to refer to the three rhetorical genres or species. Modern rhetorical scholars usually employ one or the other of these two terms synonymously. For an inquiry into the various related ancient Greek and Latin terms, see Pepe, *Genres*, Part III chap. 16.2.1.

[46] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 36.

[47] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 97.

Wilhelm Wuellner is another who rejects a rhetorical genre analysis.[48] He despairs of attempting to analyze NT texts according to the classical rhetorical genres, pointing to differing identifications from different scholars. He speaks about "the rising discontent with the whole legacy of the three Aristotelian genres."[49] However, he cites no authorities. It is the case that the assignment of a genre classification to Paul's letters and other NT texts has not been completely uniform. This difference highlights the problem, but it should not by itself imply that all attempts have failed. It may simply mean that more work needs to be done to refine the assumptions and methodologies, and it likely means that some conclusions must remain tentative.

The analysis and critique of the above studies shows that the arguments against an investigation of the rhetorical genre of a NT text are not persuasive, and indeed may be used in support of such an investigation. While not all rhetorical studies of NT texts have been completely successful in terms of applying a comprehensive theory of rhetoric, including arrangement and genre, the identification of the classical rhetorical genre or genres has been fruitful in a number of cases and has helped interpreters understand more adequately the rhetorical or persuasive force of text.[50] To this issue we now turn.

1.2.3.3 Advantages of Investigating Genre

The third step of justifying an investigation into the rhetorical genre is to underscore the advantages of such an undertaking. Determining the rhetorical genre of a discourse would certainly seem to be important for interpreting any text that exhibits a rhetorical nature. Several NT interpreters have pointed out the importance of investigating the classical rhetorical genre. Duane Watson begins his survey of the classification of the genres in the undisputed Pauline letters by highlighting the advantages of determining the rhetorical genre for interpreting rhetorical discourses. He helpfully collates the thoughts of some scholars, beginning with Karl Donfried, who states, "to recognize …

---

[48] Wuellner, "Criticism," 178.

[49] Wuellner, "Criticism," 178.

[50] See Duane F. Watson, "The Three Species of Rhetoric and the Study of Pauline Epistles," in *Paul and Rhetoric*, edited by J. Paul Sampley and Peter Lampe (New York: Continuum, 2010). Moreover, the studies of other scholars who analyze more-modern discourses have fruitfully analyzed these discourses using the three classical genres. See K. H. Jamieson and K. K. Campbell, "Rhetorical Hybrids: Fusions of Generic Elements," *QJS* 68 (1982): 146–157 and their catalogue of studies.

which of the three types (*genera*) of rhetoric—deliberative, judicial or epideictic—a document is employing already gives important clues to its social situation as well as its intention."[51] Watson himself explains that the genre "is a window on the social situation of" the author and addresses.[52] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza suggests that a determination of the rhetorical genre can assist in understanding the rhetorical situation.[53] As Pepe explains, genres can serve as a hermeneutical tool. The analysis of genre enables a text to be placed in one category rather than another, and it further "provides the key to explaining how the text in question functions, what it sets out to do, and which are its main components in terms of content and form."[54] Finally, David deSilva suggests that determining the rhetorical genre "is more than a quest for a label"[55]—discovering the rhetorical genre or genres helps to identify the principal issues and goals of the author and the text. Knowing the genre enables one to focus on what the text is designed to accomplish and how the text seeks to achieve that goal.[56] While surveying the above authors is relevant and helpful, what is most important, as deSilva points out, is the realization that each rhetorical genre has a unique "end" or goal (purpose). While these genres can overlap and mix,[57] the specific "end" of a particular genre would suggest the purpose or purposes of the discourse. Thus, an investigation of the rhetorical genre of a text such as the FG would have the advantage of helping one to understand more sufficiently its rhetorical goal or purpose and its rhetorical and social situation.

1.2.3.4 Literature Survey

This literature survey of rhetorical studies on the FG serves two purposes. First, it provides the final step in justifying a genre investigation, and second, it provides the first part of the justification of the Gospel's narrative rhetoric. A number of previous studies of the FG have included a rhetorical genre analysis. These have been undertaken with regard to various chapters or sections of the FG, or in one case the entire Gospel. Alan Odiam has investigated three separate discourses in the FG, analyzing 3:1–21 as deliberative, 5:19–47 as forensic (judicial),[58] and 17:1–26 as epideictic rhetoric.[59] Constructively, Odiam's study helpfully shows that the FG is a rich rhetorical text containing all three rhetorical genres. His study includes other features of classical rhetoric, including the various types of "proofs," including *logos*, *ēthos*, *pathos*, and thus Odiam's study is able to demonstrate that features of classical rhetoric are present in the FG. The primary limitations of his study in relation to our study are three: (1) his discussions are limited to three main texts; (2) his determination of the genre of John 17:1–26 as epideictic requires interaction because this text likely contains more than one genre. For instance, there are features that suggest the presence of deliberative rhetoric, including advantages to be gained and honorable actions to perform; and (3) his study does not relate any rhetorical features to the FG's Prologue, which I will argue is necessary for an adequate understanding of the Prologue's relationship to the rest of the Gospel.[60] These limitations, then, suggest that further study of the FG's rhetorical strategies is warranted.

---

[51] Karl Donfried, "The Theology of 1 Thessalonians," in *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters*, edited by Karl P. Donfried and I. Howard Marshall (Cambridge: CUP, 1993), 3–4. Cited also in Watson, "Three Species," 27.

[52] Watson, "Three Species," 27.

[53] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians," *NTS* 33 (1987): 391.

[54] Pepe, *Genres*, 3.

[55] David A. deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 46.

[56] deSilva, *Perseverance*, 47.

[57] The overlapping and mixing of rhetorical genres will be explored in chapter 2.

Beth Sheppard analyzes the entire FG from the perspective of classical rhetoric, arguing that the Gospel functions as a type of forensic rhetoric. She posits that the genre is forensic by observing several features. First, the purpose statement suggests a forensic genre: that the audience "may begin/continue to believe that Jesus is the Messiah" (20:31).[61] Second, forensic rhetoric has as its goal to defend or accuse an individual, which is similar to how the FG attempts to defend Jesus. Finally, the pervasive presence of judicial themes suggests the forensic genre. Sheppard attempts to respond to Duane Watson's two-fold criticism of investigating the rhetoric of a Gospel. She cites Watson's criticisms:

---

[58] The terms "forensic" and "judicial" when applied to rhetorical genre are used synonymously by contemporary rhetorical specialists. This study will generally use "judicial."

[59] Odiam, "Rhetoric."

[60] Odiam's study seems to apply the features of classical rhetoric in a rather wooden fashion to the Gospel. For example, Sheppard ("John," 104n102) rightly questions Odiam's designation of the Father as an "ancient witness." See also Odiam ("Rhetoric," 144), where he suggests that the believers' knowledge of God in 17:3 is not scientific certitude but "rhetorical probability." Most interpreters, however, rightly see this as knowledge in a relational sense that coheres with this type of knowledge in the OT.

[61] Sheppard, "John," 27.

> Studying the Gospels as a single rhetorical unit … has not worked. It cannot work. This is due to limitations in Ancient Rhetoric. Ancient Rhetoric did not have a theory of narrative which discussed plot with issue, development, and resolution of the issue. Rhetorical usage (in narrative) was limited to smaller units in larger works, and involved description and speeches.[62]

Sheppard's study is well articulated and rightly shows how judicial rhetoric is present in the FG. The question, however, is whether judicial rhetoric alone can account for all the rhetorical dimensions of the Gospel. There are other rhetorical dimensions in the FG that point to two other genres, epideictic and deliberative, and these will be explored in chapters 2 and 3. Responding to Sheppard (and Watson) involves addressing two main issues. The first concerns the genre of the FG and the second concerns Watson's criticisms.

Regarding the first issue (genre), it should be observed first that the FG has a two-fold purpose relating to both Christology and soteriology. George Mlakuzhyil observes that 20:31 specifies a two-fold purpose for the FG: "[John 20:31abc] states the *immediate Christological purpose* of writing the Gospel ('that [*hina*] you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God') … [20:31d] … reveals the *ultimate soteriological purpose* ('and that [*hina*] believing you may have life in his name')."[63] Shepperd's study focuses almost exclusively on the Christological purpose. But almost by definition judicial rhetoric cannot account for the soteriological dimensions of the FG since judicial rhetoric has as its “end” (purpose) that which is just or unjust (Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 1.3.5). There is indeed overlap,[64] but this overlap cannot account for the ultimate purpose, in which significant soteriological benefits and the required choices and actions to obtain them are set before both the audience in the narrative world and the readers of the FG. Thus, the ultimate soteriological purpose of the Gospel is best investigated using the prism of deliberative rhetoric. Second, the FG reveals that an ideal response to Jesus involves at least five aspects that include actions.[65] Moreover, this response is often presented to the audience in the text and the audience of the Gospel in terms of a decision, at times formulated as a two-way choice (e.g., eternal life or perishing: 3:16; 8:24).[66] These features of audience response consisting of choices and future actions are more properly the domain of deliberative rhetoric. Third, the FG seems to share some aspects of the literary genre of an ancient biography.[67]

---

[62] Sheppard, "John," 9, citing Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*, BIS 4 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 116. Watson is drawing on Mack, who also observed that classical rhetoric did not have a theory of narrative (Mack, *Rhetoric*, 79). Interestingly, Mack goes on to state that "the ancient rhetorical understanding of narrative does bear upon the composition of the Gospels" (79). Dennis Stamps also expresses a concern about using classical rhetoric to analyze the Gospels. See Dennis L. Stamps, "The Johannine Writings," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.—A.D. 400*, edited by Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 617–19. Stamps's criticisms that concern the Prologue and rhetorical arrangement will be dealt with in chapter 6.

[63] George Mlakuzhyil, *Christocentric Literary-Dramatic Structure of John's Gospel,* 2nd ed. AnBib 117 (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical, 2011), 353 [emphasis original]. See also Adelbert Denaux, "The Twofold Purpose of the Fourth Gospel. A Reading of the Conclusion to John's Gospel (20,30–31)," in *Studies in the Gospel of John and Its Christology. Festschrift Gilbert Van Belle*, edited by Joseph Verheyden, et al., BETL 265 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014), 535. Marianne Meye Thompson ("Eternal Life in the Gospel of John," *Ex Auditu* 5 [1989]: 42) also argues that "faith in Jesus is penultimate," and that soteriology is the main concern of the FG. See also Cornelis Bennema, *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007), 109.

Concerning the FG as an ancient *bios*, while it is true that ancient *bioi* in general were written for emulation of the hero’s virtues and not their actions, since it is recognized that most of the feats of the subjects of ancient *bioi* would be incapable of emulation by the general audience, Helen Bond’s recent study on ancient biographies and the Gospel of Mark shows that the actions of Jesus in Mark’s Gospel were actions that the disciples were in fact expected to perform in the future.[68] This also seems to be the case with the FG, as Morna Hooker demonstrates. She shows that the same theme of costly discipleship so prominent in Mark finds expression in the FG. John 12:25–26 is reminiscent of Mark 8:35, and in John 15:18–21 and 16:1–4 Jesus prepares the disciples for treatment that consists of being hated, persecuted, excommunicated, and killed.[69] As Thompson notes, the disciples’ path may become “intertwined with Jesus’ path" that "runs through the cross."[70] Further, the disciples are to choose to perform (imitate) Jesus' example of washing their feet, and, strikingly, they are to do greater works than he does (14:12).[71] These future actions are best understood from the framework of deliberative rhetoric. In summary, the rhetorical "appeals"[72] related to the significant advantages offered in the FG and the choices and future actions required of Jesus' followers are evidences that an analysis of the FG from the prism of deliberative rhetoric is justified.

---

[64] See, e.g., Quintilian, *Inst*. 3.4.16.

[65] Seglenieks argues that a genuine belief-response “requires cognitive, relational, ethical, ongoing and public aspects” (*Johannine Belief*, 105). See his detailed argument in his chapters 2–5.

[66] See Peter Riga, “Signs of Glory. The Use of *Sēmeion* in St. John’s Gospel,” *Int* 17 (1963): 403.

[67] The subject of the FG and its relationship to ancient *bioi* will be examined in chapter 6.

[68] See Helen K. Bond, *The First Biography of Jesus. Genre and Meaning in Mark’s Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020), 159–61. “Jesus’ direction to take up one’s cross is not simply metaphorical” (161). See also Morna D. Hooker, *Not Ashamed of the Gospel: New Testament Interpretations of the Death of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 51–54.

[69] Hooker, *Not Ashamed*, 103. See also 111.

Finally, the second main issue concerns Watson's two criticisms. The first deals with Watson's statement that Kennedy's six-step method cannot be used for the Gospels.[73] As for Kennedy's six-step method, the step that seems to be particularly problematic with the Gospels relates to arrangement. However, neither Sheppard's nor this study attempts to analyze the FG using Kennedy's six-step methodology. Nevertheless, both Sheppard and I seek to investigate the rhetorical genre of the Gospel, which is not intrinsically problematic for a rhetorical text like the FG.

Watson's second argument correctly notes that classical rhetoric did not have a theory of narrative. In a similar manner, C. Clifton Black, in his discussion of the impact of George Kennedy's treatise, points out that since the Gospels are narratives and not speeches, they are less amenable to the use of Kennedy's methodology.[74] However, Black concurs with Kennedy's assessment that the intention of (at least) the FG was to persuade.[75] Interpreters have responded to the concern raised by Watson (and Mack and Stamps) about the Gospels being narratives and not speeches in at least two ways. Sheppard proposes that the FG is similar to one of Cicero's discourses. Specifically, she points out that one of Cicero's discourses, *Catilinam III*, is a report that narrates a legal procedure and investigation, which she suggests is similar to what the FG is doing.[76] Alicia Myers attempts to address the concerns by suggesting that rhetoric was present in the Gospel "in the way in which the narrative is constructed."[77] She notes that biographical narratives like the FG presented their characters in ways that were intended to be persuasive by using common *topoi* and techniques found in the ancient *progymnasmata*. These *topoi* included such features of the protagonists as their origins, upbringing, and deeds. The rhetorical techniques included *synkrisis*, *ekphrasis*, and *prosopopoeia*.[78] For Myers, consistency was crucial to the FG's persuasiveness. That is, the key to the FG's persuasiveness was its ability to portray Jesus throughout the narrative, using these *topoi* and techniques, in a manner that was consistent with the presentation of Jesus in the Prologue.

---

[70] Marianne Meye Thompson, "'Many of His Disciples Turned Back': The Offense of Jesus's Death in the Gospel of John (John 6:60–71)," in *Signs and Discourses in John 5 and 6 Historical, Literary, and Theological Readings from the Colloquium Ioanneum 2019 in Eisenach*, edited by Jörg Frey and Craig R. Koester, WUNT 463 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), 288.

[71] The actions associated with 14:12 and other actions specified in the FD that Jesus' followers are expected to perform will be dealt with in chapter 3.

[72] Rhetorical "appeals" are persuasive strategies employed in a rhetorical discourse. Each rhetorical genre has a specific appeal or "end," such as an appeal to what is advantageous, just, or honorable. The three means of persuasion in a speech (*logos*, *ēthos*, *pathos*) are also types of appeals. See Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 1.2.3–6.

[73] Sheppard ("John") omits, perhaps for brevity, a critical phrase in Watson's statements: "using Kennedy's method."

[74] C. Clifton Black, "Kennedy and the Gospels," in *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*, edited by C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 71.

[75] Black, "Kennedy," 72.

In an attempt to advance the discussion, this study will address the concerns about classical rhetoric lacking a theory of narrative by constructing the beginnings of such a theory of narrative rhetoric. It will have affinities to the approach taken by Myers, but will depart in ways that will enable one to understand the argumentative force of particular features of the narrative and that will also explain the relationship of the Prologue to the FG in a differently conceived way. I suggest that the components or constituent parts of a theory of narrative rhetoric can be found in the classical rhetorical treatises, and these components can be used to construct a theory of narrative rhetoric. Chapter 4 will attempt to construct the beginnings of such a theory. This theory will then be used to analyze and explain more adequately some frequently recurring rhetorical features in the FG.

Harold Attridge applies classical rhetoric to John 5. He suggests that using the "ideal" rhetorical arrangement specified in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* may be useful, but notes that John 5 contains deficiencies with regard to that arrangement, and arbitrary judgments are needed to discern the argument's structure.[79] Nevertheless, he thinks that a comparison may suggest ways in which the argument in John 5 may function.[80] He discerns various *logos*, *ēthos*, and *pathos* appeals in the text. Attridge suggests that the persuasive strategies of John 5 were not developed using the theories of ancient rhetoric, but he thinks that the text seems "to play with common rhetorical conventions."[81] Attridge is rightly cautious in his application of classical rhetoric to John 5, especially in terms of arrangement and proofs. He does not argue in detail for a particular rhetorical genre, but simply notes that the exchanges in John 5 "establish a forensic situation involving a complex case."[82] In the end, his study seems to confirm that using classical rhetoric allows one at least to offer suggestions on how the text's argument functions.

---

[76] See Sheppard, "John," 22–24.

[77] Myers, *Characterizing*, 5.

[78] Myers, *Characterizing*, 5, 43–55.

[79] Harold W. Attridge, "Argumentation in John 5," in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*, edited by Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker, ESEC 8 (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002), 192.

Carl Classen's *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament* also offers an analysis of the FG. Although my aim here is not to provide a full engagement with Classen, some interaction is appropriate. The first aspect to discuss is his concept of rhetoric. By rhetoric he means "the deliberate, calculated use of language for the sake of communicating various kinds of information in the manner intended by the speaker (and the theory of such a use)."[83] What is clear is that Classen does not take rhetoric to mean what Aristotle understood it to mean, namely, "Let rhetoric be [defined as] an ability, in each [particular] case, to see the available means of persuasion" (Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 1.2.1; cf. 1.14.1 [Kennedy]).[84] Classen's rather vague notion of rhetoric will not be used here. Differently, this study will use rhetoric in concert with Aristotle's definition in the sense of seeking to persuade an audience. The second aspect of Classen to consider is his actual rhetorical analysis of the FG.[85] Owing to his vague definition of rhetoric, it is evident that Classen is not interested in identifying and explaining the persuasive features of the FG. Classen chooses rather to treat various terms, concepts, and metaphors found first in the Prologue, such as λογός, θεός, ζωή, φῶς, and relate them to the rest of the Gospel. While his brief treatment of the FG helpfully discusses important terms and concepts occurring in the Prologue and the Gospel, I suggest that his analysis does not adequately contribute to showing how these concepts function in a persuasive manner consistent with the Gospel's purpose statement in 20:31. This study will investigate rhetorical strategies that reveal the persuasive effect of these concepts. Finally, regarding the relation of the Prologue to the Gospel, Classen views the Prologue as "laying the foundation" for the ensuing narrative.[86] He then suggests that the Gospel will "elaborate and illustrate" the concepts that first emerge in the Prologue. This "elaboration and illustration" approximates what I will argue as the relationship between the Prologue and the Gospel, but I will nuance this relationship and provide a more adequate foundation for it.

---

[80] Attridge, "Argumentation," 192.

[81] Attridge, "Argumentation," 192.

[82] Attridge, "Argumentation," 191.

[83] Carl Joachim Classen, *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*, WUNT 128 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 45.

[84] Kennedy frequently provides two types of text in brackets ([]): (1) added English text that is implied by the Greek, and (2) italicized transliterated Greek. Kennedy uses parentheses () to indicate remarks that he thought Aristotle intended to be parenthetical. The citations of Kennedy in this study will cite his exact text, including his bracketed text. At times I will add additional brackets, and note this.

[85] He devotes a section to each of the Gospels. See 91–98 for his analysis of the FG.

Adele Reinhartz has utilized aspects of classical rhetoric to inform, in part, her examination the FG's rhetoric in her recent *Cast Out of the Covenant*. In her introduction she presents a brief overview of the major features of classical rhetoric, including genre, invention (external and internal proofs), arrangement, and style. She suggests that all three rhetorical genres function in the FG,[87] and that the rhetorical arrangement resembles the epideictic genre.[88] In my examination of the genre of the FG, I will confirm and advance the argument that that the Gospel exhibits all three genres, proposing that deliberative rhetoric is a dominant genre. Further, I will argue that the arrangement resembles more that of the deliberative genre.[89] One noteworthy feature of Reinhartz's study is her investigation of the Gospel's rhetoric not only in the discourses but also "in the ways in which the Gospel tells the story and depicts its characters."[90] This broadened scope allows one to see more adequately the persuasive nature of the FG, and one that I will exploit. Reinhartz uses and modifies Kennedy's methodology to pursue her own aims. Her main analysis of the FG using classical rhetoric occurs in her section, "The Rhetoric of Fulfillment."[91] Her study goes on to investigate other rhetorical strategies that are not specifically conceptualized in the classical rhetorical treatises. Although not her primary purpose, Reinhartz's study adds to the list of studies that engage the FG through the lens of classical rhetoric. As noted above, my study will argue for a genre classification more extensively, and it will argue for a different rhetorical arrangement.

---

[86] Classen, *Rhetorical*, 94.

[87] Adele Reinhartz, *Cast Out of the Covenant: Jews and Anti-Judaism in the Gospel of John* (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2018), xxxvii n41.

[88] Reinhartz, *Cast*, xxv.

[89] See Reinhartz, *Cast*, xxiv–xxvi. For the deliberative arrangement, see Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 24.

[90] See Reinhartz, *Cast*, xxvi.

[91] See Reinhartz, *Cast*, 6–15. Reinhartz also treats the vituperative element of classical epideictic rhetoric in her chapter 4.

It should be noted that the number of rhetorical studies on the FG has not been extensive. The survey of rhetorical studies on the FG in Watson and Hauser's 1994 bibliography comprises only three full pages (42 entries). Many of these studies have style, irony, dramatic, or narrative concerns.[92] Numerous studies have examined the FG in terms of a trial motif, but these studies have for the most part not explicitly utilized the classical rhetorical treatises.[93] Nevertheless, they help demonstrate that features associated with judicial rhetoric function in the FG. Other previous rhetorical studies have examined the FG from the perspective of the epideictic rhetorical genre, often using the ancient *progymnasmata* as a lens to understand the Gospel. These studies have helpfully shown that the FG contains features associated with this genre. Chapter 2 below, which analyzes the rhetorical genre of the PM, will examine all three rhetorical genres for their presence in that part of the Gospel, including analyzing these judicial and epideictic related studies in more detail. But the focus of that chapter will be on deliberative rhetoric, since it does not seem that there have been many substantial studies that have investigated the FG from the perspective of this genre.

Other previous rhetorical studies have had a specific focus on the Farewell Discourse (FD). Included among these are the studies of George Kennedy, one of the first to investigate the FD from the perspective of classical rhetoric, Jongseon Kwon, Alan Odiam, Fernando Segovia, and John Stube. Some of these investigations approach the FD from the perspective of epideictic rhetorical genre, while others argue for a mixture of epideictic and deliberative rhetoric. These studies will be examined in more detail in chapter 3, which is devoted to examining the rhetorical genre of the FD. The aim there will be two-fold: to advance the argument of the genres in the FD, arguing more robustly for the deliberative genre, and to put the argument on a more theoretical foundation.

---

[92] See Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 175–78. Noted also by Attridge, "Argumentation," 189n5.

[93] Attridge, for example, notes that A. E. Harvey's frequently cited study on the forensic features of the FG makes little use of classical rhetoric. See Attridge, "Argumentation," 191n15; Anthony E. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel* (London: SPCK, 1976).

Chapters 5 and 6 will include an investigation of the relationship of the Prologue to the body of the Gospel. Previous proposals will be examined in varying degrees of detail, including those of such early twentieth-century scholars as Johannes Belser and Jean Réville, but also later studies, such as those of Rudolf Bultmann, Alan Culpepper, Morna Hooker, J. A. T. Robinson, Michael Theobald, Jean Zumstein, and others. The general consensus mentioned above will be questioned, and a better relationship proposed, which views the Prologue as containing propositions that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative.

We can summarize the above discussion on previous rhetorical studies of the FG using classical rhetoric. First, several studies have helpfully demonstrated that a rhetorical analysis of the FG offers benefits in understanding some of the rhetorical dimensions of the text, and that an analysis of the FG in terms of its rhetorical genres is justified. Second, these studies also indicate that an investigation of the deliberative rhetoric of the FG is warranted. This study aims to show that such an analysis enables one to see the spectrum of rhetorical appeals in the FG with finer granularity, and thus understand more precisely how the rhetorical genres function as a rhetorical strategy in the Gospel. Third, Watson's concern about classical rhetoric not embodying a theory of narrative can be addressed by developing the beginnings of such a theory from components contained in classical rhetoric and then applying that theory to the FG. The application of this theory will illuminate several features of this narrative rhetorical strategy in the Gospel.

1.2.3.5 Summary

As an overall summary of justifying this study, each of the four steps above has contributed to showing that a new investigation of the rhetorical genre of the FG and its narrative rhetoric is justified. First, we have seen evidence that the classical rhetorical genre triad was active and valid for the date of the FG's composition. Second, studies suggesting that a genre analysis is not important for a rhetorical analysis of a NT text have been found to be unconvincing. Third, we discovered the advantages that a rhetorical genre analysis provides in helping to understand more precisely the rhetorical goal of the text. Finally, previous studies have helpfully highlighted some of the rhetorical dimensions of the FG, but they have also revealed that areas remain for additional rhetorical investigation particularly concerning two areas: (1) the appeals most closely associated with deliberative rhetoric, and (2) the narrative rhetoric or logic of the FG. Cumulatively, these four steps establish that this study is important and justified.

This opens the possibility for exploring rhetorical strategies in the Gospel that either have not been previously examined or have not been examined in sufficient detail, since the FG itself purports to be a rhetorical discourse (20:31). Regarding genre, this study will perform two investigations of the rhetorical genre of the FG. The first will focus on the public ministry (PM) of Jesus, while the second will focus on the Farewell Discourse (FD). Certain rhetorical strategies and features in the Gospel are conspicuous and seem to call for an analysis of the rhetorical genre. For instance, it is widely recognized that the FG, especially the PM, contains a trial motif. Analyzing the trial motif in terms of the judicial rhetorical genre would seemingly allow one to explain more adequately this motif. Further, the Gospel narrates the character of Jesus and his noble qualities. Analyzing his character according to the epideictic genre would conceivable show more sufficiently how his character is being portrayed. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the ultimate purpose of the Gospel is that the audience would obtain the soteriological benefit of eternal life (20:31). This benefit can be understood in terms of classical rhetorical theory as an appeal to what is advantageous associated with deliberative rhetoric. But the FG includes other benefits or advantages organic to eternal life. The FG sets before the audience a choice that involves numerous actions that comprise a complex belief-response to Jesus. An analysis of the appeals of the deliberative rhetorical genre as they relate to the FG would enable one to identify more deeply and widely (1) the advantages of belief in Jesus, (2) the choices and actions that the author deems necessary for a proper response, and (3) how these actions are honorable in the sight of Jesus' Father. This study intends to show that the FG is a mixture all three of the classical rhetorical genres, and thus can be understood as a "rhetorical hybrid."[94] Regarding the persuasive force of the narrative, developing a theory of narrative rhetoric in chapter 4 will enable us to investigate the FG's narrative logic in which the FG seeks to demonstrate propositions through the narrative itself.

---

[94] The denomination "rhetorical hybrid" was seemingly coined by Jamieson and Campbell ("Hybrids," 147) to define generic blends.

1.3 Methodology and Outline

1.3.1 Methodology

The aim of this study is to investigate two main rhetorical strategies and show how these make up part of the deep rhetorical character of the FG. The principal methodology to be used to execute this aim will be an investigation of the FG using concepts found in classical rhetoric. The sources that this study will use include chiefly the rhetorical handbooks,[95] including, though not limited to, those of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. The *progymnasmata* and ancient speeches will supplement the investigation.

The first strategy to investigate is the rhetorical genre of the FG (focusing on the PM) and the FD. The methodology to be used includes providing a description of the rhetorical genres in classical theory with prominent attention given to the deliberative rhetorical genre and adapting it for use with the FG. The primary reason for performing two separate investigations is that the specific rhetorical appeals, actions, and proofs, while overlapping to a certain degree, are nonetheless somewhat different between these two texts.

The second strategy to examine is the narrative rhetoric of the FG. The methodology includes developing a partial theory of narrative rhetoric that is based on the classical rhetorical treatises. This is necessary because, as noted above, classical rhetorical theory did not have a theory of narrative. Though lacking such a theory, classical rhetoric nevertheless appears to contain the components that could be used to construct such a theory. Therefore, these "building blocks" will be used to erect this theory. The theory will be partial in the sense that it covers the type of narrative that seems to function in the FG, namely, claims or propositions that are demonstrated or proven in the narrative. The study will apply this newly constructed narrative rhetorical theory to the FG to investigate how the narrative seeks to demonstrate the claims that the FG makes. Further, this type of narrative rhetoric seems to correspond in some ways to the type of anecdotal proofs contained in some of the Plutarchan biographies. This correspondence warrants further investigation, and this study will attempt to demonstrate that the FG and Plutarch's *Pericles* have remarkably similar rhetorical strategies, including a similar rhetorical structure with a prologue, narrative proofs, and an epilogue. The rationale for focusing on the narrative rhetoric of the FG is to demonstrate how the narrative functions to persuade the audience to conclude and believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and ultimately to have life in his name (20:31).[96] These two rhetorical strategies flow like tributaries that converge in the FG to help persuade the reader to recognize Jesus' divine identity and embrace the FG's offer of eternal life.

---

[95] Also called "rhetorical treatises."

This study will make no assumptions regarding the author's possible formal education in classical rhetoric.[97] We pointed above to scholars who suggest that it was not necessary to show that the Evangelist had formal rhetorical training. The present final form of the text, including chapter 21, will be the subject of our study. This is the approach taken recently in commentaries,[98] narrative studies,[99] those studies that recognize that the FG conforms reasonably well to the literary genre of ancient *bioi*,[100] and rhetorical studies in particular.[101] It should be emphasized that in using classical rhetoric for the FG, the focus of this study will not principally be on style. Kennedy makes this point and suggests that to do so would constitute a limitation and to a certain degree even a distortion.[102] This study will pursue exegetical details where they bear on the primary question of the thesis.[103] Further, the social setting of the FG will not be the main concern of this study. Recent studies have argued for a Jewish audience,[104] a Greco-Roman audience,[105] in addition to wider general audience.[106] Primary attention will be given to illuminating the rhetorical purpose, and this may in turn help determine the audience, at least from a rhetorical perspective.

---

[96] This study will investigate the Jesus of the FG. For a recent discussion of the relationship of the FG to the Synoptics, see Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 185–201. See Warner ("Persuasion," 153–77) on the issue of reliability and persuasion.

[97] Sheppard ("John," 34), following Stamps's suggestion, does not pursue the issue of whether the author of the FG had rhetorical training simply because the identity of the Evangelist cannot be determined with any certainty.

[98] See Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John*, SP 4 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 13–20; Marianne Meye Thompson, *John: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015), 22–24.

[99] R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 89. Christopher Skinner aptly notes, "The Gospels as we now have them reached their final forms at a given point in time for specific reasons. One of these reasons was surely that they were regarded as valuable and authoritative within early communities *in those forms*." ("Narrative Readings of the Religious Authorities in John: A Response to Urban C. von Wahlde," *CBQ* 82 [2020]: 426 [emphasis original]).

[100] See John A. Dennis, *Jesus' Death and the Gathering of True Israel: The Johannine Appropriation of Restoration Theology in the Light of John 11:47–52* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 9.

[101] See Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 4; Myers, *Characterizing*, 5.

[102] See Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 3, 12.

1.3.2 Outline of the Study

The aim of this study is to investigate the two rhetorical strategies of rhetorical genre and narrative rhetoric in the FG. We will accomplish this in the following chapters. Chapter 2 will investigate the rhetorical genre of the public ministry of Jesus. It will first examine and highlight the rhetorical features and appeals associated with the three classical rhetorical genres. It will then probe the specific appeals associated with the deliberative rhetorical genre, and identify a methodology for determining the rhetorical genre. The chapter will go on to apply this methodology to an investigation of the genre of the PM of Jesus. All three genres will be examined, with the result that although all three are deemed to be present in the PM, the deliberative rhetorical genre is the dominant genre. Thus, this examination will reveal that the PM is a richly textured rhetorical discourse in terms of its rhetorical genre.

Chapter 3 will investigate the rhetorical genre of the FD. It will utilize the methodology identified in chapter 2 for determining the rhetorical genre. The chapter will give primary attention to the deliberative rhetorical genre. The investigation will show that the FD is also highly rhetorical in its genre.

Chapters 4 to 6 will investigate the second rhetorical strategy, which is the narrative rhetoric in the FG. This study will argue that an earlier view of the relationship of the Prologue to the ensuing narrative more adequately accounts for the relationship of shared features among these two entities (Prologue and narrative). This earlier view understands the Prologue as containing propositions that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. We will advocate this view via a two-dimensional argument. The first argument is from a textual dimension while the second is from a literary dimension. We will present this two-dimensional argument in sequence, performing the textual argument first in chapter 5. Chapter 5 will examine several propositions in the Prologue and show how they are proven by means of the Gospel's narrative from textual evidence identified in the narrative. In the course of reading (or hearing) the Gospel, the audience can confirm that the narrative demonstrates the propositions in the Prologue. They can thus conclude and believe that Jesus is the life-giving, divine Messiah and Son of God, and have life in his name (20:31).

---

[103] Following George Lyons (*Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding*, SBLDS 73 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985], 8).

[104] Dennis, *Jesus' Death*; Christopher M. Blumhofer, *The Gospel of John and the Future of Israel*, SNTSMS 177 (Cambridge: CUP, 2020).

[105] Reinhartz, *Cast*; Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*.

[106] See the well-known and debated work *The Gospel for All Christians*, edited by Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

The second, literary, argument will show that there are good literary/theoretical grounds for conceiving the Prologue as containing propositions. This requires that we show that the Gospel in its essence is a highly rhetorical discourse whose structure coheres with the structure (rhetorical arrangement) specified in classical rhetorical theory, especially the four-part structure of Aristotle. This will be accomplished in chapter 6. Chapter 6 will apply the theory of narrative rhetoric (chapter 4) to the FG to demonstrate how the body of the Gospel itself argues through several types of narrated proofs. The chapter will then investigate the rhetorical nature of one of the Plutarchan Lives, *Pericles*, and will show that this Life is remarkably similar in its rhetorical strategies and rhetorical arrangement to the FG. Based on a comparison of the rhetorical strategies and arrangement of the FG with that of *Pericles*, the chapter will argue, with respect to the FG and *Pericles*, (1) that both are highly rhetorical discourses, (2) that both have rhetorical arrangements that are remarkably similar, and (3) that both conform reasonably well to an Aristotelian conception of rhetorical arrangement. Moreover, the Prologue of *Pericles* contains propositions that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative of the Life.

From all this we can infer that the Prologue of the FG functions not as a "summary" or an "introduction" to the Gospel but as containing propositions. This will enable us to plausibly conclude from a theoretical perspective that the rhetorical function of the FG's Prologue is to specify propositions that are demonstrated in the rest of the Gospel.

Thus, the two arguments in chapters 5 and 6, which build on chapter 4, work in tandem to argue that the second rhetorical strategy, namely, narrative rhetoric, is a significant rhetorical strategy in the FG. The Evangelist seeks to lead the audience via the propositions in the Prologue through the narrative demonstrations to believe that Jesus is the life-giving, divine Christ, the Son of God, and to have life in his name (20:31). Chapter 7 will conclude the study, summarizing the findings of our investigation, and suggesting further avenues for research.

We now turn to chapter 2 to investigate the rhetorical genre of the PM.

Chapter 2. The Rhetorical Genre of the Fourth Gospel

2.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter and the next is to investigate the first rhetorical strategy of our study, the rhetorical genre of the FG, with emphasis on the PM, and the FD. The classical rhetorical handbooks discuss three genres: the deliberative, the epideictic, and the judicial. In this chapter we will investigate the rhetorical genre of the FG in order to identify which of these three rhetoric genres, if any, are present in in the FG. We intend to show that, in fact, all three genres are present. Specifically, our study will show that the deliberative rhetorical genre is present as the dominant genre. Previous studies have rarely attempted to demonstrate in any substantial manner that the deliberative genre is present in the FG,[107] and thus our investigation will attempt to fill this void. Determining the rhetorical genre, particularly the predominant genre, is important because, if the predominant genre can be identified, it will in turn help to illuminate the primary rhetorical purpose of the Gospel. This is because, as we will show below, each rhetorical genre has a stated "end" or purpose, and the predominant genre would suggest the predominant purpose.

This chapter will present a brief discussion of the genres identified in the rhetorical handbooks. The discussion will then highlight how a given rhetorical discourse can contain multiple (i.e., a mixing of) rhetorical genres, while underscoring that one of these genres will typically predominate. We will then discuss how ancient rhetorical speeches conformed to, but also at times diverged from, these handbooks. We will present a methodology for determining the rhetorical genre of a discourse that is based on appeals. The methodology will be used in the two following steps: first, we will identify the appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric, and second, using these identified appeals we will examine the PM to determine if these appeals are present. If our findings show that the appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric are present, then we can plausibly conclude that this genre is present in the PM. Our focus will be on the genre of deliberative rhetoric, and thus most of the examination below will be narrowly focused on this genre. Near the end, however, we will examine the PM further to determine whether the other two genres, epideictic and judicial, are also present. Most studies offering treatments of classical rhetorical features of the FG have focused on these last two genres. Therefore, our method in analyzing these two genres will consist mainly of a survey of a few of the more recent investigations to determine the extent to which these other two genres are present. If one or more of the three rhetorical genres are present, and especially if all three are present, we have good reasons to conclude that the PM is a highly rhetorical discourse in terms of its rhetorical genre.

---

[107] See Odiam ("Rhetoric," 54–93) for a study of John 3:1–21 as an instance of deliberative rhetoric.

2.2 Rhetorical Genres in the Handbooks

We saw in chapter 1 that the rhetorical handbooks in the Greco-Roman period presented a three-fold schema for the types of rhetorical discourses, which was generally attributed in antiquity to Aristotle and his *Rhetoric*.[108] According to Aristotle, there are three specific species (*eide*, also called *genera*)[109] of rhetoric: deliberative, judicial (also called forensic), and epideictic (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.3). These correspond, respectively, to three different situations or places: typically the general assemblies, the law courts, and (often) funeral orations, although the handbooks recognize that deliberative discourses, for example, can occur in private settings (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.3; 1.5.1–2).[110] They also correspond to three different time periods: deliberative rhetoric relates to the future, because the speaker is exhorting for or dissuading against a further course of action; judicial rhetoric relates to the past (in judicial rhetoric, the speech would be addressed to a jury person who would make a judgment about the past); and epideictic rhetoric relates to the present, although Aristotle allows that the past and future may be relevant: "for all speakers praise or blame in regard to existing qualities, but they often also make use of other things, both reminding [the audience] of the past and projecting the course of the future" (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.4 [Kennedy]). Aristotle also allows for deliberative rhetoric to deal with the past as in a narrative of an event in the past. This is "in order that being reminded of those things the audience will take better counsel about what is to come” (*On Rhetoric*, 3.16.11 [Kennedy]). Aristotle states that each of the three rhetorical genres has two opposite functions. Advice in deliberative is either “protreptic [‘exhortation’] or apotreptic [‘dissuasion’]” (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.3 [Kennedy]). In judicial rhetoric there is either accusation or defense, and in epideictic there is either praise or blame.[111] The three rhetorical genres also correspond to three different “ends” (τέλος) or purposes, which are essentially forms of appeals. Deliberative rhetoric has the end or objective of what is advantageous or (in the case of dissuasion) harmful, judicial rhetoric has the end of what is the just or the unjust, and epideictic rhetoric has the end of the honorable or the shameful (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.5).

---

[108] See further Aune, "Rhetorical genres," 419. See also [*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.1 1421b7–8.

[109] The following discussion will generally use the term "genre."

[110] See Pepe (*Genres*, 160–65, esp. 165) on how Aristotle, with the use of the term συμβουλευτικός, widened the domain of action from the public assembly to include "private advice intended for a single addressee." See also [*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.2; Quint., *Inst.* 3.8.4, 10. Quintilian notes that Plato's own opinion was that rhetoric was also applicable to private and domestic affairs (*Inst.* 2.21.4; see Pepe, *Genres*, 46).

2.3 Overlap and Mixture of Rhetorical Genres

It is important to recognize that in each instance of a rhetorical discourse a rhetorical genre may contain appeals normally associated with the other genres. A few rhetorical handbooks, such as Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*[112] and Quintilian’s *Institutes of Oratory*, provide evidence of this. For example, in his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle stated this in the context of deliberative genre:

> For the deliberative speaker [the end] is the advantageous [*sympheron*] and the harmful (for someone urging something advises it as the better course and one dissuading dissuades on the ground that it is worse), and he includes other factors as incidental: whether it is just or unjust or honorable or disgraceful. (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.5 [Kennedy])

These incidental “other factors” are the primary features in judicial and epideictic discourse, respectively. In the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, the author includes honor as one of the constituent parts of the advantageous in deliberative rhetoric (*Rhet. Her.*

---

[111] Epideictic rhetoric in antiquity was more nuanced than the handbooks often indicate. See esp. Pernot, *Epideictic*. See also George A. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B.C – A.D. 300* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972), 21–23, 428–29; Christopher Carey, “Epideictic Oratory,” in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 236–37; and Tim MacBride, *Preaching the New Testament as Rhetoric: The Promise of Rhetorical Criticism for Expository Preaching* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014), 75–88.

[112] Incorrectly attributed to Aristotle. The author may be Anaximenes of Lampsakos. See George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*, 2nd ed. rev. and enl. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 24. Kennedy suggests that the original treatise may have been revised to make it more Aristotelian.

3.2.3).[113] Quintilian insists that the strict division of the genre is "facile and tidy rather than true" (*Inst*. 3.4.16 [Russell, LCL]), writing:

> I cannot agree either with those who hold that the subject matter of Encomium is limited to the honourable, that of Deliberation to the expedient, and that of the forensic kind to the just. This division is facile and tidy rather than true. For in a sense they all depend on the help of the others. Justice and expediency come up for treatment in Encomia, honour in Deliberations, and one rarely finds a judicial case in part of which something of the themes just mentioned cannot be found. (*Inst*. 3.4.16 [Russell, LCL])

He states that certain topics normally associated with judicial rhetoric (e.g., justice) and deliberative rhetoric (e.g., the expedient) can also occur in epideictic (which he calls encomium) rhetoric. He holds that the honorable can be found in deliberative, and that all these themes can occur in judicial rhetoric, and he further explains that epideictic has some similarities with deliberative oratory (*Inst*. 3.4.14).[114] There is thus an overlap, or borrowing, of the appeals of the three genres. In this way, each genre can rely on and use the appeals of the other two.[115]

In addition to this overlap or borrowing of genres, rhetorical discourses at times were composed of a mixture of the three genres: judicial, deliberative, and epideictic. Several rhetorical handbooks discuss this. *Rhetorica ad Herennium* states, "if epideictic is only seldom employed by itself independently, still in judicial and deliberative causes extensive sections are often devoted to praise or censure" (*Rhet. Her*. 3.8.15 [Caplan, LCL]). Quintilian also states that discourses can have a mixture of genres: "Can anyone deny that 'panegyrics' are epideictic? Yet they have the form of advice, and often discuss the interests of Greece" (*Inst*. 3.4.14 [Russell, LCL]).[116] The *progymnasmata* contain similar lines of thought. Writing in the fifth century CE, Nicolaus the Sophist explains that an encomium belongs to discourses that are either parts or wholes. It is considered a whole "whenever we use it to speak well of someone, and as a part whenever in the course of deliberative speaking we praise something or other that we are urging be done, or when prosecuting we both recommend the merit of our case and attack that of our opponent" (*Prog*. 48 [Kennedy]). He adduces Isocrates's *Panegyricus* as an example of the former (the whole) and Demosthenes's *On the Crown* as an example of the latter (a part) (see *Prog*. 48).

---

[113] See Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 27.

[114] Cicero recommends not having separate rules for deliberative and epideictic discourses (*De or*. 2.82.333).

[115] See Watson, "Three Species," 26.

[116] Quintilian is discussing the *Panegyricus* of Isocrates, which contained both praise for the Athenians and an exhortation for unity (an appeal often associated with deliberative rhetoric).

Furthermore, this mixture of genres was recognized in other ancient treatises. Menander Rhetor pointed out that deliberative and epideictic rhetoric could occur in a single discourse, stating that the "talk" (*lalia*) genre falls under both rhetorical branches (Menander Rhetor 2.3.1). We also see a mixture of genres in the ancient rhetorical handbook of Ps.-Aristides (*Ars rhetorica* 1.149–50). Cristina Pepe writes: "In affirming 'I say that other species occur in one, and it is necessary to take them and mix them up'..., the Pseudo-Aristides shows that he considers the mixture not as an exception but as a generally valid principle."[117] Pseudo-Aristides then proceeds to cite an example of mixture in Demosthenes's speech *Against Aristocrates* in which all three genres are present: "I have undertaken to prove three propositions—first that the decree is unconstitutional, secondly that it is injurious to the common weal, and thirdly that the person in whose favour it has been moved is unworthy of such privilege" (*Aristocr.* Or 23, 18 [Vince, LCL]).[118] David Aune states that the possibility of a speech in a *mixtum composition* (mixing of genres) enables one to argue that the early Christian letters are mixtures of rhetorical as well as epistolary genres.[119] We suggest that this possibility of genre mixing could occur in the FG, and the discussion below will seek to demonstrate this mixture.

---

[117] Pepe, *Genres*, 371.

[118] The courtroom setting may suggest that the judicial genre is dominant. See Aune, "Rhetorical genres," 420.

[119] See Aune, "Rhetorical genres," 420. In his article "Mixtum Compositum," in *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), 307, he provides the example of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a teacher of rhetoric in Rome, who wrote an eclectic history, *Antiquitates romanae*, comprised of a combination of several genres (though these are mostly different literary genres). Aune gives R. N. Longenecker, *Galatians*, WBC 41 (Dallas: Word, 1990) as an example of one who argues that Galatians is a mixture of both judicial and, starting at Gal 4:11, deliberative rhetoric. Several other interpreters also argue that Galatians contains both deliberative and judicial elements. Janet Fairweather ("The Epistle to the Galatians and Classical Rhetoric," *Tyndale Bulletin* 45 [1994]: 7) observes that Chrysostom, in his commentary on Galatians, finds both deliberative and judicial elements in Galatians.

2.4 The Dominant Rhetorical Genre

We have just shown that rhetorical discourses can contain one, two, or all three of the rhetorical genres. One genre, however, typically predominates a given discourse. Many have observed that some of Paul's epistles contain more than one rhetorical genre, but one usually predominates.[120] In regard to this, Kennedy states: "Although many written discourses, such as epistles, combine features of deliberative, judicial, or epideictic rhetoric, it is often useful to consider the dominant rhetorical genre of a work in determining the intent of the author and the effect upon the audience in the original social situation."[121] We will investigate below the rhetorical genres in the FG, and attempt to identify which genres are present, and which one is the dominant genre. We will argue that all three rhetorical genres are present in the FG, and that the deliberative genre is the dominant genre.

2.5 Rhetorical Genre in Selected Speeches

Now that the rhetorical genres have been investigated from the standpoint of the rhetorical handbooks, we turn to focus our examination on a few actual deliberative speeches in antiquity to determine to what extent they correspond to the rhetorical handbooks. Particularly helpful in this respect is Kennedy's study on focusing arguments in deliberative speeches from the fourth and fifth centuries BCE. He shows that these speeches did not always conform to the scheme specified in the rhetorical handbooks, in terms of both appeals and the mixing of genres. The types of appeals used in deliberative discourse arguments varied over time throughout antiquity, and varied among the different speakers. The techniques and appeals used in deliberative discourse changed over time.

Kennedy identified three historical phases in the evolution of Greek deliberative argumentation between the fifth and fourth centuries BCE. In the first phase (the fifth century), a single form of argument was typically used. Speeches in this period most often included the advantageous, but sometimes the focus was on the just, the honorable, the possible,[122] and the necessary.[123] In general, the appeal to what was advantageous was the primary focus in many of these discourses. Some orators explicitly rejected the appeal to justice.[124] Kennedy adduces evidence that suggests that in the fifth century, arguments focused either on the advantageous or justice, but not both.[125]

---

[120] Watson, "Three Species," 27–39. For example, Mitchell (*Rhetoric*) argues that 1 Corinthians contains both the deliberative, as the dominant, and epideictic (see, esp. 1 Cor 13) genres.

[121] George A. Kennedy, "The Genres of Rhetoric," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, edited by Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 45–46. For a further discussion of the importance of determining the predominant rhetorical genre, see Watson, "Three Species," 27.

Interestingly, Isocrates (436–338 BCE) found no conflict between self-interest (advantageous), justice, and honor. According to Kennedy, Isocrates, writing in the aftermath of the disasters of the Peloponnesian War and the tyrannical rule of the Thirty, may have been impacted by the moral writings of Socrates and Plato, and thus concluded that justice and honor must be accorded equal status to arguments from the advantageous.[126] Thus, Isocrates in his arguments in the *Panegyricus* asserts that Athens was just in her claim to leadership, that it was based on her honorable past, and that her campaign against Persia would not only be advantageous to her, but also just and honorable.[127]

The second phase is found in the late fifth and fourth centuries BCE. In this phase, arguments tended to combine multiple appeals, such as both advantage and justice, which followed the pattern advocated and seen in Isocrates.[128] The third phase is represented by Demosthenes (384–322 BCE), whose orations belong to both categories (single appeal, and mixture of appeals). Kennedy detects at least three sub-phases in Demosthenes's orations. In his first sub-phase, Demosthenes's orations contain a mixture of genres, combining what is advantageous, honorable, and just.[129] The second sub-phase, as exemplified by his *First Philippic*, focuses on what is advantageous. The third sub-phase is represented by a return to that of the advantageous, though now with a more restrained sense, and one that was conditioned by the need to preserve Athenian traditions.[130]

---

[122] George A. Kennedy, "Focusing of Arguments in Greek Deliberative Oratory," *TAPA* 90 (1959), 131.

[123] Kennedy, "Focusing," 137–38.

[124] See, for example, Didotus in the famous Mytilene debate recorded in Thucydides 3.47.5.

[125] Kennedy, "Focusing," 133–36.

[126] Kennedy, "Focusing," 133, 138.

[127] All three occur in the *Panegyricus*. Regarding Athens: her leadership is just (20), her past is honorable (23), and regarding the proposed campaign against Persia, it would be: honorable (179), just (181, 183), and advantageous (184). See Kennedy, "Focusing," 132.

[128] Kennedy, "Focusing," 136.

[129] Kennedy refers to the speeches *On the Symmories* and *On the Liberty of the Rhodians*.

In sum, these observations show the following: (1) that deliberative oratory could contain different sorts of appeals, (2) that these discourses could contain appeals normally associated with each of the three genres, and (3) that a given discourse could contain more than one rhetorical genre. Therefore, the speeches in these three periods show variation, but that this variation seems to coincide with and thus conform to the descriptions in the rhetorical handbooks.

2.6 Methodology for Determining the Rhetorical Genre

To determine the rhetorical genre of a discourse it is necessary to utilize a methodology that is rhetorically oriented and informed. R. D. Anderson points out that the different rhetorical genres contain specific *sets of appeals*. He and two other prominent NT interpreters who engage classical rhetoric, Frank Hughes and Duane Watson, advocate using a methodology that employs sets of appeals to identify the rhetorical genre.[131] We will follow their precedent and use this methodology in the following several sections to analyze the FG. Specifically, we will utilize the appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric.

In addition to appeals, other features can assist in further confirming the rhetorical genre of a discourse. In her study on deliberative rhetoric in 1 Corinthians, Margaret Mitchell helpfully identifies four principal features in classical rhetoric that characterize deliberative rhetorical discourse. These are (1) a focus on deliberating about a particular course of action in the future; (2) the use of a specific set of appeals or "ends" (or, purpose); (3) appropriate subjects for deliberation, such as factionalism and unity; and (4) the use of examples.[132] She then applies these to 1 Corinthians to confirm that, in fact, the letter exhibits these qualities, and thus can be considered an example of deliberative rhetoric. Some of these features are applicable to the PM, while some are more applicable to the FD. The following will examine these features.

---

[130] Kennedy, "Focusing," 136–38.

[131] R. Dean Anderson, Jr., *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, rev. ed. (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 104; Frank W. Hughes, "The Gospel and Its Rhetoric in Galatians," in *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*, edited by L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson, JSNTSup 108 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 214; Watson, "Three Species," 27–39. Duane Watson follows essentially the same methodology for determining the rhetorical genre of 1 Cor 10:23–11:1, identifying it as deliberative. Duane F. Watson, "1 Corinthians 10:23–11:1 in the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Role of Rhetorical Questions," *JBL* 108 (1989): 302. William Brandt (*The Rhetoric of Argumentation* [New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970], 14) suggests following Aristotle in seeking to determine the purpose or "end" of the discourse to determine the genre. This aligns closely with what is advocated here with the focus on the appeals, since the appeals are tailored to the ends, such as the just, honorable, and advantageous.

For the PM, concerning the first feature, deliberation regarding a future course of action, both the handbooks and speeches advocate this. Aristotle states, "Each of these [i.e., rhetorical genres] has its own 'time': for the deliberative speaker, the future (for whether exhorting or dissuading he advises about future events)" (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.4 [Kennedy]; brackets added).[133] This is mirrored in a speech of Demosthenes, where he states, "the universal norm is to deliberate ahead of events."[134] We plan to show that this feature is applicable to both the PM and the FD. The second feature, appeals, will be discussed in further detail immediately below. Concerning the third feature, appropriate subjects for deliberation, subjects such as factionalism and unity appear to be more directly applicable to the FD, and thus we will take up an examination of these subjects in chapter 3.[135] The fourth feature, examples, is clearly present in the PM. However, the use of examples in the PM is complex and multidimensional, and is beyond the scope of this study.[136]

2.7 The Appeals Associated with Deliberative Rhetoric

This section investigates in more detail the second feature, appeals, that is associated with deliberative rhetoric. In addition to the appeals discussed by Aristotle, rhetorical handbooks beginning with the fourth century BCE offered treatments on the subject of appeals. The author of the mid-fourth-century rhetorical treatise *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* listed the following as appeals for deliberative discourse: just (δίκαια), legal (νόμιμα), advantageous (συμφέροντα), noble (καλά), pleasant (ἡδέα), and easy to do (ῥᾴδια πραχθῆναι). The writer added that if these are not available, then one needs to demonstrate that the course of action is possible when advising something difficult, and that the action is necessary ([*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.4).[137] The author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* writes that advantage in political deliberation has two aspects: security and honor. The treatise goes on to explain security: "To consider Security is to provide some plan or other for ensuring the avoidance of a present or imminent danger" (*Rhet. Her.* 3.2.3 [Caplan, LCL]). The author states that the honorable is subdivided into the right and the praiseworthy (*Rhet. Her.* 3.2.3).

---

[132] Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 23. See 24–64 for her detailed discussion.

[133] See also Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, LEC 5 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 108.

[134] Demosthenes, "On the Peace," in *Demosthenes: Selected Speeches*, translated by Robin Waterfield (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), sec. 2.

[135] The lexeme σχίσμα ("division") occurs thrice in Jesus' PM. Although these instances do not appear to have a direct bearing on the deliberative rhetoric in the PM, they may serve to cause the audience to consider more deeply the issues and choices being discussed.

[136] In the conclusion (chapter 7) where areas for future study are suggested, we will identify several views as to how examples function in the Gospel.

As Mitchell points out, the list of deliberative appeals contained in *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* continued through the rhetorical tradition into the era of the Roman Empire. This is attested by the rhetorical handbook by Pseudo-Aristides which has τὸ δίκαιον ("the just"), τὸ συμφέρον ("the advantageous"), τὸ δυνατόν ("the possible"), τὸ ῥᾴδιον ("the easy"), τὸ ἀναγκαῖον ("the necessary"), τὸ ἀκίνδυνον ("the safe"), τὸ καλόν ("the good"), τὸ εὐσεβές ("the pious"), τὸ ὅσιον ("the natural"), τὸ ἡδύ ("the pleasant") καὶ τὰ ἐναντία τούτοις ("and the opposites of these things").[138] Other ancient rhetorical treatises contain appeals closely corresponding to those of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. These commonly contain a subset of the appeals. In Hermogenes the list varies from four to six.[139] Plutarch refers to several of these: "But always make the objects of your expenditures useful and moderate, having as their purpose either what is good or what is necessary, or at any rate what is pleasant and agreeable without anything harmful or outrageous in it" (*Mor.* 822C [Fowler]).[140] It should be noted that not all of these appeals would be present in every rhetorical discourse. For our purposes, it is not necessary to demonstrate that all the possible appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric are present in the FG.

---

[137] Regarding the date of this treatise, R. Dean Anderson, Jr. (*Theory*, 38) observes that it is now undisputed that this treatise dates to the last part of the fourth century BCE. Anderson (39) further points out that this work is now generally attributed to Anaximenes.

[138] Pseudo-Aelius Aristide, *Arts Rhétoriques*, translated by Michel Patillon (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002), sec. 1.151. The parenthesized translations are Mitchell's (*Rhetoric*, 26n20). Mitchell's rendering of "the good" for τὸ καλόν is probably more correctly translated as "the honorable," based on the following discussion of τὸ καλόν in section 1.157 where the concept is related to virtue and works done: "ὅλως ὅσα κατὰ ἀρετὴν καὶ ἀρετῆς ἔργα" (1.157.9–10). See Pernot (*Rhetoric in Antiquity*, trans. by W. E. Higgins [Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005], 225) for essentially the same list of criteria. See also Mack, *Rhetoric*, 37.

[139] See Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 26n20. See also, e.g., Hermog. *Prog.* 6.54; 11.37 (from Thesaurus Linguae Graecae).

[140] See also Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 26n20.

2.8 The Fourth Gospel as Deliberative Rhetoric

This section will examine the FG with special focus on the PM.[141] The purpose is twofold. First, it will investigate the appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric to determine whether they are present. The principal appeal of deliberative rhetoric is to what is advantageous. Another frequent appeal is to the honorable. Therefore, the deliberative rhetorical appeals that we will examine are (1) the appeal to what is advantageous, and (2) the appeal to the honorable. Second, this section will examine what courses of action to pursue or avoid are advocated in the FG to obtain these advantages. The investigation will attempt to show that there are significant advantages or benefits offered by the FG, but that these advantageous require significant actions for the audience to perform in order to obtain them.

An exhaustive treatment will not be provided in as much as the focus of this chapter is primarily to ascertain whether the Gospel shows evidence of the sorts of appeals and future actions commonly associated with deliberative rhetoric. Furthermore, it should be noted that the categories can overlap, as we observed above. The first subsection below will investigate the appeal to the advantageous in the FG. The subsequent subsections will examine the appeal to the honorable and the future-oriented actions.

We stated above that this section will investigate the deliberative rhetorical features that are mainly in Jesus' PM. It will not explicitly investigate the appeals in the FD.[142] The reasons for this are several. First, the audience in the narrative world during Jesus' PM is different from the audience in the narrative world of the FD. The audience in the PM consists of significantly more-diverse groups of people: disciples of varying degrees of adherence, others not specifically designated as disciples, and, in particular, the Ἰουδαῖοι. The audience focus greatly narrows in the FD to that of Jesus' immediate disciples, especially after the departure of Judas (13:30).[143] Second, the principal appeal to the advantageous has different objects in the PM compared to that of the FD. In the

---

[141] As Vistar points out, the term "public ministry," if used to refer solely to the events of John 1–12, may be somewhat misleading, since the events following John 17 are clearly part of Jesus' public ministry. The cross in particular is perhaps the most public of all Jesus' actions. Deolito V. Vistar, Jr., *The Cross-and-Resurrection: The Supreme Sign in John's Gospel*, WUNT 2/508 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 9n7.

[142] In some instances, it will be helpful to touch briefly on features outside the PM.

[143] Except for 13:33, which refers back to 7:34, the term Ἰουδαῖος is missing from the FD.

PM, for instance, the appeal to the advantageous is mostly focused on life or eternal life. Similarly, the appeal to walk in the light as opposed to the darkness is confined to the PM.[144] The lexeme *ζωή* occurs thirty times in the PM, but only three times in the FD.[145] On the other hand, the lexeme *ἀγάπη* occurs once in the PM, but six times in the FD, and *ἀγαπάω* occurs seven times in the PM, but thirty-seven times in the FD.[146] Further, the ministry of the Spirit (Paraclete) receives additional elaboration in the FD. Third, other appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric are present in the FD, such as the appeal to unity/harmony and the possible. Fourth, while there is some overlap between the future actions advocated in the PM and the FD (e.g., *πιστεύω* and *μένω*), the benefits are somewhat different, and the actions to partake of these benefits are also different. Therefore, it seems appropriate to provide a separate treatment of the rhetorical genre for the FD, which we will perform in the next chapter.

2.8.1 The Deliberative Appeal to the Συμφέρον ("Advantageous")

This section investigates the deliberative rhetorical appeal to what is advantageous. The appeal to the advantageous is both the primary and the most frequent appeal in the rhetorical tradition. It is the primary appeal in that the appeal to what is advantageous or beneficial is the hallmark of deliberative rhetoric. We highlighted above the essential "end" or "purposes" of each of the three genres, and observed that the primary end of deliberative rhetoric was the advantageous (*συμφέρον*) (*On Rhetoric,* 1.3.5).[147] Furthermore, Aristotle points out that while deliberative speakers at times would consider other incidental appeals, “they would never admit that they are advising things that are not advantageous … or that they are dissuading … from what is beneficial” (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.6 [Kennedy]). Moreover, the *συμφέρον* was also the most frequently occurring appeal in the rhetorical handbooks as well as the ancient orations.[148]

---

[144] As Richard Bauckham (*Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015], 127) and Jörg Frey ("Johannine Dualism: Reflections on Its Background and Function," in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018], 126) point out, the light/darkness metaphor is confined to chapters 1–12.

[145] Occurrences of *ζωή* in the FG: prologue: twice; PM: thirty times; FD: three times; and 20:31.

[146] André Feuillet, "The Structure of First John. Comparison with the Fourth Gospel. The Pattern of Christian Life," *BTB* 3 (1973): 205; Raymond F. Collins, "A New Commandment I Give To You, That You Love One Another," *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 35 (1979): 238.

[147] Similarly, the primary "end" of the judicial speech was the "just" and the "unjust," and the "end" of the epideictic speech was the "honorable" and the "shameful."

Kennedy (*On Rhetoric*, 49n81) discusses the term *συμφέρον*, noting that it is often translated "expedient," and explains that the later rhetoricians, such as Quintilian (*Inst.* 3.8.1–3), sought to modify what they saw as expedient in Aristotle's formulation. But Kennedy explains, "Since Aristotle has said in 1.1.12 that we must not persuade what is bad, he would presumably recommend that a speaker seek to identify the enlightened, long-term advantage to the audience." Kennedy suggests "advantageous" or "beneficial" as the best translation. In his *De officiis*, Cicero devotes the entirety of Book 3 to argue that what is expedient cannot conflict with what is morally good.

It is necessary to recall that some handbooks associated multiple elements in the appeal to the advantageous, and a frequent element among them was the appeal to security. We saw above that the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* writes that the appeal to advantage has two elements: security and honor, and that security involves “some plan or other for ensuring the avoidance of a present or imminent danger” (*Rhet. Her*. 3.2.3 [Caplan, LCL]).[149] This element of security is also advocated in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, which defines the advantageous as: “protection of existing goods, acquisition of nonpresent goods, disposal of existing harms, or the prevention of damages that are expected to occur” ([*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.9 [Mirhady, LCL]). Thus, the appeal to the advantageous emphasizes both the acquisition of benefits not presently enjoyed, as well as the protection from damages or dangers. In the FG, both aspects are presented as that which is advantageous. There are many benefits that accrue to the one who believes, but, on the other hand, the believer is also protected from significant dangers. The dangers are particularly highlighted in the section below that examines the antithetical statements in the Gospel. First, however, we turn to the positive advantages.

Our aim is to show that the Gospel offers many advantages to believing in Jesus as the divine Messiah, the Son of God, as presented in 20:31. The results of this section will add to our fund of rhetorical strategies. This section thus will contribute to our understanding of the various rhetorical strategies in the Gospel. By showing the rhetorical appeal to the advantage we will be able to establish further the highly rhetorical nature of the Gospel. This section will proceed by (1) discussing the overall advantages, and (2) showing how these advantages are often contrasted with corresponding disadvantages in order to provide a stark backdrop that serves to highlight the full impact of the related advantage.

---

[148] Mitchell makes this observation. She notes (*Rhetoric*, 26n20) that *συμφέρον* is in every list in the rhetorical handbooks.

[149] See *Rhet*. *Her*. 3.2.3. The appeal to honor will be treated more fully below.

2.8.1.1 The Advantages of Believing in Jesus

The benefits offered by the Gospel have been generally recognized by scholars. But what is not widely understood is that these benefits are set within the context of a rhetorical discourse, and thus they can be construed rhetorically as appeals to what is advantageous. In other words, they function rhetorically to advance the Evangelist's argument through his appeal to the audience that the proposed course of action is the proper course of action to take, which is to believe that Jesus is the divine Messiah/Son of God (20:31).

The foremost appeal to what is advantageous in the Gospel is set forth in the purpose statement: "so that … you may have life in his name" (20:31).[150] A variation of this is stated in John 10:10: *ἐγὼ ἦλθον ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσιν*. This is frequently stated in terms of *αἰώνιος ζωή* (e.g., 3:15, 16; 17:2, 3).[151] At times this is juxtaposed with negatives or disadvantages: death, sin, judgment, among others, as we will see later in this section. It is appropriate here to discuss some aspects of the rather complex concept of eternal life in the FG. In 17:3, eternal life is stated[152] in terms of knowing the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent.[153] Eternal life has Jewish roots and has been defined as "the life of the eschatological Age to Come."[154] Jewish writings speak of "two ages": the life of this age and the life of the age to come. It views these ages as quantitatively and qualitatively different. This differentiation is perhaps most fully developed in 4 Ezra 7:12–13; 8:52–54. Qualitatively, the dangers, hardships, evil, illness, and death associated with life in this age have been eliminated in the age to come and replaced with a broad and safe city where abundance, rest, goodness, and wisdom abounds.[155] A quantitative difference is also present, as Dan 12:2–3[156] and 4 Ezra 7:13 make clear.[157]

---

[150] Unless otherwise noted, English translations are from the NRSV. "(Eternal) life" is "the primary benefit" (Bennema, *Power*, 137). Jerome H. Neyrey (*The Gospel of John*, NCBC [Cambridge: CUP, 2007], 44) suggests that becoming children of God is "the ultimate benefaction."

[151] *Ζωὴ αἰώνιος* occurs seventeen times in the FG. The terms "life" and "eternal life" are used interchangeably in the FG, the former term often serving as shorthand for the latter. See Andreas J. Köstenberger, *A Theology of John's Gospel and Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 346; Bennema, *Power*, 137n118; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 144. Thompson adduces evidence that "life" and "eternal life" are used synonymously in the FG by noting where the two expressions are juxtaposed: 5:24, 39–40; 6:47–48; 10:10, 28 (cf. 3:16 and 20:31). See Thompson, "Life," 37–38.

[152] Scholars debate whether 17:3 expresses an actual definition of eternal life. See Thompson ("Life," 40) for a brief discussion of the positions and proponents.

[153] Although this clearly includes a cognitive component, most likely this "knowledge" has roots in the OT concept of the knowledge of God (e.g., Jer 31:34; Hos 2:10; Hab 2:14), as many commentators note. D. A. Carson (*The Gospel According to John* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991], 556) points to the relationship aspect, and suggests that this knowledge includes "fellowship, trust, personal relationship, faith."

[154] George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 295. Leon Morris (*The Gospel According to John*, rev. ed. NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995], 201) points out that the lexeme *αἰώνιος* means "pertaining to an age." The term has both a qualitative and a quantitative sense. See Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 3 vols (London: Burns & Oates; New York: Crossroad, 1968–82), 1:389; Moisés Silva, "*αἰών*," *NIDNTTE* 1:197.

The FG adopts this Jewish concept and reinterprets it.[158] That the Gospel starts with this concept can be observed both explicitly and implicitly. The most explicit evidence to the Jewish idea is found in 5:39: "You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life," but it can also be seen in 4:14, 36; 5:39; 6:27; and 12:25.[159] The concept occurs implicitly in the references to the covenant theology of Deuteronomy and the eschatological promises of the prophets, especially Ezekiel and Daniel.[160]

The FG reinterprets the Jewish idea of eternal life by presenting eternal life in two dimensions—a present dimension and a future dimension.[161] With regard to the present dimension, eternal life is characterized as a possession that believers already "have" (ἔχει, present indicative) as shown by 3:36; 5:24; 6:47 and 54.[162] David Hill suggests that the FG can assert that life can be obtained in the present from the fact that in the Synoptic Gospels the presence of the kingdom of God was in a certain sense manifested in what Jesus brought (see, e.g., Matt 12:28). Hill additionally argues that the vertical dualistic language in the FG in such statements as, "You are from below, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world" (8:23), expresses the idea that the contrast is not exclusively a temporal one, but also a contrast between the world above and the world below. "*Already* it was possible for a new existence (still 'from above') to possess a man so that he might see and enter the Kingdom of God."[163] The advantage or benefit of eternal life is held out as a possession that those who choose to believe in Jesus can have in the present time.

---

[155] See also Dodd, *Interpretation*, 145. He notes that 4 Ezra dates to about 100 CE.

[156] Daniel 12:2 is the only passage where ζωὴ αἰώνιος occurs in the OT (LXX).

[157] For additional references to eternal life as "life of the age to come" in Jewish apocalyptic and rabbinic writings, see Thompson, "Life," 37; Dennis, *Jesus' Death*, 289–92.

[158] Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, 2:521n5) disagrees with Dodd that "eternal life" in the FG relates to the Jewish idea of the life of the age to come. For a response to Schnackenburg, see Thompson, "Life," 38.

[159] See Dodd, *Interpretation*, 146.

[160] As pointed out by Dennis, *Jesus' Death*, 289–91.

[161] That there is a present dimension of eternal life in the FG is currently a commonplace in Johannine studies. See Bennema, *Power*, 12n62; Dennis, *Jesus' Death*, 291; Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 1:323; Ladd, *Theology*, 292–94; Thompson, *John*, 129, and esp. her "Excursus 4: Life and Eternal Life in John" (*John*, 87–91).

[162] See Thompson, *John*, 88; Jörg Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie III: Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten*, WUNT 117 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 282. See also 10:28. Thompson ("Life," 46) disputes those who claim that the FG holds out eternal life only as a future prospect and not a present reality.

Nevertheless, in addition to the present dimension of eternal life, the FG also offers the audience the appeal to a future dimension to eternal life. It is probably incorrect to differentiate these two dimensions. Once a believer "has" eternal life, this present possession is one that endures. Eternal life is "a communion with God" that "opens into a never-ending future."[164] As such, it is an existence that begins in this life and continues beyond death, which no longer poses a threat (11:24–25), into the presence of Jesus to see his glory (14:2; 17:24), and one in which Jesus himself will raise the believer on the last day (6:39, 40, 44, 54). Those who choose to follow Jesus will never perish, and no one is able to take them from Jesus' and the Father's hand (10:28–29).[165] They are no longer lost and do not come into judgment.[166]

There are, then, two dimensions to eternal life in the FG: a present and a future. These two dimensions at times occur in conjunction with each other. In John 5, for example, both dimensions of eternal life come together.[167] John 5:25 concerns the gift of eternal life in the present: "Very truly, I tell you, the hour is coming, and *is now here*, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live."[168] They have passed out of death to life (5:24).[169] But Jesus proceeds to speak of the hour that is coming but *is not yet*, which concerns a future dimension that includes the resurrection of the body from the tomb, which is the subject of 5:28–29: “The hour is coming when all who are in their graves will hear his voice and will come out … to the resurrection of life, and … to the resurrection of condemnation.”[170] Similarly, both dimensions occur in 6:54: ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα *ἔχει* ζωὴν αἰώνιον, κἀγὼ *ἀναστήσω* αὐτὸν τῇ *ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ*.[171]

---

[163] David Hill, "The Background and Biblical Usage of *Zōē* and *Zōē Aiōnios*," in *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1967), 195–201, citation on 196 [italics original]. For a fuller treatment of the vertical dualism that carries with it a present sense of eternal life, see Franz Mussner, *ΖΩΗ: Die Anschauung vom "Leben" im vierten Evangelium unter Berücksichtigung der Johannesbriefe* (Munich: Karl Zink, 1952), 56.

[164] Udo Schnelle, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 723.

[165] Frey, *Eschatologie III*, 282.

[166] Schnelle, *Theology*, 723.

[167] Ladd, *Theology*, 294.

[168] Emphasis added. See Thompson, *John*, 129; Jörg Frey, *Die johanneische Eschatologie II: Das johanneische Zeitverständnis*, WUNT 110 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 144. This could be considered a "spiritual" resurrection (Ladd, *Theology*, 294). See also 4:23, where the identical expression ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν occurs (see Frey, *Eschatologie II*, 146).

[169] The perfect μεταβέβηκεν indicates the change of state of those who believe. See Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, SBG 1 (New York: Lang, 1993), 259; K. L. McKay, *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An*

The FG shows evidence of a qualitative difference in the eternal life that Jesus offers: the abundant (eternal) life (10:10) that he came to provide includes such aspects as lack of hunger and thirst (6:35), light for illumination (8:12), and protection from dangers, death, and judgment.[172] Thus, the striking reformulation that the FG has made to the Jewish conception is that many of the future benefits have been brought forward into the present, and are set forth before the audience as an advantageous choice they should make.[173]

The advantageous or beneficial appeals begin immediately, at the outset of the Gospel in the Prologue. These advantages consist of “the highest goods: the possibility of becoming God’s children [1:12–13], of seeing the glory of God [1:14], of receiving grace in abundance [1:16].”[174] A triad of advantages clusters around what has been called the “‘salvation-creating’ act of God,”[175] which encompasses three notions: the removal of sin (1:29),[176] salvation from death (3:16), and the provision of new life

---

Aspectual Approach, SBG 5 (New York: Lang, 1994), 49; Frey, *Eschatologie II*, 112. It is doubtful whether C. K. Barrett (*The Gospel According to St. John*, 2nd ed. [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978], 261), following Rudolf Bultmann (*The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, JMS 1 [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014], 257–58), is correct in seeing a future sense here. See Herman N. Ridderbos (*The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*, translated by John Vriend [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 197): death is “behind” the believer.

[170] Thompson, *John*, 129.

[171] Emphasis added. See Frey, *Eschatologie II*, 144; Brown, *John*, 1:292. Frey notes that 12:48 represents an additional, albeit negative, formulation. Both dimensions also occur in 6:39–40: see Dennis, *Jesus’ Death*, 291.

[172] See Dodd, *Interpretation*, 146–47.

[173] Naturally, some of these present benefits cannot be fully enjoyed until after Jesus’ resurrection. Some are not realized until the believer’s own resurrection (see 6:30; 14:2–3; 17:24).

[174] Jean Zumstein, “Der Prolog, Schwelle zum vierten Evangelium,” in *Der Johanneprolog*, edited by Günter Kruck (Darmstadt: WBG, 2009), 69. See also Thompson, *John*, 34–35; Lindsey M. Trozzo, *Exploring Johannine Ethics*, WUNT 2/449 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 145; Neyrey, *John*, 40.

[175] Jörg Frey, “The Death of Jesus in the Gospel of John,” in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 195.

[176] For the debate regarding what Jesus’ death accomplished and whether it is to be considered vicarious/substitutionary, or even expiatory, see Carson, *John*, 422; Dennis, *Jesus’ Death*, 13–24; Frey, “Death,” 171–97; Köstenberger, *Theology*, 534–38.

(6:50).[177] Additional elaboration of the advantages emerges over the course of the narrative. One of these is the removal of sin (1:29), which is formulated in various linguistic expressions: not die in sins (8:21, 24), deliverance from the slavery of sin (8:34), and cleansing from sin (13:10; 15:3; cf. 20:21).

The advantages that accrue to those who believe include, among others: life (3:16; 10:10; 20:31), love (3:16),[178] knowledge of God (8:32; 10:14; cf. 14:7; 17:3), truth (8:32), cleansing from sin (1:29; cf. 13:8; 15:3), freedom from sin (8:32–36), following Jesus or discipleship (8:12),[179] the right to forgive sins (20:23), and a future resurrection by Jesus himself (6:39, 40, 44, 54).[180] Believers have the advantage of the security of having eternal life and not perishing and not being taken out of the Father's and Jesus' hand (10:28–30).[181] Bultmann explains this as a two-fold security enjoyed by those who believe: a subjective security because they know Jesus as their shepherd and follow (obey) him (10:3–5, 27), and an objective security because Jesus knows them and no one can snatch them out of his and the Father's hand (10:28–30).[182] Not least of all, the benefit of partaking of eternal life in the FG also entails a relational component. It is a "personal relation and participation" with the one who has "life in himself" (5:26).[183] This relational component, however, must be expanded to include the key notion of the gathering of the dispersed children of God into one (11:52; cf. 10:16), and how the power of Jesus' death is able to unify and thus constitute the people of God as the "True Israel."[184]

---

[177] For this triad, see Frey, "Death," 195.

[178] Frey ("Dualism," 143) points out that John 3:16 is the "programmatic formulation" of love in the Gospel.

[179] See Frey, "Dualism," 133, where he observes the "gain" of discipleship in 8:12. He cites Otto Schwankl (*Licht und Finsternis. Ein metaphorisches Paradigma in den johanneischen Schriften*, HBS 5 [Freiburg: Herder, 1995], 216): "Discipleship … is advantageous."

[180] This list adapts and augments the lists mentioned in Bennema, *Power*, 131, 135–46, 154. Chapter 3 will treat the benefits related to the FD: peace (chs. 14, 16, 20), joy (15:11; 16:20–24; 17:13), the Spirit (Paraclete), friendship (15:13–15), receiving and seeing Jesus' glory (17:22; cf. 1:14; 17:24), and others.

[181] This does not, however, exempt Jesus' followers from the responsibility of "abiding" or continuing in him (8:31; cf. 15:1–10). And yet, it will be the Spirit who provides the enablement for discipleship. See Bennema, *Power*, 154.

[182] Bultmann, *John*, 385–86.

[183] Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 2:357 and Frey, *Eschatologie III*, 282.

[184] See John Dennis's multi-faceted study (*Jesus' Death*) on how the FG exhibits Jesus' death as effecting the ingathering of the true sheep of Israel. (The phrase "True Israel" is taken from the title of his work.)

The advantages in the FG are sometimes formulated in spatial terms: a *transferal* from the domain of darkness into the domain of life (5:24; cf. 1 John 3:14); not dying (11:16), which is stated in terms of never *seeing* death (8:51) and never *tasting* death (8:52).[185]

These are all advantages or benefits that accrue to the one who chooses to believe in and follow Jesus. To reinforce these advantages, they are often set in opposition to disadvantages that result from the choice not to believe in Jesus. The next section investigates the juxtaposition of these oppositions.

2.8.1.2 The Advantages Contrasted to What Is Disadvantageous

The rhetorical treatises state that the appeal to what is advantageous can be most effective when done in comparisons. The related opposing appeal would then be to that which is not advantageous or to what is harmful.[186] The rhetorical tradition points out that comparisons of opposites are an effective way of arguing in deliberative rhetoric for specific courses of action to pursue, and, on the other hand, against courses of action to avoid. In these cases, advantageous actions are antithetically juxtaposed with other actions that are either less advantageous, or even disadvantageous, for the purpose of accentuating and clarifying the opposing choices. According to Aristotle, in regard to such antitheses, "opposites are most knowable and more knowable when put beside each other" (*On Rhetoric*, 3.9.8 [Kennedy]). Thus, he holds that two opposing things become better known when they are juxtaposed with each other. Further, the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* shows how the advantageous can be made plain from opposites ([*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.22–23).

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* discusses honor as a component of deliberative rhetoric. This treatise intentionally subdivides honor into two components. The first component deals more directly with the ability to evaluate advantages and disadvantages and for that reason will be examined here.[187] The work states that the advantageous in political deliberation in general consists of two aspects: security and honor, and subdivides honor into the right and praiseworthy.[188] It then further subdivides the right into virtue and duty. One of these virtues is wisdom. Wisdom itself consists in part of "*compar[ing]* advantages and disadvantages, counselling the *pursuit* of the one and the *avoidance* of the other" (*Rhet. Her*. 3.3.4 [Caplan, LCL]; emphasis added). Although sometimes honor is considered to be separate from the advantageous, here we see that there is considerable overlap. Thus, one can best counsel the most advantageous course of action when it is laid alongside that which is disadvantageous. Cicero states that "two extremely effective figures" are "comparison and example," and then goes on to discuss the "contrast of opposites" (*De or.* 3.53.205 [Rackham, LCL]).[189]

---

[185] See Frey, *Eschatologie III*, 282, for this observation.

[186] "Deliberative speakers … would never admit that they are advising things that are not advantageous … or that they are dissuading … from what is beneficial" (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.6 [Kennedy]).

[187] The second component will be examined in the section below that deals more specifically with the general appeal to honor.

In summary, we can see that the rhetorical tradition understands antitheses as an effective way to highlight choices by juxtaposing advantages and disadvantages in order to make the proposed choice more dramatic and thus clearer. As we will see, these two appeals, to the advantageous and to the disadvantageous, appear frequently in the FG, and often in juxtaposition. Thus, the FG advocates, on the one hand, for an action that is advantageous and, on the other hand, against an action that is disadvantageous to the audience.

It is widely recognized that the FG is suffused with antithetical language and concepts. To highlight just a few examples: light/darkness, life/death, from above/from below, and spirit/flesh. But what is important for our study is what is not generally recognized: These antitheses are best construed as rhetorical antitheses.[190] This is because in juxtaposing these highly contrasting concepts the author is presenting to the audience an advantage and disadvantage in a way that highlights the differences so that the readers can choose that which is advantageous in the mind of the author. In the FG, these antitheses begin immediately in the Prologue. Perhaps one of the most noteworthy is the antithesis between those who did not receive the *Logos*/Light (1:11) versus those who did and hence received ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι (1:12–13).[191]

---

[188] See the discussion in *Rhet. Her*. 3.2.3.

[189] See also *Rhet. Her*. 4.15.21; 4.45.58.

[190] Rightly, Douglas Estes, "The Rhetoric of John 3: Antithetical Argumentation from Jesus and John" (Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 4, 2020), 5.

[191] See Eugen Ruckstuhl, "Zur Antithese Idiolekt – Soziolekt im johanneischen Schrifttum," *SNTSU* 12 (1987): 158. This reference comes from Estes, "Rhetoric," 1n3.

Beyond the Prologue, perhaps the most prominent antithesis occurs in the claim, "For God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish but may have eternal life" (3:16). That is, two ways or courses of action are presented to the audience: the advantageous action of belief in Jesus that results in eternal life versus the disadvantage of perishing.[192] The surrounding context of 3:16 allows us to say more. John 3:16 is actually embedded in a short antithetically oriented sequence that begins in 3:15 and climaxes in 3:17. Two antithetical clauses are contained in 3:16 and 3:17, and, as Jörg Frey explains, build to a climax, both *syntactically* (a simple ἵνα-clause to an antithetically doubled predicate of the ἵνα-clause, to an antithetical doubling of the ἵνα-clause) and *semantically*, where the concept of salvation is extended to encompass τὸν κόσμον (3:17).[193] In this way, the oppositions eternal life/saved versus perishing/being judged are dramatically portrayed such that the rhetorical force of the antitheses is deepened (antithetically) and broadened (to include the world).

The following will survey some additional instances in the Gospel where this antithetical feature occurs.[194] The positive features associated with believing in Jesus are juxtaposed with correlative negatives: flesh, thirst, hunger, darkness, sin, and death, among others. The antithesis in John 3:3–8 concerns how it is possible for someone to see or enter the kingdom of God. The principal contrast is between "flesh" and "Spirit," and the possibility of seeing/entering the kingdom of God is reserved for those who have been born again/from above (ἄνωθεν) (3:3) and of water and the Spirit (3:5), and not only of "flesh" (3:6). The antithesis in 4:13–14 relates to the thirst-quenching properties of two different types of water: natural water from which one will thirst again versus the permanently thirst-quenching water that Jesus offers: "Everyone who drinks of this water will be thirsty again, but those who drink of the water that I will give them will never be thirsty. The water that I will give will become in them a spring of water gushing up to eternal life." Similarly, 6:35 concerns the type of bread that he embodies that permanently assuages hunger (and thirst): "I am the bread of life. Whoever comes to me will never be hungry, and whoever believes in me will never be thirsty."[195] The opposition of light and darkness is highlighted in 8:12: "I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness but will have the light of life."[196] In John 8:24 sin and not dying in sin are set in opposition, albeit implicitly: "I told you that you would die in your sins, for you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he." Regarding life and death, 11:25–26 puts these in stark opposition: "I am the resurrection and the life. Those who believe in me, even though they die, will live, and everyone who lives and believes in me will never die."[197]

---

[192] Several interpreters have observed the concept of the "two ways" in the FG and note correspondences to Deut 11:26–28; 30:15–20; Matt 7:13–27; *Didache* (1–10). See Paul N. Anderson (*The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6* [Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997], Chap 9, "The Exhortation of the 'Two Ways' (An Exegesis of John 6:25–66)"; Thomas L. Brodie, *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 200; Thompson, *John*, 224; Keener, *John*, 2:874.

[193] Frey, *Eschatologie III*, 284. Frey's analysis could be expanded by adding a connection to 3:14, since 3:15 is syntactically joined to it by its beginning ἵνα.

[194] Nearly all the following passages concern interpretive issues. We will attempt to highlight a few of these in the process of examining them, but the precise resolution of these is not ultimately determinative for this study, which has its aim to investigate the rhetorical force of the oppositions.

One of the most sophisticated and artful uses of antitheses in the PM occurs in John 10:1–13. Ruben Zimmermann argues that the two antitheses in 10:1–5 form the chiastic pattern a-b-b'-a'. The passage begins and ends with an "antithesis in strict parallelism."[198] The first antithesis ("a-b") occurs in 10:1b–2, where the first member (a) is introduced as the thief/robber who does not enter through the gate,[199] and who is compared to the second member (b), the true shepherd who uses the gate. This antithesis functions to identity the legitimate owner of the sheep.[200] The second antithesis ("b'-a'") occurs in 10:3–5, where the first member (b') introduced is the positive figure "τούτῳ" (whose antecedent is the shepherd of the sheep, 10:2b) and is compared to the second member (a'), the "stranger," whom the sheep will not follow. The emphasis lies in the middle part (b-b').[201] Thus, in this "contrastive framework" the two positive middle statements function to highlight the positive reciprocal relationship between the shepherd and his sheep that is distinguished from the negative relationship that the sheep have with the "stranger."[202]

---

[195] A similar opposition is presented in John 7:37–39. It begins with "Let anyone who is thirsty come to me." This passage contains several well-known interpretive issues for which the major commentaries propose solutions. One of the main questions is the referent of κοιλία (7:38): is it Jesus or the believer? While commentators debate the issue, ultimately, the purpose of the water is to assuage the thirst of the one who "comes" to Jesus.

[196] See also John 12:46.

[197] See John 6:50: Jesus is "the bread that comes down from heaven, so that one may eat of it and not die."

[198] Ruben Zimmermann, *Christologie der Bilder im Johannesevangelium. Die Christopoetik des vierten Evangeliums unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Joh 10*. WUNT 171 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 259.

[199] Brown, *John*, 1:385, suggests that "gate" rather than "door" is the more appropriate translation for θύρα, where in the context the enclosure is surrounded by a stone wall.

[200] Virtually all interpreters see the notion of legitimacy or authorization associated with the image of the gate. See, e.g., Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 2:289; Carson, *John*, 381; Gail R. O'Day, *The Gospel of John*, NIB 9 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 667; Udo Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, 5th ed. ThHNT 4 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2016), 230.

John 10:11–13 contain a second antithesis.[203] This antithesis consists of the contrast between the good shepherd and the hireling. The latter is characterized as one who (1) is not the shepherd (10:12), (2) does not own the sheep (10:12), (3) does not care for the sheep (10:13), and thus (4) abandons the sheep and flees when the wolf comes (10:12). By contrast, the former is characterized as the *καλός*[204] shepherd, who is the owner of the sheep, and cares for the sheep to the extent that he *ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων* (10:11). The function of the antitheses in John 10:1–13 is to emphasize that Jesus is the preferred way to life because he is the best provider for the sheep.

A final set of antitheses occurs in John 6:49–50 and 6:58. Both contain an antithesis that contrasts the manna in the wilderness with the bread that "comes" (v. 50)/"came" (v. 58) down from heaven. The manna from the wilderness did not prevent their "ancestors" from dying. This is contrasted with and eclipsed by the bread from heaven, from which one may eat and not die (v. 50)/live forever (v. 58).[205] From a rhetorical perspective, these two antitheses represent advantages and disadvantages. Jesus offers himself as the bread of life, that is, the source of life that transcends the temporal manna in the wilderness that could not provide life beyond the grave.

One other aspect that deals with antitheses remains to be considered. The rhetorical handbooks point out that when proposing a course of action, one also needs to consider whether the proposed action “outweighs the disadvantage involved in the means we adopt to secure it” (Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.8.34 [Russell, LCL]). In the FG, the author is careful to include what might be considered disadvantages associated with the advocated course of action of believing in Jesus. A short survey of these disadvantages includes the loss of “glory from one another” (5:44) or “human glory” (12:43), and hatred from the world (15:18, 19; 17:14; cf. 7:7). Moreover, one must “hate one’s life” in this world in order to keep it for eternal life (12:25). But the author is convinced that the “gains” greatly outweigh the “losses,” especially when the “gains” are considered with respect to the disadvantages of perishing and judgment that are set in antithetical juxtaposition to these advantages.

---

[201] Zimmermann, *Christologie*, 259.

[202] Zimmermann, *Christologie*, 259.

[203] Zimmermann, *Christologie*, 263–65.

[204] Expositors have differed in their understanding of *καλός* in 10:11. English translations regularly render this as "good." For the discussion, see Zimmermann, *Christologie*, 264n69. Other possible translations are "noble" (Jerome H. Neyrey, "The 'Noble Shepherd' in John 10: Cultural and Rhetorical Background," *JBL* 120 [2001]: 267–91) or "ideal" (Barnabas Lindars, *The Gospel of John*, NCB [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972], 361). See Neyrey, "Noble," 267, for a survey of other translations.

[205] It is possible that these two antitheses (6:49–50 and 6:58) form an *inclusio*, as suggested by Carson (*John*, 299) and Ridderbos (*John*, 244), and the present text seems to show this feature. Some interpreters (e.g., Bultmann, *John*, 234) argue that 6:51c–58 was a later addition. For rebuttals, see Barrett (*Gospel*, 296); Anderson (*Christology*, 207); Moloney, *John*, 220.

In summary, we have investigated the rhetorical appeal to what is advantageous. We have seen the depth and breadth of the advantages or benefits of believing in Jesus. Moreover, these advantages have been set in opposition to their related disadvantages in order to bring into bold relief and thus highlight the fully beneficial nature of these advantages. Finally, we have seen that there is nonetheless a “cost” to believing in Jesus, but that the advantages still greatly outweigh these costs that are in fact minor and temporal.[206]

2.8.2 The Deliberative Appeal to Honor

In the previous section we examined the appeal to the advantageous, which was deemed the primary and the most frequent appeal in deliberative rhetoric, and we showed how this primary appeal has a significant presence in the PM. Nonetheless, at times the rhetorical tradition, both in the handbooks and in speeches, advocated subsidiary appeals, and one of these subsidiary appeals in deliberative rhetoric was the appeal to the honorable as a course of action to pursue.[207] We pointed out in the previous section that there are two components to the appeal to honor as explained in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and we examined the first component in that section. This section investigates the second component of the appeal to honor and its presence in the PM. This second component consists of the praiseworthy, which involves choosing actions that are deemed praiseworthy or honorable.[208]

---

[206] The advantages presented here would be fully available to readers of the Gospel who believe in Jesus. Whether this would have been the case for those who believed in Jesus during his earthly ministry is a matter of debate. It seems that some of these advantages would not have been available or fully available during the earthly ministry of Jesus. See Bennema, *Power*, 136n111 and 154. For example, Bennema notes that the Holy Spirit, the agent of new life, would not be available “fully” until after the cross (see, e.g., 7:37–39).

[207] In some treatises, the appeal to honor was deemed primary. Cf. Quint., *Inst.* 3.8.30; Cicero, *De or.* 2.82.334.

The important point for evaluating honorable actions is in whose opinion the action is deemed praiseworthy or honorable. One appropriate instance of this opinion would be "the opinion of qualified persons" (*Rhet. Her.* 3.4.7 [Caplan, LCL]). In the FG's narrative world, two primary perspectives on the evaluation of actions are presented: that of the religious authorities, such as the Pharisees, and that of the Father (and Jesus). We see examples of the religious authorities in the following: the Pharisees assert, "You are testifying on your own behalf; your testimony is not valid" (8:13), and, again, "This man is not from God, for he does not observe the sabbath" (9:16). We see examples of the Father's evaluation in these passages: "the Father who sent me has himself testified on my behalf" (5:37), and "I testify on my own behalf, and the Father who sent me testifies on my behalf" (8:18). From the FG's perspective, the only ones capable of rendering a correct evaluation are the Father and Jesus. With this observation, we can now investigate the appeals to honor in the PM of this second type.

In the PM we will see that there is clear evidence of this second type of appeal to the honorable.[209] This can be observed initially through *τιμή* and *ἀτιμάζω* and related lexemes. As background we can observe that the choices Jesus himself makes are honorable ones in the estimation of the Father. Jesus asserts that he honors (*τιμῶ*) the Father (8:49) and that he always does what pleases (*τὰ ἀρεστά*) him (8:29). We see again that the Father is the only person authorized to evaluate whether the Son truly acts in an honorable manner. With this background, we turn to the honor that people owe the Father and the Son, since they are the ones deemed authorized to evaluate whether a person's actions are honorable. The Father has given all judgment (*κρίσιν*) to Jesus (5:22) so that all might honor (*τιμῶσιν*) him in the same way that they honor

---

[208] Other rhetorical treatises and orations contain rhetorical appeals to honor in the sense of this second type. Quintilian (*Inst.* 3.8.26–32) presents this type of honor. Some ancient speeches contained this second type of appeal to honor. See Kennedy, "Focusing," 131. Sometimes courses of action could be advocated that were deemed honorable but which also could be considered disadvantageous. Thus, see *Inst.* 3.8.30 for the example of advising soldiers not to surrender in time of war. See also *Rhet.* 1.3.6.

[209] Scholars have observed an honor-shame (or, dishonor) motif in the FG. See David A. deSilva, *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999), 70–90; Andrew T. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000), 285–301; Keener, *John*, 2:885–86.

(τιμῶσιν) the Father (5:23). Unless they honor Jesus, the Father himself is in fact not honored. Although Jesus was due this honor (τιμήν) in his hometown, he did not receive it (4:44).[210] Further, although Jesus honors (τιμῶ) his Father, his interlocutors dishonor (ἀτιμάζετέ) him by seeking to kill him (8:40, 49).

One of the clearest descriptions of how Jesus is to be given honor is found in 12:26, where it is stated that a person will show honor to Jesus by following him, submitting to him, and serving him. This in turn will result in that person receiving honor from the Father. “Whoever serves [διακονῇ] me must follow [ἀκολουθείτω] me, and where I am, there will my servant be also. Whoever serves me, the Father will honor [τιμήσει]” (12:26). Thus, these honorable actions are bi-directional: first, people give honor *to* the Father/Jesus through serving him and following him, which entails the willingness to face hatred, suffering, and even death.[211] Second, in consequence, people receive a two-fold promise, which entails honor *from* the Father and being in the presence of Jesus and sharing in his glory (cf. 14:2–3).[212] The Gospel is concerned with both directions and they function in concert. From the perspective of the author, those in the narrative world and, by implication, the audience, must choose actions that demonstrate that they believe in, follow, and serve Jesus. As a result, they will be granted the honor of being with Jesus and sharing in his honor. It is in this sense that the second type of appeal to honor functions in the PM. It is an appeal to make a “radical choice”[213] to perform actions that result in bestowed honor, which is an appeal associated with deliberative rhetoric.

In addition to the above explicitly stated honor, honor of this second type may be present implicitly even when the lexeme is lacking. The following survey shows that this type of honor is present in the Gospel where the honor specific lexeme is lacking. The actions that bring honor to a person, and hence constitute an appeal to honor, commence in the Prologue. Those who receive and believe in Jesus have the privilege of being born into the Father's family (1:12–13). Normally, birth, or natural birth, is conceived as "ascribed" honor, but the Gospel shows a variation on this that links "achieved" honor, which, in this case, is acquired by believing in Jesus, with "ascribed" honor from one's birth.[214] This astonishing bestowal of honor is offered to all who choose to receive and believe in Jesus. Thus, one significant means of gaining honor is to believe in Jesus, which includes believing in the one who sent Jesus.[215] This results in not coming under judgment but passing out of death into life (5:24).[216] This "new birth" is reinforced in 3:3–8,[217] which is characterized as a birth from above (ἄνωθεν),[218] where flesh and Spirit are associated with completely different realms.[219] But still further types of honor accrue to believers in Jesus. They no longer have the dishonorable status of a slave but have been elevated to the honorable status of a υἱός who "remains in the οἰκία[220] forever" (8:32–36).[221] Similarly, they are no longer slaves, but friends of Jesus (15:15).[222] Further, they become Jesus' and the Father's authorized sent-representatives (13:20), and are endowed with the authority to forgive or retain sins (20:23).[223]

---

[210] The precise identification of Jesus’ hometown, although disputed, need not detain us here. Most interpreters hold that the Johannine view is that Jesus’ hometown is Judea. But see W. H. Salier, *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 56n32.

[211] As often noted. See, e.g., Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 2:385; Ridderbos, *John*, 433; Keener, *John*, 2:873.

[212] See Ridderbos, *John*, 433. Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, 2:385–86) aptly comments, “to be united with the heavenly Lord and see his glory (17:24), is the highest reward [probably both benefit and honor] for the disciple who has followed him to death.”

[213] Ridderbos, *John*, 434.

---

[214] For a description of the terms "ascribed" and "achieved" in the context of honor, see Jerome H. Neyrey, *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 85. Ascribed honor comes "passively and through no effort of their own" (such as one's natural birth), whereas achieved honor is something received, typically through some merited action.

[215] See, e.g., 6:29; 11:42; 12:44.

[216] Judgment would bring the ultimate dishonor to a person.

[217] See Acts 22:28 for an instance of this distinction.

[218] The meaning of ἄνωθεν in 3:3, though debated, probably has the sense of "from above," although many see a double entendre. See Ridderbos, *John*, 125–26; Keener, *John*, 1:538–39.

[219] See deSilva, *Hope of Glory*, 84–85.

[220] For a discussion of the referent of οἰκία, see Stephen Motyer, *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and "the Jews,"* Paternoster Biblical and Theological Studies (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997), 177–78; Dennis, *Jesus' Death*, 128–29. The term is ambiguous and may include a double reference to both the Temple and Israel.

[221] Most commentators recognize that Jesus' Jewish interlocutors would not have based their notion of freedom on political but on spiritual grounds: descendancy from Abraham was considered a mark of blessing (Gen 12:2–3; 22:17–18), or freedom through study of Torah. See, e.g., Brown, *John*, 1:363; Motyer, *Father*, 173–74. The passage may have allusions to the two sons of Abraham (Gen 21). Jesus is here concerned with freedom from sin. Early Christian tradition mentions the heirs (υἱοί) of the kingdom being cast out (Matt 8:11–12). See also Gal 4:30. For contacts with secular ideas, see Keener, *John*, 1:751.

[222] Although there were several types of friendship associations in the ancient world, Keener (*John*, 2:1014) suggests that the FG's concept of friendship in 15:15 is likely based on such features as loyalty, intimacy, and sharing, where the obedience of the disciples is based on covenant loyalty. This usage may also echo that of Exod 33:11, where Moses, as the friend of God, received revelation from God (see further, Keener, *John*, 2:1013). It is noteworthy that Abraham, similarly called the friend of God (2 Chr 20:7; Isa 41:8), also received revelation from God (Gen 18:17–33).

[223] See deSilva, *Hope of Glory*, 85.

Additional instances of appeals to honor are present in the PM, but this survey is designed to demonstrate that the author of the FG offers the audience the opportunity to give honor to Jesus and the Father through such actions as following and serving, and to receive the honor of being in the presence of Jesus and sharing in his glory. Additionally, by believing in the Son they receive the astonishing privilege of becoming an honored member of God's family with the status of being a child of God and a friend of Jesus. The discovery that this appeal to honor is present in the PM adds to our demonstration that the PM has features of the rhetorical genre of deliberative rhetoric.

2.8.3 Future Courses of Action to Perform

This section investigates another feature of deliberative rhetoric, which concerns actions to be taken in the future. The appeal regarding future actions is another feature that distinguishes deliberative rhetoric from judicial rhetoric that relates to the past and epideictic rhetoric that relates to the present.[224] Deliberative rhetoric invariably involves either advocating a future course of action or dissuading from a disadvantageous course. We will see that both advocating for and dissuading against a future course of action for both the audience in the narrative and the audience of the Gospel is abundantly present. In the case of the FG, the course of action to be taken is not simply one action but several actions. Chris Seglenieks has shown that the FG presents a complex and yet coherent concept of belief that consists of five main components that are required for an ideal response to Jesus: "genuine belief requires cognitive, relational, ethical, ongoing and public aspects."[225] This complex response begins with believing in Jesus, that he is the Christ, the Son of God, which is the aim of the Gospel (20:31). Although believing is the primary response,[226] this action must be accompanied with other actions that are intrinsic to it. Moreover, some actions are to be avoided (dissuasion), such as accepting glory from one another and not seeking the glory that comes from the one who alone is God (see 5:44; cf. 12:43), which hinders believing. In addition to believing, numerous verbs of action are enjoined that constitute this complex response. These actions include "come" (1:39; 4:29; 6:35, 65),[227] "follow" (1:43; 8:12), "enter" (3:5), "do what is true" and "come to the light" (3:21), "ask" (4:10), "drink" (4:14; 6:53; 7:37), "be sent to reap a harvest" (4:38; cf. 20:21), "eat" (6:53), "not judge by appearances, but judge with right judgment" (7:24),[228] "remain in Jesus' word" (8:31; cf. 5:38), "not withdraw" from following Jesus (6:66), "die and bear much fruit" (12:24), "hate one's ψυχὴν in this world" (12:25), "walk while one has the light" (12:35), "confess Jesus" (1:20; 9:22 [cf. the former blind man's response in 9:25–33]; 12:42), "put away the sword" (18:11; cf. 18:36),[229] and "forgive/retain sin" (20:23).[230]

---

[224] See Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 1.3.4. At times epideictic rhetoric involved future actions that pertained mostly to virtuous actions. See Menander Rhetor 2.10.13; Dionysius of Halicarnassus [*Rhet.*] 6.4. It is noteworthy, however, that Menander Rhetor is careful to observe the distinction between deliberative and epideictic rhetoric, commenting that the "talk" (*lalia*) genre falls under both rhetorical branches (2.3.1).

[225] Seglenieks (*Johannine Belief*, 105). Seglenieks (26) distinguishes between what he calls "acceptable belief" and "genuine belief." The former is the proper response of characters during the ministry of Jesus as evaluated by Jesus since each episode progressively reveals the understanding of Jesus and his mission, and the full character of his being and mission could not be fully comprehended until after his death, resurrection, and the reception of the Spirit (cf. 12:16; 14:26; 16:33; 20:9). The latter "genuine belief" represents an ideal response that is required of the readership and consists of a complex response entailing all five components.

---

[226] The noun πίστις is lacking from the FG. The lexeme πιστεύω occurs 98 times in the Gospel. Seglenieks (*Johannine Belief*, 6) points out that studying an individual lexeme does not allow one to describe adequately the full-orbed response embodied in Jesus' invitation.

[227] There must be a willingness to come to Jesus. Thus, belief in the FG entails a moral dimension, and unbelief is in part a moral problem. Owing to an unwillingness to come to Jesus, people do not "see the true significance of that which he does" (C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1963], 297). See also James M. Boice, *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), 99; Colin G. Kruse, *John*, rev. ed., TNTC (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2017), 211. People avoid the light for fear that their evil deeds will be exposed (3:20).

[228] It may indeed be the case that "judge with right judgment" (7:24) must occur either before or simultaneously with the initial act of believing, and thus may constitute part of the initial response to Jesus. This seems to be the issue in the Gospel's narrative world. See Severino Pancaro, *The Law in the Fourth Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 166–68, for a treatment of 7:24. "To judge with right judgment" is to accept that Jesus is from God in the Johannine sense (*Law*, 167). Barrett (*Gospel*, 321) writes that the Jews need to believe and thus enter "into the true meaning of [Jesus'] mission." Ridderbos (*John*, 266) holds that the Evangelist intends 7:24 as "general warning and exhortation" to all who would presume to judge Jesus. We might therefore postulate an "initial belief-response complex" that consists, in part, of "judging with right judgment" (7:24), seeking only the approval of "the one who alone is God" (5:44), welcoming Jesus (1:12), and believing in Jesus (3:16). See also Loren L. Johns and Douglas B. Miller, "The Signs as Witnesses in the Fourth Gospel: Reexamining the Evidence," *CBQ* (1994): 534–35.

[229] See Eben Scheffler, "Jesus' Non-Violence at His Arrest: The Synoptic and John's Gospel Compared," *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 17 (2006): 315.

[230] This "forgiveness" perhaps entails granting freedom from sin and elevating a person's status to that of sonship. See Keener, *John*, 1:752. The action would pertain not solely to the original disciples, but to later generations of believers, and thus is directed at the audience of the Gospel, perhaps in ministry to non-believers. See Keener, *John*, 2:1206–7. This action may thus represent an extension of Jesus' actions in John 9. See Carson, *John*, 656.

These are all actions that a person making a proper response to Jesus is expected to perform and therefore can be regarded as future actions. They require choosing the course of action and continuing in it. It is widely recognized that an encounter with Jesus calls for a decision, a response, and this response carries immediate results that affect one's destiny.[231] Responding positively to an encounter with Jesus "leads to eternal life/salvation, whereas rejection leads to judgment and death."[232]

These responsive actions cohere precisely with the appeals of deliberative rhetoric that call for advocating a future course of action that is advantageous and shunning a future action that is disadvantageous. Moreover, we have shown in the section above on the honorable in deliberative rhetoric that the advocated choices and actions are also honorable actions that would bring honor both to God and to the believer. The aspects and actions of an ideal response are deepened and expanded in the FD. For example, in the FD the relational, ethical, ongoing and public aspects find particular elaboration.[233] The following chapter will provide a systematic treatment of the FD regarding these aspects of an ideal response.

2.8.4 Summary

This section has shown that a strong element of deliberative rhetoric is present in the PM. The Gospel advocates embracing the advantage/benefit of life or eternal life, as contained in the purpose statement (20:31). Moreover, it contrasts this advantage with significant disadvantages, seeking to persuade the readers to choose one of two ways: embracing one and avoiding the other. The Gospel simultaneously seeks to persuade the audience to embrace actions that bring honor to God and honor to oneself in the eyes of God. The FG advocates a response consisting of many actions that together constitute several aspects of a genuine belief-response to Jesus.

---

[231] Antony Billington, "The Paraclete and Mission in the Fourth Gospel," in *Mission and Meaning: Essays Presented to Peter Cotterell*, edited by Antony Billington, Tony Lane, and Max Turner (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995), 98; Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 129. Bauckham (*Gospel of Glory*, 127), following Rudolf Bultmann (*Theology of the New Testament*, translated by Kendrick Grobel [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951, 1955], 2:21), calls this a "dualism of decision." See also Leander E. Keck, "Derivation as Destiny: 'Of-Ness' in Johannine Christology, Anthropology, and Soteriology," in *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black (Louisville: WJKP, 1996), 284. In terms of deliberative rhetoric, it can be understood as a deliberative rhetorical appeal to choose what is advantageous. Although the FG contains a strong predestinarian element, Carson has shown that the FG maintains the two poles of divine sovereignty and human responsibility in tension. He insists that this tension remains, and reductionistic attempts to deal with the data selectively do not in fact solve the tension. See D. A. Carson, *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility* (London: Marshall Pickering, 1994), chapter 12, and 220–22. In Schnackenburg's thinking, the mystery of God's choice cannot be used "as an excuse for not making an effort to believe…. the Johannine Jesus insists on [a person's] responsible decision to believe" (Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 2:52. See also 2:259–65), remarking further that John contains a "dualism of choice" (2:190). But see Frey ("Dualism," 149).

[232] Bennema, *Power*, 120–21.

[233] For example, in the FD we encounter one prominent feature of the ethical aspect, namely, the "love" commands (esp. 13:34–35; 14:15; 15:12). It should be noted that the public aspect of an ideal response finds a "foreshadow" in John 1 with the witness of John the Baptist and the early disciples. See Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*, 36.

To a large extent, the deliberative rhetorical features in the PM examined here have dealt with the advantages of passing out of death/darkness into life/light and the like. This suggests that the addressed persons are initially in a state of unbelief and that the FG has an evangelistic thrust. However, certain deliberative rhetorical features suggest that a dual audience is in view: one group that encompasses unbelievers and another group that includes those who are already followers of Jesus. The shepherd discourse in John 10, for example, may address both groups, where the antitheses concern Jesus' sheep who follow his voice and not that of a stranger. The text in John 10 seems to function as a deliberative rhetoric of both persuasion and dissuasion, advising for following a beneficial course of action and against following a course of action that would be harmful (Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 1.3.5). It is clearly the case that the PM addresses some who are believers (primarily the disciples) in Jesus. A deliberative rhetoric of dissuasion is focused on these believers. This rhetoric of dissuasion emerges prominently in at least two passages: 6:60–71 and 8:31–36. In John 6, after the desertion of some of Jesus' disciples, Jesus questions the twelve regarding whether they too wish to depart. Peter asserts his allegiance to Jesus: "Lord, to whom can we go? You have the words of eternal life" (6:68), and confesses that he is "the Holy One of God" (6:69). In the second passage, Jesus clarifies that only those who continue (*μένω*) in his word are his true disciples (8:31). The need for a belief that entails an ongoing commitment to Jesus is well known and often discussed.[234]

Another aspect of the deliberative rhetoric of dissuasion occurs in passages where people are unwilling to confess Jesus because they value ("loved": *ἠγάπησαν*) human approval above God's approval (12:43).[235] The Evangelist is attempting to dissuade the readers from following the example of those who seek such human approval. In seeking human approval, they lose the opportunity of the benefit (advantage) of God's approval, something the Evangelist considers crucially important (12:26).

---

[234] See Bultmann, *John*, 434; Thompson, "Life," 41–42, 46–47; Derek Tovey, *Narrative Art and Act in the Fourth Gospel*, JSNTSup 151 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 102–3; Bennema, *Power*, 108, 140, 154; Keener, *John*, 2:1216; Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*, 75.

In terms of its deliberative rhetoric, the PM, then, seems to have a dual purpose of offering evangelistic appeals to unbelievers and a discipleship-related purpose of encouraging an unwavering ongoing commitment and open confession to Jesus. The other two rhetorical genres, epideictic and judicial, may also function in the Gospel, and we turn next to an examination of the first of these, the epideictic rhetorical genre.

2.9 The Fourth Gospel as Epideictic Rhetoric

This section provides evidence that the epideictic rhetorical genre is functioning in the FG in addition to the deliberative genre.[236] Epideictic or encomiastic rhetoric is the rhetoric of praise and blame.[237] This section is not intended to provide an exhaustive analysis of epideictic rhetoric in the FG. Rather, it simply draws upon the work of several scholars who have analyzed the FG in terms of epideictic rhetoric in order to show that this rhetorical genre is present in the FG. We will survey several modern interpreters whose works are all within the twenty-first century. First, Jerome Neyrey, in his commentary on the Gospel of John, provides an interpretation of the Gospel against the backdrop of epideictic (encomiastic) rhetoric. He introduces and explains the various *topoi* or commonplaces typically associated with praise that made up features of encomiastic rhetoric.[238] These *topoi* include such aspects of a person's life as origins, nurture and training, display of physical attributes and virtues, and death and posthumous honors.[239] He then proceeds to interpret the FG using these features to inform his discussion. One specific example should suffice for our purposes. Neyrey examines the passage in 10:11–18 according to these *topoi* to show how Jesus exemplifies the "noble shepherd" who lays down his life (as a "noble death") for his sheep. Jesus displays the virtue of courage when compared to the hireling (10:11–13). Jesus exemplifies the virtue of justice "in his piety toward and fair dealing toward the disciples/sheep."[240] The qualities of the virtuous "noble shepherd" first articulated in 10:11–18 find their demonstration in chapters 18–20. Neyrey shows that Jesus voluntarily accepts his death (18:4; cf. 10:15); Jesus' arrest and death benefit his followers (18:9); he remains unvanquished, continuing to utter commands even while arrested (18:7); and displays virtuous courage and faithfulness in "drink[ing] the cup that the Father has given" him (18:11).[241] Neyrey observes, "The symmetry between John 10 and John 18 reinforces our acknowledgement of Jesus as the Noble Shepherd."[242] Finally, Jesus voluntarily lays down his life for the benefit of the sheep (10:15), but the resurrection scene confirms that he also has the authority (ἐξουσίαν) to take up his life again (chapter 20; cf. 5:26; 10:17–18), thus showing the posthumous honors accorded him. This suggests that the FG exhibits features and topics associated with epideictic rhetoric.[243]

---

[235] See Francis J. Moloney, *Love in the Gospel of John: An Exegetical, Theological, and Literary Study* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013), 52.

[236] Unlike the discussion of deliberative rhetoric above, since this section consists mainly of a survey of previous studies, we will not attempt to provide two separate treatments, one for Jesus' public ministry here and one for the FD in the next chapter.

[237] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.3.3; [*Rhet. Alex.*] 3; 35; *Rhet. Her.* 3.6.10; *De or.* 1.31.141; *Inst.* 3.7. Epideictic rhetoric consisted of two sub-types: praise, often called encomium, and blame, often referred to as invective. See Pernot, *Rhetoric*, 175, 220. Johannine scholars often use the term "encomium" under the assumption that the Gospel is oriented toward praise (as opposed to blame).

[238] For a description of the concept of *topos*, see Pernot, *Epideictic*, 29–30. He explains that *topoi* were a general method for the orator to use in constructing a praise discourse. The various *topoi* were "rubrics and vantage points in the light of which the orator examines his subject" (*Epideictic*, 30).

Alicia Myers's investigation of epideictic rhetoric in the FG includes analyzing the character of Jesus through the lens of several ancient rhetorical techniques used for analyzing characters. Taking one example from her investigation, she analyzes the FG's

---

[239] Neyrey, *John*, see esp. 19. For noble death and posthumous honors, see his discussion on John 10 and the "noble shepherd" (180–84).

[240] Neyrey, *John*, 182.

[241] Neyrey, *John*, 290.

[242] Neyrey, *John*, 296.

[243] Jörg Frey, while agreeing that there is an element of "noble "death" in the FG, nevertheless argues that this designation does not adequately account for the full significance of Jesus' death in the FG. He points to three principal deficiencies with this concept ("Death," 180–81), to which we can add a fourth. First, Jesus' death takes place as the eschatological fulfilment of previous OT scripture. Second, the benefit of Jesus' death for others in the FG has been significantly deepened and expanded to encompass a death that has a vicarious element that brings about salvation (Frey, "Death," 186). Third, Jesus' death is situated in a context in which he has the authority to lay down and take up his life again (10:18), and, indeed, has life in himself (5:26). Fourth, we can extend this by pointing out that, though not often noted, the efficacy of Jesus' death includes the concept of removing God's wrath for believers even if it "remains" for the disobedient (3:36). (The lexeme ἱλασμός is of course absent from the FG, though it appears in 1 John 2:2; 4:10). Jesus is in this way "categorically distinguished from all other people" (Frey, "Death," 181).

Prologue in terms of common *topoi* similar to Neyrey above: origins (1:1–2), including his physical origins (1:14); upbringing (1:18 – in the κόλπος of the Father); deeds (creation [1:3], just to take one); and *synkrisis* (comparison). Regarding the last *topos* (comparison), Myers explains how the Prologue compares Jesus with two individuals: John and Moses. The former, John, is inferior to Jesus in that he [John] is not the light (1:8) and has a lesser rank than Jesus who was actually before him (1:15). Jesus is superior to the latter, Moses, in that whereas Moses was never able to see God, Jesus is in τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς (1:18), and thus fully able to make God known.[244] She concludes, "The appearance of these *topoi* points to the Fourth Gospel's genre being that of an encomiastic *bios*."[245]

Finally, Lindsey Trozzo investigates ethics in the FG by considering encomiastic topics in the FG. Like Myers, she also draws primarily on the *progymnasmata*. Trozzo, while observing that the FG is not a formal encomium *per se* because it is not arranged according to virtues,[246] nevertheless proceeds to analyze the text of the FG through the lens of encomiastic rhetoric using the associated standard topics: (1) origin (1:1–2); (2) nurture and training (cf. 1:18; 3:31–35; 7:16–18; 8:26–28; 12:47–50); (3) pursuits, deeds, and other external goods; (4) death; and (5) events after death.[247] She explains how the FG shows that Jesus embodies a number of encomiastic topics. These topics underscore Jesus' exalted status and unity with the Father.[248]

The above interpreters have demonstrated that encomiastic features are present in the FG. So far, we have shown that the FG contains both deliberative and epideictic features. There is one additional rhetorical genre, judicial rhetoric. In the next section we investigate whether this rhetorical genre is present in the Gospel. If we find that this genre is also present, we have strong evidence that the FG, especially the PM, is a highly rhetorical discourse in terms of rhetorical genre.

---

[244] See Myers, *Characterizing*, 61–71.

[245] Myers, *Characterizing*, 70 [emphasis original]. See also 46.

[246] See Trozzo, *Exploring*, 63.

[247] See Trozzo, *Exploring*, 60–80.

[248] See Trozzo, *Exploring*, 80.

2.10 The Fourth Gospel as Judicial Rhetoric

This section provides evidence that the judicial rhetorical genre is functioning in the FG in addition to the deliberative and epideictic genres.[249] That the FG exhibits judicial rhetoric in terms of a (cosmic) trial is the prevailing consensus of modern scholarship.[250] Several studies suggest that the background for this motif can be found in the רִיב controversies in Isa 40–55.[251] Other studies have addressed various lawsuit-related motifs in terms of the entire Gospel, select episodes, or more restricted passages.[252] The charges debated in the "trial" throughout the FG have been examined by Pancaro. He suggests that there are four charges brought against Jesus: (1) he is a "sinner" in that he violated the Sabbath (5:1–18; 9:16, 24); (2) "he is a blasphemer" (5:17–18; 8:58; 10:24–38); (3) "he is a false teacher who leads the people astray" (7:14–18; 9:24–34; 18:19–24); and (4) "he is an enemy of the Jewish nation" (11:47–53).[253]

Allison Trites's programmatic study that investigates the judicial character and lawsuit functions of the FG can be considered the initial representative for our purposes. He demonstrates the general judicial character of the Gospel,[254] which is essentially concerned with proving the case of Jesus' messiahship and divine sonship. He articulates the specific features of the lawsuit motif in the PM of Jesus, including the types of witnesses and the evidence adduced.[255] Trites summarizes: "In chapters one to twelve John uses forensic language to describe a cosmic lawsuit between God and the world."[256] He explains the nature of the post-resurrection lawsuit as identified in chapters 13–17 in terms of the double witness of the Paraclete and the apostles, pointing out that the witness of the original disciples does not cease with their death, but is continued through future disciples.[257] Finally, he treats the lawsuit of the Last Day.[258]

---

[249] Similar to the discussion of epideictic rhetoric in the previous section, since this section consists mainly of a survey of previous studies, we will not attempt to provide two separate treatments, one for Jesus' public ministry and one for the FD in the next chapter.

[250] See esp. Pancaro, *Law*, 7; Lincoln, *Truth*, 4; Gary M. Burge, *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 37–38, 140–41, 204–5; Bennema, *Power*, 234; Keener, *John*, 1:392–93. For the sense in which the trial is "cosmic," see Lincoln, *Truth*, 255–62.

[251] See Allison A. Trites, *The New Testament Concept of Witness*, SNTSMS 31 (Cambridge: CUP, 1977), chapter 5; Lincoln, *Truth*, 38–51. Lincoln (*Truth*, 51–54) notes other OT scriptural links, including exodus motifs.

[252] The following is a sampling of the studies that focus on judicial aspects of the FG. Attridge, "Argumentation," 188–99; Burge, *Community*, 204–11; Harvey, *Trial*; J. C. Hindley, "Witness in the Fourth Gospel," *SJT* 18 (1965): 319–37; Köstenberger, *Theology*, 436–54; Lincoln, *Truth*; Alicia D. Myers, "'Jesus Said to Them…': The Adaptation of Juridical Rhetoric in John 5:19–47," *JBL* 132 (2013): 415–30; Jerome H. Neyrey, "Jesus the Judge: Forensic Process in John 8:21–59," *Bib* 68 (1987): 509–42; Pancaro, *Law*; George L. Parsenios, *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif*, WUNT 258 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010); Sheppard, "John"; Trites, *Witness*; Rodney A. Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology*, SBLDS 67 (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982).

[253] Pancaro, *Law*, 7. See 9–125 for his treatment of these charges. In the second part of his work (*Law*, 126–288), Pancaro examines how the FG shows that the Law actually "speaks in [Jesus'] favor."

[254] Trites, *Witness*, 79–90

[255] Trites, *Witness*, 90–113.

As pertinent as Trites's analysis is, it can be supplemented, especially in regard to the function of the Prologue, since Trites's treatment of the Prologue focuses solely on the person of John the Baptist.[259] Lincoln points out that the Prologue provides important introductory information to aid the readers, such as the theme of witness, the cosmic setting of the trial, and the Evangelist's perspective on several key participants, including the incarnate *Logos*, the world, the status of those who accept the testimony, John the Baptist, and "the μονογενὴς θεός who is in the bosom of the Father."[260] But while it is true that the Prologue introduces key themes and characters, we will argue in chapter 6 that these themes can be better construed as propositions that are demonstrated in the following narrative.

The precise details of the trial motif and judicial rhetoric do not need to detain us here. We are simply interested in showing that a form of judicial rhetoric functions in the FG. Thus, in this section we have pointed to a number of studies and some of their salient features to show that a type of judicial rhetoric and a trial motif are present in the FG. As Harvey points out, however, this trial motif is only one strand amid a complex texture that has other concerns.[261] Further, as Lincoln aptly notes, it would be misleading to conclude that the rhetoric is judicial. This is because judicial rhetoric normally calls upon a jury to make a decision about a matter in the past.[262] Thus, calling the FG a judicial rhetorical discourse requires qualification. The narrative is an attempt to persuade the audience "on the present significance of Jesus and the verdict of life he had made available."[263] The epideictic rhetoric discussed above and the judicial rhetoric presented here both serve the deliberative ends also discussed above. The narrative is designed to persuade the audience to choose to embrace the author's point of view on the past in order to obtain the life offered and avoid the consequences of not accepting it.[264] Thus, although the judicial proceedings are narrated on a historical plane as witnesses successively appear in the episodes, the audience is required to "adjudge the case for themselves and assess the validity of the Evangelist's verdict (20:31)."[265]

---

[256] Trites, *Witness*, 112.

[257] Trites, *Witness*, 113–22.

[258] Trites, *Witness*, 123–24. In Keener's estimation, Trites's "conclusions are sound" (*John*, 1:392n282).

[259] Trites, *Witness*, 90–92.

[260] Lincoln, *Truth*, 14, 20, 22. Accepting the NA28 reading.

[261] Harvey, *Trial*, 123.

[262] Lincoln, *Truth*, 142.

[263] Lincoln, *Truth*, 143.

Several interpreters have provided analyses of either individual sections of the FG or the entire Gospel that explicitly apply classical rhetorical theory. We will consider two. First, Mark Stibbe offers a rhetorical analysis of 8:12–59 and demonstrates that it is suffused with judicial rhetoric.[266] He shows that all three elements of classical rhetorical arguments are present: (1) *ēthos*, or the speaker's (i.e., Jesus') character, as evident from Jesus' dependence on God (8:28), his obedience to God (8:29, 49, 55), his origin from God (8:14, 21), and his likeness to God (8:58);[267] (2) *pathos*,[268] the emotional response to the speaker; and (3) *logos*, the logical argumentation presented. In terms of *logos*, the Evangelist uses topics associated with judicial rhetoric to buttress his case: laws (8:14–18) and witnesses (8:18, 56), which are representative of "non-technical" arguments.[269] Finally, he employs examples from the OT scriptures (Abraham, 8:33–58) and everyday life (8:35).

Second, Beth Sheppard's thesis on the Gospel of John explores the entire Gospel from the perspective of classical rhetorical judicial rhetoric. She approaches the FG using the arrangement of the Latin rhetoricians, while informing her study using various artificial and inartificial proofs.[270] For example, she shows how in Jesus' PM four basic types of proofs are present: inartificial proof in the form of witnesses[271] and scripture (as ancient authoritative documents),[272] and three types of artificial proofs in the form of scripture (within logical arguments),[273] examples,[274] signs.[275] Both Stibbe's and Sheppard's studies show that judicial rhetoric is present in the Gospel.

---

[264] Rightly, Lincoln, *Truth*, 143.

[265] Burge, *Community*, 205.

[266] Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John*, Readings: A New Biblical Commentary (Sheffield: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 99–102. Additionally, Keener (*John*, 1:1:747, 752–63) notes the judicial/forensic rhetorical character of John 8, and several specific forensic features in 8:37–51.

[267] Note that the proof relating to *ēthos* has affinities with the epideictic genre.

[268] See the various responses to Jesus' words, such as indignation (8:53) and violence (8:59). See Stibbe, *John*, 101–2. It is noteworthy that Aristotle includes indignation (*Rhet*. 2.9) as one of the emotions he discusses in the *Rhetoric*.

[269] See just below for a definition of the term "non-technical."

[270] Sheppard, "John." Aristotle introduces the terms ἄτεχνοι (often translated inartificial, nonartistic, extrinsic, or non-technical) and ἔντεχνοι (artificial, artistic, intrinsic, or technical) in his presentation of the two main categories of "proofs" (πίστις) (*On Rhetoric*, 1.2.2). The former (ἄτεχνοι) are those types of proofs that are not invented and as such are already in existence, such as witnesses and legal contracts, while the latter (ἔντεχνοι) are ones that the speaker develops (εὑρίσκω: "invents" or discovers) using the principles of rhetoric. See also Odiam, "Rhetoric," 33–35.

In summary, this section has demonstrated that the FG is highly rhetorical in terms of judicial rhetoric. The numerous studies offering treatments of the trial motif have shown that the basic features of this motif are clearly present. Moreover, the two studies noted above that have explicitly applied features of classical judicial rhetoric to the FG confirm that a form of judicial rhetoric functions in the FG. But it does not seem that judicial rhetoric alone can account for the rhetoric strategies in the FG. On the surface, it might seem that the rhetorical strategy of the FG falls into the judicial category. However, Lincoln, who argues for an extensive presence of judicial rhetoric, suggests that it would be incorrect to conclude that the FG is this genre: "Such a conclusion would, however, be misleading, since judicial rhetoric aims at eliciting a judgment about a past state of affairs."[276]

2.11 Summary

The observations in this chapter are highly significant. We have seen that, according to theory and practice, rhetorical discourses can be complex in their use of rhetorical genres. A given discourse can exhibit features from all three of the classical rhetorical genres. One genre, however, will typically predominate. We have shown that the FG, especially the PM, exhibits all three rhetorical genres and that no one genre can account for all the rhetorical appeals present in the FG. For example, the epideictic and judicial rhetorical genres cannot sufficiently explain the appeals of the deliberative rhetoric without recourse to this genre. The same applies for the other genres. Although the judicial genre occupies an undeniably strategic place in the FG, it cannot explain the pervasive appeals of deliberative rhetoric in terms of (1) the advantageous appeal to life, which is the explicit purpose of the Gospel (20:31); (2) the appeal to honorable actions; and finally (3) the advocated choice of many future actions that constitute a complex genuine belief-response. Thus, the deliberative rhetoric seems to be the dominant genre. The epideictic and judicial genres function to support the deliberative genre. While the other two genres could borrow from the deliberative genre, the pervasive use of the appeals associated with deliberative suggests, again, that this is the dominant genre. This further suggests the dominant "end" or purpose of the FG. The audience is encouraged to embrace the advantages offered by the FG by believing in Jesus and choosing those actions that honor him and the Father, which constitute a genuine belief-response.

---

[271] Sheppard, "John," 79–111.

[272] Sheppard, "John," 111–13.

[273] Sheppard, "John," 113–18.

[274] Sheppard, "John," 118–20.

[275] Sheppard, "John," 120–26. She also analyzes John 13–21 in terms of judicial rhetoric. See 129–95.

[276] Lincoln, *Truth*, 142.

For the purposes of our study, the results of this chapter show that we have good reasons for viewing the FG, especially the PM, as a highly rhetorical text in terms of its rhetorical genres. In the next chapter we will explore more comprehensively the rhetorical genre of the FD itself. This will allow us to appreciate the rich rhetorical nature of the FD expressed through such deliberative rhetorical appeals as promised advantages and benefits. We will see, however, that these advantages are possible only to those who choose to perform honorable actions, imitate Jesus' own example, and preserve the unity among Jesus' followers.

Chapter 3. The Rhetorical Genre of the Farewell Discourse

3.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of the rhetorical genre of the FD. Although previous treatments of the FD's rhetorical genre have suggested other genres, such as epideictic, this chapter will argue that the FD functions primarily as a type of deliberative rhetoric according to classical rhetorical theory. The chapter proceeds as follows. First, we briefly introduce the general approach; second, we review several previous generic approaches to the FD; third, we present a methodology and its associated criteria for identifying deliberative rhetoric; and finally, we apply these criteria to the FD.

First, some preliminary remarks. The labeling of the FD as a single "farewell discourse" or multiple "farewell discourses" is not an issue that directly pertains to this chapter, and thus while the singular FD will be used, the discussion could equally speak in the plural.[277] Second, interpreters differ as to the extent of the text to be regarded as the FD. While the extent is viewed by some as covering 13:31–16:33, others consider that it includes all of chapters 13 and 17 as well, and can thus be conceived as a "farewell scene."[278] Fernando Segovia points out that several important motifs are introduced in 13:1–30.[279] In addition, a number of important rhetorically oriented themes first emerge in chapter 13,[280] and thus we suggest that including chapters 13 and 17 provides important features that relate to the rhetorical function of chapters 13–17. However, the elimination of chapters 13 and 17 would not greatly affect our conclusions.

---

[277] Some hold that there are multiple "discourses" (with an additional final prayer), but for the purposes of this study, chapters 13–17 will be considered an integrated unit, called a farewell scene or farewell discourse. Similarly, Keener, *John*, 2:895, in keeping with the trend of understanding the final form of the Gospel as a whole, prefers to "speak of 'discourse' in the singular," and more recently Thompson, *John*, 296n33. See George L. Parsenios, *Departure and Consolation: The Johannine Farewell Discourses in Light of Greco Roman Literature*, NovTSup 117 (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 4. For another argument for viewing one farewell discourse, see Klaus Scholtissek, "Abschied und neue Gegenwart: Exegetische und theologische Reflexionen zur johanneischen Abschiedsrede 13,31–17,26," *ETL* 75 (1999): 348–49.

[278] Fernando F. Segovia, *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991), 2–5, 20. He considers 13:31–17:26 to be the "farewell speech proper." Similarly, Brown (*John*, 2:545) considers 13:31–17:26 to be the "Last Discourse." Collins observes that the theme of love encompasses the entire discourse from beginning (13:1) to end (17:26). See Collins, "New Commandment," 242.

[279] Segovia, *Farewell*, 21–24. He discusses four principal motifs.

[280] John 13 introduces certain advantages and provides Jesus' own footwashing example and the cleansing it provides without which they have "no share" with him (13:8), and it introduces some

3.2 General Approach

Among the numerous treatments of the FD, George Kennedy,[281] Francois Tolmie,[282] Jongseon Kwon,[283] Fernando Segovia,[284] John Stube,[285] and George Parsenios[286] have all offered treatments of the FD that relate to our discussion. Some focus explicitly on classical rhetorical aspects. One of the primary deficiencies of most treatments is the lack of any mention of the sending motif in the FD. This is important, since Behan McCullagh, in his book, *Justifying Historical Descriptions*, states that one of the conditions for a hypothesis to be considered true is that "the hypothesis must be of *greater explanatory scope* than any other incompatible hypothesis about the same subject; that is, it must imply a greater variety of observation statements."[287] Other treatments of the FD could be considered, but these seem to represent studies that are closely related to the present one in that they seek to determine the FD's setting or function, especially from a rhetorical perspective.

3.3 The Farewell Discourse as a Literary Genre

An immense body of literature has been written on the FD in general, and particularly regarding its literary genre, aside from any consideration of its rhetorical genre. The scholarly consensus seems to be that its genre is a type of farewell speech,[288] although several other genres have been suggested as distinct from or blended into a farewell-

---

important themes for the ensuing discourse proper. One such theme is Jesus' love "to the end" (13:1). See also Michael J. Gorman, *Abide and Go: Missional Theosis in the Gospel of John*, The Didsbury Lectures 2016 (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2018), 76n12.

[281] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 73–85.

[282] D. F. Tolmie, *Jesus' Farewell to the Disciples: John 13:1–17:26 in Narratological Perspective* (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

[283] Jongseon Kwon, "A Rhetorical Analysis of the Johannine Farewell Discourse" (PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993).

[284] Segovia, *Farewell*.

[285] Stube, *Rhetorical Reading*.

[286] Parsenios, *Departure*.

[287] C. Behan McCullagh, *Justifying Historical Descriptions* (Cambridge: CUP, 1984), 17 [emphasis added].

[288] See most modern commentaries, such as Brown, *John*, 2:600–1.

type scene, ranging from testament,[289] covenant,[290] commission,[291] consolation,[292] symposium,[293] and most recently a "mission discourse."[294] One can thus see a general recognition that John 13–17 eludes any one genre as a "perfect fit" for employment in its analysis. Harold Attridge asserts that the FD indeed represents "the greatest complexity for formal analysis."[295] Attridge uses the term "genre-bending" to describe how a text such as the FD can, for example, exhibit generic affinities to farewell or testament forms, but deviate from them in significant ways. He suggests that elements of several genres are operating in the FD, such as dramatic and testament features.[296]

The discussion here will use several aspects of yet another literary genre, classical rhetoric, to highlight specific features that emerge from the text. It is important to emphasize that we are not arguing that the FD is a deliberative speech *per se*. To this extent, the approach here is analogous to that of Parsenios's. He states that his study stands midpoint between those studies that claim that the FG is a Greek drama and those who speak of the FG as "dramatic" (thus, speaking adjectivally): "While it is clearly a mistake to read John as a thoroughgoing Greek tragedy, the Gospel is dramatic in more than an adjectival sense."[297] Applying this to the present study, the FD is not a rhetorical deliberative speech, but it is more than “rhetorical.” Thus, our claim is rather modest: we suggest only that a rhetorical analysis of the text can identify questions and provide answers that other approaches are simply not designed to answer.

---

[289] See Francis J. Moloney, *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13–17* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 4–7. He holds that it is a "farewell type scene," stating his agreement with Segovia, *Farewell*, 1–24. For a helpful discussion of the terms "testament" and "farewell speech" and their often different understandings and uses by Johannine interpreters, see Parsenios, *Departure*, 3nn6–7.

[290] Yves Simoens, *La Gloire d'Aimer: Structures Stylistiques et Interprétatives dans le Discours de la Cène (Jn 13–17)*, AnBib 90 (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1981); Rekha M. Chennattu, *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship*, foreword by Francis J. Moloney (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006), see esp. her chap 3; John W. Pryor, *John: Evangelist of the Covenant People. The Narrative & Themes of the Fourth Gospel* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1992). Chennattu (*Discipleship*, 66–68) argues that Simoens unnecessarily excludes a farewell or testament-type scene from consideration.

[291] Cf. John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 341, 418–53, who combines the testament and commission forms.

[292] The best representative is Parsenios, *Departure*.

[293] See Parsenios, *Departure*, 6n17, for representatives.

[294] Gorman, *Abide*, 82, esp. 76–83. On the other hand, Ruben Zimmermann ("Metaphoric Networks as Hermeneutic Keys in the Gospel of John: Using the Example of Missionary Imagery," in *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, and Interpretation*, edited by Gilbert van Belle, Michael Labahn, and P. Maritz [Leuven: Peeters, 2009], 387) denies that the FG contains a "mission discourse." In a strict sense, Zimmermann is probably correct. On the other hand, Gorman's point is simply that the main purpose of the FD is to prepare Jesus' followers for participation in God's mission.

[295] Harold W. Attridge, "Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel," *JBL* 121 (2002), 17. See Kasper Bro Larsen, "Introduction: The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic," in *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic*, edited by Kasper Bro Larsen. SANt 3 (Göttingen: Ruprecht, 2015), 14 and 14nn13–17 for several genre applications to the FD.

[296] Harold W. Attridge, "The Gospel of John: Genre Matters?" in *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic*, edited by Kasper Bro Larsen. SANt 3 (Göttingen: Ruprecht, 2015), 37.

[297] Parsenios, *Departure*, 18.

3.4 Previous Rhetorical Studies Dealing with the Farewell Discourse

Numerous studies have attempted to analyze the FD to determine its form and function. Several recent works have helpfully addressed the issue of consolation in the FD.[298] However, according to Segovia, a view restricted to consolation, though helpful, is too general and leaves too much unsaid.[299] Others have also doubted that the primary function is consolation. Billington aptly points out that “the need of consolation for sorrow would surely quickly vanish after the resurrection (cf. John 16:22).”[300] Moloney notes, “Jesus’ love for his own is not for their comfort and encouragement. It inevitably leads to mission, matching the mission of Jesus … to make God known.”[301]

This section will provide an analysis of previous treatments of the FD from a classical rhetorical perspective. It will remain brief, interacting primarily with rhetorical features. Several interpreters have provided rhetorical analyses of the FD that are based on classical rhetoric and its associated genres. The first to appear since interpreters began analyzing biblical texts rhetorically in the recent period is that of George Kennedy.[302] He considers the FD as an instance of epideictic rhetoric, with the text as a type of consolation discourse. We mentioned above that regarding the discourse as a type of consolation is too general and leaves too much unsaid. Curiously, in his discussion of chapter 13, Kennedy omits any treatment of Jesus’ example of footwashing. In addition, he tends to downplay the verbal actions to be performed and their associated benefits, as well as the “sending” motif, which we will examine below.[303]

---

[298] For example, Parsenios, *Departure*; and Paul A. Holloway, “Left Behind: Jesus’ Consolation of His Disciples in John 13,31–17,26,” *ZNW* 96 (2005): 1–34.

[299] Segovia, *Farewell*, 47. See also Stube, *Rhetorical Reading*, 20.

[300] Billington, “Paraclete,” 93.

[301] Moloney, *Glory*, 121.

[302] Again, Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 73–85.

[303] Alan Odiam’s treatment of the FD (“Rhetoric,” 136–63) as epideictic rhetoric is restricted to John 17. We will suggest below that chapter 17 also contains features associated with deliberative rhetoric.

Jongseon Kwon also interprets the FD as a form of epideictic rhetoric.[304] Kwon's study provides a very useful theoretical discussion of classical rhetoric, especially as it might be applied to NT texts. The primary deficiencies lie in what is missed regarding several features or appeals that pertain to deliberative rhetoric, and some key textual features in their own right. Concerning Jesus' "new commandment" in 13:34–35, Kwon seems to redirect any outward focus back to the community: "The mutual love is decisive in maintaining the identity of the discipleship of the community and in experiencing the love of Jesus in his absence."[305] He omits reference to the overwhelming benefits and the "sending" motif. His study contains the same deficiency noted above that focuses on consolation.[306]

Although Fernando Segovia's project is not primarily focused on utilizing classical rhetoric to analyze the FD, he nonetheless offers a rhetorical analysis at the end of his work in the section, "The Strategic Flow of the Farewell Discourse."[307] There he restricts his comments regarding the rhetorical nature of the text to footnotes.[308] Segovia seems to be the first to see in the discourse an element of deliberative rhetoric present. He attempts to identify the rhetorical genre at the level of the four units he identifies within 13:31–16:33, seeing a type of ABBA pattern of epideictic (A), deliberative (B), deliberative (B), and epideictic (A). He does not think that the discourse should be classified as epideictic. Rather, its overarching concern is to persuade the audience to take some future action, based on self-interest and future benefits.[309] Although he refrains from explicitly classifying it as deliberative rhetoric, these two features are specifically connected with deliberative rhetoric. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that he intended his classification to be labeled deliberative.

John Carlson Stube offers a rhetorical analysis of the FD that includes chapters 13–17. Stube provides a brief analysis and helpful critique of Segovia[310] and Kwon.[311] One of the major strengths of his proposal is that he sees a strong emphasis on mission, which other treatments tend to downplay.[312] Stube argues for viewing both epideictic and deliberative rhetoric in the FD, but views epideictic as primary.[313] It seems that Stube has misread Segovia in this respect when he states, “F. Segovia … sees both epideictic and deliberative rhetoric in Jn 13.31–16.33 with epideictic predominating.”[314] He appears to overlook Segovia’s closing footnote discussed above.[315]

---

[304] Kwon, "Rhetorical Analysis," 91. He utilizes Kennedy's methodology.

[305] Kwon, "Rhetorical Analysis," 132.

[306] See Stube (*Rhetorical Reading*, 26) for further analysis of Kwon.

[307] Segovia, *Farewell*, 291–99. Segovia's treatment generally covers 13:31–16:33.

[308] Segovia, *Farewell*, 291–99nn5–9.

[309] Segovia, *Farewell*, 299n9.

[310] Stube, *Rhetorical Reading*, 19–21.

[311] Stube, *Rhetorical Reading*, 26–27.

3.5 Methodology for a Deliberative Rhetorical Analysis

The same methodology employed in chapter 2 for determining the rhetorical genre will be used here. In that chapter we pointed out that scholars suggest that the different rhetorical genres contained specific *sets of appeals*. Chapter 2 defined the appeals and other features associated with the deliberative rhetorical genre and applied these to the FG in general. This chapter will in like manner examine the FD using the deliberative rhetorical appeals and strategies to determine how well the FD conforms to these features. We plan to show that, although the other two rhetorical genres are also present, the dominant genre in the FD seems to be the deliberative rhetorical genre.

To rehearse our findings from chapter 2, Mitchell, in her study on deliberative rhetoric in 1 Corinthians, identified four principal features in classical rhetoric that characterize deliberative rhetorical discourse. These are (1) a focus on deliberating about a particular course of action in the future; (2) the use of a specific set of appeals; (3) appropriate subjects for deliberation, such as factionalism and unity; and (4) the use of examples.[316]

It is important to point out that other appeals were used at times in conjunction with, or in place of, the appeal to advantage. We will investigate the appeals to the honorable and the possible. Both appeals are included in the list of appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric that span the period of our inquiry.[317] Regarding the theme of the “possible,” Cicero stated that it was of the greatest importance to discuss what was possible (*De or.* 2.82.336).[318] An action that was deemed possible was to be chosen over an action deemed impossible. Concerning the third feature of deliberative rhetoric, appropriate subjects for deliberation, such as factionalism and unity, again, both the handbooks and speeches recognize the importance of this feature. The rhetorical treatise *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* states that unity (or harmony) is one element associated with what is advantageous in deliberative rhetoric ([*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.21; 2.21).[319] Demosthenes counseled unity in his *First Olynthiac*, *Second Olynthiac*, and *On Political Harmony* speeches.[320]

---

[312] Stube, *Rhetorical Reading*, 5–25; 211–34.
[313] Stube, *Rhetorical Reading*, 215.
[314] Stube, *Rhetorical Reading*, 71.
[315] See again, Segovia, *Farewell*, 299n9.
[316] Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 23–64.
[317] See [*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.4; Pseudo-Aelius Aristide, *Arts Rhétoriques*, 1.151.

Regarding the fourth feature of deliberative rhetoric, the use of examples, Aristotle wrote that the use of examples is the primary proof in deliberative rhetoric, stating, "paradigms [i.e., 'examples'] are best in deliberative speeches; for we judge future things by predicting them from past ones" (*On Rhetoric*, 1.9.40 [Kennedy]). Quintilian points out that for deliberative discourses "almost everyone rightly agrees that the use of examples is particularly appropriate to this kind of speech" (*Inst*. 3.8.66 [Russell, LCL]).[321] Other rhetorical handbooks that suggest the use of examples with deliberative rhetoric include *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (32), *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (3.5.9), and Cicero's *De Oratore* (2.82.335–336). The last is significant because it upholds the use of moral examples, stating, "one who urges us on the path of moral worth will collect examples of our ancestors' achievements that were glorious even though involving danger, and will magnify the value of an undying memory with posterity and maintain that glory engenders advantage and moral worth is invariably linked with it" (*De or.* 2.82.335–336 [Rackham, LCL]). In her study, Mitchell examines deliberative speeches and letters, showing that moral example is often found in these discourses.[322] Often ancient authors included both positive and negative examples for imitation.[323] Examples can be used in types of discourse other than deliberative rhetoric, but when the function of the example is to guide future action (recalling the first feature discussed by Mitchell above), then the use suggests an instance of deliberative rhetoric.

---

[318] The ancient Greek orations of Demosthenes called the *Philippics* and *Olynthiacs* are the fullest expressions of the "possible" in deliberative rhetoric. See Stephen Usher, "Symbouleutic Oratory," in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 230.

[319] The dissertations by Mitchell and Odd Magne Bakke (*"Concord and Peace": A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition*, WUNT 2/143 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001]), and the article by W. C. van Unnik ("Studies on the So-Called First Epistle of Clement: The Literary Genre," in *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*, edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and Laurence L. Welborn, translated by L. L. Welborn [Leiden: Brill, 2004], 115–81) all treat the topic of unity in the context of a discourse of deliberative rhetoric and have shown how this topic was relevant to the deliberative argument.

[320] See *1 Olynth.* 7, 10*; 2 Olynth* 9, 14, 15, 29, and *Ep.* 1 (*On Political Harmony).*

[321] See also Quintilian, *Inst*. 3.8.36.

[322] Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 40–46.

With this introduction, we turn now to an analysis of the FD looking at these criteria and features.

3.6 Rhetorical Analysis of the Farewell Discourse

3.6.1 Future Courses of Action to Perform

The first feature of deliberative rhetoric concerns actions to be taken in the future. This feature is abundantly present in the FD. In this case, the course of action to be taken is not only one action but in fact several, all with the focus of loving Jesus and keeping his commands.

Michael Gorman emphasizes that the demands in the FD involve actions to do. Regarding 13:15 and Jesus' example of footwashing, Gorman finds in the context explicit statements about obligation, imitation, and "concrete action," with the promise of divine blessing, but also "implicit language of obedience and servant activity. The verse is about *doing*."[324] There are activities to "do": 13:15 ("do as I have done to you"), 13:17 ("you are blessed if you do them"); 14:12 ("do the works that I do and, … do greater works"), 15:5 ("apart from me you can do nothing"), and 15:14 ("You are my friends if you do what I command you").

There are, however, more "actions" for Jesus' followers to do in the FD. Other verbs of action, some with a mission connotation, include "abide/remain" (μένω) (11x in ch. 15); "lay down one's life" (τίθημι) (15:13); "go" (ὑπάγω) (15:16);[325] "bear fruit"

---

[323] Keener, *John*, 2:924.

[324] Gorman, *Abide*, 88–89 [emphasis original]. He catalogues many of the verses in this section that contain the verb ποιέω.

[325] A number of interpreters see a missions connotation in this verb. See Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel's Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 185, who cites, among others, Barrett, *Gospel*, 478; and Brown, *John*, 2:683, and refutes the view of some who regard "go and bear fruit" as a Semitic pleonasm.

(καρπός φέρω) (15:16);[326] "ask" (αἰτέω) (often "in my name") (14:13, 14; 15:7, 16; 16:23, 24) or (ἐρωτάω) (16:23); "love" (ἀγαπάω) (13:34; 14:15, 21, 23, 28 [contrary to fact]); "be sent" (πέμπω) (13:16, 20; cf. 20:21) or (ἀποστέλλω) (17:18);[327] "be one" (ἓν ὦσιν) (17:11, 21, 22);[328] "wash feet" (νίπτω) (13:14);[329] "testify" (μαρτυρέω) (15:27); "allow themselves to be consecrated or dedicated" (ἁγιάζω) (17:17);[330] "believe" (πιστεύω) (14:1 [2x], 10, 11, 29); "know" (γινώσκω) (chs. 14, 17); "not be troubled" (ταράσσω) (14:1); and "take courage" (θαρσέω) (16:33).

All these activities (some transitive, some intransitive, some active, and some passive) emphasize the deliberative rhetorical actions that the FD is calling Jesus' followers to participate in. Moreover, all these commands and activities require a choice to be made. Judas betrayed Jesus, showing his wrong choice.[331] Peter denied Jesus, showing his bad choice and thus the need for restoration and recommissioning that included specific tasks: love, and a choice to "follow" Jesus and commit to feeding Jesus' sheep (21:15–22).[332] Taken together, then, these verbs emphasize the many tasks that Jesus' followers are to perform. It should be borne in mind that there are consequences related to the wrong choice, which possibly find their most vivid expression in 15:6: “Whoever does not abide in me is thrown away like a branch and withers; such branches are gathered, thrown into the fire, and burned.” Since deliberative rhetoric similarly advises (and exhorts) for or against (i.e., dissuades) actions to be taken, it seems plausible to view a form of deliberative rhetoric functioning in the FD.

---

[326] The precise meaning of "bear fruit" is disputed. This is probably owing to the fact that the meaning is not explicitly stated. Most see either love or the life of Jesus reproduced in the lives of the disciples, cf. Thompson, *John*, 325 and n118; and Moloney, *John*, 420–21. Marinus de Jonge (*Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God*, translated by J. E. Steely. [Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977], 179) sees continuation of Jesus' works in believers. Others see a missions focus, perhaps even converts, cf. again, Thompson, *John*, 325n118; Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 258. Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, 3:112) notes that the concept is deliberately kept very open, and may involve a missionary aspect, but holds that the dominant thought is the fruitfulness in the Christian life, especially demonstrated through love. More recently, Gorman (*Abide*, 99–106, esp. 99n104) has provided a helpful analysis. "I see converts more as the fruit of the fruit—(part of) the result of continuing the works of Jesus."

[327] According to Zimmermann ("Networks," 390), almost all the mission statements are expressed through verbs. Most see no difference in meaning between the two verbs for "send." See Zimmermann, "Networks," 390, esp. n27 for an excellent review of the options. See also below sec. 5.2.2.1 ("Jesus' Deity and Preexistence").

[328] For this discussion the intricacies of this concept do not need to be explained fully. What is important to note is that the purpose of this "oneness" is so that the world may believe that the Father has sent Jesus (17:21).

[329] Note the active voice: wash another person's feet.

[330] See Thompson, *John*, 354n182 for a succinct discussion, emphasizing the focus on sanctification for mission. For the same interpretation of "sanctification for mission," see Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, 3:185–88); and Brown (*John*, 2:762, 765), where he notes the coherence with the OT understanding of consecration; cf. Exod 28:41. See also John 10:36.

[331] Judas, of course, did not stay for the full discourse. But he heard the command to follow Jesus' example, and yet chose to leave (and later betray Jesus).

[332] Moloney, *Glory*, 186. This is one of several indications that chapters 13–17 are best not considered in isolation from the rest of the Gospel. Among other indications are the activities of Judas and Peter.

Of all the three types of rhetoric, deliberative rhetoric has as its primary focus the future (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.4). Throughout the FD Jesus speaks about the benefits they will receive and the opposition that they will encounter, and actions that they will need to perform in order to receive these benefits.[333] All the actions discussed above are essentially commands that relate to the future. Even the “requests” that Jesus makes to the Father in John 17 are in essence actions that Jesus’ followers themselves will need to either perform or submit to.

3.6.2 The “End”/“Goal” of the Advantageous

The one appeal unique to deliberative rhetoric is the end or purpose of the discourse being that which is advantageous (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.6). All of the benefits that the FD offers are benefits that are advantageous to the audience. The benefits are mostly contained in chapter 14, but others emerge in chapters 13 and 15–17. Among these advantages or benefits are: inclusion as one of his own (13:8), being with Jesus in his Father’s house (14:2–3), seeing Jesus (14:19; 16:16; partially fulfilled in chapter 20), receiving the Spirit/Paraclete (14:16–17; 16:7–15), receiving the Father and Jesus’ love (14:21, 23, 15:9; 16:27), having the Father and Jesus make their home with them (14:23), receiving peace (14:27; 16:33), obtaining joy (15:11; 16:22, 24; 17:13), bearing fruit (15:1–8), answered prayer (14:13–14; 15:7; 16:23–24), doing greater works than Jesus (14:12), receiving Jesus’ glory (17:22), and being with Jesus and seeing his glory (17:24).

All of these are benefits, or, advantages, of believing in Jesus and loving and keeping his commands, and remaining in him. The emphasis in the FD on the many advantages, which is the goal of deliberative rhetoric, suggests that the FD is a type of deliberative rhetoric. We turn next to the appeal to honor.

---

[333] Brown, *John*, 2:600; Ashton, *Understanding*, 449.

3.6.3 The Appeal to Honor

According to the classical rhetorical handbooks, one of the principal goals of deliberative rhetoric, in addition to the primary goal of "the advantageous," was to recommend a course of action that was honorable. Aristotle stated that a deliberative discourse could advise a course of action that was honorable (praiseworthy) or advise against a dishonorable one (*On Rhetoric*, 1.9.35–36). Quintilian even advocated that "the honorable" was the main goal of a deliberative discourse (*Inst.* 3.8.1). Another treatise suggested that the goal of deliberative rhetoric was to advocate a course of action that embodied both honor and security (*Rhet. Her.* 3.2.3–3.3.8). It must be recognized that the concept of what was considered honorable could and did differ across cultures and time.[334]

The biblical tradition itself discusses honor that is attributed to individuals. A short survey shows this. We see, for example, that honor will be ascribed to those who honor God (1 Sam 2:30). Moreover, God will honor, rescue, be with those in a time of trouble, and show his salvation to those who love him, know his name and call on him (Ps 91:14–16). The book of Proverbs states that honor and strife are incompatible (20:3). We saw in chapter 2 that in the FG, Jesus says that those who want to honor (τιμάω) the Father must also honor (τιμάω) the Son (5:23). According to 12:26, the Father will honor (τιμάω) those who "serve" (διακονέω) Jesus. Actions that comprise "serving" Jesus include acts such as loving him and obeying what he commands (washing feet: 13:14; believing in him: 14:1, 11; loving him and obeying his commands: 14:21, 23; not becoming afraid: 14:1, 27; remaining in him and his love: 15:4, 9–10; loving one another: 13:34; 15:12; being courageous: 16:33), and asking "in his name" so that the Father may be glorified (14:13–14; 15:16; 16:23–24; cf. 15:7).

The following will use the treatise *Rhetorica ad Herennium* as a heuristic lens to investigate the appeal to the honorable in the FD by analyzing the four virtues associated with what is honorable. The four virtues were originally Greek virtues that in time became Roman virtues. However, it is important to realize that the four virtues were also mentioned in some Jewish literature.[335] Moreover, David deSilva has shown that these virtues were present in such NT literature as the letter to the Hebrews.[336] In fact, it seems that these four moral virtues were commonplace in the culture world of the FG. Furthermore, Cornelis Bennema has shown that these four virtues indeed can be found throughout the FG even though the FG does not explicitly mention the virtues by name.[337] According to *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, "The Honorable is divided into the Right and the Praiseworthy.… Subheads under the Right are Wisdom, Justice, Courage, and Temperance" (*Rhet. Her*. 3.2.3 [Caplan, LCL]). We discuss wisdom, justice, courage, and temperance in turn in the following.

---

[334] See David A. deSilva, "The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Honor, Shame, and the Maintenance of the Values of a Minority Culture," *CBQ* 58 (1996): 434 and the literature referenced therein.

Consider first the virtue of wisdom. Wisdom in part consists of "compar[ing] advantages and disadvantages, counselling the pursuit of the one and the avoidance of the other … [or urging] a course in a field in which we have a technical knowledge of the ways and means" (*Rhet. Her*. 3.3.4 [Caplan, LCL]). With respect to the FD, we see frequent comparison of advantages and disadvantages. To take just two examples, first, in 14:17, 19 the Spirit is something the disciples will have that, by contrast, the world cannot have or see. Second, in 15:1–8 the contrast is between the one who remains in Jesus and thus bears fruit, and the one who does not (15:6). In terms of knowledge of ways and means, Jesus states he knows the way and means to the Father: it is through himself (14:6).

Consider next justice. Justice consists of several aspects, such as honoring alliances and friendships, observing duty toward parents, gods, and the homeland, and honoring ties of clientage and kinship (*Rhet. Her*. 3.3.4). In the FD, the obligation to Jesus is the foremost duty. Disciples must believe in Jesus just as they believe in the Father (14:1), they must love and obey him (14:15, 21, 23), and they must remain in his love by keeping his commandments (15:9–10). They are to love one another as Jesus has loved them (15:12), even to the extent of laying down their lives for their friends (15:13).

---

[335] See 4 Macc 1:18–19 and Wis 8:7. See also Cornelis Bennema, "Virtue Ethics in the Gospel of John: The Johannine Characters as Moral Agents," in *Rediscovering John: Essays on the Fourth Gospel in Honour of Frédéric Manns*, edited by L. Daniel Chrupcala, SBFA 80 (Milan: Edizioni Terra Santa, 2013), 167.

[336] David A. deSilva, "Investigating Honor Discourse Guidelines from Classical Rhetoricians," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1997 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1997), esp. 493–98; deSilva, *Perseverance*, 49–51.

[337] His essay is devoted to exploring these virtues in the FG. See Bennema, "Virtue Ethics."

Consider next courage. Courage consists of showing that “from an honourable act no peril or toil, however great, should divert us; death ought to be preferred over disgrace.… It behooves us to brave any peril and endure any toil” (*Rhet. Her.* 3.3.5 [Caplan, LCL]). The FD contains several admonitions to act honorably in the face of difficulties and hostilities. As mentioned above, showing one’s love for one another even to the extent of laying down one’s life is to characterize Jesus’ disciples. Moreover, in their witness to the world, they are called to endure hardship and hatred from the world (15:18–27). Thus, Bennema observes that “Jesus forewarns his disciples about imminent persecution and even possible death (15:18–16:4a) in order that they may not stumble.”[338] The summons to courage is found preeminently in the exhortation: “I have said this to you, so that in me you may have peace. In the world you face persecution. But take courage; I have conquered the world!” (16:33).

Turning lastly to the virtue of temperance, temperance consists of “[censuring] the inordinate desire for office, money, or the like; … show[ing] how much is enough, [advising] against going too far” (*Rhet. Her.* 3.3.5 [Caplan, LCL]). One possible instance of temperance in the FD may occur in 15:20 where Jesus tells his disciples that they should not desire or expect better treatment than their master. Bennema, in his treatment of temperance, summarizes: “The disciples are exhorted … to exhibit humble, sacrificial service to one another in imitation of Jesus (13:15; cf. 15:13), … and to witness to Jesus in a hostile world, which may demand their lives (15:18–16:4a).”[339]

This section has shown that the appeal to the honorable is present in the FD in ways that correspond to appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric, and thus contributes to our understanding of the FD as an instance of deliberative rhetoric. We now turn to the appeal to the possible.

3.6.4 The Appeal to the Possible

With respect to the appeal to the possible, the FD presents a contrast between the followers of Jesus and the world. This contrast is expressed through abilities or lack thereof. This is seen predominantly, though not exclusively, in the opposition of the world to the disciples. In John 14 the term "world" occurs six times (14:17, 19, 22, 27, 30, and 31). The first four are interspersed within statements of promised benefits to Jesus' followers, and function to provide contrasts or oppositions to the promises. The first contrast states that it is not possible [οὐ δύναται] (14:17a) for the world *to receive* the coming Spirit-Paraclete (14:17b), because it does not *see* him or *know* (or acknowledge) him.[340] The second and third contrasts concern the fact that the world will no longer *see* Jesus (14:19a; 14:22). The resurrection appearances and beyond are reserved for Jesus' followers.[341] The fourth contrast has a somewhat different focus in terms of the source of the benefit. Here the contrast consists in the world not being able to *give* peace (14:27) to the disciples.[342] The first three contrasts, then, are cases where the world is unable to receive the promised benefits, while the fourth states that the world cannot give the promise (of peace).

---

[338] Bennema, “Virtue Ethics,” 173.

[339] Bennema, “Virtue Ethics,” 174.

Segovia discusses these under four subunits and suggests that these promises are "systematically and radically denied" to the world, and the "cumulative effect" of these contrasts is to show an "ever-widening gulf between the disciples and the world."[343] Somewhat differently from Segovia, I suggest, rather, that the benefits or advantages offered in the first three subunits ("receive" the Spirit, "see" Jesus, "see" the manifestation of Jesus, and be "loved" by Jesus and the Father) are benefits that people in the world *cannot receive* and enjoy. Thus, were the disciples to remain in the world, they would forfeit these benefits. This seems to be the thrust of these three subunits. But the fourth subunit reveals that the world in turn *cannot provide* the disciples with the sort of peace benefit that only Jesus can give. Thus, I suggest that chapter 14 functions, one the one hand, to announce benefits that are possible for the disciples to receive based on loving Jesus and keeping his commands, and on the other hand, to draw attention to the fact that the world, through its lack of obedience, cannot enjoy these benefits. Moreover, the world cannot provide these benefits.

---

[340] See Thompson (*John*, 313): "The world has not understood who or what the Spirit is."

[341] Ridderbos, *John*, 505. It is likely that the Spirit (Paraclete) will mediate the presence of Jesus and the Father to the believer after Jesus' resurrection (see Keener, *John*, 2:973–74; Brown, *John*, 2:645; Burge, *Community*, 138–39; Bennema, *Power*, 222).

[342] Schnackenburg is probably right when he suggests, "The negative formulation of the present text, which is reminiscent of the contrasts in vv. 17, 19, and 22, is probably intended to deny that the world *can* give peace." Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 3:85 [emphasis added].

[343] Segovia, *Farewell*, 108.

John 15 also presents the appeal to the possible, again in contrasting terms. Jesus asserts that he is the true vine and maintains that to bear fruit one must remain in him. Stating the impossible, he says, "the branch cannot bear fruit by itself" (15:4). Then contrasting the possible with the impossible, he says, "Those who abide in me and I in them bear much fruit, because apart from me you can do nothing." (15:5).

Thus, the FD presents courses of action that are possible, but only through following and remaining or abiding in him. Next, we turn to the appeal to unity.

3.6.5 The Appeal to Unity

We observed above that factionalism and unity is also a theme associated with deliberative rhetoric. In the FD the same topic of unity occurs in 17:11 and 21–23 where the disciples are called to "be one."[344] What is especially significant in the latter passage (17:21–23) is that the call for unity among the disciples and all future disciples occurs within a passage that has the rhetorical objective of persuading the world to believe and know that the Father sent Jesus (17:21, 23) and that he loved them (17:23), that is, within a deliberative rhetorical type of persuasion.[345]

Ben Witherington offers an intriguing suggestion that the footwashing in John 13 may have a thematic parallel in the Lukan account of the Last Supper where a dispute arose among the disciples regarding who was the greatest (22:24–27). The call for unity ("oneness") and sacrificial service in the FD may have the similar function of encouraging unity and harmony. Witherington points out that a similar situation seems to have been present in 1 Cor 11–14. Notably, he, Mitchell, and others view 1 Corinthians as a letter of deliberative rhetoric written in part to correct the problem of factionalism. This would provide possible support for seeing an existing issue of division that the rhetoric in the FD is seeking to answer.[346] In any case, the text explicitly states that one of the rhetorical purposes of the disciples' unity[347] is to persuade the world to "believe" (17:21) and "know" (17:23) that the Father has sent Jesus. Thus, the benefit of unity is related to furthering Jesus' mission.

---

[344] See Brown, *John*, 2:599.

[345] We pointed out above that Demosthenes often counseled unity in his speeches. For unity versus strife in the biblical wisdom tradition, see Ps 133; and Prov 6:14, 19; 16:28; 17:1, 14, among others.

[346] Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 394.

Since the FD has an emphasis on inculcating unity among believers, this adds further confirmation that deliberative rhetoric is functioning in the FD. Thus, we can say that from the additional perspective of the appeal to unity, the FD appears to exhibit a type of deliberative rhetoric. We now turn to the use of examples.

3.6.6 The Use of Examples

The final feature of deliberative rhetoric to discuss is the use of examples. There are a number of examples that the FD provides that believers are expected to imitate.[348] These begin with 13:14–15, where Jesus gives the disciples his own ὑπόδειγμα ("example") to follow after washing their feet.[349] Next, in 13:34–35 Jesus gives a "new commandment"[350] that they should love one another just as he has loved them.[351] Next, Jesus recalls his prior words and deeds in 14:10–11, and then in 14:12 he provides the astonishing promise that the one who believes in him will do his works, and even greater works.[352] Next, 15:4 seems to contain a possible, "tentative" example for imitation where Jesus exhorts them to remain in him just as branches remain in a vine in order to be fruitful.[353] In 15:10 Jesus provides his own example of keeping the Father's commandments so that he can remain in his love as the pattern for the disciples. They can similarly remain in Jesus' love if they keep his commandments. In 15:12 Jesus commands the disciples to love one another according to the pattern by which he has loved them.[354]

---

[347] This unity or "oneness" probably includes both a relational and an ontological dimension. See Cornelis Bennema, *Mimesis in the Johannine Literature: A Study in Johannine Ethics*, LNTS 498 (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 124.

[348] This section utilizes results from Bennema's study on mimesis. Note that for the most part the injunction to imitate an action is not introduced by a lexeme that denotes either imitation or example (such as ὑπόδειγμα). Nevertheless, as Bennema rightly argues, although the lexemes are not present, the concept of mimesis or imitation is still present. See Bennema, *Mimesis*, section 2.2.

[349] They are to "do (footwashing/love/die) for one another" as Jesus does for them. See R. Alan. Culpepper, "The Johannine *Hypodeigma*: A Reading of John 13:1–38," *Semeia* 53 (1991): 144. See Bennema, *Mimesis*, 91–105, for his argument that the example consists of a "creative articulation" of the footwashing, rather than, or perhaps in addition to, literal footwashing.

[350] The newness here is probably the new ground and standard that Jesus provides in laying down his life for others. See Keener, *John*, 2:924. See also Bennema, *Mimesis*, 108–12, esp. 110, for various proposals for understanding the newness of the command. Most see a Christological or eschatological basis.

[351] We have stated here that the love command is an example that the author holds out for imitation. However, the phrase "as I have loved you" is multidimensional, and, as Collins ("New Commandment," 253) suggests, probably includes "the model, the reason, the ground, and the mediator of the disciples' love for one another."

[352] See Köstenberger, *Missions*, 171–75, for a brief history of interpretation and summary of some recent options of 14;12. See also Brown, *John*, 2:633; Bultmann, *John*, 610; Carson, *John*, 495–96; de Jonge, *Jesus*, 178; and Schnackenburg (*Gospel*, 3:72), who emphasizes that the "greater works" are not external in content or missionary successes. These may be works that Jesus does "through believers on a larger, worldwide scale" (Bennema, *Mimesis*, 137). Gorman, following Thompson, also understands the "greater" to be "greater *in scope*, more expansive" (*Abide*, 100 [emphasis original]). Most suggest a

The next several instances of example and imitation in the FD consist of what Bennema calls "existential" types of imitation in which a person shares a particular state of being. These are found chiefly in chapter 17 and include the following. To "be one" (17:11, 22), "be not of the world" (17:14, 16), "be sent" (17:18), and "be in the Father and son" (17:21a).[355]

All these instances of examples to be imitated add to the argument that the FD is functioning as a deliberative discourse. Moloney rightly remarks, "Jesus' exhortation is not to moral performance but to imitation of his self-gift."[356]

3.7 Conclusion of the Rhetorical Analysis of the Farewell Discourse

In conclusion, we have seen several criteria and features in the FD that align closely with those associated with deliberative rhetoric. These include a focus on future actions, the appeals to unity and the possible, the use of examples, and perhaps most significantly, appeals to what is both advantageous and honorable. Thus, one of the functions of chapters 13–17 is a deliberative rhetorical one. If people—the disciples and readers—choose to perform the actions of loving and keeping Jesus' commandments (such as footwashing, loving, and dying for one another), they will

---

salvation-historical perspective, in which several factors give rise to the greater works: Jesus' death and exaltation, the gift of the Spirit, and prayer asked in Jesus' name. Understanding the precise meaning of this verse is not essential for our purposes.

[353] Bennema labels this a "tentative" example. Although a branch is obviously not a person, the activity attributed to the branches seems to suggest that they provide a valid example for the disciples to imitate. See Bennema, *Mimesis*, 51.

[354] "Jesus shows the example first and his disciples can then (and therefore) imitate him" (Bennema, *Mimesis*, 113).

[355] See Bennema, *Mimesis*, 125–30. Another potential additional instance is "to be where Jesus is" (17:24). See Bennema (*Mimesis*, 130–31).

[356] Moloney, *John*, 376. Anderson suggests that an example ought not to require an explanation, and that it perhaps could be followed by a maxim. See Anderson, *Theory*, 223. This is, in fact, what we have in John 13:16, a "proverb" or "generally recognized principle." Cf. Johannes Beutler, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, translated by Michael Tait (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 355; Ridderbos, *John*, 464.

obtain the advantages offered. But it is a choice that they must make, and one that has consequences (cf. 15:6; 16:1).

It is possible that a mixture of rhetorical genres is present in the FD, as several interpreters have argued. However, the purpose of this investigation has been simply to show that it functions, perhaps predominantly, as a type of deliberative rhetoric. The decision and choice needed to perform future actions, the various appeals to the honorable, unity and the possible, Jesus' own example, and especially the rhetorical "end" (or purpose) of the advantageous as seen in what Tolmie calls the "overwhelming benefits,"[357] all combine to strongly suggest this.

3.8 Public Ministry and Farewell Discourse Genre Comparison

This section points out some of the differences between the genre analysis in chapter 2 (PM) and chapter 3 (FD) (above). We saw in chapter 2 that Jesus' PM has two streams, one that is evangelistic in nature and a second that seeks to develop and deepen the theme of discipleship. Scholars have observed a two-part scheme in the FG where chapters 1–12 have an emphasis on belief and chapters 13–17 (and later chapters) have a focus on discipleship.[358] These observations are confirmed and reinforced by our study of the genre.

In chapter 2 we mentioned briefly that the PM shows evidence of seeking to reach two types of audience: those who are initially in a state of unbelief (an evangelistic stream), and those who have become believers (a discipleship stream). The former, evangelistic, stream of the PM is suggested by several features. We focus here on those features that relate to deliberative rhetoric, namely, the advantages and the future actions required to perform in order to receive these advantages. It is clear from our discussion in chapter 2 that significant choices are required of the audience. The advantages and choices are juxtaposed with disadvantages. Certain key terms that relate to these advantages and disadvantages in the PM occur only or mainly in the PM. It has been pointed out, for example, that the life/death and light/darkness antitheses figure predominantly, if not exclusively in the PM.[359] The lexeme ζωή ("life") is concentrated in chapters 1–12 and 20, and *ζάω* (“live”) occurs mainly in chapters 4–11 (though cf. 14:19). Both *θάνατος* (“death”) and *ἀποθνήσκω* (“die”) occur mostly in the PM (lacking in the FD). The lexeme *φῶς* (“light”) occurs twenty-three times in the FG, all in chapters 1–12. Similarly, *σκοτία* (“darkness”) occurs mainly in 1–12 (cf. 20:1). Moreover, most of the verbal actions presented in chapter 2 as future actions to perform in order to obtain certain advantages occur almost exclusively in the PM. These include: *πιστεύω* (“believe”),[360] *σῴζω* (“save”), *πεινάω* (“hunger”), *ἐσθίω* (“eat”), *διψάω* (“thirst”), *πίνω* (“drink”). These are almost always found in a context of an invitation to believe (3:16; 6:35; 7:37–39), to have eternal life (or the opposite of judgment and the like) (3:17, 4:14), and a transfer from death to life (5:24). *Κρίνω* occurs mainly in the PM. Finally, chapter 2 examined the notion of honoring the Father, and we saw that a binary choice exists here where unless one honors the Son, they do not in fact honor the Father (5:23).

---

[357] Tolmie, *Jesus' Farewell*, 229.

[358] See, e.g., Brown, *John*, 1:513; Tovey, *Narrative Art*, 90–92.

[359] Feuillet, "Structure," 205; Collins, "New Commandment," 238.

Bultmann has examined instances of invitations in the FG where an advantage is juxtaposed with a disadvantage. In these there is a “cry of invitation and decision.”[361] Nearly all are found in the PM. Several of these are: John 3:18 (judged vs. not judged), 3:36 (eternal life vs. wrath); 5:24 (eternal life/transfer from death into life vs. judgment/death); 6:35 (no hunger/no thirst vs. hunger/thirst); 8:12 (have the light of life vs. walk in darkness); 12:44–46 (have light/not remain in darkness/be saved vs. remain in darkness/judgment). From the above appeals and actions, it is evident that the PM contains a strong call to make a decision to enter into a believing relationship with Jesus. In the words of D. Mollat, “the Gospel of St. John is par excellence the Gospel of appeals, or rather one immense appeal runs through it from beginning to end.”[362] Mollat proceeds to highlight briefly the calls that Jesus makes to people.[363] For our purposes, it is noteworthy that all of these calls occur in the PM. This coheres with our suggestion that the PM has an evangelistic stream.[364]

---

[360] See Brown, *John*, 1:513. The large majority of the instances of *πιστεύω* occur in chapters 1–12. Brown remarks (1:513), “This division of frequency agrees with the thesis that in the Book of Signs Jesus is presenting to men the *choice* of believing, while in the Book of Glory (17–20) he is speaking to those who already believe and, thus, is presuming faith” [emphasis added].

[361] Bultmann, *Theology*, 2:21–22, here 22.

[362] D. Mollat, “Le conversion chez saint Jean,” *Lumière et Vie* 47 (1960): 101–2. D. A. Carson’s translation (*Divine Sovereignty*, 164), lightly edited.

[363] Mollat, “Conversion,” 102.

[364] Not everyone agrees that the PM is (at least in part) for unbelievers. Lincoln, for example, holds that the account in the PM was not written for unbelievers, suggesting that “quite different rhetorical

However, the initial decision to believe must develop and deepen, and demonstrate itself in a complex belief-response (discipleship).[365] The PM contains a parallel stream that elucidates this belief-response in terms of discipleship. For our study of classical rhetoric in chapter 2 we briefly explored the presence of the deliberative rhetoric of dissuasion that emerges in at least two passages: 6:60–71 and 8:31–36. These passages are directed at believers or those professing to believe. The rhetoric here serves to dissuade them from departing from Jesus, thereby emphasizing the ongoing nature of discipleship in order to retain the benefits of following him, especially those of eternal life (6:68), knowledge and freedom from sin (8:31–36).[366]

We turn now to the FD and briefly discuss its unique deliberative rhetorical features. At the outset, we notice a pronounced narrowing of the audience to that of Jesus' disciples, that is, those who believe in Jesus. Thus, the advantages/benefits are available only to this audience (and not the world). Along with the change in audience, several linguistic features signal a change in the deliberative rhetorical focus. We pointed out above the lack of mention of lexeme *φῶς* after chapter 12, and the concentration of the lexeme *ζωή* and its verbal cognate *ζάω* in chapters 1–12. On the other hand, certain linguistic features take over and gain prominence in the FD. The lexeme *ἀγαπάω* ("love") occurs only seven times in the PM, but it occurs an additional thirty times beginning with chapter 13. The terms *τηρέω* ("keep") and *ἐντολή* ("commandment") acquire a special focus in the FD, with unique benefits. For example, Jesus gives the new commandment of mutual love only to his disciples, and the rhetorical purpose of this mutual love is so that the world may know that they are his disciples (13:34–35).

While keeping Jesus' word in the PM results in never seeing death (8:51), keeping Jesus' word and commandments in the FD results in receiving several advantages (benefits): the Spirit/Paraclete (14:15–16), the Father's and Jesus' love,

---

strategies would be required if the aim were to persuade readers to come to initial belief" (Lincoln, *John*, 87). Interestingly, Lincoln proceeds to suggest that the FG was ultimately intended for "a much wide audience," and that the FG was needed to equip believers to "bear effective witness" (88). We have argued, however, that the rhetoric strategy of classical deliberative rhetoric with its advocated course of action and the concomitant advantages coheres well with the accepted canons of classical rhetoric at the time of the FG.

[365] Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*, 105.

[366] Bultmann, *John*, 434, acutely notes that the promise in 8:32–36 consists of these two elements.

Jesus' self-disclosure, and their presence in the believer's life (14:21, 23).[367] The purpose of this indwelling is elaborated in the exhortations to testify (15:26–27) and to oneness (17:21–23). This latter oneness has the additional purpose of evoking belief in others. One other benefit is associated with remaining (μένω) in Jesus the true vine (15:1–11), which relates to the ongoing aspect of discipleship. In this case, the twin deliberative rhetorical dimensions of persuasion and dissuasion are present again. If the disciples remain in Jesus and his love, they will glorify God by bearing much fruit and so prove to be Jesus' disciples (15:8) and have the fullness of Jesus' joy (15:11). Otherwise, if they do not remain in the vine, they will be cast out (15:6), suffering "the same fate as those who do not believe."[368]

In the FD genre examination above we devoted a section to unity and noted how Jesus prays for the disciples' "oneness" in John 17. It is significant that for the most part the followers of Jesus are not called to oneness in the PM (though cf. 10:16; 11:52). It is primarily in John 17:11 and 21–23 where this call occurs, and here it is in the context of a ἵνα-clause stating the purpose of the oneness, namely, that the world might believe and know that the Father sent Jesus and loves the disciples.[369]

To summarize, in our genre investigations in chapters 2 and 3 we see that the focus is on different audiences in the PM and the FD. Moreover, the advantages (benefits) and the actions necessary to obtain them are different. One aspect that seems to be apparent is that whereas the advantages and actions in the PM are generally presented as a binary choice, the advantages and actions in the FD seem to be more fluid and admit degrees of perfection. Seglenieks points out, for example, that the term τελειόω in 17:23 suggests that the quality of oneness is "perfectible," and hence, there may be degrees of oneness.[370] This fluidness is further suggested by several other features: (1) the need for prayer in Jesus' name (14:13, 14; 15:16; 16:23, 24, 26; cf. 15:7), (2) the pruning and the bearing of additional fruit (15:2, 5), (3) the additional teaching of the Spirit (14:26; 16:13), and (4) perhaps the progressive deepening of love for Jesus and keeping his commandments (see 14:21, 23) that result in an intensification of the believer's experience of God's presence.[371] The overall purpose of the FG is one of missions:[372] we have seen, for example, that the PM includes numerous invitations to believe, and the FD includes equipping disciples to be sent into the world (e.g., 13:20; 17:18; see also 4:30–38; 20:21). This mission focus, however, probably includes more than evangelism narrowly conceived.[373]

---

[367] This likely occurs through the Spirit's mediating presence.

[368] Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*, 85.

[369] Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*, 91, referring to Moloney, *Love*, 131.

[370] Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*, 91.

Finally, it would be a mistake to suggest that the benefits in the PM and those in the FD are separate and compartmentalized. As Mussner has pointed out, eternal life is a single concept that encompasses many aspects, present and future.

> For John ζωή (αἰώνιος) is the comprehensive concept of salvation, … According to the Johannine conception there are no blessings of salvation that are given to the believer in addition to that saving gift of "life"; the remaining gifts of salvation are given and guaranteed along with the "life," whether for the present or for the eschatological future.[374]

Returning briefly to the purpose statement in 20:31, at the outset in chapter 1 we stated that the interpretation of 20:31 contained both text-critical and interpretative issues.[375] It should be noted that the present subjunctive of πιστεύω in the FG can be directed at unbelievers (πιστεύητε: 6:29; 10:38; πιστεύῃ: 17:21).[376] Regarding verbal aspect theory, McKay states, "The imperfect aspect [the present and imperfect tenses] presents an activity as going on, in process, without reference to its completion."[377] Thus, many now acknowledge that tense alone cannot adjudicate the audience referent.[378] Our study of rhetorical genre has attempted to advance the discussion of the audience referent in 20:31 even further by utilizing classical rhetoric to demonstrate that the audience is focused on both believers and unbelievers.

---

[371] Keener explains, "Those who obey (14:15) receive greater power for obedience (14:16–17), moving in a cycle of ever deeper spiritual maturation" (Keener, *John*, 2:952). Carson expresses it similarly: "the believer's growth in the knowledge of God and in the experience of the Holy Spirit turns at least in part on … love for Christ and obedience to him." D. A. Carson, *The Farewell Discourse and Final Prayer of Jesus. An Exposition of John 14–17* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988), 59.

[372] Strongly argued by Gorman, *Abide*.

[373] As Gorman (*Abide*, 35–36, 62–65) has argued. Gorman refers also to Harold Attridge, Warren Carter, and Jan G. van der Watt, "Quaestiones disputatae: Are John's Ethics Apolitical?" *NTS* 62 (2016): 485. Believers are implicitly called on to perform certain acts of Jesus "analogously" (Gorman's term, *Abide*, 65).

[374] Mussner, *ΖΩΗ*, 186–87, Beasley-Murray translation [lightly edited]. See G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Gospel of Life: Theology of the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 13. See also Thompson, "Life," 51.

[375] While most interpreters currently regard the present tense as the preferred reading, the meaning of the present subjunctive remains debated.

[376] Bennema, *Power*, 108; Wang, *Sense*, 40–46; Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*, 95n4. John 9:35–38 seems parallel in meaning to 6:29–30 regarding the tense change. That 17:21 refers to unbelievers, see Carson, "Observations," 705–6.

[377] McKay, *Syntax*, 29.

[378] See Carson, "Observations," 707. See also Bennema, Wang, and Seglenieks, noted above.

Having established that the FG is a highly rhetorical discourse in terms of its rhetorical genre, we now turn to an examination of the second rhetorical strategy, that of narrative rhetoric. Chapters 4 to 6 will investigate this second strategy.

Chapter 4. A Theory of Narrative Rhetoric

4.1 Introduction

This chapter and the following two (chapters 5 and 6) investigate the second rhetorical strategy, that of narrative rhetoric. This chapter lays the foundation for the other two. Chapters 5 and 6 will build on this chapter and present a two-dimensional argument that the FG's Prologue contains propositions that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative.

In chapter 1 we noted the concern expressed by Watson, Mack, and others that classical rhetoric lacked a theory of narrative, and therefore could not be used to interpret the Gospels.[379] In that chapter we also observed how two previous rhetorical studies attempted to address their objection. The purpose of this chapter is to address this objection in yet a third way by constructing a theory of narrative rhetoric based on classical rhetoric. Classical rhetoric, although it did not explicitly formulate a theory of narrative, nevertheless seems to contain the components from which such a theory could be constructed. The components that will go into constructing our theory will be taken from the standard treatises on classical rhetoric, focusing on three principal rhetoricians: Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. The plan is to provide a partial theory that can be used for examining the sorts of narratives in which a thesis is proven through a narrative. The theory will be partial or limited in the sense that it does not contain a full-orbed description of how all narratives that are rhetorical would persuade.[380] The theory will be configured to show how narratives in general can prove a proposition. This general theory can then be applied to specific narratives such as the FG and one of Plutarch's biographies that show evidence of containing propositions that are proven by means of the narrative.

This chapter consists of three main sections. The first section analyzes previous treatments of the term "narrative rhetoric" and the FG. The intention is to show how our use of the term "narrative rhetoric" will be differentiated from other studies. The second section constructs our theory of narrative rhetoric. Finally, the third section illustrates the theory by surveying examples from the OT and other literature from about the time of the FG.

---

[379] See Watson and Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 116; Mack, *Rhetoric*, 79. See also Christopher Carey, "Rhetorical Means of Persuasion," in *Persuasion. Greek Rhetoric in Action*, edited by Ian Worthington (Routledge: London, 1994), 38.

[380] Clearly, not all narratives intend to persuade.

4.2 "Narrative Rhetoric" and Previous Studies

This thesis proposes to analyze the FG using what is called "narrative rhetoric." Our use of the term narrative rhetoric designates that type of narrative that intends to persuade in the sense that the proof or demonstration of a proposition is accomplished by means of narrating actions, which may include a speech or dialogue. Several previous studies have also employed the term narrative rhetoric to analyze the FG. Thus, it is important to understand how this study's use of the term in both its meaning and its application compares with these other studies. We will survey three such studies.

The focus of Kelli O'Brien's study is centered on the blending of two notions: how characters in the story world come to authentic belief through the experience of misunderstanding and correction through learning, and how this can also aid the reader in coming to "authentic faith."[381] First, for O'Brien, the purpose of the misunderstandings is to reorient the reader.[382] Second, O'Brien sees a further notion in the narrative rhetoric through the notion of inducement (to believe) through identification. She writes, "The author presents characters who experience confusion, uncertainty, and misunderstanding but who profit from the experience and come to authentic faith.… The reader is given characters with whom he [*sic*] can *identify* and who can *induce* him [*sic*] to believe."[383] For O'Brien, these two notions work in concert: the characters in the story, through perseverance, come to a more complete understanding and belief, and the readers are expected to identify with characters who struggle to understand, and, through this identification, are induced to believe.[384]

O'Brien is perhaps correct to view inducement through identification with character responses in the story as one of the strategies of how the audience of the FG is brought to believe. Regarding the aims of this thesis, however, her study seems to be deficient in two areas: first, she does not refer to the Prologue and how it equips the reader with knowledge that the characters in the story world are not privileged to have. Second, based on this superior knowledge gained from reading the Prologue, the reader, as is commonly acknowledged, senses a type of dramatic irony in how many characters in the narrative world respond, but she makes no attempt to relate this to her argument,[385] which might cause some of her conclusions to be modified. More importantly for our purposes, there is another rhetorical dimension that her strategy of belief through identification does not address, and this is the narrative strategy (or narrative rhetoric) that the FG employs to demonstrate various propositions, including the proposition that Jesus is the divine Son of God. In other words, as useful as her study is, it does not exhaust the notion of how narrative rhetoric functions in the FG. Therefore, it leaves open the possibility of exploring how this sort of narrative rhetoric functions in the Gospel.

---

[381] Kelli S. O'Brien, "Written That You May Believe: John 20 and Narrative Rhetoric," *CBQ* 67 (2005): 296. O'Brien leaves certain terms undefined. For example, she does not explicitly define her use of the term "narrative rhetoric," which occurs only in the article title. Further, although she uses the term "authentic faith," she never defines in what this authentic faith consists.

[382] O'Brien, "Written," 288.

[383] O'Brien, "Written," 296 [emphasis added]. See also 292–93.

[384] O'Brien does not present any theoretical foundation as to how this inducement functions.

Harold Attridge's brief study of the Gospel's narrative rhetoric seeks to understand the FG in terms of its literary features that have resemblances to ancient drama. These features include the function of the Prologue as a dramatic "hypothesis," the use of irony, the "delayed exit," and the recognition scene.[386] Attridge uses the term "narrative rhetoric" explicitly in one primary sense, but he also recognizes that the Gospel uses narrative rhetoric in a sense that is similar to how this study uses the term. His explicit use of the term involves his observation that the FG employs a literary device that is regularly observed in ancient drama in which the hero comes to a point of "recognition" (*anagnoresis*), and this recognition results in a transformation of the subject experiencing the recognition. It is in these narrated dramatic encounters that consist of an event of recognition that "we find encapsulated the *narrative rhetoric* of the Gospel as a whole."[387] According to Attridge, as with ancient dramas, in the FG the recognition that results from this encounter includes the further result that people in the narrative are transformed. In the Gospel this transformation at times is a transformation into becoming emissaries, notably, the Samaritan woman (4:28–30) and Mary Magdalene (20:17). Attridge suggests that the author, through narrating various encounters, brings the readers similarly into a relationship with Jesus "and thus encourages them to experience the type of dramatic, transformative encounter" that the characters in the narrative experience.[388]

---

[385] It should be noted, however, that the motif of misunderstandings does not exhaust the matter of character responses. For instance, Peter's main crisis point comes not solely, or even primarily, in a matter of misunderstanding, but in his failure to persevere and not deny Jesus. Others do not persevere because they love the approval of other humans (5:44) and are unwilling to confess Jesus before the authorities (12:42–43). Thus, sometimes the failures are ethical rather than simply epistemological. The reader is challenged to learn from these as well.

[386] Harold W. Attridge, *History, Theology, and Narrative Rhetoric in the Fourth Gospel* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2019), 32–40.

[387] Attridge, *History*, 40 [emphasis added].

Attridge further recognizes that the FG uses narrative rhetoric with a meaning that has some affinities with our use of the term in that he states that the narrative seeks to demonstrate a claim. One can observe this second type of narrative rhetoric where he suggests that the episode of Jesus and the Samaritan woman "illustrates" what amounts to a universal truth claim.[389] That is, "The Gospel claims that in encountering the Word, fleshly Curiosity can be turned to Evangelism."[390] For Attridge, this episode has paradigmatic qualities. What happened to the woman of Samaria could happen to anyone encountering Jesus.[391] In this case, the encounter of Jesus and the Samaritan woman is a proof in narrative form of the claim. His study notes a second example of the use of narrative rhetoric where actions demonstrate a claim. "The *actions* of Jesus in John 13 *demonstrate* what his ministry is about: assuming the position of a servant to his followers."[392]

In summary, Attridge uses the term "narrative rhetoric" explicitly in one sense but in addition he recognizes that the Gospel also argues narratively to demonstrate a claim. This latter sense has affinities with the sense in which we will use the term. The scope of Attridge's study is of course limited, but his observations open the possibility for further investigation regarding how narrative rhetoric functions in the FG in the sense of narrating actions that demonstrate a claim. This present study will explore this type of narrative rhetoric by investigating how the FG seeks to provide narrative proof of propositions, including the claim that Jesus is the divine Messiah.

---

[388] Attridge, *History*, 65.

[389] That he views it as a universal claim can be observed from his suggestion that the claim is "independent of any particular circumstance" (Attridge, *History*, 53).

[390] Attridge, *History*, 53–54.

[391] Attridge, *History*, 54.

[392] Attridge, *History*, 94 [emphasis added].

Wilhelm Wuellner uses the term "narrative rhetoric" several times in his *Semeia* article, including the title. He applies the modern rhetorical theory of Perelman and Olbrichts-Tyteca and their concept of dissociation to John 11. Although Wuellner does not explicitly define his use of the term "narrative rhetoric," his statement "the narrative unfolds as argument for the plausibility of this implausibility paradox [of glory through death]"[393] suggests that he views the term as a form of argument in narrative form. In this sense, his use of the term is similar to our use, in which we will use the term where a narrative demonstrates a claim.

In sum, the above survey of studies shows that the term "narrative rhetoric" has been used with different meanings. Our study will use the term in the specific sense of narratives that demonstrate or prove propositions through actions.

4.3 Constructing a Theory of Narrative Rhetoric

This section constructs a partial theory of narrative rhetoric.[394] The fundamental concept that undergirds this theory is that a narrative can be the vehicle that provides the proof of a proposition. Thus, the restricted focus here is to develop a theory that accounts for how a narrative rhetorical text can demonstrate or prove a proposition or thesis. This partial theory should be sufficient for use with analyzing certain features of rhetorical texts that are narratives. The FG is clearly a narrative text, and we have already established in chapters 2 and 3 that it is highly rhetorical in terms of its genre, exhibiting all three classical rhetorical genres. We suggested in the introductory chapter that although classical rhetoric lacked a theory of narrative rhetoric, it nevertheless contained components from which such a theory, however partial, could be constructed.[395] We will use these handbooks, augmented as necessary, to construct our theory. A theory of narrative as it relates to rhetoric would have several features. Here I suggest and outline two principal features of this theory, which are (1) the *form* of the narration, and (2) the *function* or purpose of the narration. This theory will be developed by examining three primary classical rhetoricians: Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian, and augmented by Aristotle's *Topics*.

---

[393] Wilhelm Wuellner, "Putting Life Back into the Lazarus Story and Its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith," *Semeia* 53 (1991): 118.

[394] A few contemporary studies have sought to explicate a theory of narrative rhetoric. See, for example, John Rodden ("How Do Stories Convince Us? Notes Towards a Rhetoric of Narrative," *College Literature* 35 [2008]: 148–73). Parsons's and Martin's work *Ancient Rhetoric and the New Testament* has distilled the narrative sections of the various theorists in the *progymnasmata* into a chapter on narrative. See chapter 3 in Mikeal C. Parsons and Michael Wade Martin, *Ancient Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018). Their chapter deals briefly with the FG (*Rhetoric*, 100–101) as an ancient biography, although for the most part their chapter does not address how a narrative can demonstrate a proposition, which is the sort of theory that we are concerned with here. See also Eric Clouston, *How Ancient Narratives Persuade: Acts in Its Literary Context* (Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield, 2020). Clouston has developed a theory of narrative persuasion and applied it to the Book of Acts. His theory likewise does not specifically address how a narrative can demonstrate a proposition.

Beginning with Aristotle, his *Rhetoric* provides several resources that can serve to construct a theory of narrative rhetoric. His *Rhetoric* suggests how the form and function of a narrative rhetoric could work. Four features suggest this. First of all, Larry Arnhart helpfully explains how Aristotle discusses virtue by applying the technique of reasoning from "signs." Arnhart explains that a rhetorician could use enthymemes that follow the same general type of reasoning through signs, noting that "the 'sign' of a particular virtue is something that arises in most cases in conjunction with the virtue (major premise); if a particular [person] shows this 'sign' (minor premise), it may be inferred that [that person] is likely to possess the virtue in question (conclusion)."[396] A narrative that shows this "sign" through virtuous actions[397] would demonstrate the second (minor) premise, namely, that this person has demonstrated this virtue through specific action. The conclusion would naturally follow. This instance has both the function of demonstrating (in this case) a virtue, and the form of an argument: a major premise or proposition, a narrated minor premise, and a conclusion. Thus, Aristotle's *Rhetoric* seems to have the components from which a narrative argument could be constructed. Second, the narrative proof of virtue (or vice) finds a further place in Aristotle's treatment of judicial narration. He writes, "[you should] seize an opportunity in the narration to mention whatever bears on your own virtue … or bears on your opponent's wickedness" (*On Rhetoric*, 3.16.5 [Kennedy]).[398] Here Aristotle states that the narrative could demonstrate a virtue or a vice. Third, Aristotle further states in this section that a narrative can demonstrate moral character by showing the choices that a person makes (*On Rhetoric*, 3.16.8).[399] Fourth and finally, in his treatment of rhetorical arrangement, Aristotle's discussion of the necessary parts of a persuasive discourse has relevance to the form of the narrative proof. He writes, "There are two parts to a speech: for it is necessary [first] to state the subject and [then] to demonstrate it.… The necessary parts, then, are *prothesis* [statement of the proposition] and *pistis* [proof of the statement]" (*On Rhetoric*, 3.13.1, 4 [Kennedy]).[400] Although Aristotle is discussing a speech, it is reasonable to think that the *prothesis* (statement of the proposition) could be stated in a narrative, and the *pistis* (proof) portion could also be provided through a narrative. We can see, then, that certain basic features of his *Rhetoric* provide the building blocks that can make up a theory of narrative rhetoric in terms of both *form* and *function*.

---

[395] Perhaps the term "theory" is too grandiose. It should be borne in mind, however, that our theory is restricted to those sorts of narratives that seek to demonstrate a proposition or thesis by means of narration. Some have suggested that a complete theory of narrative rhetoric would address such features as plot and resolution. If a rhetorical text with such a plot and resolution contained a thesis that is proven, then a more complete theory could potentially be developed for it, but we will not argue nor utilize the feature of plot and resolution here.

[396] Larry Arnhart, *Aristotle on Political Reasoning: A Commentary on "the Rhetoric"* (DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1981), 81. See *On Rhetoric*, 1.9.14–16.

[397] Such as acts of justice or courage. See *On Rhetoric*, 1.9.6.

[398] See Carey, "Persuasion," 38–39.

Next, Cicero, in his *de Inventione*, explains his understanding of deductive logic, and from this we can bring several features into service. Without discussing his analysis of the number of parts of a deductive argument in detail, we can glean the following. He states that a deductive argument has a certain *form*: a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion (*Inv.* 1.34.57–60). The major premise and the minor premise each can be supported by a proof, which *functions* to demonstrate the premise. He illustrates this with the following example. The major premise is, "Things that are done by design are managed better than those which are governed without design" (*Inv.* 1.34.58 [Hubbell, LCL]). He then lists several possible proofs: "The house that is managed according to a reasoned plan, is in every respect better equipped and furnished than one which is governed in a haphazard way with a total lack of design" (*Inv.* 1.34.58 [Hubbell, LCL]). The next two proofs he provides are similar: an army commanded by a wise general and a ship navigated by an expert pilot. These three proofs constitute the proof of the premise (in this case, the major premise). For the purposes of our theory, it is clear that each of these proofs could easily be demonstrated by means of a narration of the building of a house, an army at battle, or an expert pilot navigating a ship successfully out of a harbor.[401] Thus, an investigation of Cicero shows that both *form* and *function* are present in his treatise, and that a narrative could quite naturally provide the vehicle for these.

---

[399] See also Michael de Brauw, "The Parts of the Speech," in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), 194–95.

[400] Aristotle goes on to state that a discourse can have at most four elements.

Turning finally to Quintilian, both features of form and function are present again in basic substance and can once more be put into service for our theory. Beginning with the second feature (function), Quintilian states that one function of a narrative is to persuade and to prove (or disprove) a proposition. He explains, "A narrative is an exposition designed to be *persuasive* of an action done or deemed to be done; alternatively … it is a speech instructing the hearer on what is in dispute" (*Inst.* 4.2.31 [Russell, LCL]; emphasis added). Thus, Quintilian catalogues two uses of a narrative, one being that it has a persuasive force or function, the other to instruct. That Quintilian saw a persuasive function for a narrative can be seen from his other statements. He writes, "the accuser does not simply say, 'You killed him'; he *narrates facts to prove* it" (*Inst.* 4.2.13 [Russell, LCL]; emphasis added). Thus, there is a requirement not simply to "tell" but to "show" and thus prove through narration.[402] Since the accuser provides a narrative, the defender will inevitably in turn provide some narrative "to counter prosecution arguments, to present the defendant's past life, to explain the reasons which have brought an innocent man into jeopardy, and to advance other considerations by which the charge can be discredited" (*Inst.* 4.2.12–13 [Russell, LCL]). Quintilian provides an example of how Ulysses defends himself against the charge of murdering Ajax. Ulysses narrates "how he came to the lonely place, saw the lifeless body, and withdrew the sword from the wound" (*Inst.* 4.2.13 [Russell, LCL]).[403] Narrative can also be used to demonstrate or prove a person's character. In his treatment of epideictic rhetoric, Quintilian points out that external goods are a source of topics for such characterization. These external goods can include, among others, wealth, power, and influence. He suggests that these, because they give strength for either good or bad, "are the surest test of character" (*Inst.* 3.7.14 [Russell, LCL]). Thus, a narrative seemingly would provide an ideal means of "testing character." Narrative can demonstrate the honorable use of these external goods by narrating the honorable actions of the protagonist.[404] According to Quintilian, the narrative has a two-fold purpose regarding the audience (judge). He explains: the function of the narrative is not only to enable the judge to know the facts but also to persuade the judge to adopt our point of view, that is, "take a view of it which is in our favour" (*Inst.* 4.2.20 [Russell, LCL]). He goes on to explain that the narrative "was not invented simply to acquaint the judge with the facts of the case, but rather to ensure that he agrees with us" (*Inst.* 4.2.21 [Russell, LCL]).[405] It is "a speech in miniature."[406]

---

[401] For this last example, see Quintilian, *Inst.* 4.1.61.

[402] Quintilian also seems to be suggesting here the *form* of our theory that that will be treated below: a proposition followed by a narrative that proves the proposition.

[403] Quintilian seems to be suggesting a proof from plausibility: it is more of an assertion rather than a strict proof.

Quintilian's treatise also provides components to construct the first feature of a theory of narrative rhetoric, the *form*. Two examples from Quintilian help build this other part. We observed above that Quintilian wrote that the accuser both states the facts ("you killed him") and "narrates the facts to prove it" (*Inst.* 4.2.13 [Russell, LCL]). There is, then, a requirement both to tell and to show (in our theory, through the narrative). He seems to be suggesting the *form* of our theory: the proposition ("You killed him") is followed by a narrative that demonstrates the proposition. The second example is taken from his explanation of how someone might prove that Romulus was the son of Mars and thus had a divine origin. The arguer might offer three proofs, all of which are well suited for proof through narration: (1) "when thrown into a running river, he could not drown," (2) "his actions were all such as to make it credible that he was the son of the god of war," and (3) "his contemporaries had no doubt that he was himself in person taken up to heaven" (*Inst.* 3.7.5 [Russell, LCL]). All of these proofs could be narrated through situation-specific events. For example, taking just the first, one could narrate an episode showing how Romulus was thrown into a raging river and yet did not drown. The form of the proof, suggested by Quintilian's explanation, could include a proposition ("Romulus was the son of Mars and thus had a divine origin"), narrated proofs, and a conclusion. In this case, the narrated proof would consist of three episodes that serve as examples that prove Romulus's divine origin. In this way, the form of proof would consist of a form of induction whereby multiple examples, all related to his divine origin, are adduced that cumulatively prove the proposition. Stated concisely, the *form* of the proof would be proposition (thesis/claim), ‘n’ narrated proof(s) (‘n’ >= 1), and conclusion. What is relevant and remarkable for this study is that Quintilian’s suggestion on how to prove that Romulus had a divine origin is analogous to how the FG seeks to prove Jesus’ divine messiahship.

---

[404] This appears to be what Plutarch is attempting to show in the life of Pericles that will be examined in chapter 6.

[405] See Rodden, "Stories," 160.

[406] Donald Ragsdale, "Brevity in Classical Rhetoric," *Southern Speech Journal* 31 (1966): 21.

The form and function structure provided above has an implied element that needs to be made explicit. To do this, we turn to Aristotle’s *Topics*. When there are two or more narrated proofs (‘n’ >1), a certain similarity must exist across the set of narrated proofs for the argument to be persuasive. Aristotle states, “The consideration of *similarity* is useful … for inductive arguments … For inductive reasoning it is useful because we maintain that it is by induction of particulars on the basis of *similarities* that we infer the universal; for it is not easy to employ inference if we do not know the points of *similarity*” (*Top*. 108b 7–13 [Forster, LCL]; emphasis added). This requirement ensures that an argument using narrative rhetoric will be as cogent as possible within the adduced narrated proofs.

In summary, we can see that the treatises of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian contain similar components from which a theory of narrative rhetoric can be constructed. They all contain aspects of *form* and *function*. Our theory of narrative rhetoric, then, has a basic form and function. It has the function or purpose of persuading by proving a proposition, and it has a general form that consists of three main elements: an abstract formulated proposition/thesis, ‘n’ narrated situation-specific proofs (‘n’ >= 1) that demonstrate the thesis,[407] and a conclusion. The stated order of the elements is not strictly required. The clearest and most complete form would include all three elements, though in certain instances, one member could be implied. The full form might be represented in the form of a syllogism.[408] The conclusion may take the form of a narrated action, or comment, or may be omitted altogether.

---

[407] ‘N’ = 0 would mean there is no narrative. Salier (*Impact*, 36–39) helpfully shows from the classical rhetoricians how the accumulation of proofs can be effective. Hence, ‘n’ needs to be a value that sufficiently demonstrates the proposition.

[408] Note that some scholars have attempted to frame NT biblical argumentation in terms of an enthymeme which is thought to be a truncated syllogism. However, this conception of an enthymeme has been deemed incorrect. See, for example, David E. Aune, “The Use and Abuse of the Enthymeme in New Testament Scholarship,” *NTS* 49 (2003): 299–320. I will not argue that the narrative rhetoric of the FG can be represented as an enthymeme. I will simply suggest that Aristotle’s form of a syllogism is useful for portraying, albeit imperfectly, the features of the argument stated in the above rhetorical treatises, even if the resulting syllogism is not formally valid in a rigorous sense.

With this theory in hand, we can return to Cicero's example above and the narrating of actions that demonstrate the major premise. The form of the proof consists of three elements: the abstract proposition (claim) that "Things that are done by design are managed better than those which are governed without design," three narrated situation-specific proofs ('n' = 3) that each demonstrate the proposition, and the conclusion (perhaps left unexpressed).

4.4 Illustrating the Theory

Having constructed a theory of narrative rhetoric, it will be helpful to illustrate the theory before proceeding to investigate the narrative rhetoric of the FG. Five examples will be taken from the OT and other literature close to the time of the FG. Examples one and three (from Chronicles and Philo) have been chosen because previous rhetorical studies have reflected on them, and here we are either extending their discussion (Chronicles) or offering a more adequate view of the rhetorical strategies (Philo). The first three illustrate how the other rhetorical strategy of deliberative rhetoric that we investigated in chapters 2 and 3 often works synergistically with the strategy of narrative rhetoric to form the argumentative texture of the text. The final two examples show how the theory applies in an analogous manner both to literature outside the FG and then to the FG itself.

4.4.1 The Chronicles

First and Second Chronicles provide a good demonstration of the two main rhetorical strategies that this thesis is investigating: the rhetorical genre and narrative rhetoric. Rodney Duke argues that the narratives in 1 and 2 Chronicles function as a type of persuasive narrative discourse. They contain narratives whose form and function serve to argue the thesis that the one who seeks Yahweh will be blessed. The positive and negative forms of the thesis are stated in 1 Chr 28:9, "If you seek [Yahweh], he will be found by you; but if you forsake him, he will abandon you forever." The positive form of the argument can be stated in syllogistic form:

> Major premise: The one who seeks Yahweh will be blessed.
> Minor premise: David sought Yahweh when [for example] he brought the ark to Jerusalem.

Therefore: David was successful in bringing the ark to Jerusalem.[409]

This syllogistic form coheres well with the form of our theory of narrative rhetoric. The minor premise is demonstrated by means of the narrative. David had not sought Yahweh when he first attempted to bring the ark back to Jerusalem as narrated in 1 Chr 13, and therefore the attempt was unsuccessful. First Chronicles 15 narrates his second attempt to move the ark. In this episode, he recognizes that the Levites have sole responsibility for the ark, and the attempt is successful. There are at least three other instances in Chronicles regarding the life of David where this proposition is demonstrated through the narrative, either positively (he "inquired" of God: 1 Chr 14:8–12, 13–15) or negatively (no inquiry: 1 Chr 21). Thus, the proposition is demonstrated by 'n' ('n' = 5) narrated proofs.[410]

The narrative also has a deliberative rhetorical focus that sets before the audience the appeal to what is advantageous and honorable. The advantage is obtaining Yahweh's blessing. This advantage of Yahweh's blessing, however, must be accompanied by a choice and performing significant future honorable actions that are all related to seeking him, which Duke points out include "establishing the cult (1 Chr 28:9), keeping the Torah (2 Chr 14:3), walking in God's commandments (2 Chr 17:4), and destroying Asherahs (2 Chr 19:3)."[411] The argument is buttressed by examples (also typical of deliberative rhetoric) from Israel's past leaders, both positive and negative. In sum, these narratives have two persuasive strategies: the first is a narrative rhetorical one that demonstrates through narrative that seeking Yahweh proves to be advantageous. The second is a deliberative appeal to what is advantageous and honorable, and undergirded by positive and negative examples from the past.

4.4.2 Daniel 1

Daniel chapter 1 provides another illustration of the main rhetorical strategies of this thesis: the rhetorical genre and narrative rhetoric. Daniel 1 narrates the episode of

---

[409] For the negative form of this syllogism as applied to Saul, see Rodney K. Duke, "The Strategic Use of Enthymeme and Example in the Argumentation of the Books of Chronicles," in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*, edited by Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker, ESEC 8 (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002), 133.

[410] Additional examples or proofs from other lives could be adduced from the Chronicles.

[411] Duke, "Enthymeme and Example," 135.

Daniel and his interaction with the palace master regarding the royal food that the Jewish youth consider to be defiling. Daniel asks permission from the palace master so that he would not defile himself. He offers to participate in a test of ten days, after which a comparison is to be made between the appearances of Daniel and his friends and the appearances of those who ate the king's food. At the end of the testing period, the four Jewish youths "appeared better and fatter" (1:15). The episode can be described as a deliberative argument in narrative form. The issue under consideration is what type of food is advantageous from two perspectives: that of Daniel and his friends, who view putting a priority on what food honors God, and that of the palace master, who puts a priority on what food for feeding the youth is advantageous for himself and ultimately for the king. Daniel believes that his proposed course of action can satisfy both parties. The test includes examples much like a deliberative rhetorical argument that uses examples from the past,[412] in this case, narrated examples, to support a proposed future action. Moreover, the additional point that the episode makes is that the appearance of the four youths is being compared with the other youths who ate the king's food (1:15). Thus, the test establishes a comparison by example, or better, by four identical examples of Daniel and his three friends close in time and distance that persuade the palace master to allow the youths to continue their diet. This rather deceptively simple narrative is complex in that the deliberative rhetorical argument contains several features associated with classical rhetoric, including an appeal to a future action that is advantageous to various parties using historical examples that are close in time and location. Furthermore, it narrates the results of the test in such a way as to provide a proof in narrative form. Thus, the proposition that God honors those who honor him is demonstrated by 'n' ('n' = 4) narrated proofs.

4.4.3 Philo's In Flaccum

Another example of our theory of narrative rhetoric can be found in Philo's *In Flaccum*. David Hay argues that *In Flaccum* "is carefully designed as an argument in narrative form."[413] Philo's narrative argues two explicit theses: "that Flaccus was guilty of criminal mistreatment of the Alexandrian Jews and that his loss of office and life was a divine punishment for that treatment," and a third, related thesis that Flaccus's death "proves the folly of any persecution of the Jews."[414] Philo narrates various events, actions, and speeches as proofs to demonstrate his argument.[415] Regarding this study, it is important to observe that since Flaccus was already dead, Philo may have had a more "ultimate purpose" in his treatise, which was a warning that any prefect who deals unjustly with the Jewish people will suffer irreparable harm. As Hay suggests, Philo may be arguing that "such pogroms as Flaccus allowed must never be permitted to happen again."[416] This further suggests that the discourse contains an element of deliberative rhetoric that seeks to dissuade a future course of action.[417] This would comport well with the type of rhetorical genre of the FG and the ultimate purpose of the FG.

---

[412] The best examples are those that are "closest to the audience in time and space" ([*Rhet. Alex.*] 32 [Mirhady, LCL]). See also *On Rhetoric*, 1.9.40; 3.17.5; *Rhet. Her.* 3.5.9; *Inst.* 3.8.36, 66.

[413] David M. Hay, "What is Proof? Rhetorical Verification in Philo, Josephus and Quintilian," *SBL Seminar Papers* 2 (1979): 89. I owe this example to Sheppard, "John," 77.

4.4.4 The Old Testament "Recognition Formula" and the Fourth Gospel

A specific type of narrative rhetoric called the "recognition formula" is found in the OT. It occurs especially in Ezekiel, but begins in Exodus. The purpose of a given narration of events is often conveyed by the recognition formula: "Then you/they shall know that I am the LORD." In Ezekiel, the formula occurs seventy times.[418] It is directed either to Israel: "Then you [Israel] will know that I am the LORD" (6:7), or to her enemies (e.g., Egypt): "Then all the inhabitants of Egypt shall know that I am the LORD" (29:6; see 14:18). The exile of Yahweh's covenant people "created an aching need for Yahweh to be vindicated and for his true will and character to be made clear to Israel and to the world."[419] John Strong rightly observes that "historical events take place not merely to *inform* Israel, but rather to *shape* the covenantal relationship between Yahweh and the people."[420]

---

[414] Hay, "Proof," 89.

[415] See Hay, "Proof," 90–92.

[416] Hay, "Proof," 89. In Flaccus's own words, "I am clear proof of this [his guilt], for all the acts which I madly committed against the Jews I have suffered myself" (*Flacc.* 170 [Colson, LCL]).

[417] Sheppard ("John," 77) adduces this as an example of judicial rhetoric. I argue rather for a view that it contains both judicial and deliberative rhetoric, which therefore offers more explanatory scope.

[418] John Strong, "Ezekiel's Use of the Recognition Formula in His Oracles Against the Nations," *PRSt* 22 (1995). See 118n11 for the complete list.

[419] William Sanford LaSor et al., *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 363.

[420] Strong, "Formula," 118 [emphasis added].

Strong demonstrates how the recognition formula in Ezekiel is related to the initial use of the formula as expressed in Exodus. In Exodus, the plague narratives function analogously to the events narrated in Ezekiel, which is to make the Lord's name known, in this case to Egypt. In Exod 5:2, Pharaoh asks the question, "Who is Yahweh?" This precipitates the ensuing plagues that forcefully answer the question, and it is in these acts that Egypt comes to know Yahweh's power.[421] The events are "orchestrated" to bring about recognition of "Yahweh's power as Creator."[422] The events are intended, moreover, to exhibit a testimony function. As the beneficiary of Yahweh's power, Israel serves as a testimony to Egypt of God's power in bringing order out of chaos and refashioning a people (the nation of Israel) into his image.[423] Strong is probably correct in his assertion that though Egypt gains this knowledge, they do not actually worship Yahweh. They merely passively and submissively acknowledge the testimony of this power.[424]

The narratives in Exodus and Ezekiel, then, function rhetorically to highlight the actions of Yahweh in vindicating his name and showing beneficence to his covenant people, even in the midst of their exile.[425] The significance for this study is that it shows an example of how narratives can function rhetorically, demonstrating claims.

Important for this study is the observation that the FG contains several instances of a similar recognition formula. The following are three of these: (1) "By this everyone will *know* that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (13:35), (2) "that they may all be one. As you, Father, are in me and I am in you, may they also be in us, so that the world may *believe* that you have sent me" (17:21), and (3) "I in them and you in me, that they may become completely one, so that the world may *know* that you have sent me and have loved them even as you have loved me" (17:23).[426] The disciples' love for one another and their unity are intended to be *narrative*

---

[421] Strong, "Formula," 123.

[422] Strong, "Formula," 123. Strong (122) suggests that Israel was created at the Reed Sea in Exod 14.

[423] Strong, "Formula," 122. "Yahweh … controls the watery forces of chaos by splitting the sea and allowing Israel to pass on dry land" ("Formula," 123).

[424] Strong, "Formula," 123–24.

[425] No attempt will be made here to determine the specific number ('n') of proofs in either Exodus or Ezekiel.

[426] Emphases added.

demonstrations to the world that they are Jesus' disciples and that the Father has sent Jesus.[427]

4.4.5 Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel

Matthew 11 provides another example of narrative rhetoric.[428] In prison, John the Baptist hears τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ("the works of the Messiah") (11:2), and sends his disciples to query Jesus, asking whether he is the one to come or should they wait for another person. John himself seems to be reasoning based on our theory of narrative rhetoric. He hears about the works of Jesus, and he draws a tentative conclusion: "Jesus is, possibly, the coming one." He seeks confirmation, perhaps because his imprisonment seems to suggest otherwise.[429] Jesus responds, "Go and tell John what you hear and see: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the poor have good news brought to them" (Matt 11:4–5). Jesus answers John's question by telling his disciples to recount the events of what Jesus has been doing. In other words, Jesus "proves" that he is the one to come by a narrative.[430] Jesus seeks to demonstrate to John that he is the coming one by means of a type of syllogistic argument:

> Major premise: The coming Messiah is expected to perform miracles.[431]
> Minor [narrated] premise: Jesus performs miracles.
> Conclusion: Jesus is the expected coming Messiah.

---

[427] Andreas Dettwiler (*Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten: Eine exegetische Studie zu den johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Joh 13,31–16,33) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Relecture-Charakters*, FRLANT 169 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995], 78) observes that 13:34–35 contain a "missionary movement," and the "par excellence means of proclamation," but he nevertheless suggests that the missionary aspect is not the primary focus. The love relationship serves to emphasize the identification of the believing community. However, the missionary emphasis seems to be more prominent than he allows for, particularly in light of (1) the πάντες, which is not explicitly limited to the disciples or to believers; (2) verses 17:21, 23; and (3) the sending motif in the FD (13:16, 20; 17:18).

[428] See Luke 7:18–22 for the parallel account.

[429] Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, WBC 33a (Dallas: Word, 1993), 300. The Lukan account lacks mention of the Baptist's imprisonment.

[430] See Beutler, *Gospel*, 148.

[431] Evidence from the DSS (4Q521) shows that there were expectations of a Messiah who would perform "glorious things that have not taken place," including acts of liberation, healings, and even raising the dead. See John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 131–41.

Hagner aptly notes the conclusion to Jesus' "argument": "Since Jesus fulfills these [OT messianic] expectations, he is the Messiah awaited by John."[432] Morna Hooker remarks regarding the Baptist's task: "John is left to draw his own conclusions."[433] We see, then, how this sort of narrative argument functions in a narrative that demonstrates a claim, in this case, the claim that "Jesus is the coming one."

The next chapter will show how this narrative rhetoric functions in the FG. For now, we can select one example from John 3, the episode of Nicodemus coming to Jesus at night. From the signs that he has seen, Nicodemus concludes that "Jesus is no ordinary teacher."[434] He says to Jesus: "Rabbi, we know that you are a teacher who has come from God; for no one can do these signs that you do apart from the presence of God" (3:2). The narrative rhetorical argument can be put in syllogistic form: Major premise: "Only a teacher from God can perform signs." Minor premise: "Jesus performs signs." Conclusion: "Jesus, you must be a teacher from God."[435] The signs (2:23) provide the "incontestable grounds"[436] or proof[437] necessary for Nicodemus to form his conclusion regarding Jesus. The conclusion that Nicodemus draws is "accurate as far as it goes,"[438] but not quite adequate from the viewpoint of the Evangelist. Jesus is more than "a teacher who has come from God"—he is the divine Messiah. The FG is bold enough to claim *that* Jesus is this divine Messiah (John 1) and then to go on to demonstrate *how* he is. This demonstration will occur, in large measure, by means of the narrative, as we will show in the next chapter.

4.4.6 Summary of Illustrating the Theory

The above survey establishes that a theory of narrative rhetoric can explain the rhetorical strategy of narrative discourses that seek to demonstrate a thesis by way of a narrative proof.[439] These examples further show that the two rhetorical strategies that this thesis is attempting to explicate, namely, rhetorical genre and narrative rhetoric, can be found in the OT, which is the background of the FG, and other ancient literature from the time of the FG. In the last two instances, we provided a preview of how the this narrative rhetoric functions in the FG, which further serves to confirm that the theory is appropriate for the FG.

---

[432] Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 301. Regarding whether the Messiah was expected to perform miracles, see Marianne Meye Thompson, *The Incarnate Word: Perspectives on Jesus in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993), 144–45n28, and the literature there. See also the previous note.

[433] Morna D. Hooker, *Beginnings. Keys That Open the Gospels* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009), 61–62.

[434] Carson, *John*, 186.

[435] Odiam ("Rhetoric," 65) makes the same observation, with a slightly different formulation. He rightly points out that the major premise, often omitted, as here, is a generally accepted opinion.

[436] Ridderbos, *John*, 124. The number of signs in 2:23 is not stated, hence 'n' in our formula must be left unspecified, though the plural σημεῖα implies > 1, and sufficient for Nicodemus to be persuaded.

[437] Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 1:366.

[438] Thompson, *John*, 78.

4.5 Summary

This chapter began the three-chapter treatment of the rhetorical strategy of narrative rhetoric, and is foundational for the next two chapters. The specific purpose of this chapter has been to answer in part those critics who argued that classical rhetoric could not be used to examine a narrative text such as the FG using classical rhetoric on the grounds that classical rhetoric lacked a theory of narrative rhetoric. Our response was to suggest that classical rhetoric contained the components from which such a theory could be developed. At the outset we defined our meaning of the term "narrative rhetoric" by differentiating our use from that of several previous studies, and by providing a contrastive meaning that embodied the concept of a narrative proof or demonstration. We then developed a theory of narrative rhetoric based on several classical rhetoricians. Finally, we illustrated the theory in order to demonstrate the theory's general viability and specific applicability to the FG. The next two chapters will utilize this theory to demonstrate how narrative rhetoric functions in the FG. This study argues in part for the view that the Prologue contains propositions that are demonstrated in the body of the Gospel. Chapters 5 and 6 will present a two-dimensional argument that advocates this view.

We turn now to chapter 5 to present the first dimension of this argument, which is to show how the propositions or claims specified in the Prologue are demonstrated through textual features in the ensuing narrative.

---

[439] Additional illustrations of discourses that take the form of a proposition followed by a narrative proof can be found in Juvenal's satires. In Satire 8, the proposition could be formulated as, "One does not gain a noble status from one's birth, but through honorable actions." Juvenal proceeds to narrate several examples to prove his proposition. Other scholars have observed that a narrative can have a persuasive function in classical Greek discourses such as Demosthenes' *Against Conon* (54) (de Brauw, "Parts," 194–95) and Lysias (Carey, "Persuasion," 38–43; Craig Cooper, "Forensic Oratory," in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington [Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010], 211–14).

Chapter 5. Propositions in the Prologue Demonstrated in the Gospel

5.1 Introduction

Chapters 4 to 6 examine this study's second rhetorical strategy, narrative rhetoric. Chapter 4 developed a theory of narrative rhetoric. This theory is narrowly focused on those sorts of narratives that seek to demonstrate a proposition or thesis by means of narration. Chapters 5 and 6 will present a two-dimensional argument that the Gospel's Prologue specifies propositions that are demonstrated in the FG's ensuing narrative. The current chapter will present a textually based argument. It will argue that the abstract-formulated statements in the Prologue can be viewed as "propositions" that find demonstration by means of textual features in the subsequent narrative. The propositions are formulated in the abstract in that they are not situation specific.[440] However, these propositions find corresponding textual statements (sayings or actions) in concrete situation-specific episodes in the narrative. We suggest that these situation-specific features in the text can be considered as instances of examples that inductively prove the corresponding proposition in the Prologue. According to our theory (chapter 4), the FG will present 'n' narrated situation-specific examples that cumulatively seek to prove the corresponding proposition.

5.2 Propositions in the Prologue Demonstrated in the Fourth Gospel

5.2.1 Introduction

This chapter will examine four abstract-formulated propositions in the Prologue and show that situation-specific examples can be found in the subsequent narrative text. These 'n' examples serve to prove or demonstrate inductively the abstract-formulated propositions. The four propositions are (1) "Jesus is God come in the flesh" (1:1, 14); (2) "The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it" (1:5); (3) "He gave them the power to become children of God" (1:12–13); and (4) "We have seen his glory" (1:14).

---

[440] A detailed treatment of the abstract statements in the Prologue is provided below in sec. 6.2.4 ("The Prologue Contains Abstractions").

5.2.2 Jesus is God come in the flesh (1:1; 14)

Jesus is presented as the *Logos*/God in the FG beginning with the Prologue. John 1:1 and 18[441] affirm Jesus' deity. This identification as God, however, is not a complete identification: "Jesus constantly distinguishes between himself and the Father."[442] The statement "Jesus is God come in the flesh" (1:1, 14) can be considered a proposition that is demonstrated in the body of the Gospel. The demonstration is carried out in the FG through various statements and actions attributed to Jesus. While much could be said regarding Jesus' deity in the FG, the discussion below will highlight three principal features: (1) Jesus' preexistence, including the "sending" motif; (2) Jesus' divine dignity in terms of his role as the grantor of life, judge, and the honor and glory ascribed to him; and (3) the "I am" statements, with more sustained attention given to the absolute "I am" statements.

5.2.2.1 Jesus' Deity and Preexistence

Jesus' deity and preexistence is presented throughout the Gospel. In the Prologue, Jesus as the *Logos* is presented as the divine agent through whom God created the world: "All things came into being through him" (1:3, cf. v. 10).[443] But Jesus' preexistence is demonstrated also in the body of the Gospel. John the Baptist affirms Jesus' preexistence at the beginning of the Gospel (1:30; cf. v. 15),[444] and Jesus' deity is confessed by Thomas in 20:28. In addition, Jesus' deity and preexistence are frequently conveyed in the FG through various expressions that indicate his divine origin, often through specific prepositions and verbs. De Jonge discusses the prepositions that indicate Jesus' origin: ἄνωθεν (3:31); ἐκ τῶν ἄνω (8:23); οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν (18:36); ἐκ/ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (3:13; 6:38); ἀπὸ/παρὰ/ἐκ θεοῦ (13:3; 6:36; cf. 7:17), and suggests that they "actually indicate the same thing, 'from above'—'from heaven'—'from (or, out of) God.'"[445] Several verbs express Jesus' movement between earth and his Father

---

[441] Owing to a textual variant, the reading of μονογενὴς θεός in 1:18 is uncertain. Most modern scholars prefer this reading. See Murray J. Harris (*Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992], 74–83) for a detailed analysis of the principal variants.

[442] Ladd, *Theology*, 287.

[443] Ladd, *Theology*, 278; Thompson, *John*, 36.

[444] Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:504.

[445] De Jonge, *Jesus*, 144.

(heaven), the primary verbs being ἀποστέλλω and πέμπω.[446] Other verbs[447] include ἐξέρχομαι (8:42); πορεύομαι (16:28); ὑπάγω (7:33); μεταβαίνω (13:1); and ἀναβαίνω (6:62);[448] καταβαίνω (3:13); and ἔρχομαι [εἰς τὸν κόσμον] (1:9).[449]

John the Baptist is also designated as one ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ (1:6). But John the Baptist was sent only to be a witness of the light (1:7) and was not the light himself (1:8). Jesus, on the other hand, came as the true light (1:9). De Jonge explains: "there is a fundamental difference between Jesus' coming from God and being sent by God, on the one hand, and that of men like John the Baptist on the other hand."[450] This difference is clarified by the use of such phrases as "from heaven" (3:13, 31; 6:33, 38, 51) or "from above" (3:31; 8:23). Moreover, the sending of Jesus from the Father is part of the content that needs to be believed (17:21, 23). Indeed, the sending of the Son "is itself the saving event (3:17; 17:3)."[451] Finally, that Jesus "has seen the Father" implies his preexistence.[452]

5.2.2.2 Jesus' Divine Dignity

Certain prerogatives that are the sole possession of God have been delegated to the Son. Among these are (1) the authority to confer life (5:21, 26, 39–40; 6:33; 10:28; 17:2);[453] (2) the authority to execute judgment (5:22, 27, 30);[454] (3) the same honor that is owed to God: “The Father judges no one but has given all judgment to the Son, so that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father. Anyone who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent him” (5:22–23)[455] (this honor finds demonstration in 9:38; 20:28);[456] and (4) Jesus shares the same glory as the Father (11:4, 40; 12:41; 17:5, 24). Finally, Jesus has the divine prerogative of giving the Spirit as seen in the insufflating of believers with the Spirit (see 1:33; 4:10, 14; 6:63; 7:37–39; chs. 14–16, and 20:22).[457]

---

[446] See Frey, *Eschatologie II*, 233. The Evangelist seems to use these two verbs without much discernable semantic difference. See Leon Morris, *Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 102–3; Moisés Silva, "πέμπω," *NIDNTTE* 3:703–4; Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Two Johannine Verbs for Sending: A Study of John's Use of Words with Reference to General Linguistic Theory," in *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*, JSNTSup 168 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 125–43. See, however, K. H. Rengstorf, "ἀπόστολος," *TDNT* 1:404.

[447] For further explication of many of these verbs in the context of the FG, see Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric*, chapter 7.

[448] See Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:176.

[449] See Schnelle, *Theology*, 669.

[450] De Jonge, *Jesus*, 145. See also Morris, *Jesus*, 103.

[451] Schnelle, *Theology*, 681.

[452] Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John*, Volume 1. Introduction, Analysis, and Reference. ECC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 348.

[453] See esp. Ruben Zimmermann and Zacharias Shoukry, "*Creatio Continua* in the Fourth Gospel: Motifs of Creation in John 5–6," in *Signs and Discourses in John 5 and 6 Historical, Literary, and Theological Readings from the Colloquium Ioanneum 2019 in Eisenach*, edited by Jörg Frey and Craig R. Koester, WUNT 463 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), 105–6n102.

[454] Bultmann, *Theology*, 2:38; Dunn, *Christology*, 57; Morris, *Jesus*, 100; Thompson, *John*, 128. Although other figures in the biblical tradition were given authority to execute judgment (see, e.g., Gen 49:16; Exod 18; Abel in *Testament of Abraham* 13), only Jesus has been given "the power to determine who lives; the power of judgment is the power of life" (Thompson, *John*, 128). See Keener,

5.2.2.3 Jesus’ “I Am” Statements

The “I am” (ἐγώ εἰμι) sayings in the FG provide further evidence of Jesus’ divine identity. In order to understand adequately the ἐγώ εἰμι statements in the FG, Catrin Williams has argued persuasively that one must recognize the background of these sayings in the OT, specifically in Deut 32:39 and Isa 40–55,[458] and perhaps Exod 3:14.[459] The bipartite form ἐγώ εἰμι in the LXX occurs in the Pentateuch only in Deut 32:39, but it occurs as a distinctive feature in Isa 40–55. The related Hebrew form is אֲנִי הוּא. This form plays a prominent role in contexts where Yahweh’s unique identity as the one true God is being presented.[460]

> Claims regarding Yahweh’s control over the course of history (41:2–4), his unique ability to predict events (43:9–10), the continuity between his past,

---

John, 651; Max Turner, “The Spirit of Christ and ‘Divine’ Christology,” in *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 423.

[455] Dunn, *Christology*, 57; Morris, *Jesus*, 101; Ladd, *Theology*, 285.

[456] See Carson, *John*, 659.

[457] See Turner, “Spirit,” 415, 421. See also the discussion in Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 396–400.

[458] Catrin H. Williams, *I Am He*, WUNT 2/113 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

[459] Williams argues that the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι sayings in the FG relate more directly to Deuteronomy and Isaiah, rather than Exod 3:14. But she seems willing to acknowledge that, perhaps in the case of John 8:58, the background may include Exod 3:14 (but also Isa 40–55, owing to the presence of themes and motifs from this section). See Williams, *I Am He*, 276–83.

[460] David M. Ball (*“I Am” in John’s Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*, JSNTSup 124 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996]) also investigates the ἐγώ εἰμι sayings in the FG through the background of Isa 40–55. For other modern authors who view Isa 40–55 as the background for understanding the ἐγώ εἰμι statements of Jesus, see Ball, *“I Am” in John’s Gospel,* 33–34. See also Ethelbert Stauffer, *Jesus and His Story*, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: Knopf, 1974), esp. 186–87; Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:84; Brown, *John*, 535–37; James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making. A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*, 2nd Edition (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 31; Ladd, *Theology*, 287; Bauckham, *God Crucified*, 55; Lincoln, *Truth on Trial*; 43–45, 88–96; and John L. Ronning, *The Jewish Targums and John’s Logos Theology* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010), 194–223.

> present and future involvement with Israel (43:12–13; 46:3–4) and his creative activity (48:12–13) all serve to substantiate the prophet's message that real power belongs to Yahweh alone.[461]

The use in Deut 32:39 ("See now that I, even I, am he; there is no god besides me. I kill and I make alive; I wound and I heal; and no one can deliver from my hand") conveys the similar thought of "Yahweh's unique and true divinity, with the result that all other gods are to be excluded."[462]

The ἐγώ εἰμι sayings attributed to Jesus generally fall into two categories: those with a predicate and those used absolutely (i.e., without a predicate). In the former category are the "I am" sayings found in 6:35, 51 ("I am the bread of life"); 8:12; 9:5 ("I am the light of the world"); 10:7, 9 ("I am the gate for the sheep"); 10:11, 14 ("I am the good shepherd"); 11:25 ("I am the resurrection and the life"); 14:6 ("I am the way, and the truth, and the life"); and 15:1, 5 ("I am the true vine").[463] These predicate uses reveal Jesus' role as the mediator of divine life. They have the role "of making the saving character of Jesus' mission visible in impressive images and symbols,"[464] and reveal that Jesus is uniquely endowed with the ability to confer life.[465]

The occurrences and significance of the absolute use of ἐγώ εἰμι is debated. The most complete list is held to include 4:26; 6:20; 8:24, 28, 58; 13:19; and 18:5, 6, 8.[466] More controversial is whether the meaning conveyed by these absolute uses is strictly limited to one of identification (thus, Jesus is simply affirming his identity), or whether an additional, deeper, more pregnant[467] sense is involved (identifying a "theophany"). By itself, the absolute use of ἐγώ εἰμι does not necessarily suggest deity. The context is key (see 9:9). But even when an implied complement is lacking, the saying "becomes unintelligible except as an allusion to God's name in the Hebrew Bible or LXX."[468] In the FG, "the absolute form is a claim to deity."[469] The occurrence of ἐγώ εἰμι in 8:58 is perhaps the least controversial.

---

[461] Williams, *I Am He*, 39.

[462] Williams, *I Am He*, 48.

[463] Zimmermann argues in his Habilitation that "I am king" in 18:37 should be included in these predicate instances. Zimmermann, *Christologie*, 125, esp. n75.

[464] Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:88.

[465] Thompson, *John*, 160.

[466] See Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:80. For Brown (*John*, 533–34), the absolute list includes 8:24, 28, 58; and 13:19; but allows that 6:20 and 18:5 may have a two-fold sense that includes a theophany. Pancaro (*Law*, 60) holds that the absolute use is found only in John 8 and 13:19, suggesting that 6:20 and 18:5, 6, 8 "are not true examples of the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι." Elizabeth Harris (*Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist*, JSNTSup 107 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994], 130–36) also argues for the above complete list. They all "require a theological content" (136). Others who hold that the full list above comprises the absolute forms include Ladd, *Theology*, 287; Frey (*Eschatologie III*, 446–47); Richard Bauckham, *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 244.

[467] Brown (*John*, 1:534), "sacral use."

David Ball and Catrin Williams analyze all the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι sayings in the FG, attempting to determine the precise OT referent in order to provide an adequate explanation for each instance in the FG. The examination below will in the main utilize the results of their studies. The discussion will examine the complete list in order of occurrence. It has been suggested that, once it is recognized that at least some occurrences more explicitly indicate the presence of the divine in Jesus, it seems reasonable that the audience would naturally extend this sense to the other more debated instances.[470]

John 4:26: λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι.

The first occurrence of the absolute use of ἐγώ εἰμι occurs in 4:26. The words ἐγώ εἰμι in 4:26 might be construed as a simple messianic identification for Jesus.[471] Williams notes that this is the most obvious and most widely held view,[472] but goes on to suggest that this is not the only possible interpretation.[473] Williams points out that while the statement certainly has the role of self-identification, it nonetheless moves the woman's words to a higher plane (or "level") that even the woman does not fully comprehend.[474] Williams suggests that the key to identifying this higher plane is to observe that the lexeme ἀναγγέλλω that the woman uses (4:25) also has a distinctive usage in the LXX of Isa 40–55. She offers three strands of evidence that the background to John 4:26 is to be found in the ἐγώ εἰμι statements in Isa 40–55, thus suggesting an identification of Jesus with Yahweh.

---

[468] Keener, *John*, 769. Barrett (*John*, 342) explains, "ἐγώ εἰμι without complement … is hardly a Greek expression, … ἐγώ εἰμι is in itself (as Greek) a meaningless expression."

[469] Keener, *John*, 770.

[470] See Keener, *John*, 1:620, 674, 770. Barrett (*Gospel*, 281) cautions against this suggestion, but Williams (*I Am He*, 225) responds that this reticence would amount to "an overly atomistic approach" to understanding these sayings. Bauckham suggests that all the absolute sayings are to be taken as a set. While the surface meaning may be present in some cases, this possibly suggests cases of a double entendre, where the deeper meaning of Jesus' divine identity is also evident. Readers who attentively study the Gospel will realize that Jesus is a Messiah with a divine identity. Bauckham, *Testimony*, 245, 248.

[471] For example, Carson (*John*, 227n1) writes, "This instance of *egō eimi* … is not theologically loaded." See also Thompson, *John*, 106.

[472] Williams, *I Am He*, 259.

[473] Williams, *I Am He*, 262. Similarly, Ball (*"I Am" in John's Gospel*, 179) asks, "But is this all that this 'I am' saying signifies for Jesus' identity?"

[474] Williams, *I Am He*, 262. Ball (*"I Am,"* 178–81) and Ronning (*Targums*, 200) also argue that the narrative operates on two levels.

First, the use of ἀναγγέλλω (4:25) points to the revelatory aspect of Jesus' words. The words, ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος λαλῶν δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀναγγέλλων ἀλήθειαν (Isa 45:19), coupled with Jesus' statement, ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι (4:26), point to Jesus as "the eschatological agent who communicates divine truth."[475]

Second, the frequent use of ἀναγγέλλω in Isa 40–55 draws together Yahweh's announcements and his acts of deliverance. "God seeks to convince the exiles of his claim to exclusive divinity by presenting his salvific acts in the past (41:4; 43:12; 51:10) as the basis for his future manifestation as their deliverer (41:14; 43:3, 13; 46:4)."[476] A parallel thus exists between Yahweh's statements of deliverance in Isa 40–55 and Jesus' saving offer of living water that leads to eternal life (4:10, 14).[477]

Third, the woman's words ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα ("he will proclaim all things to us") (4:25) invite comparison with statements in Isa 43. In comparing the challenge offered to the gods of the other nations (LXX 43:9: τίς ἀναγγελεῖ ταῦτα;) with Yahweh's own saving proclamations (LXX 43:12: ἀνήγγειλα καὶ ἔσωσα), it is evident that Yahweh is able to proclaim his unique identity and his claim to be the one true God.[478] It is also evident from the woman's words, εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα (4:39), that she does not fully comprehend the "all things" she mentions in 4:25 and the full import of Jesus' claim. "But for the readers of this narrative, Jesus' first utterance of ἐγώ εἰμι already points to his role as the one in whom the divine promises of revelation and salvation are being fulfilled."[479] In summary, Williams has made a case for understanding Isa 40–55 as the background for at least one of the of ἐγώ εἰμι statements in the FG. Rather than simply a messianic identification, a deeper level also seems to be present.[480] This suggests that 4:26 points both to Jesus' messianic identification and to his identification with Yahweh of the OT, especially as found in Isaiah.[481]

---

[475] Williams, *I Am He*, 263. For William's complete argument, see 257–66. Ball (*"I Am,"* 179) and Ronning (*Targums*, 201) suggest that the background text includes Isa 43:10 and 52:6. See also Franklin W. Young, "A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel," *ZNW* 46 (1955): 224.

[476] Williams, *I Am He*, 263.

[477] Williams (*I Am He*, 263n32) also notes the promise of water to quench thirst in Isa 43:20; 44:3; 49:10; and 55:1. Observe further that Isa 44:3 promises the pouring out of water and the pouring out of the Spirit, which finds similar expression in John 7:37–39. Further references to Yahweh's saving acts of redemption occur in Isa 52:8–9.

[478] Williams, *I Am He*, 264–65.

[479] Williams, *I Am He*, 266.

John 6:20: ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

Determining the precise meaning of the ἐγώ εἰμι saying in 6:20 is made difficult because the incident seems to be paralleled in the Synoptic accounts (Mark 6:45–53; Matt 14:22–34), which have the same ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε (though prefixed by θαρσεῖτε). One motif common to all three accounts is Jesus' action of walking on the sea. This suggests to Williams that this episode is "a demonstration of divine power and authority."[482] Thus, while at first glance, this "I am" saying might simply function as a means of self-identification, there seems to be more at stake than that, though self-identification is undoubtedly part of the interpretation. According to Dodd, in light of the significance that the ἐγώ εἰμι statements have in the rest of the FG, "it seems more than probable that it is to be understood here as elsewhere as the equivalent of the divine name אני הוא, I AM."[483] Moreover, the motif of God controlling the waters is found in the biblical tradition. Job 9:8 LXX refers to God as one walking (περιπατέω) on the waters (see also 38:16; Hab 3:15).[484] Williams elucidates several features that cumulatively argue for understanding Isa 40–55 as the background for the ἐγώ εἰμι in 6:20:[485] (1) the depiction of Jesus approaching the disciples to guide them through the darkness is reminiscent of Isa 42:16; (2) Yahweh creates a way through mighty waters for the redeemed to pass through (Isa 43:16; 51:10); and (3) as Yahweh will be with his people when they pass through the waters such that they will not be harmed, Jesus also "comes near" (6:19) and his presence ensures their safe journey (6:21). To these we can add an additional text from Isa 43:1, which contains the words, "Do not fear, for I am with you," which is in the context of another ἐγώ εἰμι saying (43:10).[486] Just as Yahweh accompanies his people and provides for their safety, Jesus acts in a similar capacity to accompany his people and bring them safely to their destination.[487]

---

[480] In John 4:14, Jesus has already shown that Samaritan woman that he is "more than a human Messiah by offering the living water from which eternal life springs." Bauckham, *Testimony*, 248.

[481] Brown (*John*, 1:172) also notes the possibility that the use of ἐγώ εἰμι in 4:26 is intended to indicate Jesus' divinity. See also J. Terence Forestell, *The Word of the Cross: Salvation as Revelation in the Fourth Gospel* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974), 27.

[482] Williams, *I Am He*, 219.

[483] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 345. While many interpret Jesus' words as theophanic, others are more reticent. For the two principal views and proponents, see Craig R. Koester, "Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John," *Bib* 70 (1989): 340n29.

[484] Williams, *I Am He*, 219. Thus, Barrett's (*Gospel*, 281) "self-identification" seems inadequate.

[485] See Williams, *I Am He*, 225–28.

Though not directly related to Isa 40–55, the reaction of the disciples seems to figure prominently in the sea-crossing scene. Their willingness to receive Jesus (6:21: ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν) linked with the immediate (εὐθέως) result that they safely reach their destination prefigures the function of the subsequent absolute ἐγώ εἰμι sayings, and serves "as a succinct expression of Jesus' identity as the one who offers the Father's gift of eternal life to those who receive him."[488]

The narrative account in John 6:15–21 has an important demonstrative function relative to the Evangelist's program of providing propositions in the Prologue that are illustrated and demonstrated in the rest of the Gospel. Gail O'Day aptly notes: "The Prologue informs the Gospel reader that Jesus is the incarnate Word of God, and the rest of the Gospel demonstrates and serves this central claim [in 1:1, 14, 18]."[489] And further, "John 6:15–21 provides a bold and vivid demonstration of the unity of God and Jesus, the Father and the Son."[490]

The ἐγώ εἰμι statements in John 8:24 and 8:28 may be profitably considered together.[491]

> 8:24: ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν.
>
> 8:28: ὅταν ὑψώσητε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τότε γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ...

Similar to the ἐγώ εἰμι statements in 4:26 and 6:20, an adequate understanding can only be achieved from a consideration of the OT background. The most immediate OT reference seems to be Isa 43:10 (LXX): γένεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες κἀγὼ μάρτυς λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός καὶ ὁ παῖς ὃν ἐξελεξάμην ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

---

[486] Ball, *"I Am" in John's Gospel*, 183.

[487] Forestell suggests that textual features seem to indicate the divine presence in Jesus. Forestell, *Word of the Cross*, 70.

[488] Williams, *I Am He*, 228.

[489] Gail R. O'Day, "John 6:15–21: Jesus Walking on Water as Narrative Embodiment of Johannine Christology," in *Critical Readings of John 6*, edited by R. A. Culpepper, BIS 22 (Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1997), 158.

[490] O'Day, "John 6:15–21," 159. She continues, noting that as John 10:30 is a "verbal summary of the Gospel's central claim about God and Jesus," so "6:15–21 offers a narrative summary of the same claim."

[491] Similarly, Ball, *"I Am" in John's Gospel*, 188–94; Williams, *I Am He*, 266–75.

The similarity of linguistic expression (“know” and “believe” “that I am”) seems to imply that these sayings in the FG can be understood by recourse to this Isaiah passage.[492] In the immediate context, God declares that he is the only savior (43:11). The linking together of (1) ἐγώ εἰμι (43:10, 13), (2) the statement that there is no god besides Yahweh (43:10: “Before me no god was formed, nor shall there be any after me”), and (3) “besides me there is no savior” (43:11) points to the exclusive divinity of Yahweh and that he is the only savior of Israel.

In the same context are two additional features relevant to John 8: (1) the words, “I, I am He [ἐγώ εἰμι ἐγώ εἰμι] who blots out your transgressions for my own sake, and I will not remember your sins (43:25); and (2) 43:26–27, which call on Yahweh’s people to consider the judgment of their predecessors for their transgressions. These two features help clarify Jesus’ warning to the Jews that they will die in their sins, but forgiveness and eternal life is possible if they πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι (8:24).[493] Ball summarizes:

> If Jesus’ “I am” saying of 8:24 alludes to these verses [43:25–27] from Isaiah as well as to 43:10, then the implication of that must carry over to the “I am” saying of 8:28. By means of ἐγώ εἰμι Jesus identifies himself with the forgiving action of Yahweh. In other words, when Jesus is lifted up by the Jews, it will be revealed that he is the one who blots out transgressions and remembers sin no more. However, for those who do not believe, the result will be that they die in their sins.[494]

John 8:58: πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμί.

---

[492] Ball, *“I Am” in John’s Gospel*, 189. Williams concurs, and adds that the wider context of Isaiah also needs to be considered, as well as the one occurrence of ἐγώ εἰμι in the Pentateuch, LXX Deut 32:39, and its context. Williams, *I Am He*, 271.

[493] I am indebted here to Ball, *“I Am” in John’s Gospel*, 194. See also Williams, *I Am He*, 274–75. See Ball (188–94) and Williams (266–75) for their more detailed analysis. Although the lexeme for forgiveness is lacking, the concept seems to be present. The “I am” statements in Isa 43:10 and 8:24 both occur in the context concerning sin (Isa 43:25 and 8:24). Ball points out that, if the result of the Jews’ unbelief means that they die in their sins, the converse would seem to be true: “belief would result in them being saved from such a death” (*“I Am” in John’s Gospel*, 193–94). See also Ronning’s detailed discussion of forgiveness in 8:24 (*Targums*, 191–92). Note that in the FG Jesus does not explicitly tell anyone that their sins are forgiven. Thompson, *John*, 422.

[494] Ball, *“I Am” in John’s Gospel*, 194.

That 8:58 refers to Jesus' deity is a commonplace among interpreters. "No clearer implication of divinity is found in the Gospel tradition."[495] Similarly, Keener points out that the words in the Prologue (1:1, 18) and the appellations to Jesus in 20:28 show that the readers are expected to interpret Jesus' words in 8:58 as referring to his deity.[496] The reference to Jesus' deity can be observed in particular from the tense contrast between the aorist *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι* (8:58)[497] and the present tense *ἐγὼ εἰμί*, which is reminiscent of the same temporal distinction (aorist vs. present) found in Psa 90:2 (LXX: 89:2): *πρὸ τοῦ ὄρη γενηθῆναι … ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος σὺ εἶ.*"[498] A similar contrast in the same verbs and tenses is found in Isa 43:10 LXX: *ἐγώ εἰμι ἔμπροσθέν μου οὐκ ἐγένετο ἄλλος θεός*. Ball notes that the temporal sense of *ἔμπροσθέν* in Isa 43:10 possibly matches the use of *πρίν* in 8:58.[499] Additionally, there is some thought that the usage of *ἐγώ εἰμι* in 8:58 harks back to texts in Isaiah that connect Yahweh's statements about his eternal existence with the words *ἐγώ εἰμι*: *ἐγὼ θεὸς πρῶτος καὶ εἰς τὰ ἐπερχόμενα ἐγώ εἰμι* (41:4 LXX), and *ἐγώ εἰμι πρῶτος καὶ ἐγώ εἰμι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* (48:12 LXX). In light of the other *ἐγὼ εἰμι* statements made earlier in chapter 8, this final occurrence in v. 58 suggests that Jesus' words are a claim to deity,[500] and denote his timeless preexistence.[501] More seems to be at stake, however, than Jesus' timeless existence. The statement is primarily about the salvation that Jesus offers.[502] Just as Yahweh acted as the savior of his people, including deliverance and forgiveness of sins (Isa 43:3, 11, 12, 16, 25; 51:10; cf. Exod 3:6, 14; 13:15–22), so Jesus now provides true freedom (8:21–36) and eternal life (8:51: "not seeing death").[503]

---

[495] Brown, *John*, 1:367.

[496] Keener, *John*, 1:771.

[497] By itself the infinitive does not express a temporal relation, but it can when a deictic indicator, such as a preposition (in this case *πρίν*), is present. See Porter, *Aspect*, 388.

[498] Brown, *John*, 1:367. Brown notes that the Prologue also contains a similar tense contrast: 1:1–3 (imperfect versus aorist). See also Keener, *John*, 1:770.

[499] Ball, *"I Am" in John's Gospel*, 195–96.

[500] Ball, *"I Am" in John's Gospel*, 197.

[501] Lindars, *John*, 336. See also Edwin D. Freed, "Who or What Was Before Abraham in John 8:58?" *JSNT* 5 (1983): 52.

[502] Williams, *I Am He*, 276, 278; Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:88–89; 223–24; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 139.

[503] The intriguing formulations of the double *ἐγώ εἰμι* (Isa 43:25; 45:19; 51:12) suggest to some that the divine name is involved. See esp. Brown, *John*, 536; but also, Dodd, *Interpretation*, 94; and Williams, *I Am He*, 282–83.

John 13:19 *ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.*

The most conspicuous feature in 13:19 is Jesus' ability to predict future events. As noted previously, this a prominent feature in Isa 40–55, where Yahweh's ability to predict the future in comparison with the failure of pagan gods to do the same is dramatically portrayed (e.g., Isa 42:9; 45:21; 48:3, 5). In this section, Isa 43:9–10 seems to be the clearest parallel text to Jesus' prediction and *ἐγώ εἰμι* statement. Ball notes some connections between Isa 43:10 and 13:16–19: *ἐξελεξάμην* (43:10) and *ἐξελεξάμην* (13:18), and *ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνῆτε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι* (43:10) and *ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι* (13:19).[504] Williams suggests, however, the need to consider the wider context of Isa 40–55. It is in this section that Yahweh's exclusive divinity, sovereignty, and claim to be the only true God who can save are emphasized (43:11, 13; cf. 45:21–22). Moreover, as Yahweh's elect are called upon to testify to his saving actions (*γένεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες* … *ὃν ἐξελεξάμην* (43:10, 12), so also the disciples, chosen by Jesus (13:18; 15:16), and who will be present at the fulfillment of Jesus' predictions (18:5–8), will be called upon to testify of Jesus' saving actions (15:27).[505] Thus, 13:19 is conveying a much more significant message than Jesus' ability to predict future events. His predictive proclamation, *ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι*, has the purpose of enabling the disciples "to recognize that the Father has 'given all things into his hands' (v. 3), and that the path leading to Jesus' death is one that he openly accepts" (cf. 18:11).[506]

John 18:5 *λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ εἰμι.*

John 18:8 *εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι. εἰ οὖν ἐμὲ ζητεῖτε, ἄφετε τούτους ὑπάγειν·*

These two (or three, counting v. 6) *ἐγώ εἰμι* sayings culminate the *ἐγώ εἰμι* statements in the FG. Although, at the surface level, an understanding of these statements as expressions of mere self-identification might seem adequate, further analysis suggests that a deeper, more profound explanation is required. It seems hardly likely that the arresting party, whose primary purpose was to apprehend Jesus, upon discovering him, would express astonishment at meeting him.[507] Williams discusses several previous explanations for the reaction of the arresting party, and concludes that none seems sufficient to explain the reaction, especially since none of them attempts to relate the reaction to Jesus' ἐγώ εἰμι statement.[508] Similar to the analyses above of the other ἐγώ εἰμι statements in the FG, Williams argues for the background of the OT, especially Deut 32:37–42 and Isa 40–48. She adduces four features that suggest that these texts lie behind John 18:5–8.[509] First, as we have seen from these texts, Yahweh is the one who is sovereign over the events of history (see Isa 43:8–13; cf. 41:22–23, 26; 42:9; 44:7). Similarly, Jesus reigns sovereign over events, in this case beginning with his prediction of his betrayal (13:19) that is fulfilled in the garden (18:1–11). Second, the confrontation that recurs in the FG, heightened in chapter 8, only intensifies in the garden with the arrival of Judas (now indwelt by Satan: 13:27; cf. 6:70; 13:2) and the members of the arresting party. This confrontation mirrors the dramatic trial scenes in Isa 41:1–4; 43:8–13; 44:6–8 (cf. Deut 32:37–42). Third, as Yahweh demonstrates his power by subduing his enemies (Isa 43:13; Deut 32:35), in like manner, Jesus demonstrates his power as indicated by the arresting party falling to the ground. Fourth, as Yahweh alone can secure his people's deliverance, so also Jesus, in his second utterance of ἐγώ εἰμι, procures the freedom of his disciples (18:8). The "saving" significance of 18:8, however, seems to extend beyond the mere avoidance of arrest. Jesus' fulfillment statement in 18:9 does not have a precise referent but, according to Williams, several options are possible: 6:39 (lose nothing); 10:28b ("they will never perish"); and 17:12 (none lost except Judas), and together these three passages help clarify the meaning of Jesus' freeing of his disciples.[510]

---

[504] Ball, *"I Am" in John's Gospel*, 199.

[505] Williams, *I Am He*, 285–86.

[506] Williams, *I Am He*, 285–86.

These four features, then, suggest that the background to the ἐγώ εἰμι sayings in 18:5–8 is to be found in Isa 40–48 and Deut 32. The two ἐγώ εἰμι sayings in 18:5 and 8 convey distinct theological features that offer interpretive clues on how the episode is to be understood. They are reminiscent of the actions of Yahweh in Isa 40–48 and other passages that depict Yahweh's sovereign control over events and indicate that he alone is Israel's God and savior. Jesus is depicted as acting in the same way that Yahweh acted in the OT. The first ἐγώ εἰμι saying (18:5) demonstrates Jesus' control over the events of history, his ability to predict the future, and that the darkness cannot overcome the true light (1:5). The second ἐγώ εἰμι saying (18:8) demonstrates Jesus' unique identity as the one who alone can confer eternal life.[511]

---

[507] Williams, *I Am He*, 289. See also her remarks about the significance of the phraseology of 18:6.

[508] Williams, *I Am He*, 289–91.

[509] See Williams, *I Am He*, 293–97, for her detailed analysis. See also Ball, *"I Am" in John's Gospel*, 201.

[510] Williams, *I Am He*, 296–97. Williams seems to prefer 10:28b, in the context of 10:1–21.

To summarize, the absolute ἐγώ εἰμι sayings show that Jesus acts in an analogous way to Yahweh acting in the OT, especially Deut 32:39 and Isa 41–48 (and perhaps Exod 3:14). Among the most forceful monotheistic claims in the OT are the "I am he" statements, especially as articulated in Deut 32:39 and Isa 41–48. Jesus, in identifying himself with the words ἐγώ εἰμι, is simultaneously and "unambiguously identifying himself with the one and only God, YHWH."[512] Moreover, Jesus, even in his role as one "sent from the Father," performs such actions as granting life, determining a person's destiny (judgment), and revealing God's glory.[513] These are actions that are prerogatives that God cannot delegate to someone who is not God.[514] As an overall section summary, these three subsections: Jesus' deity and preexistence, his divine dignity, and his ἐγώ εἰμι statements cumulatively demonstrate the proposition that "Jesus is God come in the flesh." The conclusion is doubly expressed in Thomas's confession in 20:28 and in the immediately following purpose statement in 20:31.[515]

5.2.3 The Light Shines in the Darkness, and the Darkness did not Overcome It (1:5)

Another proposition in the Prologue is related to the text in 1:4–5, which reads: "in him was life, and the life was the light of all people. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it" (1:4–5). This is another claim that finds demonstration in the ensuing narrative. The claim is actually formulated in two parts.

---

[511] Williams, *I Am He*, 297–98.

[512] Bauckham, *Testimony*, 247.

[513] Although Jesus bestows on the disciples the (divine) authority to forgive/retain sins (20:23), the following should be noted. First, only Jesus is said to take away sins (1:19), second, the passives in 20:23 are probably to be regarded as "divine passives" (ultimately, God himself is acting) and v. 23 is linked with 20:22 and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Jeremias notes that Jesus, through the ministry of the Spirit, "is himself directly at work as the One who forgives." J. Jeremias, "κλείς," *TDNT* 3:753. See also Thompson, *John*, 423; Ridderbos, *John*, 644.

[514] Bauckham, *Testimony*, 248.

[515] It is to be noted again that it is disputed whether all the above instances function in a heightened sense that relates to Jesus' divine identity with Yahweh. The argument here does not depend on this. Even if not all function in the way that Ball and Williams have argued, several seem to.

The first is a positive claim: “in him was life, and the life was the light of all people” (1:4). The second part, on the other hand, is formulated negatively: “The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it” (1:5). Although both claims are demonstrated in the Gospel, only the second claim will be addressed here. First, it is necessary to recognize that the meaning of the verb *καταλαμβάνω* (1:5) is contested. Two main options for the meaning are possible: “understand” and “overcome.” Although the former has been suggested as the more appropriate meaning,[516] in the context, there seems to be an element of adversarial action,[517] and thus the latter meaning seems to be meaning here.[518]

Several passages show how the FG demonstrates the proposition that the darkness did not overcome the light. Perhaps the first piece of evidence comes from the Prologue itself: the use of the present tense φαίνει in 1:5. At the time of the composition of the FG, the assertion is that the light is still shining.[519] The significant feature is that Jesus acts sovereignly over all the events of his life, mostly pointedly over those that surround his death by crucifixion. Jörg Frey has enumerated many of these, including Jesus’ knowledge of his death (13:1, 3), and his voluntary submission to the Father (10:18; 18:11). Jesus determines and announces the “hour” of his death (12:23), even to the extent of orchestrating the sequence of events that will lead to his arrest (13:26–27), and actively submitting to his own arrest (18:4).[520] The scene of the crucifixion is especially noteworthy (see 19:28–30). Verse 28 reads, “After this, when Jesus knew that all was now finished, he said (in order to fulfill the scripture), ‘I am thirsty.’” Verse 30b reads, “he said, ‘It is finished.’ Then he bowed his head and gave up his spirit.” The key lexical/grammatical item here is the perfect tense form *τετέλεσται* that occurs twice in 19:28–30.[521] This indicates that Jesus has emerged victorious. He has completed the work that the Father has given him, and nothing has deterred him from that goal. In fact, Jesus considers it “food” to “finish” his Father’s work (4:34). Further, Jesus has not been defeated by the “ruler of this world.” Rather, “the ruler of this world has been condemned” (16:11), and has been “cast out” (12:31). Moreover, Jesus has defeated the world (16:33: *νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον*). In sum, Jesus reigns victorious over the darkness (1:5) because he has willingly completed the work given to him by the Father (4:34; 19:28–30), he has conquered the world (*νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον*) (16:33), and has condemned and cast out the ruler of this world (12:31; 16:11).[522] Thus, the cross is not an instrument of dishonor, but the means for Jesus’ glorification.[523] Kovacs writes, “The worst attacks of the devil are foiled, and Christ—through, not despite, the cross—is installed as the victorious, glorious king.”[524] Finally, the darkness cannot prevent Jesus from rising from the tomb (20:1). The conclusion follows: “the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it” (1:5).[525]

---

[516] See, e.g., Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 1:246–47; Ridderbos, *John*, 39–40; Beasley-Murray, *John*, 11.

[517] Van der Watt, *Family*, 256; Dennis, *Jesus’ Death*, 131n67.

[518] See Morris, *John*, 76; Moloney, *John*, 36; Dennis, *Jesus’ Death*, 131n67; Frey, “Dualism,” 126, and the literature referred to in n129; Lindars, *John*, 87, who notes, “this is the interpretation of Origen and most of the Fathers.” See also Kovacs, who attempts to integrate the two meanings. Judith L. Kovacs, “‘Now Shall the Ruler of This World Be Driven Out’: Jesus’ Death as Cosmic Battle in John 12:20–36,” *JBL* 114 (1995): 231. Similarly, Edwyn Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, edited by Francis Noel Davey (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 143; Barrett, *Gospel*, 158. Thus, a typical Johannine double entendre may be present, although Schnackenburg (1:247) rejects this.

[519] Morris, *John*, 75; J. Ramsey Michaels, *The Gospel of John*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 56–57; Frey, “Dualism,” 126–27; Hartwig Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 2. Auflage. HNT 6 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 72.

[520] For these and several other aspects of Jesus’ sovereign actions, see Frey, “Death,” 179–80.

5.2.4 He Gave them the Power to Become Children of God (1:12–13)

One of the propositions stated in the Prologue is contained in 1:12–13. The claim is made: “But to all who received [λαμβάνω][526] him [the *Logos/Light*/Jesus], who believed (πιστεύω) in his name, he gave power [ἐξουσία][527] to become children of God, who were born, not of blood or of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, but of God (ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν)” (1:12–13).[528] The ensuing narrative seeks to demonstrate this claim. Throughout the course of the narrative, various aspects of this claim are developed and illustrated. One aspect that seems to form what almost might be considered a type of *inclusio* is that of divine initiative. Beginning early in the narrative, the aspect of the divine initiative in the "new birth" emerges in the episode of Jesus and Nicodemus in John 3, where the divine birth is characterized as being "born again," or perhaps better, "born from above" (*γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν*) (3:3),[529] and born of "water and the Spirit" (*γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος*) (3:5). Furthermore, this "new birth" is a condition for "seeing" (3:3) and "entering" (3:5) the kingdom of God. In the context, key lexical items from the proposition in Prologue occur: e.g., *λαμβάνω* (1:12; 3:11), *πιστεύω* (1:12; 3:12–18), and *γεννάω* (1:13; 3:3, 5), which serve to link the episode with the proposition. These textual features, especially the passive voice (*γεννηθῇ*) in 3:3, 5 (cf. 1:13) help convey the understanding that birth into the divine family is by divine initiative.[530]

---

[521] Frey, “Death,” 172–76; Jörg Frey, “The Glory of the Crucified One,” in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 253–54.

[522] See Kovacs, “Ruler of This World,” 233.

[523] Frey, “Death,” 173.

[524] Kovacs, “Ruler of This World,” 246.

[525] It may be that the episode in John 11 (the raising of Lazarus) also represents a victory: a victory over death. See Dodd, *Interpretation*, 366.

[526] On the meaning of λαμβάνω in the FG, see Gerhard Delling, “λαμβάνω, κτλ,” *TDNT* 4:6; Heil, *Jesus*, 148.

[527] The lexeme ἐξουσία is variously translated as “power,” “right,” or “authority.” See Brown, *John*, 1:10–11; Keener, *John*, 1:403; Werner Foerster, “῎Εξεστιν, ᾿Εξουσία, κτλ,” *TDNT* 2:569; Moisés Silva, “ἐξουσία,” *NIDNTTE* 2:220.

[528] The related proposition in 1:11 could also be demonstrated: “his own people did not accept him.” As has often been pointed out, the FG narrates that, for the most part, many did not receive Jesus.

Next, John 6 may serve to illustrate in narrative form another aspect of "receiving" (*λαμβάνω*) Jesus. Although certain key features from the proposition are not mentioned explicitly in this episode (e.g., children of God, believing, being born), the action of a willing reception of Jesus and the resultant effect seem to function to illustrate this reception.[531] The narrative records that when Jesus revealed himself to the disciples in the middle of the sea, they were willing to receive him (*ἤθελον ... λαβεῖν αὐτόν*) into the boat (6:21a). This positive response to Jesus (*λαμβάνω αὐτόν*) occurs at other times in FG, including the proposition in the Prologue (1:12; 13:20; cf. 5:43). The result of this positive response is narrated in 6:21b: "immediately the boat reached the land toward which they were going." Thus, two features seem to be prominent: the willingness to receive Jesus, and Jesus' provision of salvation; that is, provision for the safe arrival at their destination.

---

[529] Since the adverb *ἄνωθεν* has the meaning of "above" (heaven) in 3:31 and 19:11, the meaning "from above" is to be preferred, although both meanings (a double entendre, frequent in the FG) may be present. For a discussion of the issues, see Jan Van der Watt, *Family of the King: Dynamics of Metaphor in the Gospel According to John*, BIS 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 172n50; Mark Zhakevich, *Follow Me: The Benefits of Discipleship in the Gospel of John* (Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield, 2021), 45n29.

[530] Paul A. Rainbow, *Johannine Theology: The Gospel, the Epistles and the Apocalypse* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014), 286; and Zhakevich (*Follow Me*, 31–35) explicate this divine initiative.

[531] As several interpreters have noted. See Williams, *I Am He*, 228; Ronning, *Targums*, 203. Both Williams and Ronning point out that, in the context, the crowd was unwilling to "receive" him, but instead wanted to take him by force (*ἁρπάζω*) (6:15), which comports with and serves to demonstrate 1:11–13.

John 8 further explains the birth from God in 1:13 in terms of the parentage integral to the divine birth, which reflect the birth from God in 1:13. Several aspects of the issue of parentage surface in the narrative. It is appropriate here to mention just two. First, parentage affects status: Jesus provides the status of true freedom versus that of slavery (8:31–36). Second, parentage affects behavior: if God is one's Father, that person will love the one he sent, namely, Jesus (8:42; cf. 14:15, 21, 23). Jesus' public ministry ends with one final appeal to join the divine family: [532] "While you have the light, believe in the light, so that you may become children of light [υἱοὶ φωτός]" (12:36).

The FD contains instructions that prepare the divine family (to be created in 19:27; see below) for mission. The inter-trinitarian divine love between the Father and the Son is to be the model of the love that the members of the divine family are to have for one another (15:9–12, 17; cf. 13:34–35). This will enable a unity among the family members that is intended to lead to effective witness to the world (17:11, 21–23).[533] It is quite possible that it is in 19:25–27 when Jesus first creates the new divine family among believers.[534] In 19:27 Jesus speaks to the BD, and says, "Here is your mother."[535] This suggests that the BD becomes a brother of Jesus. After Jesus' resurrection, he announces for the first time that his followers have God as their Father: Jesus instructs Mary to tell "my brothers" (ἀδελφούς μου), "I am ascending to my Father and your [ὑμῶν] Father, to my God and your [ὑμῶν] God" (20:17).[536] They are subsequently commissioned (20:21), given the Holy Spirit (20:22), and charged with task of forgiving others (20:23).[537]

---

[532] Keener, *John*, 2:882.

[533] See Zhakevich, *Follow Me*, 40.

[534] See Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 1992), 152; Van der Watt, *Family*, 266; Moloney, *Love*, 145–50. Vistar has recently advocated this view, and, in addition, has helpfully analyzed various symbolic interpretations. Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 202–6.

[535] Margaret Wesley suggests that this is a speech-act in which Jesus forms the new divine family. Margaret Wesley, *Son of Mary: The Family of Jesus and the Community of Faith in the Fourth Gospel*, ACTMS (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015), 431.

[536] Craig R. Koester, *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*, 2nd Edition (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 243.

[537] See Zhakevich, *Follow Me*, 49n71.

Finally, in the resurrection appearance to the disciples in chapter 21, several salient features can be mentioned.[538] First, Jesus addresses the disciples as "children" (παιδία) (21:5), which recalls the proposition in the Prologue.[539] Second, the pericope contrasts failure at Peter's initiative with success at Jesus' divine initiative,[540] first mentioned above in the discussion of John 3. Third, the symbolic nature of the immense catch without the net breaking is disputed, but may refer to the universality and unity of the disciples' mission.[541] Finally, the episode shows that Jesus will be present with his followers, continuing his "life-giving and life-sustaining work."[542]

In sum, the proposition (1:12–13) in the Prologue has been demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. Several features of this divine family were developed and illustrated, including Jesus constituting the divine family at his crucifixion. The Gospel ended on a note that those who believe in Jesus now have God as "their Father" (20:17), and that Jesus now calls them "children" (21:5). They also now have life in Jesus' name (20:31).

5.2.5 We Have Seen His Glory (1:14)

5.2.5.1 Introduction

The text in John 1:14 reads, "And the Word became flesh and lived among us, and we have seen his glory, the glory as of a father's only son, full of grace and truth." The emphasis of this statement seems to lie in the words "we have seen his glory."[543] Thus, while the entire statement can be considered a proposition, here we will select the key phrase, "we have seen his glory," as the proposition to consider.[544] The following will show how this proposition is demonstrated in the body of the Gospel. The important term to observe is *δόξα*, which in the NT has two principal meanings: "honor, reputation" or "visible splendor."[545] In the FG both these meanings are present. Concerning the second meaning ("visible splendor"), Brown notes that regarding the *δόξα* of God, two specific aspects are present: "it is a *visible* manifestation of His majesty in *acts of power*."[546] Both these aspects, visible manifestation and acts of power, are present in Jesus: in the Prologue (1:14) and in the sign miracles (2:11; 11:4, 40; cf. 17:4).[547] Specifically, God's glory is the visible manifestation of himself, and in the FG it is the radiance of his divine character.[548]

---

[538] Much could be said regarding chapter 21. See Chennattu, *Discipleship*, 168–76; Moloney, *Love*, 176–87, and major commentaries.

[539] See Chennattu, *Discipleship*, 170–71. Believers in 1:12 are identified as τέκνα.

[540] Moloney, *Love*, 180.

[541] See Chennattu, *Discipleship*, 171–73; Brown, *John*, 1075. Ridderbos disputes this universality and unity. He suggests, for example, that the unbroken net refers, rather, to not letting any of fish be lost. See Ridderbos, *John*, 663.

[542] Thompson, *John*, 434.

[543] C. K. Barrett, *The Prologue of St John's Gospel* (London: Athlone, 1971), 47; Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*, JSNTSup 89 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 181n1.

The "we" in 1:14 probably refers to the original eyewitnesses. See Keener, *John*, 1:411; Thompson, *Incarnate Word*, 42; though some see the believing community. Richard Bauckham (*Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitnesses Testimony*, 2nd ed. [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017], 380–81) argues that the "we" in this phrase pertains to the BD, "the 'we' of authoritative testimony."

[544] Dodd also considers the statement, "we saw his glory," to be a proposition. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 206.

Several facets seem to make up the notion of Jesus' glory in the FG. First, it is in Jesus as "full of grace and truth" that God's glory is seen (1:14) in the incarnation.[549] Jesus' glory may also contain an element of divine love.[550] According to Dodd, Jesus' incarnate life and death are where God's *ἀγάπη* is ultimately revealed: it is "the fullest manifestation of the glory of God which [a person] is capable of receiving."[551] He writes further: "The glory of God is manifested whenever His love becomes effective: supremely in his self-offering of Christ."[552] In addition, an aspect of God's goodness seems to be present in his glory.[553] Jesus' glory is also manifest in his "humility before God and his obedience to God."[554] Finally, Jesus' glory is evident when he reveals his divinity by exercising one of the divine prerogatives, the principal ones being his prerogative to have life in himself (1:4; 5:26); to give life (1:4; 5:21); and to enact judgment (5:22).[555] When Jesus displays one or more of these facets or characteristics, he manifests God's and his glory.

---

[545] Gerhard Kittel, "*δοκέω, δόξα, κτλ*," *TDNT* 2:232–55; Silva, "*δόξα*," *NIDNTTE* 1:761–67; Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 44.

[546] Brown, *John*, 1:503 [emphasis original].

[547] Brown, *John*, 1:503; Silva, "*δόξα*," *NIDNTTE* 1:766.

[548] Bauckham, *Glory*, 52, 58, 72–73.

[549] Bauckham, *Glory*, 198 (cf. also 73).

[550] Bauckham suggests that, owing to his desire to echo Exod 34:6, the Evangelist uses "grace" in the Prologue (only) but uses "love" (which does not occur in the Prologue) as its equivalent in the body of the Gospel. Bauckham, *Glory*, 64n2.

[551] C. H. Dodd, "The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Christian Worship," in *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, edited by F. L. Cross (London: Mowbray, 1957), 22. Pamment also emphasizes this element of love. Margaret Pamment, "The Meaning of *Doxa* in the Fourth Gospel," *ZNW* 74 (1983): 12–16.

[552] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 199.

[553] Carson, noting that the background of 1:14–18 is Exod 33–34, states, "God's glory … is supremely his goodness." Carson, *John*, 129. Similarly, Bauckham, *Glory*, 50.

[554] Bauckham, *Glory*, 58.

The following will examine some of the sign miracles and a few aspects of their related discourses in the FG. It should be pointed out that these sign narratives and discourses nearly always illustrate parts of other propositions in the Prologue. For example, we will see that the sign narratives and discourses often illustrate the proposition in 1:4 that "in [Jesus] was life, and the life was the light of all people."[556]

5.2.5.2 John 2: Turning Water into Wine

The first sign occurs in 2:1–11 with the episode of Jesus turning the water into wine. Several features regarding this first sign are noteworthy. This sign is terminated with the words, "Jesus did this, the first of his signs, in Cana of Galilee, and revealed his glory; and his disciples believed in him" (2:11). This indicates that Jesus' glory is in a sense hidden in such a manner that requires faith. "The glory of the earthly Jesus can be seen only by πίστις."[557] The signs have a revelatory function: to reveal God's glory.[558] Further, although the term δόξα occurs only with the first and last signs in Jesus' public ministry (2:11; 11:4, 40), these occurrences form a "deliberate *inclusio*" and suggest that all the signs are manifestation of Jesus' glory.[559] This first sign functions as an initial fulfillment of the proposition in 1:14: "we have seen his glory."[560] Also, as Barrett observes, the term "first"/"beginning" (ἀρχή) may suggest more than simply the first in a series. It may include the sense of being a "primary sign," being

---

[555] Udo Schnelle, *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John: An Investigation of the Place of the Fourth Gospel in the Johannine School*, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 81. Jesus also has the divine prerogative to accept worship. Bauckham, *Testimony*, 243. As Thompson points out, Jesus has this life "*in himself*." Those who believe in Jesus have life derivatively, and are unable to give life to others. Marianne Meye Thompson, "The Raising of Lazarus in John 11: A Theological Reading," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 237.

[556] Another proposition that these signs seem to demonstrate is found in 1:11: "He came to what was his own, and his own people did not accept him." See, e.g., 6:61–71; 9:39–41. John 1:5 is illustrated in John 9.

[557] Kittel, *TDNT* 2:249. See also Riga, "Signs," 410–12.

[558] Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 55. See also 11:4, 40.

[559] Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 53, 55, citing 53 here. See also Barrett, *Gospel*, 193; Keener, *John*, 1:276, 515. Forestell suggests that the logion in 1:51 is intended to inform the readers that the true disciples will be able to see the divine glory in Jesus throughout his entire public ministry. Forestell, *Word of the Cross*, 24. Hurtado suggests that the phrase "the glory you have given me" (17:22) reflects Jesus' ministry as a manifestation of God's glory. Hurtado, *Lord*, 377.

[560] As many note. See, e.g., Dodd, *Interpretation*, 297; Matthew S. Collins, "The Question of *Doxa*: A Socioliterary Reading of the Wedding at Cana," *BTB* 25 (1995): 106.

"representative of the creative and transforming work of Jesus as a whole."[561] It is in this sense "paradigmatic for Jesus' signs in general, … revealing Jesus' character by allowing him to show concern for a bride and groom."[562] Finally, the glory manifested in Jesus' signs is also the glory of God.[563] These signs point to "God's life-giving and joyful presence" that is found in Jesus.[564] Thus, the miracle in Cana (2:11: "the first of his signs") "characterizes the start of Jesus' life-giving ministry."[565]

5.2.5.3 John 4 and 5: Life-Giving Healings

What the signs in John 4 and 5 have in common with the first sign is the "life-giving" abilities and prerogatives of Jesus, even if in the first sign the miracle is of a more mundane enrichment of life.[566] The sign-miracle in 4:46–54 has in common with the sign-miracle in 5:1–11 in that (1) both people who were healed "were as good as dead":[567] the first was indeed at the point of death, and the second was virtually dead, "living chronically in a state of suspended vitality."[568] Further, (2) the key feature of the story is that they were healed with the life-giving word of Jesus,[569] which is reminiscent of Psalm 107:20.[570] These features demonstrate that Jesus has both the willingness and the divine ability to grant life, which the following discourse in 5:12–30 makes clear: "Indeed, just as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life [ζῳοποιεῖ] to whomever he wishes [θέλει]" (5:21). Thus, the two narratives convey the same notion: the "σημεῖον of the life-giving Word."[571] Although the lexeme δόξα does not occur in these two episodes, it was pointed out above that the framing of the signs in chapters 2 (2:11) and 11 (11:4, 40) suggests that Jesus manifested his glory in these two episodes as well.

---

[561] Barrett, *Gospel*, 193. Barrett cites a similar use in Isocrates, *Paneg*. 38.

[562] Keener, *John*, 1:515.

[563] Forestell, *Word of the Cross*, 68; Ashton, *Understanding*, 177n74; Carson, *John*, 128; Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 55.

[564] Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 79. See also Brown, *John*, 1:503; Ashton, *Understanding*, 176–77. In the case of John 2:1–11, Whitacre suggests that the "gratuitous generosity" is the glory that is revealed. Whitacre, *Johannine Polemic*, 109. See also Marianne Meye Thompson, "Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel," *BBR* 1 (1991): 102. It is often suggested that the FG embodies a replacement motif. See Dodd, *Interpretation*, 299. Rather than seeing a replacement motif in the FG, Jo-Ann Brant suggests that John seems to be "appropriating and building upon" various institutions and practices. Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John*, Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 61–62.

[565] Cornelis Bennema, *Excavating John's Gospel: A Commentary for Today* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008), 40.

[566] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 319.

[567] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 318.

[568] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 318.

[569] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 318. Dodd notes that the episode in 5:1–11 adds the feature that the man who had been ill acted in obedience to Jesus' word.

[570] Psalm 107:20 recounts a similar desperate situation that included a healing with a word: "he sent out his word and healed them."

5.2.5.4 John 6 and the Feeding of the 5,000

John 6:1–15 narrates the sign (6:14) of Jesus feeding the five thousand with five loaves and two fish with an abundance to spare. The interpretation of the feeding miracle is provided in the subsequent discourse (6:22–71). The discourse is multi-faceted and does not require detailed treatment here. A few brief comments are sufficient. First, when Jesus offers himself as food and drink for eternal life (6:35), he is transcending traditional messianic categories. Much the same as the thought in 5:17–29, Jesus claims for himself divine prerogatives and functions,[572] the foremost being to make live (ζῳοποιέω) (5:21) and pronounce judgment (κρίσις) (5:22). Second, there seems to be a progression in thought from inadequate or mistaken ideas about Jesus' messianic status (6:14–15, 26–34) to Jesus as the one who is the true Bread who gives eternal life (6:35–58). Third, this episode has in common with the previous signs in John 4 and 5 the function to illustrate Jesus' divine prerogative to give life.[573] But it also illustrates Jesus' divine prerogative to judge, which occurs twice in the narrative: (1) in 6:1–21, the disciples are separated from the crowd; and (2) 6:22–71 (esp. 6:61–71), the true disciples are separated from false disciples.[574]

5.2.5.5 John 9 and the Healing of the Man Born Blind

Whereas in the preceding narratives, the theme of life predominated (though also, as we saw, judgment), in the episode in John 9 the theme of light emerges as the dominant theme.[575] Further, the sign/discourse in John 9 serves a dual purpose. The healing of the man born blind illustrates Jesus' claim in 8:12: "I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness but will have the light of life." It also demonstrates the claim in the Prologue, "in him was life, and the life was the light of all people" (1:4). But the sign/discourse also has the purpose of judgment,[576] and in this sense may illustrate 1:11.[577] Jesus' glory is also displayed in John 9. As noted above, the *inclusio* of "glory" (2:11; 11:4, 40) suggests that Jesus' glory is present in each of the signs in the Gospel. Jesus' glory is manifest when he displays the character of God, especially when he exercises certain divine prerogatives, such as giving life (5:21, 26) and executing judgment (5:22, 27: "because he is the Son of Man").[578] Jesus exercises both prerogatives in John 9.[579] He demonstrates the prerogative to give life because, as the "light of life" (8:12; cf. 1:4), he has given both physical sight and spiritual sight (9:39) to the man born blind: the man has believed in Jesus as the Son of Man (9:35–38) and worshiped him.[580] Jesus has also pronounced divine judgment on the Pharisees. Because they claim to see, Jesus says that they remain in their sin (9:41). Thus, through the two divine prerogatives of granting life and pronouncing judgment (cf. 5:21–22), Jesus' glory is manifested.

---

[571] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 318.
[572] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 340.
[573] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 340–44.
[574] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 343–45.
[575] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 357.

5.2.5.6 John 11 and the Raising of Lazarus

Chapter 11 is the last sign-miracle in Jesus' public ministry that reveals his glory. The discussion here will focus mainly on how the narrative demonstrates Jesus' divine glory. That Jesus reveals his divine glory is evident from 11:47–48 and 12:17–18.[581] Whereas John 9 took up the twin themes of life/light and judgment, John 11 is concerned solely with the theme of life.[582] This episode continues the theme of Jesus as the one who is the giver of life (1:4; 5:21–29).[583] Two stories are intertwined in chapter 11. Jesus returns to Bethany, some two miles from Jerusalem, to raise Lazarus from the dead. But at the same time, this act will precipitate Jesus' own death. Several features link the raising of Lazarus with Jesus' own death: (1) The narrative begins by identifying Mary as the one who would later anoint Jesus' body for the day of his burial (11:2; 12:7); (2) the reference to God's glory and Jesus' glorification (11:4) points ahead to the hour of Jesus' own death; (3) Thomas expresses the thought that in going to Lazarus in Bethany, they will also die (11:16); and (4) while some believe in Jesus (11:45), others report Jesus' deed to the Pharisees (11:46), which results in the decision to arrest Jesus (11:47–57).[584] Jesus reveals God's glory in the raising of Lazarus through his exercise of the divine prerogative of giving life, revealing God's life-giving character.[585] Moreover, in the act of raising Lazarus, which precipitates his own death, Jesus demonstrates the greatest act of love in laying down one's life for his friend (11:3, 5, 11; 15:13).[586] While Jesus has demonstrated in previous episodes in the FG that he has the divine prerogative to confer life, the current episode adds this new dimension: "the gift of life is here presented expressly as victory over death."[587]

---

[576] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 358.

[577] Dorothy A. Lee, *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning*, JSNTSup 95 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 184.

[578] For a detailed study of the use of "Son of Man" in John 9, see Francis J. Moloney, *The Johannine Son of Man*, 2nd ed. BibSciRel 14. (Rome: LAS, 1978), 142–59. Whether the phrase "Son of Man" is a title in the FG is debated.

[579] See Koester, *Symbolism*, 108n58.

[580] Although it is debated whether the healed blind man actually worships Jesus as God, certain features suggest that true worship is present. The juxtaposition of the terms and phrases υἱός τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, πιστεύω, προσκυνέω, κύριος and ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σοῦ ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν (cf. 4:26, where it expresses the revelatory words of Jesus) suggests that this is the case. Martijn Steegen, "To Worship the Johannine 'Son of Man.' John 9:38 as Refocusing on the Father," *Biblica* 91 (2010): 544–48. Steegen further points out that in 9:35 characteristics are assigned to Jesus that are assigned to the Father ("seeking true worshipers" [cf. 4:23]). Steegen, "Worship," 548–49. See also Keener, *John*, 1:794. John 9 may also illustrate 5:23: "so that all may honor the Son just as they honor the Father."

[581] Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 162–63.

[582] Judgment is not in view. Dodd, *Interpretation*, 364. However, while there is no explicit mention of judgment, there is a distinction between the two terms "resurrection" and "life," and resurrection involves a resurrection of judgment. See Thompson, "Raising," 240.

In terms of the narrative's demonstrative function, John 11 demonstrates the proposition in the Prologue that "in him was life" (1:4) and the claim in 5:21 that Jesus can give life.[588] The narrative also demonstrates the greatest gift of love for one's friends (1:14; 11:5, 11; 15:13). These, then, demonstrate Jesus' glory. Furthermore, the stated purpose of the Gospel is that people might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and have life in his name (20:31), and this episode illustrates this through Martha's confession in 11:27.[589]

---

[583] Thompson, "Raising," 238–39; Dodd, *Interpretation*, 364; Andrew T. Lincoln, "'I Am the Resurrection and the Life': The Resurrection Message of the Fourth Gospel," in *Life in the Face of Death*, edited by Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 128.

[584] I am indebted to Lincoln for these points. See Lincoln, "I Am," 139–40.

[585] Thompson, "Raising," 235, 244.

[586] Thompson, "Raising," 236; Andrew T. Lincoln, "The Lazarus Story: A Literary Perspective," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 219; Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 168.

[587] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 366.

[588] See again Thompson, "Raising," 238–39; Lincoln, "I Am," 128.

[589] Most interpreters view the content of Martha's confession as correctly expressing the Gospel's intended purpose (20:31). It is debated, however, how much Martha understands the full significance of what she voices. See Vistar for a list of proponents of the two major views. Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 178. See also Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, 205–6; Thompson, "Raising," 242.

5.2.5.7 Jesus' Crucifixion

The ultimate demonstration of Jesus' (and God's) glory was Jesus' crucifixion. "Jesus' death was … the supreme manifestation of Jesus' glory."[590] The crucifixion of Jesus was the ultimate locus of the divine revelation because "through it the glory of God was brought into human experience."[591] Dodd similarly writes, "the action in which [Jesus] most fully expressed Himself, namely his self-devotion to death in love for [humanity], is the conclusive manifestation of the divine glory."[592] Actually, it was the time or events of Jesus' "hour" (ὥρα) that would constitute his glorification. "The hour has come for the Son of Man to be glorified" (12:23; cf. 17:1). This hour comprises the complex of events that includes Jesus' crucifixion, resurrection, and exaltation.[593] Jesus reveals that the hour of his glorification would extend from the time of 12:23 (ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα) to include his departure from the world to his Father ("his hour had come to depart from this world and go to the Father" (13:1).

Jesus' glory was supremely manifested on the cross because it revealed most fully the love of God (3:14–17).[594] Jesus was sent to accomplish the Father's saving will, granting eternal life to those who believe (3:17; 4:34; 6:38–40). This granting of life would be made possible only through death. Several images in the FG depict this "life through death" motif: the lifting-up of the serpent on the pole (3:14–17); the shepherd laying down (τίθημι) his life for the sheep (10:11, 15); Jesus' raising Lazarus from the dead, which precipitates his own death (11:1–57); one man dying to prevent the whole nation from perishing (11:50); the grain of wheat falling into the ground to produce fruit (12:24); Jesus humbly and lovingly washing the disciples' feet (13:1–10); and the ultimate expression of love: "No one has greater love than this, to lay down one's life for one's friends" (15:13). Moloney notes that although the lexemes for love are absent from the passion narrative, Jesus "*shows* perfect love (13:1; 19:28–30) in *what he does*."[595] Through his crucifixion, Jesus also demonstrates his love and obedience to the Father (14:31). The revelation of glory through the crucifixion enables Jesus to draw people to himself (12:32; previously something reserved for the Father [6:44]). The cross would be the means by which his accusers would recognize his divine identity: γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι (8:28), and it would be one of the means by which people would believe in him (19:35).

---

[590] Carson, *John*, 437. See also Moloney, *Son of Man*, 177.

[591] Koester, *Symbolism*, 235.

[592] Dodd, *Interpretation*, 207–8.

[593] Brown, *John*, 1:517–18; Carson, *John*, 171; Lincoln, "I Am," 131; Koester, *Symbolism*, 238. Moloney refutes W. Thüsing's (*Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*, 2nd ed. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 21.1 [Münster: Aschendorff, 1970]) view that Jesus' hour is restricted to the events of the crucifixion. Moloney, *Son of Man*, 176–78.

[594] Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 73–74.

[595] Moloney, *Love*, 159 [emphasis original].

It seems evident that the cross (and resurrection) qualify as events or an event complex that demonstrates Jesus' divine glory. It may be worth considering whether this event complex can be considered a sign as such. The discussion on the number and identification of the signs has been extensive, and the views diverse,[596] and this "diversity … points up the ambiguity in the Johannine use of 'signs.'"[597] A number of interpreters have deemed the cross and resurrection to be a sign, even the supreme sign.[598] In his chapter on literature review, Vistar suggests that what helps identify the cross-resurrection (including the resurrection appearances) as a sign is that the ultimate purpose of the cross-resurrection, as with any sign in the FG, is to signify "who Jesus truly is."[599] This study does not strictly depend on whether the cross and resurrection can be identified as a "sign," but this complex event seems to function as a sign, as Vistar has demonstrated. Besides Vistar's comment above about the ultimate purpose of the signs, one can observe one additional point: 19:35 functions to promote belief just as does the purpose statement in 20:30–31.[600]

The signs throughout the FG are designed to promote belief in Jesus as the Messiah, the Son of God (20:31). They reveal Jesus' divine glory or identity as the life-giving, divine Messiah. The proposition in 1:14, "we have seen his glory," has been demonstrated throughout the narrative, beginning with the first mention of δόξα in 2:11 where Jesus' disciples saw his glory and believed in him, which again coheres with the purpose statement in 20:31. George Caird aptly remarks: the purpose of the incarnation was that "others might see [the glory of the eternal *Logos*] and draw from it the conclusion that he was the unique Son of God."[601]

---

[596] Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 6–7n1. See also 8–28 for his examination of previous narrow and broad views of the signs in the FG.

[597] Thompson, *John*, 629n46.

[598] For a list, see Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 24n92.

[599] Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 27. Vistar's entire study is a sustained defense of the view that the cross and resurrection is a sign, indeed the supreme sign (hence, the subtitle).

[600] Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 212–17. In almost all the sign-miracles, belief by one or more persons is expressed (see 2:11; 4:50, 53; 6:69; 9:38; 11:45; cf. 11:27).

5.2.6 Conclusion

This chapter has examined four main propositions that are advanced in the Prologue. It has shown how these propositions are demonstrated in the Gospel's ensuing narrative: (1) Jesus has been shown to be "God come in the flesh" through his sayings and actions, (2) the *Logos*/Light shines in the darkness and the darkness did not overcome it, (3) people who believe were shown to have been given the power to become children of God, and (4) the believing witnesses in the narrative saw Jesus' glory. Recall that our theory of narrative rhetoric in chapter 4 drew upon the example of how someone might prove that Romulus had a divine birth. The arguer might offer three proofs, all of which are well suited for proof through narration. In an analogous manner, the Evangelist has written the FG to prove that Jesus is the divine Messiah, and that life can be gained by believing in him. The Evangelist offered at least[602] four propositions in the Prologue that were demonstrated in the Gospel's ensuing narrative. Each proposition was demonstrated by several ('n') narrated proofs according to our theory. The readership of the FG saw that the propositions in the Prologue were successfully demonstrated, and that the conclusion reached by Thomas in 20:28 and the purpose statement (20:31) is justified.

The relationship of Thomas's confession in 20:28 to the statement that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (20:31) requires comment. Interpreters have observed that an *inclusio* is formed by 1:1, 18 and 20:28,[603] and that Thomas's confession expresses the climax of the FG's Christology.[604] Recognizing that 1:1 claims that "The Word was God" and 20:28 states "My Lord and my God," Cullmann writes, "there can be no doubt that for [the author] all the other titles for Jesus which are prominent in his work … ultimately point toward this final expression of his Christological faith."[605] The FG's purpose statement (20:31) reads in part, Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεου. It is unlikely that 20:31 expresses a "lower" Christology than that in 20:28.[606] Rather, the theological content of 20:31 "must be understood in its light and filled out by it."[607] D. M. Smith explains that while it is clear that the readers ought to believe that Jesus is the Messiah,

---

[601] George Caird, "The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics," *NTS* 15 (1969): 269.

[602] The discussion above alluded to other propositions (e.g., 1:4; 1:11).

[603] Harris, *Jesus as God*, 128. See also Zumstein, "Prolog," 52; Cullmann, *Christology*, 308; Keener, *John*, 2:1210; William Loader, *Jesus in John's Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017), 117, 346–47.

[604] Brown, *John*, 2:1060, and many others. It should be noted that other early Christian devotion to Jesus as expressed in the Pauline letters often refers to Jesus as "Lord" in confessional (e.g., Rom 10:9–10; 1 Cor 12:3) and other settings (1 Cor 16:22: μαράνα θά; Phil 2:10–11; cf. 3:8). In the Johannine letters we find the commandment to believe in "his Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 3:23), and believe that "Jesus is the Christ" (1 John 5:1). It is noteworthy that κύριος is lacking in the Johannine letters.

> it is equally clear, as the narrative of this Gospel unfolds, that the traditional, Jewish meaning of messiahship is being transformed and extended almost beyond recognition, as it is here suggested by the title Son of God. That title and all it entails, seriously qualifies, changes, and enriches the identification of Jesus as Messiah or Christ.[608]

Larry Hurtado writes: "In GJohn, asserting Jesus' messiahship and divine sonship means much more than the claim that he is Israel's rightful king." The terms "Christ" and "Son of God" connote that "Jesus is in some intrinsic way also divine and of heavenly origin."[609] Hurtado is certainly correct here. What must be emphasized, however, is that it takes the whole Gospel to inform that reader that Jesus is "divine" and has a "heavenly origin." We have shown above in the first proposition ("Jesus is God come in the flesh") how Jesus is divine and of heavenly origin and exercises specific divine prerogatives (in particular, give life and enact judgment). The audience takes into account the narrative demonstration of Jesus' divinity and his exercise of divine prerogatives when they finally reach the purpose statement in 20:31. Thus, it has been suggested that the interpretation of Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of God" (20:31) must be informed by the picture of Jesus gained from reading the whole Gospel.[610] However, it should to be simultaneously emphasized that 20:31 expresses no lower Christology than 20:28, as the words "have life in his name" (20:31b) indicate. Only

---

[605] Cullmann, *Christology*, 308.

[606] A "retreat." Thompson, *John*, 430.

[607] Beasley-Murray, *John*, 388. See also Carson, *John*, 663; Loader, *Jesus*, 347.

[608] Smith, *John*, 387.

[609] Hurtado, *Lord*, 362.

[610] Brown, *John*, 2:1060; Vistar, *Cross-and-Resurrection*, 54. See also Beasley-Murray, *John*, 388. See also his quotation (388) of Josef Blank, *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie* (Freiburg: Lambertus, 1964), 30–31.

Jesus shares the divine prerogative to give life. Jesus has exercised his divine prerogative to grant life throughout the FG, as our investigation in this chapter has shown. Thus, the entire Gospel leads simultaneously to 20:28 and 20:31. In his explanation of 20:31b, Brown writes, “Unless Jesus is the true Son of God, Jesus has no divine life to give. Unless he bears God's name, he cannot fulfill toward [humanity] the divine function of giving life.”[611] The picture thus gained shows Jesus as the life-giving, divine Messiah, the Son of God.

As Thompson has noted, “The narrative of the Gospel has demonstrated how the Father has entrusted to the Son all authority to give life and to judge: the Father has, therefore, made the Son ‘equal to God’ [cf. 5:18; 10:33]. Thomas now articulates the Gospel’s Christology as a personal confession.”[612] However, this “personal confession” can be read rhetorically as the fitting conclusion to the demonstration of the propositions that the Gospel has put forth beginning in the Prologue. The readers have read the Prologue and have observed the unfolding of the demonstration of its propositions, and therefore have good reasons to conclude with Thomas that Jesus is “My Lord and my God” (20:28).[613] They can believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and through believing have life in his name (20:31). Moloney describes well the argument of this study: “The [Gospel] was written so that a narrative that reports *how* Jesus has lived his story might confirm *what* was proclaimed in the Prologue. The author believes passionately that Jesus’ life story proves the claims made for him in the Prologue.”[614]

5.3 Summary

This chapter presented the first of a two-dimensional argument that the Prologue specifies propositions that are demonstrated in the subsequent narrative. This chapter’s textual argument was that the FG’s Prologue contains abstract-formulated propositions that are demonstrated inductively in the ensuing narrative through concrete situation-specific examples. We showed that situation-specific textual features can be found in the text that correspond to the propositions in the Prologue. These correspondences cohere well with our theory (chapter 4) where a proposition in the abstract is demonstrated in the narrative by means of ‘n’ situation-specific examples. However, other options that account for this correspondence exist, such as the view that the Prologue is a summary or an introduction to the Gospel. Thus, while it is necessary to show that there are correspondences between the Prologue and the ensuing narrative, these correspondences alone are insufficient to argue that the abstract statements in the Prologue are propositions. Thus, an additional dimension to this chapter’s textual argument, a literary one, is required to show that the most plausible construal of the relationship of the abstract statements in the Prologue to the rest of the Gospel is that they are propositions. This literary argument that will show that the FG is a type of rhetorical discourse that has a rhetorical structure consisting of (1) an introductory Prologue that contains propositions, (2) a subsequent narrative that demonstrates these propositions, and (3) a conclusion. We turn now to chapter 6 to present this literary argument.

---

[611] Brown, *John*, 1061. See also Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:339; Morris, *John*, 756; Ridderbos, *John*, 388; Thompson, *John*, 430.

[612] Thompson, *John*, 425–26.

[613] See Bruce: “Thomas’s confession thus corroborates the prologue to the Gospel: ‘the Word was God.’” Bruce, *John*, 394. See also Lindars, *John*, 616. His “summary” can be reframed as a rhetorical conclusion.

[614] Moloney, *John*, 543 [emphasis original].

Chapter 6. The Fourth Gospel as a Rhetorical Discourse

6.1 Introduction

This chapter continues the investigation of the second rhetorical strategy, the narrative rhetoric of the FG, that began in chapter 4. To recap, chapter 4 developed a theory of narrative rhetoric that was narrowly focused on those sorts of narratives that contain a proposition that is demonstrated through an ensuing narrative. Chapter 5 began our two-dimensional argument that the FG's Prologue contains propositions or claims that are demonstrated in the body of the Gospel. The dimension that was the focus of chapter 5 was a textual argument that showed how the abstract propositions specified in the Prologue were successfully demonstrated from corresponding situation-specific textual features contained in the ensuing narrative. This present chapter takes up the second dimension of the two-dimensional argument, which is the literary argument. This literary dimension argues that the FG is a specific type of literary text that has distinct features and a structure that characterize it as a rhetorical discourse. Furthermore, the FG has a structure that coheres with the rhetorical structure (arrangement) of Aristotle's rhetorical theory, which allows us to draw conclusions about the relationship of the FG's Prologue to the rest of the Gospel.

This literary argument will proceed in several steps. First, it will show that the FG itself is a highly rhetorical discourse that, among its various strategies, includes a Prologue that contains abstract themes, and that the FG also includes a type of "narrative rhetoric" or logic within the narrative itself that demonstrates propositions or claims by means of narrated examples that inductively prove these claims. Second, it will show that Plutarch's *Pericles*, composed at approximately the same time as the FG,[615] is also a highly rhetorical discourse with such features as a Prologue containing propositions that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. Third, the study will suggest that the FG is like an ancient biography, which is an additional way in which the FG is similar to *Pericles*. Fourth, this study will investigate the "rhetorical arrangement”[616] or structure of both the FG and *Pericles*, demonstrating that they correspond more closely to the arrangement specified in Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* than to the arrangement specified in the Latin rhetorical handbooks. Thus, we will see that the FG and *Pericles* are remarkably similar in several of their rhetorical strategies, particularly in how they seek to demonstrate propositions by means of a narrative, and how they have a similar rhetorical structure.

---

[615] C. P. Jones ("Towards a Chronology of Plutarch's Works," *JRS* 56 [1966]: 73) dates most of Plutarch's Lives to after 96 CE. For further discussion see Timothy E. Duff, *Plutarch's Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 2n4.

One key feature of our investigation will be the recognition that *Pericles* contains a Prologue that contains abstract propositions that are demonstrated situationally in the body of the narrative. This similarity of rhetorical strategies and arrangement combined with the recognition that the Prologue of *Pericles* contains abstract propositions will enable us to conclude plausibly that the abstract themes in the FG’s Prologue can be construed as rhetorical propositions. We are claiming only that it is plausible that the Prologue contains rhetorical propositions since the data in the FG is not sufficient to make this claim conclusively.[617] We turn now to an examination of the various rhetorical features that are related to how the FG argues through its narrative.

6.2 Rhetorical Features of the Fourth Gospel

In this section we will investigate several features in the FG that contribute to its functioning as a narrative rhetorical discourse.

6.2.1 People Draw Conclusions about Jesus’ Person

One way that rhetorical features surface in the FG is in the form of character responses to people and events. The narrative portrays people observing events (including actions and statements) and drawing conclusions from them. Nathanael, for example, on hearing Jesus' recognition of him as "an Israelite in whom there is no deceit" (1:47), concludes that Jesus rightly knows him (1:48a). Then in response to Jesus' further claim to have seen him under a fig tree before Philip called him (1:48b), Nathanael reasons that Jesus must be the "the Son of God," "the King of Israel" (1:49). He seems to reason in a quasi-syllogistic manner:

---

[616] The arrangement of a rhetorical discourse refers to the various parts of the discourse and the order in which they appear. See Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 13, 23–25; Kennedy, *On Rhetoric*, 257. As one of the procedural elements in developing the rhetorical discourse, “arrangement is the ordering and distribution of the matter, making clear the place to which each thing is assigned” (*Rhet. Her.* 1.2.3). See Duane F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*, SBLDS104 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 20.

[617] Given the limited data in the FG, plausible conclusions may be the only ones possible. Sosa Silieza follows this dictum: “we need to use all the tools that are available to us to interrogate the limited extant evidence in order to arrive at a plausible explanation of an observable literary phenomenon in [the FG],” Carlos R. Sosa Siliezar, *Creation Imagery in the Gospel of John*, LNTS 546 (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 14.

> Major premise: Only one who is "the Son of God" or "the King of Israel" can see things in the distance.
> Minor premise: Jesus says that he saw him in the distance.
> Conclusion: Jesus must be "the Son of God," "the King of Israel" (1:49).

In John 3, Nicodemus, upon observing the signs that Jesus has performed, concludes ("we know") that Jesus is a teacher sent from God. He reasons that only a person who has God with him ("unless God is with him") can do such signs (3:2).[618] He further reasons that no one can be born again from his mother's womb. His reasoning is faulty in both cases: his logic in both cases prohibits him from correctly understanding Jesus and how a person can be *γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν* (3:3). But the FG narrates his reasoning nonetheless. The narrative of Jesus' encounter with the Samaritan woman in John 4 recounts that after Jesus tells her of her past and present marital relationships and status, the woman "rightly judges Jesus to be a prophet."[619] In all these cases, the FG narrates people drawing conclusions with regard to who Jesus is. Granted, these conclusions are for the most part faulty, but these conclusions are nevertheless narrated. This shows that at the story level, people are reasoning and attempting to understand the person of Jesus.

Another way this reasoning emerges is through the narrative depicting people interacting with one another. Parties often engage in a "verbal sparring match"[620] with one another over Jesus' identity, arguing based on a type of reasoning. One prime example occurs in John 9, the incident of the man born blind. This story is particularly apt, since many interpreters have recognized its remarkable literary qualities. Raymond Brown explains:

---

[618] See our discussion in chapter 4 of Nicodemus's reasoning in John 3:2.

[619] Thompson, *John*,103. See also Sukmin Cho, *Jesus as Prophet in the Fourth Gospel*, NTM 15 (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009), 177. Cho, 175, observes that Jesus' introduction of "living water" may also suggest to the woman that Jesus is a prophet like Moses. Jesus is, of course, according to the Evangelist, more than simply a prophet.

[620] Thompson, *John*, 204.

> The internal construction of the story shows consummate artistry; no other story in the Gospel is so closely knit. We have here Johannine dramatic skill at its best. … The blind man emerges … as one of the most attractive figures of the Gospel. … [his] confutation of the Pharisees in vss. 24–34 is one of the most cleverly written dialogues in the NT.[621]

Moreover, the man born blind in John 9 seems to function as a universal representative. This is "because there is a sense in which all are born blind and in darkness."[622] An additional reason for considering John 9 is that the narrative exhibits all three types of classical rhetorical genres. It is widely recognized that John 9 contains elements of judicial rhetoric. "The theme is clearly trial and judgment."[623] The judicial rhetoric serves the epideictic rhetoric that vindicates and honors Jesus, as especially narrated in 9:16, 30–33, and the final vindication and honor ("worship") in 35–41.[624] When an epideictic discourse contains facts that are not "acknowledged points," then a proof in the form of a positive demonstration is needed.[625] In the case of the blind man, both the validity of his healing and the status of Jesus are in dispute. The exchanges serve to provide the requisite proof. Foremost in epideictic discourse is the honor and glory ascribed,[626] and the final vindication and worship of Jesus in 9:35–41 furnishes this.[627] Finally, deliberative rhetoric also functions in this chapter, offering a choice to the readers of either sight or blindness. "Jesus confronts [people] with a choice … [they] must decide either for or against him."[628]

The sparring example itself occurs in the exchange in 9:16: "Some of the Pharisees said, 'This man is not from God, for he does not observe the sabbath.' But others said, 'How can a man who is a sinner perform such signs?' And they were divided" (σχίσμα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς). The former argue in a quasi-syllogistic manner:

---

[621] Brown, *John*, 1:376–77.

[622] Lincoln, *Truth*, 98.

[623] Paul D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985), 126 and Trites, *Witness*, 107–8. See also Lincoln (*Truth*, 96–105) for his treatment of judicial rhetoric and the trial motif in John 9.

[624] Pernot, *Epideictic*, 90.

[625] Pernot, *Epideictic*, 90–91.

[626] Pernot, *Epideictic*, 92.

[627] In the final scene, Jesus emerges as judge, vindicating those who believe and judging those who think they see as "blind."

[628] Trites, *Witness*, 108. David W. Wead (*The Literary Devices in John's Gospel*, edited by Paul N. Anderson and R. Alan Culpepper, JMS 7 [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2018], 25–26) suggests that in the story world the Pharisees are offered a choice.

> Major premise: A man from God observes God's laws, including refraining from work on the Sabbath.
> Minor premise: This man is working on the Sabbath, and thus does not observe God's commandments.
> Conclusion: He cannot be from God.

The opposing parties ("others") also appear to argue in a syllogistic manner:

> Major premise: Only a good man can perform such signs (such as healing a person born blind).
> Minor premise: Jesus did a good deed by healing a person born blind.
> Conclusion: Jesus must be a good person, that is, not a sinner.[629]

The blind man also argues quasi-syllogistically, concluding: "He is a prophet" (9:17), with the major and minor premises left unstated.[630] The man further argues in 9:30–33. Theobald points out that here the blind man's argument is so compelling because it brings together experiential knowledge (9:30e: "and yet he opened my eyes"), generally accepted theological knowledge (9:31), and the general experience of humanity (9:32). "Der Argumentationsweg ist glasklar."[631]

It is noteworthy that within the narrative of the healing of the man born blind, there are at least two additional narratives in which the healed man is called upon by others to give a narrative of "how" (πῶς) he was healed (9:10, 15, 19 [the request to his parents, who decline the request, though they confirm various details], 26).[632] The significance of this is that it adds rhetorical force to the narrative rhetoric already functioning in the story. This seems to operate on two levels. At the story level, the people ("they" [9:10]—neighbors [9:8] or "others" [9:9]) gain direct knowledge of how Jesus healed the man by listening to the man narrate his healing. At the level of the Gospel, the story is reiterated to the audience, and this seems to have the effect of reinforcing the narrative rhetoric. The audience hears three times "how" Jesus, being the light of the world (8:12; 9:5), provided sight to the blind man.[633]

---

[629] Brown, *John*, 1:373, notes that at times sinners in the OT did perform miracles. See Exod 7:11.

[630] Perhaps the major premise is, "Only God's prophets can do these sorts of miracles," and the minor premise, "This man is doing a miracle of that sort."

[631] Michael Theobald, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes: Kapitel 1–12*, RNT (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2009), 651. Similarly, Thompson, *John*, 218.

[632] Theobald, *Evangelium*, 641, points out that "how" is a leitmotif running throughout the FG.

But even the blind man's understanding of Jesus is only partially complete; at the point of 9:31 in the narrative his faith is still developing (he views Jesus not as God, but only as a worshiper of him), and his conclusion is only partially correct: "He is a prophet" (9:17).[634] According to the FG, Jesus is more than a prophet. "The healed man still can reason only from his experience and lacks an adequate grid for interpretation (9:36)"[635] At the end of the episode, however, we find him worshiping Jesus (9:38).[636]

Two final examples can be adduced to demonstrate how the narrative portrays people reasoning in the FG, both occurring in chapter 20. The first occurs in the narrative that describes Mary Magdalene arriving at the tomb and observing the stone rolled away from the opening (20:1–2). She draws the incorrect conclusion[637] that the body was stolen. The second occurs when Peter and the Beloved Disciple (BD) are pictured as running to the tomb to investigate Mary's report that Jesus' body had been stolen. The BD, after allowing Peter to observe the state of affairs in the tomb first, himself enters: "Then the other disciple, who reached the tomb first, also went in, and he saw and believed" (20:8). The BD observes the burial cloths, and "draws the (correct) conclusions."[638] Here the narrative records that the BD, by looking at the condition of the tomb and the configuration of the cloths lying neatly arranged and set to the side, is able to rightly conclude, first, that Jesus has risen from the grave, and, perhaps even, second, that Jesus has life (11:25), is himself life (11:25), and possesses the authority to lay it down and take it up again (10:18).[639] What is especially significant about these two examples is that they are unique to the FG. Thus, these two examples show that the FG has a special interest in narrating that people in the story world are investigating and observing phenomena and drawing conclusions from such observations.

---

[633] See Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, 172.

[634] Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 389n50.

[635] Keener, *John*, 1:795.

[636] Whether this is an indication that the man perceived Jesus to be divine is a matter of dispute. See Seglenieks (*Johannine Belief*, 65n60) for a discussion.

[637] See Jörg Frey, "Bodiliness and Resurrection in the Gospel of John," in *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018), 223.

[638] Frey, "Bodiliness," 223.

[639] Frey, "Bodiliness," 223.

In summary, this section has surveyed how the FG's narrative portrays people observing actions or statements and drawing conclusions, though not always correct ones. It thus serves to demonstrate that the FG has a focus on a type of rhetoric of logical reasoning.

6.2.2 Narrative Rhetoric in the Fourth Gospel

Instances of narrative rhetoric, that is, persuasion through narration, emerge in a number of different patterns in the FG. This section will survey some of these patterns. There are other such patterns, but the ones below seem to be the most prominent in the FG. We will see that these patterns of narrative rhetoric function in several ways. The first pattern concerns how Jesus' own knowledge of people and their character is demonstrated by his knowledge that is expressed through the words he addresses to those he encounters. A second pattern deals with the narration of actions that show one's parentage. A third is seen in the episodes that narrate the words "come and see" and the manner in which the narrative demonstrates this. A fourth pattern concerns how Jesus' words, expressed as a prophecy, are demonstrated through the narration of events related to those words of prophecy. A fifth pattern emerges in the narration of Jesus' expression of his own identity and how the narrative demonstrates his identity through his actions.[640]

6.2.2.1 Narrative Rhetoric and Jesus' Knowledge of People and Character

The first pattern of narrative rhetoric to consider is Jesus' prior knowledge of the people he encounters. In this way he shows evidence of his divine omniscience. A survey of several principal texts demonstrates this: John 1:40–42; 47–48; 2:24–25; 4:17–19, 6:6, and 11:11–12.[641] Here we consider several of these. According to 1:40–42, Jesus, upon seeing Simon Peter for the first time, remarkably is able to call him by his name

---

[640] Gail O'Day aptly notes (*John*, 539), "the deeds reveal the doer."

[641] See, e.g., Bultmann, *John*, 102n1; Morris, *John*, 182n106, for these and other texts. See G. R Beasley-Murray, *John*, 2nd ed., WBC 26 (Waco, TX: Word, 1999), 61, on the reference to 11:14 and Jesus' prophetic insight. Of course, some OT prophets exhibited supernatural knowledge, such as Elisha (2 Kgs 5:25–27; see 2:3–6, known also to other prophets). See Sukmin Cho, *Jesus as Prophet*, 179.

("Simon").[642] Thus, Jesus demonstrates his ability to recognize and see "into the hearts of the strangers whom he meets."[643] In 1:47–48 Jesus shows his divine knowledge by his awareness of Nathanael's character: he is "truly an Israelite in whom there is no deceit" (1:47). John 2:24–25 shows that Jesus is able to understand the inner heart of a person.[644] "By claiming Jesus' knowledge of human character, John … affirms Jesus' deity."[645] Turning to 4:17–19, Jesus again exhibits his "more-than-human knowledge."[646] Although the woman asserts that Jesus is a "prophet" (4:19),[647] he is more than a prophet, as the rest of the FG develops.

6.2.2.2 Narrative Rhetoric and Actions that Show Parentage

Another pattern of narrative rhetoric in the FG is the narration of the connection between one's parentage and one's actions. The discussion in the FG that brings this to light is "the most poignant exchange"[648] between Jesus and his opponents in 8:12–59, especially 8:31–44, culminating in the solemn statement that they are "from [their] father the devil" (8:44). The fundamental assumption underpinning the discussion is that "one's origins determine one's character. Jesus' true source, and likewise his opponents' true source, determines their respective characters."[649] Jesus' opponents claim to have Abraham as their father (8:39a), but Jesus disputes their claim because if they were Abraham's descendants, they would do the deeds of Abraham.[650] But they are attempting to kill Jesus, which Abraham did not do (8:39b–40). Jesus states further that if God were their Father, they would love him (8:42). Belonging to God and doing his works requires being born from God, and thus sharing his nature. But Jesus' opponents demonstrate that their parentage is not from Abraham (8:39) or God (8:42), otherwise they would not be attempting to kill him (8:40).[651] If they had been taught by the Father, they would have come to Jesus (6:45) and love him (8:42).[652]

---

[642] This was likely the first time that Jesus had met the disciples. The Synoptic accounts probably record a subsequent encounter. See Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001), 80; Brown, *John*, 1:77.

[643] Bultmann, *John*, 102. See also Beasley-Murray, *John*, 27; O'Day, *John*, 686–87.

[644] That is, whether or not faith is adequate.

[645] Keener, *John*, 1:531.

[646] Carson, *John*, 220. Interpreters have observed that Jesus' statement is designed not simply to reveal his identity, but also to lead the woman to understand the true nature of her need and Jesus' gift. See Carson, *John*, 221; Bultmann, *John*, 188.

[647] See Carson (*John*, 221) for discussion.

[648] Bennema, *Mimesis*, 88.

[649] Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 178.

[650] The "deeds" of Abraham probably in this context consist of his hospitality in Gen 18:1–8. See Thompson, *John*, 191; Keener, *John*, 1:758; Michaels, *John*, 516; Edwyn Hoskyns, *The Fourth Gospel*, edited by Francis Noel Davey (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 342; Theobald, *Evangelium*, 600–1. Lindars (*John*, 327) suggests that it was "the response of faith."

6.2.2.3 “Come and See” Narration

The recurring invitation phase “come and see” in 1:39, 46; 4:29; and 11:34 seems to suggest a type of “investigation.”[653] Such investigation would consist of an encounter with Jesus through coming to him and learning by observing or perhaps testing the claims of Jesus.[654] Thus, a person will gain an understanding of Jesus through an experience of his words and actions. This suggests that the narrative itself might function to portray the events in such a manner as to provide evidence that would elicit belief. In this vein, Beth Sheppard notes that “come and see” is a device that functions to encourage the reader to decide whether Jesus is the Christ.[655] The object of the investigation or “testing” is determined by the context, even in the case of something seemingly mundane as in 1:39 where the investigation is to see where Jesus is staying,[656] or in 11:34 where the thought is mainly to determine where Lazarus’s body had been laid.

---

[651] Keener, *John*, 1:757. For evidence that ancient writers shared the idea that children reflected the conduct and character of their parents, see Thompson, *John*, 191n186, who cites Matt 5:44–48; 4 Macc 15:4; Sir 22:3–5; Plutarch, *Aem*. 2.1 [Mor. 495A–B, 496C]. To this can be added the biblical injunctions going back to the Decalogue, esp. Deut 5:16 [Exod 20:12], Prov 15:20; 30:11, 17; Mal 1:6; 2:10; and Eph 6:2–3. Cf. also *L.A.B*. 33.5.

[652] Jo-Ann Brant suggests that an additional type of rhetoric is functioning in Jesus’ verbal exchange. She explains: Jesus responds to his opponents’ claim, “Our father is Abraham,” with a *modus tollens* type of deductive argument: if [P] you are Abraham’s children, then [Q] you would do the deeds of Abraham. But [Not Q] you are not doing them; therefore, [not P] you are not Abraham’s children. See Jo-Ann A. Brant, *John*, Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011), 145.

[653] See Keener, *John*, 1:471–72, 485, 622–23.

[654] Michaels, *John*, 129, thinks the thought may involve testing the claims of Jesus.

[655] Sheppard, “John,” 91.

[656] Even in 1:39 the thought may not simply be “mundane,” but it likely included a more pregnant theologically nuanced sense. See Keener, *John*, 1:471; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 1:309; D. Moody Smith, *John*, ANTC (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 72; Thompson, *John*, 50. Barrett (*Gospel*, 181) holds that the phrase “has no special significance,” but then goes on to note that in *παρ’ αὐτῷ ἔμειναν* the Evangelist intends more and a “superficial meaning.” See esp. the discussion in Ridderbos (*John*, 82–83) and his observation that the statement, “We have found the Messiah” (1:41), though an indirect statement about the first meeting, suggests that the facts of the situation take on an importance beyond the language.

6.2.2.4 Narrative Rhetoric and Prophetic Fulfillment

Another pattern of narrative rhetoric in the FG pertains to prophetic statements made by Jesus that find their fulfillment later in the Gospel. Literary-critical studies have investigated these prophetic statements and their fulfillments in the FG under the rubric of "predictive prolepses." This section interacts with Adele Reinhartz's study on this topic.[657] In the process we present arguments suggesting that these "predictive prolepses" are in fact a type of narrative rhetoric. Reinhartz's point of reference is the definition of prolepsis by Gérard Genette: "any narrative manoeuvre that consists of evoking in advance an event that will take place later."[658] Reinhartz focuses on two specific types of prolepses in the FG: *external* predictive prolepses that refer to events beyond the temporal framework of the narrative (i.e., after the post-resurrection appearances), and *internal* predictive prolepses that refer to events within the narrative's temporal framework.[659] Her study is furthered limited to those prolepses that are attributed to the Johannine Jesus in an attempt, finally, to ascertain the Christological function of these prolepses. An example from John 11:4 serves to illustrate this process: "This [Lazarus's] illness does not lead to death; rather it is for God's glory." This prediction is fulfilled in the course of the ensuing narrative where Jesus raises Lazarus from the dead. Thus, the narrative serves the rhetorical purpose in proving the validity of Jesus' statement.[660]

Although both internal and external prolepses may have a similar rhetorical function, we will focus our attention here on those prolepses with an internal referent. This will enable us to show more precisely the rhetorical function of these prolepses. In her study of internal prolepses, Reinhartz identifies three events that relate to Jesus' prophecy of events to transpire later in the narrative, all prophesied by Jesus and later fulfilled and demonstrated in the narrative: first, his betrayal by Judas that Jesus predicts in 6:70 and 13:21 is fulfilled and demonstrated in the events narrated in 18:3–5; second, Peter's three-fold denial that Jesus predicts in 13:38 is fulfilled in 18:17, 25, and 27;

---

[657] Adele Reinhartz, "Jesus as Prophet: Predictive Prolepses in the Fourth Gospel," *JSNT* 36 (1989): 3–16.

[658] Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980), 40.

[659] She refers to and expands on Culpepper (*Anatomy*, 61–69) for their distribution and function.

[660] Reinhartz, "Prophet," 4.

and finally, the bestowal of the Spirit that Jesus promises in 7:37–38 is fulfilled in 20:22–23.[661]

Another example of this narrative rhetoric through prophetic fulfillment concerns Jesus' prediction of his own death in 3:14–15; 8:28; 10:17–18; 12:24–25, 32–33, which finds its fulfillment in the passion narrative in chapters 18–20.[662] What is significant about the Johannine version of this predictions-fulfillment is the statement "This was to fulfill what Jesus had said when he indicated the kind of death he was to die" (18:32). The predictions-fulfillment of this event is also recorded in the Synoptic Gospels,[663] but these other Gospels do not recount a "fulfillment statement" equivalent to 18:32. Commenting on 18:32, Reinhartz holds that the Johannine narrator views this literary device "in theological terms as prediction and fulfillment."[664] This is certainly true; nevertheless, it does not explain the rhetorical force and function of the text. The FG makes the explicit link of the event that narrates the fulfillment with the prediction. We see, then, another example of how narrative rhetoric is functioning in the FG.

On at least two occasions Jesus makes a predictive statement that includes mention of the purpose to facilitate belief by his disciples. The first is found in 13:18 where Jesus predicts his betrayal by Judas, and he follows this in 13:19 with, "I tell you this now, before it occurs, so that when it does occur, you may believe that I am he." Thus, the statement has a rhetorical dimension: the narration of the fulfillment of his prediction of the betrayal should enable the disciples to understand that he has authority to predict this event. The second instance occurs in 14:28–29 where he refers to his previous statements earlier in the chapter (see 14:2–4, 12, 18–19, 21, 23) about his "going to the Father" (i.e., his ascension), and when this finally transpires he expects his disciples to believe. This also has a rhetorical dimension. There are actually two levels to the prediction. The first level concerns the disciples in the narrative world: they are expected to believe based on observing the events in the life of Jesus. The second level contains the recorded narration of the events in Gospel, and in this case, this suggests that the readers also are expected to believe.[665]

---

[661] Reinhartz, "Prophet," 4–5. This study will not attempt to reconcile the different narrative accounts of the giving of the Spirit in the FG with that in the Book of Acts. For a recent attempt, see Bennema, *Excavating*, 219–21.

[662] Reinhartz, "Prophet," 4–5; See also her n14.

[663] See Matt 20:19; 26:2; Mark 10:33–34; Luke 18:32–33.

[664] Reinhartz, "Prophet," 5.

Reinhartz also observes that this is an assertion-demonstration sequence, the demonstration supporting the claim made by Jesus, thus proving that "Jesus himself is truly a prophet."[666] Her study seeks to show that the purpose of these sequences is part of the Johannine Christology, whereby Jesus is shown to be a prophet like Moses, but even further beyond the category of a Prophet-like-Moses[667] where Jesus' divine identity is emphasized.[668] This seems eminently plausible, but this study argues that these statements have in addition a rhetorically oriented purpose. Reinhartz goes on to suggest that the fulfillment of Jesus' words is seen as a "proof or demonstration of Jesus' divine identity,"[669] and here seems to acknowledge that they function rhetorically, using the rhetorical language of "proof" or "demonstration," though she does not explicitly use the term "rhetoric."

The literary-critical analysis presented by Reinhartz is correct in what it affirms, namely, that the prophecy is connected with the narration of its fulfillment. Moreover, she rightly emphasizes that Jesus' ability as a foreteller is demonstrated when the events occur, and that these have Christological implications for Jesus' divine identity. Although these are significant observations, we suggest that this type of analysis cannot account for all that the text is seeking to accomplish. That is, it does not do sufficient justice to the rhetorical dimension. Thus, we are pointing out that these sequences are part of the author's rhetorical strategy expressed in terms of a narrative rhetoric where the narrative presents a demonstration of the claims made previously in the Gospel.

Culpepper's explanation of the purpose of these internal prolepses is as follows. His states that these "internal prolepses have the more exciting task of heightening dramatic intensity by anticipating coming events.”[670] However true this may be, this study suggests that when viewed from a rhetorical analysis framework, these internal prolepses have the function of providing a proposition that is followed by a demonstration in order to prove that proposition.[671]

---

[665] Reinhartz, "Prophet," 10, makes the same association of belief by both the disciples and the readers.

[666] Reinhartz, "Prophet," 9–10. See also Cho (*Jesus as Prophet*, 134), who points out that this incident helps show that Jesus is the "prophet *par excellence*," but he further correctly notes that this actually occurs in conjunction with (1) his union or oneness with the God, 139; and (2) his use of "father"/"son" language, 157.

[667] Reinhartz realizes that no explicit reference to Deut 18:15–21 can be found in the FG, but points out that the events in the FG do fulfill one criteria of the Prophet-like-Moses found in the Deuteronomy text. She draws attention ("Prophet," 10, 15n27) to the fact that many scholars see an implicit reference to this text.

[668] Reinhartz, "Prophet," 10, 15, notes that Isa 42:8–9; 44:7–8; 46:9–10, though not cited in the FG, and other Isaianic allusions suggest a biblical influence on the author.

[669] Reinhartz, "Prophet," 10.

In summary, employing a rhetorical analysis of these sequences provides a more adequate understanding of these textual features, especially in terms of their rhetorical force and how they contribute to an understanding of the rhetoric dimension of the FG. They show that what is actually functioning in these texts is a type of claim-demonstration whereby Jesus is making a claim and the demonstration of that claim is provided by a subsequent narration of events that fulfills that claim. Thus, they further contribute to our picture of the FG as a highly rhetorical discourse.

6.2.2.5 Narrative Rhetoric and Jesus’ Claims

At various junctures throughout the FG, Jesus predicates certain attributes to himself, most notably through the well-known “I am” statements in the FG. The following will examine two of these and discuss how they are demonstrated narratively. These can be construed as an additional pattern of narrative rhetoric.

6.2.2.5.1 Jesus’ Claim to Be the Light of the World

The first example of this type in the FG occurs through the “light” metaphor where Jesus claims, “I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness but will have the light of life” (8:12). Many commentators point out that the Evangelist proceeds to demonstrate this claim by means of a narration of Jesus fulfilling this claim John 9. Thus, “The healing of the blind thus becomes a narrative commentary, a vivid retelling and enacting of the revelation-word of 8:12.”[672] The narrative in John 9 thus provides evidence confirming Jesus' claim to be able to provide sight to the world. Providing physical sight is the vehicle to show that Jesus can give the "light of life," which in turn harks back to the Prologue's statement that "in him was life, and the life was the light of all people" (1:4).

---

[670] Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 69–70.

[671] These prolepses also seem to have a unifying function, though I will not pursue this here.

[672] Otto Schwankl, *Licht*, 225; Frey, “Dualism,” 133. Brown, *John*, 1:379, points out that “Jesus acts out here the truth he proclaimed in viii 12.” See also David Mark Ball, *“I Am” in John’s Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*, JSNTSup 124 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 82, 87; Barrett, *Gospel*, 353. F. F. Bruce (*The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983], 210) suggests that John 9 is “an acted parable setting forth Jesus’ ministry as ‘the light of the world.’” Hoskyns, *Gospel*, 361, agrees that this episode proves Jesus’ claim in 8:12, but nevertheless curiously argues (362) that John 9 is not an attempt to provide a concrete example that Jesus is the light of the world. However, in light of the FG’s extensive use of narrative rhetoric, his view does not seem plausible.

6.2.2.5.2 Jesus' Claim to Be the Resurrection and the Life

John 11, which narrates the well-known story of Jesus raising Lazarus from the tomb, provides another example of narrative rhetoric in the FG by portraying Jesus as making a claim and then narrating the demonstration of that claim.[673] It is generally recognized that the sign narratives in John 5, 6, and in a certain sense John 9,[674] are structured somewhat differently from the miracle/sign narrative in John 11. In the former chapters the narration of the sign precedes the explanation, principally through discussion and dialogue. In John 11, however, the claim precedes the sign.[675] The following remarks will focus primarily on the narrative rhetorical features of the passage. The claim of Jesus in 11:25 is demonstrated narratively by his ensuing actions and words.[676] Several features of the claim are demonstrated. First, the claim in 11:25 to be the resurrection and the life, though strictly not needed, does in fact seem to be required. Without this claim, "the raising of Lazarus would be no more than a spectacular miracle."[677] Second, it shows that Jesus has the divine authority to raise the dead and give life (5:26). Frey's remarks are insightful: "Here the Son of God does what is exclusively God's work in the Old Testament and in early Judaism and thus steps wholly onto the side of God."[678] Third, it also seems to function as a "symbolic prolepsis"[679] of the resurrection that Jesus promised to those who believe in him as expressed in 5:21, 25–29; 6:39, 40, 44, and 54. Fourth, Thompson points out that "This account puts the *assertions* of John 3:16 into *narrative form*: God's love for the world is expressed through the giving of life,"[680] and further, this event "recounts in narrative form the Gospel's claim that God confers life through his Word."[681] Similarly, Frey points out that the paradigmatic statement in John 3:16 is dramaturgically presented in such texts as John 11.[682] Finally, it is significant that narrative rhetoric continues into the following chapter where "Lazarus can be 'viewed' later as a living object demonstrating the authority of Jesus (12.9)."[683] Thus, the narrative serves as additional evidence that demonstrates the prior claims in John 3:16 and 5:25. Jesus loves the family and comes to their assistance, despite the fact that it will cost him his life (see 11:8, 16, and others), and provides life to their beloved brother.[684]

---

[673] Wuellner attempts to explicate a form of "narrative rhetoric" in his article on John 11. His approach differs from this study in that he employs tools from modern rhetorical criticism. Although he states that he seeks to eschew the older forms of rhetorical criticism that mainly focused on stylistic features, such as ἵνα-clauses or metaphors, or analyzing style using classical rhetorical handbooks, he nevertheless engages with various stylistic elements in John 11, such as internal monologues, irony, and repetitions. While such an approach may help explain certain rhetorical features of the text, it does not seem to be able to explain how a rhetorical argument of claim and proof functions. See Wuellner, "Putting Life," esp. 120–24.

[674] John 9 is rather complex in the sense that it also harks back to Jesus' prior claim in 8:12 that he is the light of the world. The claim is reiterated in 9:5, and further dialogue and discussion occur after the sign.

[675] Recall that in chapter 4, section 2 we remarked that in the form of our theory of narrative rhetoric, the stated order of the elements is not strictly required. The proposition can occur before or after the narrative proof.

[676] See Marianne Meye Thompson, "The Raising of Lazarus in John 11: A Theological Reading," in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 238, where she observes that the larger scope of the Gospel provides the full context with which to relate John 11. See section 6.7.1 below where we critique J. A. T. Robinson's assertion that a simple parable without a claim could have illustrated the truth that Jesus is the resurrection and the life.

[677] Ball, *"I Am" in John's Gospel*, 103.

6.2.2.6 Conclusions Regarding the Narrative Rhetorical Functions

At this point we can draw some conclusions regarding the narrative rhetorical functions of the FG. According to the theory we developed in chapter 4, the main concept of narrative rhetoric concerns a demonstration through the narration of an act to confirm the validity of a statement or claim. The FG assembles a number of these sorts of "proof of claim through deed" episodes. In this sense the FG provides an inductive argument in an attempt to prove the final purpose statement in 20:30–31.[685] That is, through these demonstrations, the FG is arguing inductively to demonstrate the various claims of Jesus to be the life-giving, divine Messiah, the Son of God.

---

[678] Frey, "Bodiliness," 218.

[679] Frey, "Bodiliness," 219. See also Witherington, *John's Wisdom*, 204.

[680] Thompson, *John*, 251 [emphasis added].

[681] Thompson, "Raising," 236.

[682] Frey, "Death," 195.

[683] Frey, "Bodiliness," 219.

[684] Keener (*John*, 2:838) suggests that the episode also serves as an example of a discipleship model for believers.

[685] Below I will argue that the Prologue itself contains propositions that are demonstrated narratively in the Gospel narrative.

Andrew Lincoln suggests that “the testimony of the narrative as a whole has been at pains to demonstrate the fit between word and deed.”[686] However true this may be, it needs refinement. There are actually two important criteria to consider in this type of argument. First, there is the criterion that *in a given episode* the deed and act must correspond with each other. Otherwise, the episode could not be considered an example of a proof. Several scholars have correctly observed this phenomenon in the FG. This is what Lincoln, Thompson, Schwankl, and Koester have endeavored to show.[687]

In chapter 4 we pointed out that a second criterion is needed for the inductive argument to be effective. For the inductive argument to be persuasive, the set of adduced demonstrations must have a certain correspondence or “similarity” across this set. For example, many other features of Jesus’ life could have been proven, but only those that relate to his claim to be the Messiah/Son of God would ensure that the inductive proof was effective. The claim to be the light of the world (8:12, see ch. 9) and the claim to be the resurrection and the life (11:25) meet both criteria. They meet the first criterion in that the individual claim is congruent with the deed: John 9 demonstrates that Jesus is the light of the world, and John 11 demonstrates that he is the resurrection and the life. They also meet the second criterion in that they are similar to what they are seeking to prove. In John 9, the giving of sight to the blind in the OT is assigned to God himself (Exod 4:11; Ps 146:8)] and to messianic activity (Isa 29:18; 35:5; 42:7). Thus, John 9 “has significance in John’s plan for showing Jesus to be the Messiah.”[688] John 11 shows that Jesus has the Father-given ability to give life, and thus points to his divine status, as claimed in, for example, John 5:26.[689] Dorothy Lee rightly points out that John 11 contains “the greatest example of Jesus’ gift of life.… Natural life is now the symbol of divine life.”[690] Thus, taking the two examples of John 9 and 11 as representative examples, the induction proof by means of narrated demonstrations that have a similar topic would be effective and persuasive, and thus match the conclusion in 20:30–31. Taken together, they would enable the reader to infer that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. “The correlation between Jesus’ words and actions shows that he is worthy of trust, and those who trust Jesus enter into a proper relationship with the God who sent him.”[691]

---

[686] Lincoln, *Truth*, 157. Similarly, Thompson, “Raising,” 238, following Lincoln.

[687] For Lincoln and Thompson, see previous footnote. See Schwankl, *Licht*, 235, 394. Craig R. Koester (*Symbolism*, 122) explains: “the sign confirms the words that Jesus spoke to Martha.”

[688] Morris, *John*, 422.

[689] Marianne Meye Thompson (*The God of the Gospel of John* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 78–79) notes that Jesus is not a second God or second source of life.

[690] Lee, *Symbolic Narratives*, 225.

6.2.3 *Reader Evaluation Invited*

The FG invites the reader to believe various features in the Gospel. The reader is explicitly in focus in 19:35: “He who saw this has testified so that you also may believe,” where the ὑμεῖς is explicitly included and where we find the second person plural verbs πιστεύ[σ]ητε and ἔχητε in 20:31.[692] When we examine *Pericles* below, we will see that the invitation to reader evaluation is also found in that work. Thus, this is another example in which *Pericles* is similar to the FG. Again, showing that the FG and *Pericles* are similar in their rhetorical strategies and structures enables us to draw conclusions regarding the function of the FG’s Prologue.

6.2.4 *The Prologue Contains Abstractions*

Several interpreters of the FG have discerned that the Prologue contains abstract features and themes.[693] Michael Theobald observes that the Prologue of the FG “generalizes and abstracts” whereas the Gospel itself has “situation-related narration, speaking and argumentation.”[694] Zumstein points out that the Prologue contains “open concepts,” such as identifying the *Logos* with Jesus, the statement (claim?) that the *Logos* is the light of humanity, (the claim?) that the glory of the incarnate *Logos* has been seen, and that the Prologue itself is fundamentally an “open text.”[695] Udo Schnelle points to the meta-reflexive statements in 1:12c, 13, 17, and 18.[696] Moloney considers the statements in the Prologue to be “the theory” for which the narrative will provide matching facts.[697] Frey states that the light metaphor in 1:5 gives an interpretation at a more general level than the FG.[698] These statements consider that the Prologue contains certain features that are characterized by a certain higher level of abstraction when compared to the rest of the Gospel. We will interact more critically with Theobald below, but for now it is sufficient to recognize that this phenomenon is present in the Prologue. An example of one particular abstract concept is found in the expression "we have seen his glory" (1:14).

---

[691] Koester, *Symbolism*, 122.

[692] See also John 1:7: “so that all might believe.”

[693] Most interpreters hold that the Prologue consists of 1:1–18. See Köstenberger (*Theology*, 118–19) and Seglenieks (*Johannine Belief*, 31n2) for discussion.

[694] Michael Theobald, *Die Fleischwerdung des Logos. Studien zum Verhältnis des Johannesprologs zum Corpus des Evangeliums und zu 1 Joh* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1988), 371. See also Zumstein, “Prolog,” 57.

[695] Zumstein, “Prolog,” 68–69.

[696] Schnelle, *Christology*, 226.

[697] Francis J. Moloney, *Belief in the Word: Reading the Fourth Gospel, John 1–4* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 52.

We should note here that this study is investigating whether these abstractions in fact can be considered propositions or claims that are demonstrated throughout the rest of the Gospel. Before we can answer this question, we must perform further investigations.

6.2.5 Conclusion to the Fourth Gospel's Argument in 20:30–31

Expositors are in general agreement that the FG incorporates a concluding section in 20:30–31 that conveys the purpose of the writing: these have been written so that the audience may conclude and believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and have life in his name (20:31). Brown is representative: these verses provide a "conclusion which evaluates what has been written and its purpose."[699] The FG is unique among the canonical Gospels in including this conclusion.[700]

There is, of course, much discussion and debate about the relationship of the following chapter (21) to the preceding chapters. It is possible that chapter 21 has a rhetorical function that demonstrates several of the Gospel's claims, such as chapter 10 and the discourse about the Good Shepherd.[701] At this point, we will not attempt to demonstrate those claims. For purposes of this present section, our interest is simply in the fact that 20:30–31 provides a conclusion to the work that shows its purpose.

The important point to observe at this juncture is that the concluding text in 20:30–31 forms one of the four principal parts of the rhetorical arrangement specified in Aristotle's treatment of arrangement.[702] We will see below that *Pericles* also contains a conclusion. This is one of several ways in which the FG and *Pericles* are similar rhetorically. This observation will enable us to draw conclusions regarding the purpose of the FG's Prologue.

---

[698] Jörg Frey, "Heil und Geshichte im Johannesevangelium," in *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten: Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften I*, herausgegeben von Juliane Schlegel (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 621.

[699] Brown, *John*, 2:1057.

[700] Brown, *John*, 2:1057; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 3:335.

[701] See, e.g., Sheppard, "John," chapter 5, for a discussion of the FG's epilogue and chapter 21.

[702] *On Rhetoric*, 3.13.4, Kennedy. See sec. 6.6 below for a detailed discussion.

6.2.6 Conclusions Regarding the Fourth Gospel as a Rhetorical Discourse

In this section we have shown that the FG is a rhetorical discourse from several different vantage points. We have shown that people within the Gospel reason about situations. We demonstrated how the concept of narrative rhetoric functions in the Gospel by examining a number of related features in the Gospel. We observed Jesus' prophetic statements and the narration of their fulfillment. We showed how narrative rhetoric functions to prove Jesus' claims, particularly the claims to be the light of the world and the resurrection and the life. We observed that reader evaluation is invited, and that the author was selective in the use of his material, choosing only a subset of episodes that he deemed sufficient to be persuasive. We showed that the Prologue contains abstract statements. Finally, we showed that the FG contains a conclusion that evaluates the work. This conclusion is one of the principal parts of Aristotle's rhetorical arrangement. All these strategies, then, together demonstrate that the FG is a highly rhetorical discourse.

The aim of this section in terms of its structure and discussion has been to conduct a series of investigations to demonstrate the rhetorical nature of the FG. In the following section we will investigate the rhetorical nature of *Pericles*, one of Plutarch's biographies. If we can show that *Pericles* is also a highly rhetorical discourse, and that both of them have a nearly identical rhetorical arrangement, which is the aim of section 6.6 below, then this will allow us to draw some conclusions regarding the function of the FG's Prologue; namely, that it contains abstract propositions that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. We now turn our attention to an investigation of the rhetorical nature of Plutarch's *Pericles*.

6.3 Plutarch's *Pericles* as a Rhetorical Discourse

6.3.1 Introduction

Part of the argument of this chapter is that Plutarch's *Parallel Lives* and the FG are rhetorically configured discourses, and therefore it seems plausible to compare them in order to identify various rhetorical strategies and features that are common to both. Rather than attempting an examination of all of Plutarch's Lives from a rhetorical vantage point, which would take us beyond the scope of this project, it should suffice to examine one main biography of a specific Plutarchan pair, the *Life of Pericles*, from the *Pericles-Fabius* pair (or "book"). The reason for considering *Pericles* in particular is that it seems to have remarkable rhetorical affinities with the FG, as we shall see. Before beginning our investigation, it will be helpful to point out other Plutarchan *Lives* have been examined by contemporary scholars with a view to their relationship with classical rhetoric. George Harrison suggests that an examination of Plutarch's biographies must start with an assessment of his rhetorical and philosophical aims,[703] the rhetorical aim being especially relevant for this study. Regarding the use of rhetoric to analyze a Plutarchan biography, two possible approaches could be used. One consists of examining the use of rhetoric by the characters in the narrative, for example, analyzing their speeches for rhetorical effect. The other approach is to examine how Plutarch utilizes rhetorical strategies to construct his biography. For the most part, the latter will be the focus here.[704] This section, then, will investigate the rhetorical strategies and features of *Pericles*.

At the outset of our rhetorical investigation of one of Plutarch's biographies, some justification is needed for (1) choosing a single Life and (2) that of *Pericles*. It is important to keep in mind that a given Plutarchan book often has a four-part structure: an overall Prologue-first Life-second Life–*synkrisis*.[705] The overall Prologue of a given book itself consists of two parts (Part A and Part B), and the second part, as is common,[706] introduces the subjects and their virtues. Our study will put special emphasis on following components: the overall Prologue (second part: Part B) and the first Life, *Pericles*. The rationale for this approach is several-fold: first, the first part (Part A) of the overall Prologue deals with general concerns not specific to the Lives of *Pericles* and *Fabius*, and which, for the most part, does not contribute significantly to this study's focus on rhetoric. Second, the second part (Part B) of the overall Prologue requires particular attention because it introduces the important virtues to be demonstrated in the Lives that become verbal and conceptual links with *Pericles*, including its epilogue.[707] Third, in the case of *Pericles*, the Life ends with an appropriate epilogue[708] that both functions as a "ring composition" that recalls the beginning of the book[709] and, more importantly, recalls the virtue of πρᾳότης and other virtuous actions, ascribing them to Pericles. This seemingly provides a rather complete closure to the Life. Finally, as scholars have pointed out, the remaining parts (the second Life, *Fabius*, and the *synkrisis*) closely reflect the virtues highlighted in the second part of the Prologue and the first Life, *Pericles*.[710] The follow-on Life of *Fabius* also extols these virtues. Plutarch uses these two lives to illustrate their self-restraint.[711] The *Pericles-Fabius* pair employs the term πρᾳότης (or its cognates) more frequently than any other pair of *Lives*.[712] The lives of Pericles and Fabius are similar in a number of respects: their lack of superstition in religious matters, their δικαιοσύνη, their use of oratory as a persuasive tool, their restraint in war, and their inner fortitude while facing deaths in their family.[713] "But for Plutarch the great similarity between the two statesmen, that which subsumes all the others, was their ability to endure the stupidities of the mass of common citizens and their own colleagues, that is, the virtue of πρᾳότης."[714] The *synkrisis* of *Pericles-Fabius* is, like others of Plutarch, somewhat disappointingly "rather pedestrian" in the way it compares the lives.[715] The themes of πρᾳότης and δικαιοσύνη and the ability of the two to endure the follies of the people and colleagues in office are mostly missing from the *synkrisis*, although the *synkrisis* does serve to show how Pericles outstrips Fabius in these virtues.[716] Since the purpose of our study is to compare rhetorical strategies, what is most important with regard to the two Lives is that *Pericles* seems to have a better correspondence to the FG than *Fabius* in that the former includes an element of judicial rhetoric that will be investigated below. For these reasons, it seems justifiable to focus our study on the overall Prologue (second part) and the first Life (*Pericles*).[717]

---

[703] George W. M. Harrison, "Rhetoric, Writing and Plutarch," *AS* 18 (1987): 275. Harrison notes approvingly the studies of Frank J. Frost, *Plutarch's Themistocles* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980) and Stadter (see below). See also G. Schepens, "Rhetoric in Plutarch's *Life of Pyrrhus*," in *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*, edited by L. Van der Stockt, CDC 11 (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 414–15.

[704] I am indebted to Schepens (413) for pointing out these two approaches. Schepens also uses the second approach in his analysis of *Pyrrhus*, though our techniques differ somewhat.

[705] Timothy E. Duff, "The Structure of the Plutarchan Book," *Classical Antiquity* 30 (2011): 213, argues this in his extensive article.

[706] Duff, "Structure," 219.

---

[707] See the three-fold description in *Per.* 2.5, presented below.

[708] According to Philip A. Stadter, *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989), 350, such epilogues are unusual in the *Lives*.

[709] Duff, "Structure," 244. See 245–46 for special reference to this feature in *Pericles*.

[710] This is perhaps somewhat unusual. Some books show significant differences in virtues among the pairs, and in several cases, the *synkriseis* explore issues that diverge from those of the Lives themselves. See Christopher Pelling, "*Synkrisis* in Plutarch's Lives," in *Plutarch and History. Eighteen Studies* (Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011), 349–63. See also Duff, *Exploring*, chapter 8.

Stadter, *Commentary*, 352, points out that at the conclusion of the *synkrisis*, although not stated explicitly in the text, "Pericles clearly emerges superior from the comparison." Stadter also notes that both Pericles and Fabius are presented throughout their respective lives as men who embodied the same virtue of self-control. See Philip A. Stadter, "Plutarch's Comparison of Pericles and Fabius Maximus," *GRBS* 16 (1975): 82.

[711] According to Stadter, *Commentary*, 61, and Duff, *Exploring*, 77, πρᾳότης refers to primarily to self-restraint. See also Hubert Martin, Jr., "The Concept of *Praotes* in Plutarch's Lives," *GRBS* 3 (1960): 65–73. Calmness is also a possible translation. See Duff, *Exploring*, 77, 87.

[712] According to Philip A. Stadter ("Comparison," 82n18) sixteen times, versus the next highest at six.

[713] Stadter, "Comparison," 81.

When investigating rhetorical strategies and structures in Plutarch's biographies it is important to emphasize that they are not orations *per se*. Nevertheless, they are suffused with highly rhetorical language with a highly rhetorical purpose. Moreover, Plutarch intended his audience to be moved to imitate his subject's virtuous actions. This seems especially evident with *Pericles* since the Prologue states that the Life seeks to promote a view of Pericles and Fabius as admirable heroes who are worthy of the reader's imitation.[718]

---

[714] Stadter, "Comparison," 81. I am indebted to Stadter for most of the material in this paragraph.

[715] Stadter, *Commentary*, xxxii; See also Pelling, "*Synkrisis*," 360, on the "gearing down" or "thought-diminishing" nature of some *synkriseis*, and his postscript (359–61), for his interaction with Duff, *Exploring*, 243–86, on the latter's highlighting of some *synkriseis* that seem to suggest a reassessment of what has been offered in the Prologue and the narrative. For themes in the Life not picked up in the *synkrisis*, see Duff, *Exploring*, 265; Simon Verdegem, *Plutarch's* Life of Alcibiades*: Story, Text and Moralism* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010), 29–32.

[716] For a full treatment of the *synkrisis* of *Pericles-Fabius*, see Stadter, "Comparison." See also Stadter, *Commentary*, xxxi–xxxii. Stadter, "Comparison," 85, points out that both lives strengthen and explain each other. In one place the *synkrisis* sets Fabius' πρᾳότης over against Pericles's banishment of Cimon and Thucycides. See *Comp. Per. Fab.* 3.2. Nevertheless, the *synkrisis* consciously elevates Pericles above Fabius. The *synkrisis* ends with the "judgment" that Pericles's building projects were "incomparable" and take "first prize" compared to any Roman achievements before the Caesars. See Duff, "Structure," 256. Interestingly, Plutarch, *Comp. Per. Fab.* 1.4, muses on whether it is more easy to govern [as Fabius did over Rome] "a city broken and tamed with calamities and adversity, and compelled by danger and necessity to listen to wisdom than to set a bridle [as Pericles did over Athens] on wantonness and temerity, and rule a people pampered and restive with long prosperity as were the Athenians" [Dryden trans., 256–57.]

[717] A full comparison of the two Lives, including the *synkrisis*, would not substantially change the picture of either of these two men. Normally, a given paired Life (book) is to be read together: see Duff, "Structure," 214, and the literature in 214n6. On the other hand, it does not appear that adding a discussion of Fabius's Life would substantially alter or enhance our understanding of Pericles. The first Life often provides the pattern for the two Lives, while the second Life "exploits it with an interesting variation" (Pelling, "*Synkrisis*," 357). According to Pelling, *Pericles* serves to illuminate the difficulties that Fabius will encounter. In this sense, *Pericles* sets the pattern, and thus seems to stand on its own. See also Philip A. Stadter, "Before Pen Touched Paper: Plutarch's Preparations for the *Parallel Lives*," in *Plutarch and His Roman Readers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 126–27. See Verdegem, Alcibiades, 11, for his justification for treating only the *Life of Alcibiades* from the *Coriolanus-Alcibiades* pair.

Plutarch's advocacy of imitation, however, has come under scrutiny from a number of Plutarchan scholars. The advice for imitating (or avoiding) certain subjects is not so straightforward as a surface reading might suggest. Timothy Duff has forcefully brought this to the fore in his study.[719] The moralism in the Lives is richly textured, and it seems to invite the reader's critical reflection. To be sure, moralism is at the heart of Plutarch's purposes, but as Duff has pointed out, "it is a challenging moralism. Plutarch invites us to address moral issues, but simple answers, simple paradigms, are not always forthcoming."[720] Indeed, some Lives contain a moralism that is rather problematic and controversial.[721] On the other hand, other Lives treat virtues that are for the most part uncontroversial. These uncontroversial cases "could provide a model for imitation in their own lives."[722] It is important for our study to recognize that the two particular virtues that Plutarch singles out for Pericles and Fabius, πραότης and δικαιοσύνη, were common stock virtues. Duff helpfully explains in his analysis of *Cic*. 6.1 where the same two virtues are found (along with ἐπιμέλεια): "The language chosen here invokes well-known and uncontroversial virtues, and readers will have felt confident that the narrator's view coincides with that of the Sicilians." Regarding Plutarch's readers: "most readers will feel confident that the narrator's viewpoint coincides with that of such onlookers, and that they are expected to share both."[723] Since the virtues considered in *Pericles* are common and uncontroversial, and since Pericles seems truly to exemplify them, this Life seems to be an appropriate one to investigate. Pericles receives "one of the most positive treatments of all Plutarch's protagonists."[724] For Plutarch's contemporary reader, imitation of Pericles would not apply to his most of his actions as a statesman or military leader. Rather, the imitation would focus on his virtues, and the manner in which he exemplified them would serve as a matter for consideration.[725]

---

[718] See *Per* 2.2–5.

[719] Duff, *Exploring*. See his chapter 3 and following.

[720] Duff, *Exploring*, 71.

[721] Such as the *Phocion-Cato*, *Lysander-Sulla* and *Coriolanus-Alcibiades*. See Timothy E. Duff, "Plutarch's Readers and the Moralism of the *Lives*," *Ploutarchos* n.s. 5 (2007–8): 12–13.

[722] Duff, "Moralism," 6. He suggests that *Cic*. 6.1 and *Alex*. 42.6–10 are two prime examples of this.

[723] Timothy E. Duff, "Plutarch's *Lives* and the Critical Reader," in *Virtues for the People: Aspects of Plutarchan Ethics*, edited by Geert Roskam and Luc Van der Stockt (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2011), 66n23, 66. See also Duff, "Moralism," 5. See further Aristotle, in his *Rhetoric* 1.9.5, where he lists πραότης and δικαιοσύνη among the nine "parts" of virtue. Both δικαιοσύνη and πραότης are key themes or virtues in the NT writings. For a prominent instance of πραότης, see Gal 5:23, where it is listed among the well-known "fruit of the Spirit." A quality said to be of Jesus, according to 2 Cor 10:1.

The emphasis of our study lies not with how perfectly the protagonist displayed certain virtues, but with the rhetorical strategies Plutarch used to argue that these virtues were demonstrated in the Lives of his subjects.

We are now in a position to begin our investigation of the rhetorical strategies in *Pericles*. Philip Stadter's essay is pertinent for the present study.[726] According to Stadter, the rhetorical strategies in *Pericles* play a "prominent if not overwhelming part in determining Plutarch's presentation."[727] His study of Plutarch's *Pericles* shows that *Pericles* is a highly rhetorical biography that shows evidence of numerous features of classical rhetoric. According to Stadter's analysis, Plutarch skillfully and artfully used a number of rhetorical strategies to demonstrate that Pericles was a virtuous person, and thus worthy of emulation. An investigation of some of these strategies follows.

6.3.2 All Three Rhetorical Genres in Pericles

One comparable strategy between Plutarch's *Pericles* and the FG is the use of the rhetorical genres. In *Pericles*, Plutarch employs at least two (and possibly all three) classical rhetorical genres, judicial, epideictic, and deliberative, in order to persuade the reader to admire and emulate his virtues. The need for judicial rhetoric was occasioned by the negative criticisms of Pericles over the centuries. The three major criticisms were: (1) Pericles was a tyrant who dominated the city of Athens; (2) he was a demagogue who, rather than looking out for their true welfare, ruined the Athenian people by submitting to their own desires;[728] and (3) he started the Peloponnesian war to escape from political attacks.[729] Thus, the issue that Plutarch was required to address was how to argue that Pericles used his power in a beneficial manner. In the Prologue, Plutarch sets forth the specific virtues that he plans to demonstrate in Pericles (and Fabius).[730] “The men were alike in their virtues, especially for their self-restraint (*πρᾳότητα*) and uprightness (*δικαιοσύνην*) … and their capacity to endure follies of the people and colleagues in office (*δύνασθαι φέρειν δήμων καὶ συναρχόντων ἀγνωμοσύνας*).”[731] Stadter outlines Plutarch’s three-fold goals in writing *Pericles*: (1) to demonstrate through a narration of Pericles’s actions that he embodied the virtues of *πρᾳότης* and *δικαιοσύνη*, (2) to rebut the claims of those who thought differently, and (3) to prompt the readers to choose to put those virtues into practice in their own lives.[732] To buttress his judicial argument, Plutarch assembles anecdotes that serve as examples to demonstrate that from his training as a youth, his use of oratory that suited the greatness of his ideas, and his careful use of power, Pericles proved his statesmanship and nobility.[733] Stadter summarizes Plutarch’s presentation of Pericles. Plutarch, in his account that runs from Pericles’s birth to his death, “has successfully demonstrated that Pericles is worthy of imitation.”[734]

---

[724] Duff, *Exploring*, 64, though Pericles falls short on several occasions. See Philip A. Stadter, "Should we Imitate Plutarch's Heroes?" in *Plutarch and his Roman Readers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 336, for a further assessment of Pericles's shortfalls. See also Hubert Martin, Jr., "Moral Failure Without Vice in Plutarch's Athenian *Lives*," *Ploutarchos* 12 (1995): 15–16.

[725] For a discussion of imitation in Plutarch, see Duff, *Exploring*, index of themes, *s.v. Mimesis*. For Plutarch's use of the mirror image, see Duff, *Exploring*, 32–34; Philip A. Stadter, "The Rhetoric of Virtue in Plutarch's *Lives*," in *Plutarch and his Roman Readers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 237–43. Stadter points out that Plutarch in his *Moralia* employs a range of subjects for imitation, ranging from people such as Plato, Epaminondas, and Lycurgus to fathers, and finally to ants. See Philip A. Stadter, "Mirroring Virtue in Plutarch's *Lives*," *Ploutarchos* n.s. 1 (2003–4): 90n2 for his list and references. Note that the biblical wisdom tradition uses the example of ants. See Prov 6:6. The NT urges imitation of God (Eph 5:1) and Christ (1 Cor 11:1), with the implication that the imitation refers only to specific virtuous actions (but see John 14:12), but see Bond, *Biography*, 159–61; Hooker, *Not Ashamed*, 51–54.

[726] Philip A. Stadter, "The Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," *AS* 18 (1987): 251–69.

[727] Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 251.

The penultimate purpose of the rhetoric was to highlight the virtues of Pericles, and in this sense the Life, or biography, could be considered a written encomium, and thus a type of epideictic rhetoric. In epideictic rhetoric, praise was an essential element.[735] Nevertheless, strictly speaking, *Pericles* is not an encomium since a true encomium would avoid mentioning human weaknesses, which Plutarch consciously mentions, but reduces to a minor role.[736] Thus, although Plutarch did not write a true encomium, which would have omitted any character defects, he did not simply inform, but urged his readers to admire Pericles as a virtuous person.

---

[728] See Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 6.18, for remarks about corrupt demagogues interested only in personal gain.

[729] Stadter, “Rhetoric of Plutarch’s *Pericles*,” 255, and Stadter, *Commentary*, xxxviii.

[730] The *Pericles* and *Fabius* are the tenth pair that Plutarch composed. See *Per.* 2.4.

[731] *Per.* 2.4. Translation mine.

[732] Stadter, *Commentary*, xxx.

[733] Stadter, “Rhetoric of Plutarch’s *Pericles*,” 258–60.

[734] Stadter, “Rhetoric of Plutarch’s *Pericles*,” 263. See also Stadter (“Rhetoric of Plutarch’s *Pericles*,” 258–64) for his treatment of Pericles’s life. Sections 15–24 of *Pericles* appear to be addressing accusations from Plato’s charges put forth in the *Gorgias*. See Stadter, “Rhetoric of Plutarch’s *Pericles*,” 260, 260n17. Pericles’s integrity [*δικαιοσύνη*] in the use of money, ambition for the city, and caution in generalship and foreign policy demonstrate his statesmanship.

[735] Pernot, *Epideictic*, 98.

If the penultimate purpose was associated with epideictic rhetoric, the ultimate purpose of the biography was associated with deliberative rhetoric. Not only did Plutarch intend for his readers to admire Pericles, he further intended to persuade his readers by presenting the actions of Pericles (and Fabius) "in such a way as to evoke from reader a decision (*proairesis* or, moral choice) to imitate the virtue which they had been shown."[737] Stadter points out that the Life has this additional protreptic[738] purpose that is normally associated with deliberative rhetoric.[739] Thus, the biography functions as "argument in narrative form" (or "narrative rhetoric") for choices of actions that the reader ought to make (or avoid) that are associated with the virtues Plutarch presents.

Several additional strands of evidence emerge in support of viewing deliberative rhetoric functioning in *Pericles*. First, we see how Plutarch consciously includes narrative that is associated with the appeals or "ends" of deliberative rhetoric. Immediately after the Prologue, Plutarch narrates how Pericles's great-uncle, Cleisthenes, took actions that closely match those associated with the appeals of deliberative rhetoric. Cleisthenes "expelled the Peisistratids, *honorably* dissolved the tyranny, gave laws, and established a constitution excellently tempered toward *concord* and *security*."[740] The features of honor, concord, and security are "rhetorical appeals" directly associated with deliberative rhetoric in the rhetorical treatises.[741] Thus, Cleisthenes acts in a way that is commensurate with those actions associated with deliberative rhetoric. It should be pointed out that no actual speech is associated with the action, and thus no "debate"—Cleisthenes is simply acting. Plutarch has nevertheless narrated this action so that these virtuous actions could emerge for the reader to observe that this is part of Pericles's background. We must keep in mind that the subjects in Plutarch's Lives were intended as models for emulation (or caution), but also be mindful of the strictures by Duff that we pointed out above.[742] Thus, our study suggests that while no deliberative oration is being depicted, nonetheless the topics associated with this type of oration are being acted out and put forth for imitation, and thus there seems to be present a type of implicit deliberative rhetoric.

---

[736] Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 254; see also 269.

[737] Προαίρεσις (*Per*. 2.4) seems to involve a type of moral choice. See esp. Duff, *Exploring*, 37–40, for an extended treatment of *Per*. 2.4 and this term. Duff discusses two potential references for this term, the first being "to the characters of the subjects of the *Lives*, and the moral choices they make which are 'provided' for the benefit of the reader, the spectator" (*Exploring*, 39). See Duff, *Exploring*, 39, for the second referent. See also Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 253; Stadter, *Commentary*, xxx.

[738] That is, persuasive. See David E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*, LEC 8 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987), 159, 198, 219.

[739] Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 253.

[740] Stadter's translation of *Per*. 3.2 [emphasis added]. See "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 257.

[741] For honor, see *Inst*. 3.8.4; *Rhet. Her.* 3.23; *Inv*. 2.51.156 (348:453), *Part. or*. 24.83. For concord, see [*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.21, 2.21. Recall from chapter 3 that Demosthenes often counseled unity or concord in his speeches. See *1 Olynth*. 7, 10; *2 Olynth.* 9, 14, 15, 29; *Ep*. 1 (*On Political Harmony).* For security, see *Rhet. Her.* 3:23; *Part. or*. 24.83; [*Rhet. Alex.*] 1.9.

A second stand of evidence that deliberative rhetoric is functioning is to observe how Plutarch explains that one of the purposes of the decree to summon the people to the congress was "excite them to … think big and consider themselves equal to large projects."[743] That is, within the narrative, people were to consider choices and actions ("projects": πραγμάτων), and not merely observe Pericles's own virtue and actions. This suggests that Plutarch designed his narrative world in such a way as to advocate imitation of actions as well as virtue.

The above two stands of evidence show (1) that Plutarch was interested in the topics associated with deliberative rhetoric; and (2) that he, perhaps implicitly, wanted his readers to make a choice of future actions (e.g., those of "large projects"), which is another feature of deliberative rhetoric. To these, we can add a third stand of evidence for deliberative rhetoric. The reason Pericles proposed the congress in 17.1 was in part to show that Pericles's actions, and thus his virtue, were those associated with deliberative rhetoric: to make decisions for future actions based on what was to the advantage of Greece, namely, peace and safety.[744] Furthermore, Plutarch points out that the congress in fact never took place owing to the factious Lacedaemonians, which is related to another element of deliberative rhetoric, namely, harmony and discord.[745]

At this point someone might question whether *Pericles* can be viewed as containing a type of deliberative rhetoric. The consensus is that Plutarch's biographies are mainly concerned with the heroes' virtues and vices. The discussion above, nevertheless, has attempted to provide evidence that some features and appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric function in *Pericles*, even if only implicitly. These include certain advantageous and honorable actions, and concerns for security and concord. Our argument, however, does not strictly depend on whether Pericles exhibits a form a deliberative rhetoric. At a minimum, two genres seem to be present (judicial and epideictic), and perhaps all three.

---

[742] The Prologue of *Pericles* explicitly deals with imitation: see *Per*. 2.2–4.

[743] Stadter, *Commentary*, 204, from *Per*. 17.1.

[744] *Per*. 17.2, τὴν εἰρήνην ἄγωσιν, and *Per*. 17.3: εἰρήνῃ καὶ κοινοπραγίᾳ τῆς Ἑλλάδος. For peace, see above. According to Cicero, security is one part of what is advantageous, and "security is a reasoned and unbroken maintenance of safety" (Cic. *Inv*. 2.61.179 [Hubbell, LCL]).

[745] See fn. just above on unity and harmony.

Having provided evidence that *Pericles* has at least two, and perhaps all three of the classical rhetorical genres present, we turn next to a discussion of the Prologue of *Pericles* and the proposition contained therein.

6.3.3 The Prologue Contains a Proposition to be Demonstrated

We observed above that the Prologue set forth the specific virtues that Plutarch planned to demonstrate in Pericles (and Fabius): "The men were alike in their virtues, especially for their self-restraint (πρᾳότητα) and uprightness (δικαιοσύνην) … and their capacity to endure follies of the people and colleagues in office (δύνασθαι φέρειν δήμων καὶ συναρχόντων ἀγνωμοσύνας)."[746] Regarding the person of Pericles, the proposition (or thesis) to be demonstrated can be formulated as: "Pericles was a person who embodied the virtues of self-restraint and uprightness, and the capacity to endure foolish people." Plutarch will draw on examples from Pericles's life in the narrative to demonstrate this proposition. These narrated examples will furnish the necessary evidence to support the proposition in the Prologue. This evidence will allow the reader to conclude that Pericles embodied these virtues. In the next section we examine some of these narrated examples in order to see how they demonstrate the thesis.

6.3.4 Demonstration by Narrated Example (Narrative Rhetoric)

Having stated the proposition in the Prologue of *Pericles*, Plutarch proceeds to demonstrate the proposition by drawing upon various examples from Pericles's life. Stadter discusses section by section the six-part structure of the Life, and points out the major themes and issues that Plutarch will successively treat.[747] For example, the second section (chs. 7–14) explores Pericles's acquisition and retention of political power. Here Plutarch "narrated and simultaneously justified Pericles's actions in winning over the *demos*."[748] Numerous specific illustrations of proof by example could be cited showing Plutarch's rhetorical technique, but a sample of three show Pericles's character through his deeds. Plutarch utilizes two examples to demonstrate that Pericles was virtuous in the matter of money: the management of his estate and his recognition of the proper use of wealth of a statesman versus that of a philosopher. A third demonstrates his high-minded spirit through his decree proposing the Congress at Athens.[749] What is noteworthy for our purposes is that Plutarch comments on his reason for adducing this example: "I have cited this incident, however, to show forth the man's disposition and the greatness of his thoughts" (*Per*. 17.3 [Perrin, LCL]).[750] Some of the above examples concern what might be called "sub-propositions" that are included at key junctures in the narrative to demonstrate specific features of Pericles's character, such as his statesmanship, his superiority to money, and his caution as a general.[751] That is, after these "sub-propositions" are introduced, the following narrative demonstrates how they were evident in his life.

---

[746] *Per*. 2.5. Translation mine.

[747] Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 257–64.

Plutarch's technique, then, is to "show forth" Pericles's "disposition and the greatness of his thoughts," demonstrating this virtue through the narration of his actions. Having discussed Plutarch's method of proof by narrated example, we turn next to what Plutarch expected of his reader.

6.3.5 Reader Evaluation Invited

Plutarch invites the reader to render a judgment with regard to his presentation of Pericles: "But whether we aim correctly at what we should can be judged from my account" (*Per*. 2.5).[752] What is noteworthy for the present study is that at times Plutarch writes that this judgment is to come from an evaluation of the narrative itself. For example, in the Prologue to *Agis*, Plutarch states: "As to this matter, however, my reader will judge for himself from my narrative" (*Ag. Cleom*. 2.9 [Perrin, LCL]).[753] This suggests that the themes in the Prologue are intended to be demonstrated in the following narrative, and that the reader is invited to evaluate how successful Plutarch has been based on the narrative. In the next section we discuss chapter 39, which provides a fitting conclusion to the Life and which guides the reader in his or her evaluation.

---

[748] Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 260.

[749] Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 260, 261. The three examples are from *Per*. 16.3, 16.7, and 17.

[750] The term for "show forth" is ἐνδείκνυμι, which Plutarch uses elsewhere to demonstrate his subject's character or to refute other views of events. See, e.g., *Caes*. 17.1; *Arat*. 15.1; *Sol*. 19.5; *Agis*. 20.1.

[751] See Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 260–61.

[752] Translation by Timothy E. Duff, "The Prologues," in *A Companion to Plutarch* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2014), 342.

6.3.6 The Conclusion to Plutarch's Argument in Pericles *Chapter 39*

According to Stadter, by the end of his narrative, Plutarch "has successfully demonstrated that Pericles is worthy of imitation."[754] Stadter explains that the last chapter (39) of the Life includes what amounts to an epilogue that functions as the peroration of a speech. Such an epilogue is unusual for Plutarch's biographies.[755] In this instance, Plutarch's epilogue provides a concluding evaluation of Pericles's life: "The man is to be admired not only for his reasonableness and the gentleness which he maintained in the midst of many responsibilities and great enmities, but also for his loftiness of spirit" (*Per*. 39.1 [Perrin, LCL]). The mention of πρᾳότης in 39.1 links the epilogue with the Prologue (2.5). Plutarch has provided evidence for Pericles's character narrated through his actions, and the conclusion follows: Pericles is to be admired for these virtues.

6.3.7 Other Rhetorical Features

That *Pericles* is a richly textured rhetorical discourse is evident from the preceding discussion. Much more could be said in regard to Plutarch's use of rhetorical techniques and strategies, including the two other rhetorical "proofs" of *ēthos* and *pathos*.[756] The reason for focusing on the features presented above is that these relate more directly to the issue of this chapter, which is to develop a plausible case for viewing the Prologue of the FG as containing propositions that are demonstrated in the FG proper.

---

[753] See also Duff, "Prologues," 347n46.

[754] Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 263.

[755] See Stadter, *Commentary*, 350.

[756] Stadter's full treatment of Plutarch's rhetoric in *Pericles* can be found in his "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*" essay and his *Commentary*, xxxviii–xliv.

Nonetheless, these other features are further evidence that *Pericles* is a rhetorically oriented biographical discourse.

6.3.8 Synkrisis *in Plutarch*

One important difference between the Plutarchan biographies and the FG is the presence of a final *synkrisis* (comparison) in some pairs. Plutarch's unique biographical method and format consisted of two fundamental practices: "he used the heroes' deeds and words as evidence for their moral qualities or virtues, and he compared two people with the same or similar qualities to determine the exact nature of those qualities in the individual."[757] These *synkriseis* (comparisons), or epilogues, have been the subject of numerous studies.[758] It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss the complexities of how these *synkriseis* function. But here we simply note, as pointed out above, that although they purport to compare the two lives, sometimes these epilogues are less impressive and illuminating than might be thought,[759] and this seems to be the case with *Pericles*. Nothing significant is provided in the *synkrisis* of *Pericles*.[760]

6.3.9 Pericles's *Prologue Contains Abstract Traits as Propositions*

In the section above on the rhetorical genres in *Pericles* we discussed the Prologue in terms of the virtues that Plutarch seeks to demonstrate in the two *Lives*. In the section that followed (6.3.3) we showed that the Prologue of *Pericles* contained propositions. The purpose of this section is to analyze the Prologue itself in terms of its rhetorical function, focusing on how these propositions are formulated as abstract concepts.

The Prologues of Plutarch's Lives often contain statements of traits described in abstract and general terms that can be viewed as propositions. We stated earlier the proposition put forth in *Per*. 2.5. Frequently, Plutarch "introduces the hero's traits crudely and refines them as he goes on."[761] Stadter points out that Plutarch's *Lives* allow the reader "to see how the virtues, neatly defined in the *abstract*, take on particular form in individuals."[762] The definition of these virtues in the abstract is placed in the Prologues. What is abstract in the Prologue finds particular expression—that is, "proof," through examples—in the narrative in situation-specific instances.

---

[757] Stadter, "Comparison," 77.

[758] See Pelling, "*Synkrisis*," which includes a postscript where he expresses some reflections and refinements since his original 1986 essay; Stadter, "Comparison," on the *Pericles* and *Fabius* pair; Duff, *Exploring*, esp. chapter 8.

[759] Pelling, "*Synkrisis*," 349–50.

[760] For a treatment of the *synkrisis* of *Pericles-Fabius* and how its themes differ from those of the Lives, see Duff, *Exploring*, 265–66.

[761] Pelling, "*Synkrisis*," 354. See also Christopher Pelling, "Aspects of Plutarch's characterization," in *Plutarch and History. Eighteen Studies* (Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011), 293; Christopher

Plutarchan scholars recognize that the Prologues often contain traits formulated in a general or abstract manner, for which the ensuing narrative of the subject's deeds and words offer a demonstration. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that not all Plutarchan biographies have this close correspondence between the formulation in the opening Prologue and the following Life or Lives. Often the formulation in the Prologue can be "a little misleading"[763] or "inadequate" with regard to the trajectory that the Life actually takes.[764] In the case of Alcibiades, he "was indeed *philotimos*," but the Life itself turns out to be more complex. Pelling agrees that there are cases where "the 'proving' just demonstrates the total correctness of the initial formulation."[765] We noted above that Stadter, in his discussion of the distinguishing features of Plutarch's method, explained that one of these features is that "[Plutarch] used the heroes' *deeds and words as evidence* for their moral qualities or virtues."[766]

We suggest that this use of deeds and words as evidence for moral qualities occurs in the *Pericles-Fabius* pair. The formulation of the traits ascribed to Pericles and Fabius in the opening Prologue (second part) has a strong correspondence with the narratives of Pericles and Fabius primarily because Plutarch portrays these two heroes as uniformly and consistently embodying these traits.[767] The abstract formulation of the trait in the *Pericles-Fabius* pair stated in the Prologue (*Per*. 2.5) "was their ability, as Plutarch states in the preface, to endure the stupidities of the mass of common citizens and of their colleagues, that is, their *praotēs*."[768] This was in essence the major premise

---

Pelling, "Childhood and personality in Greek biography," in *Plutarch and History. Eighteen Studies* (Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011), 312; "*Synkrisis*," 359.

[762] Stadter, *Commentary*, xxvii [emphasis added].

[763] Duff, *Exploring*, 70.

[764] Pelling, "Aspects," 294.

[765] Christopher Pelling, email message to author, April 2, 2020. Pelling said that his interests lie with the more complex cases.

[766] Stadter, "Comparison," 77 [emphasis added].

[767] The reader is referred to Stadter's analysis for specific evidence that this is the case. Plutarch, in his account that runs from his birth to his death, "has successfully demonstrated that Pericles is worthy of imitation" (Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 263). See also Stadter (258–64) for his analysis of Pericles's life. This study will not attempt to demonstrate these virtues in *Fabius*.

[768] Stadter, *Commentary*, xxx.

of a quasi-syllogistic argument. The minor premise, or proof, was provided in the situation-specific events of the subsequently narrated episodes. The conclusion of the argument follows from the major premise and the minor premises. These men indeed had the virtue of πρᾳότης.

6.3.10 Conclusion

At this point some intermediate conclusions can be drawn. So far this section has attempted to show evidence of the rhetoric nature of *Pericles* and Plutarch's rhetorical strategies in this Life. These rhetorical strategies are several-fold, consisting of the use of at least two (if not all three) rhetorical genres of classical rhetoric, and the use of proof by narrated example in which virtues are demonstrated through the narration of choices and events in the life of the statesman. Additionally, the reader is asked to render an evaluation of how successful Plutarch has been, thus acting in the capacity of a judge who is then encouraged to act in a manner that shows evidence of the advocated virtues. A final, but unusually occurring, epilogue concludes the Life.

One of the most noteworthy features of the Life for this study is an identification of the rhetorical structure of the Life. It begins with a Prologue that contains an abstract formulation of traits that functions as a proposition to be demonstrated concretely and situationally by means of a "narrative proof" in the following narrative. This narrative proof serves to show that Pericles was in fact a man of πρᾳότης. The Life closes with a final "conclusion" (ch. 39). Thus, we can conclude that there is evidence that the rhetorical strategies and structure in *Pericles* play a "prominent if not overwhelming part in determining Plutarch's presentation."[769] Showing that *Pericles* and the FG have a similar rhetorical structure with similar rhetorical strategies will enable us to draw conclusions regarding the nature of the FG's Prologue.

6.4 Comparison of the Fourth Gospel and *Pericles*

At this point we have investigated the rhetorical nature of both the FG and *Pericles*. The purpose of this section is to summarize, by way of a brief comparison, the rhetorical strategies between them. Remarkably, our findings show that they are very similar in this respect. There are similarities in (1) the presence of all three rhetorical genres in the FG[770] and least two (if not all three) rhetorical genres in *Pericles*; (2) the demonstration by narration of examples, or narrative rhetoric; (3) the invitation to reader evaluation; (4) a Prologue that contains abstract themes; and (5) a conclusion to the argument.[771] With regard to the last point, we pointed out above that the conclusion to the FG (20:30–31) is unique among the canonical Gospels and that the conclusion to *Pericles* (ch. 39) is unusual for Plutarch's biographies. This, then, is further evidence that the FG and *Pericles* are an appropriate pair to compare. In summary, we can conclude that *Pericles* and the FG are remarkably similar in their rhetorical strategies and structure.

---

[769] Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 251.

It is important to bear in mind that despite these similarities, there are also some differences in the rhetorical strategies of *Pericles* and the FG. Beyond the clear differences in the subject matter and the propositions to be demonstrated, one noteworthy difference is the FG's sustained use of witnesses or testimony, which is normally considered to be a type of inartificial proof.[772] Moreover, the deliberative rhetorical purposes of each are different. Whereas Plutarch, in *Pericles*, has in mind the inculcation and imitation of specific virtues, the FG enjoins believing in Jesus as the divine Son of God and performing actions associated with a complex belief-response in order to have life.[773] These differences, however, do not overshadow the fact that these two discourses are remarkably similar rhetorically.

At the outset of this chapter we stated that its purpose was (1) to show that the FG and *Pericles* are highly rhetorical discourses, and (2) to argue that the abstract themes in the FG's Prologue could be conceived of as rhetorical propositions for which the ensuing narrative furnishes demonstration of these propositional claims. The argument related to the second purpose is supported in part by our findings up to this point. One aspect of these findings is that both the FG and *Pericles* have a similar structure or "rhetorical arrangement." They both begin with a Prologue that introduces one or more abstract themes, they both contain a narrative that functions rhetorically to demonstrate various propositions, and finally they both contain a conclusion. We will discover below that this structure coheres well with the "rhetorical arrangement" specified by Aristotle.

---

[770] See chapters 2 and 3 above for our demonstration of the three genres in the FG.

[771] Brant, *John*, 273–74, points out an additional similarity between the FG and Plutarch in the selective use of material. For example, at the beginning of the life of *Alexander* (*Alex*. 1.1), Plutarch makes a similar statement to notify his audience that he is only providing enough details sufficient for his "portrait." With regard to Pericles, Plutarch uses only a selection of material from his Life. See Stadter, "Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*," 264. The narratives are episodic or disjointed, and designed to demonstrate particular virtues. Most of the historical context is omitted, as well as details about Pericles's family (Stadter, *Commentary*, xli).

[772] See the footnote in sec. 2.10 ("The Fourth Gospel as Judicial Rhetoric") above for the meaning of inartificial (and artificial) proofs. For witnesses, see *On Rhetoric*, 1.15; *Inst*., 5.7. Sheppard, "John," specifically investigates this type of rhetorical strategy in her chapter 2.

[773] This study discussed these actions in chapter 2 and 3.

It remains to investigate an additional similarity, which deals with their participation in the ancient biographical genre.

6.5 The Fourth Gospel and Ancient Biography Genre

This study assumes, in part, that the FG is a type of ancient biography. However, it will not attempt to adduce evidence from the FG itself but will show that the FG is a type of biography by referring to recent works that have already argued for this. Until 1915 it was generally held that the Gospels were a type of ancient biography.[774] During the remainder of the twentieth century, however, this view changed.[775] Nevertheless, a complete reversal has occurred in the last several decades such that it is now widely held among contemporary scholars that the Gospels, including the FG, are again to be viewed as a type (or sub-genre) of ancient biography.[776] Regarding the Gospels in general, in his recent study Craig Keener affirmed, "most Gospel scholars today view the Gospels as belonging to the genre of ancient biography."[777] This would also include the FG, as Richard Burridge,[778] Keener[779] and others have concluded. That the FG is a type of ancient biography seems to be the consensus among contemporary scholars studying the genre of the Gospels, including those scholars studying the FG.[780] Our study, however, does not require that the FG belongs solely to that genre. One crucial difference exists between the Gospels and ancient *bioi*. In ancient *bioi* the author intended the audience to emulate the hero's virtues but not necessarily the actions. In the Gospels, costly discipleship includes being hated, persecuted, excommunicated, and killed. This comports well with the deliberative rhetoric in the FG.[781]

---

[774] Craig S. Keener, *Christobiography: Memory, History, and the Reliability of the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019), 30. Keener, *Christobiography*, 30n18, specially mentions the studies of Johannes Weiss and Clyde Votaw.

[775] "Arguments concerning the biographical character of the Gospels have thus come full circle" (Keener, *John*, 1:12). For a succinct summary of the twentieth-century treatments of the genre of the Gospels, see Keener, *Christobiography*, 30–33.

[776] Ancient biographies differed from modern biographies in that the latter focused on a person's internal processes, and personality growth and development. Ancient biographies, on the other hand, "understood external actions to reveal a person's character or virtue (or vices). This did not rule out any concern with development, but it shifted the focus significantly" (Warren Carter, *John: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006], 9.) See also Aune, *Environment*, 63. Interestingly, Plutarch's biographies often come close to themes and concerns found in modern biographies, but these concerns often "lead to shallow and disappointing results" (Pelling, "Aspects," 283).

[777] Keener, *Christobiography*, 27. See his 27n1 for a large sampling of modern scholars who hold this view. Moreover, Keener goes on to assert that even detractors understand that this is the general consensus, 27, esp. 27n2. Elizabeth E. Shively, "Recognizing Penguins: Audience Expectation, Cognitive Genre Theory, and the Ending of Mark's Gospel," *CBQ* 80 (2018): 273–292 also argues for seeing the Gospels, in her case even Mark, though it lacks explicit moral reflection, as ancient

Several recent commentaries on the FG have included discussions of genre in their introductions, most of which hold that the FG is a type of ancient biography. For example, Andrew Lincoln comments: "The canonical Gospels with their account of the mission of Jesus, written in Greek, are most likely to have been thought of by their first readers as sharing the broad characteristics of the *bios* or Life, that is, as belonging to the literary genre of ancient biography."[782] Keener's commentary on John contains a significant section dedicated to the topic of genre,[783] and he concludes, "Whatever else may be said about the Fourth Gospel's genre, it must fall into the broad category as the Synoptics;… The genre of the Synoptics is clearly historical biography, so the same would follow for John."[784] A number of other Johannine commentaries include discussions of genre.[785]

---

biographies. She further attributes (277n15) the establishment of this consensus to both Richard Burridge, *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004) and Dirk Frickenschmidt, *Evangelium als Biographie: Die vier Evangelien im Rahmen antiker Erzählkunst* (Tübingen: Francke, 1997).

[778] Burridge, *Gospels*, 213–32.

[779] The Fourth Gospel's genre "must fall into the same category as the Synoptics" (Keener, *John*, 1:33).

[780] Gorman has discerningly remarked, "Although a gospel is certainly *more* than an ancient biography, it is not *less* than one" (Gorman, *Abide*, 158 [emphasis original]).

[781] See Bond, *Biography*, 159–61; Hooker, *Not Ashamed*, 51–54.

[782] Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John*, BNTC (London: Continuum, 2005), 14–15; see 14–17 for his treatment of genre. He includes the FG as a form of ancient biography, 15. Lincoln goes on to observe that "the canonical Gospels have features that make them distinctive within ancient biography," 15. See also his, *Truth*, 170, 370–78, for additional discussion regarding genre and ancient biography.

[783] Keener, *John*, 1:3–52.

[784] Keener, *John*, 1:33.

[785] See D. Moody Smith, *John*, 22–23. Smith notes that the most contemporary readers would have probably thought they were reading ancient lives when encountering the Gospels. Nevertheless, he suggests that the form-critical movement, represented by K. L. Schmidt (1923), rightly recognized the distinctive religious and cultic function of the Gospels. See D. Moody Smith, *John*, 22; Mark W. G.

In summary, the purpose of this section was simply to observe that, based on the current general consensus, the FG seems to belong to the ancient genre of biography. We have not attempted to offer an extensive proof of this.[786] This study does not strictly depend on understanding the FG as an instance of an ancient biography. If, however, the FG is a type of ancient biography, then this is another way the FG is similar to Plutarch's *Pericles*.[787]

6.6 Prologues and Ancient Rhetorical Arrangement

Since we are investigating the rhetorical nature of *Pericles* and the FG, one aspect of a rhetorical study concerns the rhetorical arrangement of the discourse. But in this regard, one immediately encounters a problem when considering *Pericles* and the FG. The problem with comparing the Prologues of these two discourses with the descriptions of Prologues in the classical rhetoric handbooks is that neither *Pericles* nor the FG is a speech *per se*. Moreover, their *arrangement* (order of the discourse) does not follow the arrangements specified in the handbooks, particularly the Latin handbooks. The handbooks themselves are not consistent. Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian all differ, as Watson points out.[788] The six-part arrangement contains the *exordium*, the *narratio*, the

---

Stibbe, *John* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), 13. Stibbe added more nuance to his thinking in his 1994 study in his *John's Gospel*, NTR (London: Routledge, 1994), but in the end still agrees that at least in form the FG is "an example of Hellenistic biography," 72. Charles H. Talbert (*Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*, rev. ed. [Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2005], 65) states that the FG's genre is "probably that of ancient biography." Warren Carter (*John*, 3–20) views the FG as an instance of ancient biography; Witherington (*John's Wisdom*, 2–4) holds that the FG is a type of dramatic biography. See also Jean Zumstein, *Das Johannesevangelium*, KEK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016), 46n42. His discussion of genre (Gattung) is mostly confined to this footnote. He suggests a mixture of ancient biography and historiography, and adduces as evidence the same features presented by Aune, *Environment*, 32–36: structure (chronological), content (chief person in an encomiastic way), and the goal (function) of bringing before the eyes a model (for imitation). See also Köstenberger, *Theology*, 104–24, for an assessment of the FG's genre.

[786] We have also not provided proof that *Pericles* is a biography. This seems to be the consensus of contemporary Plutarchan scholarship, and is in fact among the frequent texts with which genre comparisons are made. Nevertheless, Christopher Pelling ("Plutarch's adaptation of his source material," in *Plutarch and History. Eighteen Studies* [Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011], 106) notes that "some Lives fit Plutarch's theory better than others." He concludes (106), "This biographical genre is an extremely flexible one, and admits works of very different patterns."

[787] Although Burridge selected *Cato* from Plutarch's biographies for his study, our findings above suggest, rather, that *Pericles* is more pertinent to a comparison between the FG and a Plutarchan biography from the vantage point of rhetoric, including the rhetorical arrangement. For example, *Cato* lacks an evaluative epilogue. *Cato* itself contains no prologue, however, because it is paired with the *Phocion*; the prologue in the latter serves as the prologue for *Cato*.

[788] Watson, *Invention*, 20. The structure can have as few as four and as many as six parts.

partitio, the *probatio*, the *refutio*, and the *peroratio*.[789] The problem essentially consists in the fact that the *narratio*, or the narration of the facts of the case, precedes the *partitio*, which is the enumeration of the propositions to be proved.[790] In the case of *Pericles*, it is evident that the Prologue contains the propositions to be proven, and the narration is in fact the proof or demonstration of those propositions, and this is followed by a conclusion.[791] The arrangement suggested by Aristotle seems to provide a much better correspondence to both *Pericles* and the FG, as we will see below.[792]

Aristotle holds that a discourse can have as few as two parts:

> There are two parts to a speech; for it is necessary [first] to state the subject and [then] to demonstrate it. It is ineffective, after stating something, not to demonstrate it and to demonstrate without a first statement; for one demonstrating, demonstrates *something*, and one making a preliminary statement says it first for the sake of demonstrating it. Of these parts, the first is the statement [*prothesis*], the other the proof [*pistis*]. (Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 3.13.1–2 [Kennedy])[793]

He continues by reiterating that these are the necessary parts of a rhetorical discourse: "The necessary parts, then, are *prothesis* [statement of the proposition] and *pistis* [proof of the statement]. These are, therefore, the parts that really belong [in every speech]" (Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 3.13.4 [Kennedy]). But he goes on to state that the discourse contains at most four elements, "and at the most, prooemium,[794] *prothesis*, *pistis*, epilogue" (Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 3.13.4 [Kennedy]). One further text from Aristotle is pertinent to our investigation. "In the prooemion it is right to identify the subject, in order that question to be judged not escape notice; but in the epilogue one should speak in recapitulation of what has been shown" (Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 3.19.4 [Kennedy]).

---

[789] See Watson, *Invention*, 20–21. See esp. 21 for a description of these.

[790] *Pericles* and the FG also do not fit with other parts of the six-part arrangement.

[791] This study will argue that the same also holds for the FG.

[792] See also Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 24.

[793] Emphasis and bracketed text added by Kennedy.

[794] The prooemium (προοίμιον) is the beginning of the discourse. Kennedy offers a helpful description of the terms as translated from the Greek and Latin treatises: "*Oimos* literally means 'stripe' or 'layer' but metaphorically means the 'course' or 'strain' of a song. A *pro-oimion* is thus a 'prelude' or introductory song. Transliterated into the Latin alphabet this becomes *prooemion* or *proemium*, sometimes shortened in English to *proem*. The Latin translation is *exordium*" (*On Rhetoric*, 260). Kennedy regularly translates προοίμιον as *prooemion*.

When we compare *Pericles* with Aristotle's suggested four-part arrangement, it is apparent that there is a close conformance. The (1) prooemium and (2) the *prothesis* together are contained in the Prologue: the identification of the subject, Pericles (and Fabius), and the proposition, an abstract statement that he (and Fabius) embodied certain virtues. The (3) *pistis* (proof) is contained in the following narrative, and (4) the epilogue is found in chapter 39.

Similarly, when we compare the FG with Aristotle's suggested four-part arrangement, there is also a close conformance. The (1) prooemium and (2) (to be argued below) the *prothesis* together are contained in the Prologue: the identification of the subject, the Word/Jesus (and John the Baptist and Moses), and abstract statements. The (3) *pistis* (proof) is likewise contained in the following narrative, and (4) the epilogue is found in chapter 20:30–31 (and perhaps chapter 21).

Therefore, we can conclude that both *Pericles* and the FG have a rhetorical arrangement that conforms to Aristotle's theory, with, of course, the issue of how to understand the abstract statements in the FG's Prologue and their rhetorical purpose.[795] Whether they can be construed as rhetorical propositions is the question we take up in the following section.

6.7 Rhetorical Propositions and the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel

6.7.1 Introduction

The argument of this chapter, in part, is to show from a literary perspective that the Prologue of the FG contains propositions that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. The preceding sections of this chapter have explored the narrative rhetorical strategies of both the FG and *Pericles*, and how they are similar in this respect. The immediately preceding section established that both the FG and *Pericles* have a rhetorical arrangement (structure) that coheres with that of Aristotle.

The present section will examine more closely the function of the Prologue with respect to the following narrative, and will seek to demonstrate that the abstract statements in the Prologue (see 5.2.5) can be plausibly construed as containing rhetorical propositions (or claims or theses) that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. It may not be possible to prove conclusively that the Prologue contains such propositions. As Marianne Meye Thompson observes, "There is no doubt that in the Prologue, John stakes his claim: the central figure of the Gospel, Jesus of Nazareth, is none other than the incarnate Word of God, who was with God, and who was God."[796] But she goes on to qualify this with two further relevant observations: first, none of Jesus' later claims and none of the later debates over his identity are expressed in the exact same formulations as provided in the Prologue, and second, "the Gospel is a narrative of the 'life-giving work of the Word that became flesh.… [it] is not a series of theological propositions.'"[797]

---

[795] Margaret Mitchell similarly argues (1) that 1 Corinthians is an instance of deliberative rhetoric, and (2) that it coheres with Aristotle's simple arrangement of proposition followed by proof. She points out that "Aristotle's simplified description well fits the extant deliberative texts." Mitchell, *Rhetoric*, 198–200, citing 199.

Furnished with these observations, our investigation will now attempt to show that the Prologue of the FG contains rhetorical propositions. The Prologue, however, may have additional functions that a rhetorical proem might provide, such as introducing characters, in this case, Jesus, John the Baptist, and Moses. It seems best, then, to view the Prologue as having the dual purpose of simultaneously functioning as a proem and providing propositions that will be demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. As noted in chapter 1, Dennis Stamps is generally critical of utilizing classical rhetoric to analyze the FG. In his critique of George Kennedy, Stamps claims that Kennedy "cannot decide between identifying it[798] as a proem or proposition."[799] Stamps is quite correct to point out that there is little evidence to substantiate Kennedy's assertion that all the Gospels approximate an oratorical structure in terms of rhetorical arrangement, if we view arrangement in terms of the Latin rhetorical arrangement of "proem, narration, exposition, and epilogue."[800] Classical rhetoric conceived of the second element, the narrative, as simply a "statement of the facts," or "facts of the case," and the third element, the exposition, as a proof of the narrated facts. Certainly, the FG does not show evidence of this type of structure, and in this sense Stamps is correct.

---

[796] Thompson, *John*, 36.

[797] Thompson, *John*, 36.

[798] That is, the Prologue, which Kennedy treats as consisting of 1:1–14.

[799] Stamps, "Johannine Writings," 618. Cf. Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 109.

[800] Stamps, "Johannine Writings," 617. This is his statement of the rhetorical arrangement, which corresponds more directly to the Latin handbooks.

Nevertheless, ancient biographies, such as Plutarch's *Lives*, which, as we observed in the case of *Pericles*, were highly rhetorical in function, and contained a proem that had the dual purpose of introducing the work and setting forth propositions to be proved. Moreover, they similarly did not conform to the arrangement of an oratorical speech in terms of narration following the proem, followed by an exposition of the case. Rather, Plutarch's biographies at times provide a proposition at the beginning and then set forth a narrative that consists of a series of anecdotes or other descriptive features that attempt to demonstrate the proposition in the proem.

Kennedy views the Prologue (again, 1:1–14) as "a proposition" containing at least five propositional "topics"[801] in sequence, "most of which are given development subsequently in the Gospel."[802] Kennedy writes, "These topics are a series of definitions: The Word was God; God was the creator; God is life; God is light; the Word was made flesh."[803] While this may hold true for some of the propositions (1:1–3), the manner in which other propositions are formulated in the Prologue suggests that the formulations in the Prologue are more than simple definitions. For example, the statement, "The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it" (1:5), conveys the sense that something more dynamic is occurring—namely, a claim that calls for an explanation or demonstration that shows how (and when) the darkness did not overcome it. Kennedy observes that while the topic "in him was life" (1:4) is given amplification in vv. 5 and 9, "the topics are authoritatively enunciated with no attempt at proof."[804] We suggest that the reason no proof is furnished (that is, in the Prologue) is that while admittedly the topics are given in a rather authoritative and categorical manner in the Prologue, the plan of the FG is to provide demonstrations of how these topics are true by means of narrating events later in the Gospel. We suggest, then, that these asserted topics are to be viewed as separate, though related, propositions for which the Evangelist provides demonstration or proof in the following narrative.

---

[801] Kennedy uses the term "topics" in a general sense, though he also states (*Interpretation*, 111) that they are in fact "assertions."

[802] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 109–10.

[803] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 110.

[804] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 110.

Some interpreters are skeptical of understanding propositions in the Prologue, such as J. A. T. Robinson and Jean Zumstein.[805] Robinson argues in essence that the Prologue does not contain theses to be demonstrated. To be sure, his aim is to show that the Prologue was not composed at the time of the writing of the Gospel proper.[806] It is useful to cite his work in detail:

> If the prologue shaped and controlled the composition of the material that follows it, then it is possible to read the Fourth Gospel as though John were primarily interested in timeless truths of mystical or philosophical speculation which are subsequently *illustrated* in the history,… The Lazarus story, for instance, could illustrate the truth that Jesus is the resurrection and the life equally well if it were simply a parable, like that of Dives and Lazarus, cast into the form of a miracle for dramatic effect.[807]

His argument, however, is not compelling for several reasons. First, he essentially concedes that the Prologue has features that suggest that it controls the following narrative. Second, it simply does not follow that the Evangelist would have used a parable instead of the narrated episode in John 11. Third, we have shown above that the FG presents many patterns of propositions and their related demonstrations much like *Pericles* does in the framework of a biographical narrative. Thus, his argument is not sufficiently demonstrated.

6.7.2 Necessity of a Prologue

Several interpreters have deemed that the Prologue is necessary for the FG. For example, Keener points out that if one removes the Prologue, a more formal introduction than 1:19 would be expected.[808] Similarly, Barrett writes:

> Prologue and gospel together are the supreme example of the coinherence of the "that" and the "what" of the story of Jesus. The Prologue assumes simply that the light shone in the darkness, that he came to his own, that the Word became flesh, and analyses the theological significance of the bare fact expressed in the

---

[805] I will interact with Zumstein in sec. 6.7.4 below.

[806] J. A. T. Robinson, "The Relation of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John," in *Twelve More New Testament Studies* (London: SCM, 1984), 68. Whether the Prologue was composed before or after (or at the same time as) the FG is not immediately relevant for this study. But perhaps some comments regarding this are pertinent. Some, for example, such as Robinson, 71, hold that some form of Prologue was necessary from the beginning: "To take away the porch now leaves the masonry disturbed."

[807] Robinson, "Relation," 75 [emphasis original].

[808] Keener, *John*, 1:333.

> "that." The gospel will tell how he came to his own, what happened when the Word became flesh. And *the Prologue is necessary to the gospel, as the gospel is necessary to the Prologue*. The history explicates the theology, and the theology interprets the history.[809]

Morna Hooker concurs with Barrett's thoughts. Moreover, she argues that those approaches that hold that the Prologue was a later addition are "overly-analytical," and overlook the Prologue's "purpose and necessity" for this sort of narrative, which is to enable the plot to be understood by the readers.[810] Brown observes that in its present form the Prologue is not "totally extraneous to the Gospel."[811] James Dunn, similarly, states that he finds it impossible to regard the Prologue as a later addition after the final form of the Gospel: "the themes of the prologue are too closely integrated into the Gospel as a whole and are so clearly intended to introduce these themes that such a conclusion is implausible."[812]

James McGrath concurs that that the Prologue is needed, and further agrees with others that the whole Gospel is intended to be read through the lens of the Prologue. He adds that this is true both of its high Christology and "its apologetic and polemical aims and intentions."[813] We will refine this below to suggest that to this must be added the rhetorical aims of the Prologue, namely, the propositions it contains. Finally, Hartwig Thyen suggests that the Prologue contains "reading instructions" for interpreting the Gospel.[814]

Alan Culpepper takes the opposite approach when he suggests that the Prologue "would probably never be convincing to the reader were it not for the rest of the narrative. Confession ultimately depends upon story for its credibility."[815] In this sense, Réville rightly remarks: "we have the duty to interpret the gospel in the light of the Prologue. This is why it was written."[816]

---

[809] C. K. Barrett, *The Prologue of St John's Gospel* (London: Athlone, 1971), 28 [emphasis added].

[810] Morna D. Hooker, "Beginnings and Endings," in *The Written Gospel*, edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 2005), 189. See also Hooker, *Beginnings*, 64–83, where she argues that the Prologue provides the key to understanding the Gospel.

[811] Brown, *John*, 1:19.

[812] James D. G. Dunn, "Let John Be John: A Gospel for Its Time," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, edited by Peter Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 313n78. Similarly, Harnack held that correspondence in a large number of different concepts and theology in the Prologue and the Gospel is "that which connects the prologue with the Gospel, [and] what makes every separation of the Gospel from it impossible." He then suggested that one must oppose any efforts to detach the Prologue from the Gospel. See Adolf von Harnack, "Über das Verhältnis des Prologs des vierten Evangeliums zum ganzen Werk," *ZTK* 2 (1892): 213.

[813] James F. McGrath, "Prologue as Legitimation: Christological Controversy and the Interpretation of John 1:1–18," *IBS* 19 (1997): 119.

[814] Hartwig Thyen, "Johannesevangelium," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie 17*, edited by G. Müller, H. Balz, and G. Krause (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988), 213.

6.7.3 Prologue a Summary of the Fourth Gospel?

Several interpreters have suggested that the Prologue is a summary of the FG. Thus, Hoskyns states that the Prologue is not a preface to the FG but a summary of it.[817] Barrett views the Prologue as having the dual purpose of introducing and summarizing the FG.[818] Jörg Frey views the Prologue as a "proleptic summary" of major elements of the Johannine plot."[819]

Some interpreters understand specific verses in the Prologue to refer to various sections of the FG. Bultmann holds that 1:5 is a summary of chapters 3–12, and 1:12–13 is a summary of chapters 13–17.[820] Others hold to this or a variation of it. Brown, for example, views that 1:11–12 are a summary of the two major sections of the FG, 1:11 for chapters 1–12, and 1:12 for chapters 13–20.[821] Ashton, while rejecting the Prologue as such to be a summary of the FG, nevertheless suggests that John 1:18, properly understood, is "an admirable summary of the message of the whole Gospel: the Jesus of the story that follows—all that he says and does, his life, death and resurrection—is God made manifest, God fully revealed."[822]

The point here is not to address which, if any of these proposals, are correct, but mainly to assess whether the Prologue can reasonably be conceived as a summary. The question arises why some interpreters conceive of the Prologue as a summary. If one is familiar with the entire FG, and aware that there are terms and themes in the Prologue that seem to have close correspondences, on the surface it would seem that it is appropriate to assume that the Prologue contains a summary.

---

[815] Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 89.

[816] Jean Réville, *Le Quatrième Évangile: son Origine et sa Valeur Historique* (Paris: Leroux, 1901), 116.

[817] Hoskyns, *Gospel*, 137. See also Heinrich Schlier, "Im Anfang war das Wort. Zum Prolog des Johannesevangeliums," *Wort und Wahrheit* 9 (1954): 169.

[818] See Barrett, *Gospel*, 151. Similarly, D. Moody Smith, *John*, 63: the Prologue is both a prelude and a summarization of the Gospel.

[819] Jörg Frey, "Love Relations in the Fourth Gospel. Establishing a Semantic Network," in *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten: Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften I*, herausgegeben von Juliane Schlegel (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 751.

[820] Bultmann, *John*, 48.

[821] Brown, *John*, 1:19. He calls the two parts, the "Book of Signs" and the "Book of Glory." He considers chapter 21 to be an added epilogue.

[822] John Ashton, "Really the Prologue?" in *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological, and Philosophical Contexts*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt, R. Alan Culpepper, and Udo Schnelle, WUNT 359 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 44.

But the view that the Prologue is a summary has a number of problems that interpreters have observed. As Paul Trudinger points out, several themes presented in the body of the FG are missing, including such important ideas as Jesus' death and resurrection, his gift of the Spirit, and eternal life.[823] To this we can add that the important theme of Jesus' commissioning his disciples is also missing from the Prologue. While these observations are not necessarily fatal to the view that the Prologue is a summary of the FG, it does raise questions about the soundness of this hypothesis.[824]

6.7.4 Prologue as the Hermeneutical Key?

Several interpreters hold to the view that the Prologue was added after the FG was completed, but also affirm that the Prologue is needed as an interpretive key in order to understand properly the FG. Raymond Collins suggests that the Prologue was added "[w]hen the Gospel had been substantially complete," holding that it is the "oldest commentary" on the FG, though he offers no arguments for viewing it as later than the FG itself.[825] Nevertheless, he believes that the Prologue provides "a *hermeneutical key* for the interpretation of John's Gospel,"[826] and that it furnishes "an early and authoritative clue to the meaning of the Gospel."[827] Zumstein also understands the Prologue as a secondary addition to the Gospel.[828] But, similar to Collins, Zumstein speaks of the Prologue as having the function of "defining *the hermeneutic framework* within which the narrative must be read."[829] Robinson also argues that the Prologue was added after the FG was completed.[830] Nevertheless, he similarly believes that the Prologue is necessary, likening it to the porch of a house, "designed and executed by the same architect but in a grander and more elevated style. Moreover, there is no clear line demarcating it from the main building."[831] To repeat, taking away the porch "leaves the masonry disturbed."[832]

---

[823] L. Paul Trudinger, "Prologue of John's Gospel: Its Extent, Content and Intent," *RTR* 33 (1974): 11–12.

[824] Ashton ("Prologue?," 32), following Zumstein, holds that the Prologue is not a summary of the FG. See Zumstein's "Prolog," 74.

[825] Raymond F. Collins, "The Oldest Commentary on the Fourth Gospel," in *These Things Have Been Written. Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 153. Collins does not state explicitly whether the Gospel ever circulated without the Prologue.

[826] Collins, "Oldest Commentary," 153 [emphasis added].

[827] Collins, "Oldest Commentary," 157.

[828] Zumstein, "Prolog," 58, following Michael Theobald. Both Zumstein and Theobald follow Collins in considering the Prologue to be the "first commentary" on the FG.

[829] Zumstein, "Prolog," 75 [emphasis original].

Curiously, both Zumstein and Robinson offer impressive evidence for a connection between the Prologue and the Gospel proper. Zumstein devotes an entire subsection that describes four types of connections between the Prologue and the Gospel. It is important to point out, however, in his last type, that of theological categories, he essentially "de-propositionalizes," or flattens the formulation of these concepts in the Prologue, reducing them from an abstract proposition-like, almost plot-like, form such as "The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it" (1:5), or "He came to what was his own, and his own people did not accept him" (1:11), to mostly one-word terms, such as "glory" (rather than, "we have seen his glory" [1:14]) and "light-darkness-dualism" (see the full phrase in 1:5).[833] This, unfortunately, obscures the function that they have in the Prologue. Robinson includes the connections involving John the Baptist, a list of themes common to both, and a corresponding structure.[834]

There seems to be a contradiction, when on the one hand Collins and Zumstein hold that the Prologue came later, but on the other hand maintain that it is the hermeneutical key with significant connections.

6.7.5 The Prologue an Introduction?

At the outset of this study we stated that most contemporary scholars understand the Prologue to be an introduction to the Gospel, somewhat like an overture or foyer that introduces the major characters and themes.[835] The key characters of John (the Baptist), Jesus (the Logos), Moses, and the Father appear for the first time. Various themes are also found for the first time. We can examine just two of these themes: life is light (1:4; cf. 8:12) and seeing the Logos's glory (1:14; cf. 12:41).[836] Although Robinson and others point out the links between the Prologue and the rest of the Gospel, the precise relationship is often not made clear. Simply noting that life is light (1:4) has links to 8:12, and that seeing the Logos's glory (1:14) has links to 12:41 does not tell us much about how these links function. In section 6.2.6 we observed how the statements in the Prologue are formulated abstractly. In the ensuing narrative the corresponding passages are formulated in situation-specific and concrete terms. This requires explanation. We have shown that the FG is a highly rhetorical text, and therefore we would expect the Prologue to have a more rhetorical function than a simple introductory function, especially in light of the rhetorical arrangement that can be identified in both the FG and *Pericles*. We argued above in section 6.6 that the Prologue of *Pericles* and the FG (tentatively) have the dual rhetorical function of (1) introducing major characters and themes (prooemium), and (2) (to be argued more definitively below for the FG) proposing propositions (*protheses*) that are demonstrated in the ensuing narrative. Although the Prologue functions as an introduction, we will argue below that the Prologue also has an important rhetorical function.

---

[830] Robinson, "'Relation," 71. Lindars (*John*, 76) likewise suggests that the original Gospel did not include the Prologue.

[831] Robinson, "Relation," 67.

[832] Robinson, "Relation," 71.

[833] Zumstein, "Prolog," 52–55. He borrows from Brown, *John*, 1:19. Brown's discussion contains much of the original proposition-like phraseology. Brown himself borrows from Robinson, as does Carson (*John*, 111) who also retains most of the original phraseology.

[834] Robinson, "Relation," 68. His discussion contains much of the original proposition-like phraseology, though the correspondence of structures he makes is debatable.

6.7.6 Proponents of Propositions in the Prologue

That the Prologue includes propositions (themes or claims) that are demonstrated in the FG has been advocated by several interpreters of the FG. Two works early in the twentieth century championed this view. First, Jean Réville in 1901 wrote that the goal of the narrative was to demonstrate the theses proclaimed in the Prologue.[837] He stated that the general thesis of the Prologue is "Jesus Christ, the incarnate Logos, the unique Son of God, accomplishes the final work of revelation and salvation that could not be accomplished under the previous manner of its revealing activity."[838] Réville cites evidence from the rest of the FG where in the narrated events and discourses Christ makes himself known in ways that correspond to the propositional themes in the Prologue: a principle of the new order of salvation (1:1–18; 1:35–4:42); the principle of life (1:4; 4:43–6:71) in the healing of the royal official's son, the healing of the paralytic, the feeding of the 5,000, and Christ's assertion of his being the bread of life; the bringer of light of the world even though people did not recognize him as such (1:4, 5, 10; 7:1–12:50), but some did receive him (1:12–13). Réville suggests that chapters 13–17 "are in a way the illustration of the words of the beginning: 'The goodness and the truth (of God) have come by Jesus Christ, the unique Son of God' (1:17 and 18)."[839] While his precise identification of the theses in the Prologue and how they correspond to the ensuing narrative seems reasonable but perhaps debatable, at this point we are mainly interested in his assertion that there are theses in the Prologue that are demonstrated in the following narrative.

---

[835] See again the literature in Myers, *Characterizing*, 40n62; Sheridan, "Prologue," 172n4. See also Heinrich Lausberg, *Der Johannes-Prolog: Rhetorische Befunde zu Form und Sinn des Textes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 5; Hooker, *Beginnings*, 83; and Thompson, *John*, 26.

[836] Adapted from Robinson, "Relation," 68.

[837] Réville, *Quatrième Évangile*, 114.

[838] Réville, *Quatrième Évangile*, 117. He also presented a few specific theses.

Second, Johannes Belser in 1903 first formulated his view that the Prologue contained theses that were demonstrated in the FG in an article on the Prologue[840] and then in his subsequent commentary on the FG.[841] His analysis, however, did not go unchallenged. Franz Kiefl reviewed Belser's commentary shortly after its publication, and critiqued Belser's nine main theses outlined in his commentary.[842] With regard to Belser's second thesis ("point"), which dealt with the Prologue containing theses, Kiefl's main objection was with Belser's specific identification of the theses and how they related to the FG, and not with the concept of theses in the Prologue itself.[843] Kiefl's critique is perhaps justified, but only with respect to the identification of the theses and their correspondence to the rest of the FG.[844]

We pointed out above that Kennedy conceived of the Prologue of the FG as containing propositional topics in sequence that were given development subsequently in the FG.[845] Barrett notes that some view the Prologue as "the staple Johannine proposition, illustrated … in the narratives and discourses that follow,"[846] but he does not cite any specific studies. Gary Manning observes that the Prologue "tells" that John the Baptist "is the supreme witness to Jesus, so that 'all might believe through him' (1:6–8). The first two disciples 'show' that the Prologue was correct: John faithfully testified to Jesus, and the two disciples believed through the witness of John."[847] We can reformulate this in terms of narrative rhetoric, and say that the Prologue "claimed" that John was the supreme witness, and the ensuing narrative proved this claim by showing John's disciples coming to Jesus, "following" him, and "staying" with him (1:37–40).

---

[839] Réville, *Quatrième Évangile*, 119. For his discussion of how the narrative (in four parts) demonstrates the themes and theology in the Prologue, see 116–19.

[840] J. E. Belser, "Der Prolog des Johannesevangeliums," *Theologische Quartalschrift* 85 (1903): 483–519.

[841] J. E. Belser, *Das Evangelium des Heiligen Johannes* (Freiburg: Herder, 1905).

[842] See Belser, *Evangelium*, v–vi. Belser discusses nine "points," which Kiefl, immediately below, calls "theses," which are not to be confused with the concept of "theses" contained in the Prologue.

[843] Franz Xaver Kiefl, "Review of Das Evangelium des Heiligen Johannes. J. E. Belser," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 4 (1906): 410–17. See 412–13 for this specific critique.

[844] See chapter 5 above for our examination of several of the Prologue's theses (propositions) and their demonstration.

Several interpreters of the FG who do not explicitly state that the Prologue contains propositions that will be demonstrated by the narrative, nevertheless, provide observations that could well be interpreted as evidence for this view. Francis Moloney, for example, comes very close to this view when he states that the Prologue makes claims (propositions) that are proved in the narrative: "The author believes passionately that Jesus' life story proves the claims made for him in the Prologue."[848] He writes, "The Prologue plays an important role in the 'rhetoric of the Fourth Gospel.'"[849] The Prologue states *who* Jesus is and *what* he has done, but not *how* this action has been done. This *how* is answered and demonstrated by the following narrative.[850] Although Moloney does not explicitly refer to a rhetorical "proposition-proof" scheme, his formulation fully coheres with such a rhetorical view of the Prologue's function. Another, Jean Zumstein, suggests that the Prologue has an inducement function, and that the Prologue presents "open concepts" that only a careful reading of the narrative will clarify.[851] He goes on to point out that only by reading the narrative does one discover who Jesus really is, how and by what means Jesus is the light of the world, and how his glory is revealed.[852] One can also see how Zumstein's observations comport well with construing these statements in the Prologue as propositions. The FG narrative demonstrates how Jesus is the light of the world,[853] and demonstrates how his glory is revealed.[854] Andrew Lincoln suggests that the Prologue "sets out … convictions about Jesus … and then illustrates, confirms, and reinforces these convictions in the narrative."[855] Finally, Alan Culpepper remarks that the narrative "systematically confirms the information given in the prologue."[856] All of these remarks cohere reasonably well with an understanding that the Prologue sets forth propositions for which the ensuing narrative offers a demonstration.

---

[845] Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 109–10.

[846] Barrett, *Prologue*, 6.

[847] Gary T. Manning, Jr., "The Disciples of John (the Baptist): Hearers of John, Followers of Jesus," in *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John*, edited by Hunt, et al. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016 [originally published: Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013]), 130.

The text does not explicitly state that the two disciples believed at that moment. But the conjunction of the Johannine theologically laden terms ἀκολουθέω, ἔρχομαι, ὁράω, and μένω suggest a deeper level of meaning related to discipleship than one at the mere mundane level. They "are about to become disciples of Jesus" (Brown, *John*, 1:78). See Carson, *John*, 154–55; Keener, *John*, 1:467–68; Schnackenburg, *Gospel*, 1:308. See also Bauckham's extended treatment in *Gospel of Glory*, 141–50.

[848] Moloney, *John*, 543.

[849] Moloney, *John*, 34.

[850] Moloney, *John*, 34.

6.7.7 Propositions in the Prologue

We will now attempt to gather together some of the intermediate conclusions of our findings from above. In the process we will argue that these findings enable us to draw the final conclusion that from a literary perspective the Prologue contains rhetorical propositions. Our investigation has first shown that the FG itself is a highly rhetorical discourse, especially in terms of its narrative rhetoric, but it contains additional rhetorical features. We then turned to the biographer Plutarch and saw that his biographies must be examined from a rhetorical point of view in order to properly understand them. Thus, we investigated one particular biography, *Pericles*, from a rhetorical perspective and found that *Pericles* is also a highly rhetorical discourse, especially in terms of its narrative rhetoric that seeks to prove that Pericles was indeed a virtuous man. In terms of the judicial, epideictic, and deliberative rhetorical genres, the FG, especially the PM, exhibits all three genres and *Pericles* exhibits least two (if not all three) genres. Both have many rhetorical strategies and features in common, and both are biographies (or biographic-like).

---

[851] Zumstein, "Prolog," 68–69.

[852] Zumstein, "Prolog," 69.

[853] See John 8:12; chap. 9 where Jesus gives sight to the man born blind.

[854] See, e.g., John 2:11; John 11, esp. 11:40–44.

[855] Lincoln, *Truth*, 180.

[856] R. Alan Culpepper, "The Plot of John's Story of Jesus," *Int* 49 (1995): 353.

We showed that the rhetorical arrangements of the FG and *Pericles* are remarkably similar, and that both conform reasonably well to an Aristotelian conception of arrangement, rather than to those specified in the Latin rhetorical handbooks. *Pericles* (1) begins with a Prologue that introduces the hero and states the primary virtue of πρᾳότης in the abstract (e.g., no concrete situations), and (2) continues with a narrative that demonstrates inductively through situation-specific examples that Pericles had that virtue. The narrative at various key points contains additional sub-propositions that are demonstrated by means of the narrative (e.g., statesmanship, use of money, and caution as a military leader). The biography (3) is finalized by a conclusion. Similarly, the rhetorical arrangement of the FG (1) begins with a Prologue that introduces the hero and specifies abstract themes that have correspondences to material in the following narrative, and (2) continues with a narrative that demonstrates inductively through situation-specific examples that certain sub-propositions stated throughout the narrative are true. The FG is (3) also finalized by conclusion.

Since the FG and *Pericles* seem to have much in common from a rhetorical perspective, the crucial point to focus on is the Prologue. As we pointed out, *Pericles* has a Prologue[857] consisting of an introduction and *abstract "propositions"* that correspond to material in the following narrative, which indeed demonstrate the propositions. Similarly, the FG has a Prologue consisting of an introduction and *abstract "themes"* that correspond to material in the ensuing narrative. Some of these abstract themes are in fact unique in that they do not have corresponding sub-propositions in the narrative. These unique themes are contained in such statements as, "Jesus is God come in the flesh" (1:1, 14, 17), "The Light shines in the darkness, and the darkness did not overcome it" (1:5), "He came to what was his own, and his own people did not accept him" (1:11), "to all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God, who were born, not of blood or of the will of the flesh or of the will of man, but of God" (1:12–13), and "we have seen his glory" (1:14), to mention a few. These are clearly abstract themes (they are not situation specific) that have corresponding situation-specific narrative sequences in the rest of the Gospel but have no counterpart sub-propositions in the narrative. The question is, how best to account for these abstract themes in the Prologue that have no counterpart sub-propositions in the narrative? We observed that some interpreters have suggested that these serve as an introduction to the FG, or that they are (proleptic) summaries. But the FG is strikingly similar to Plutarchan biographies, especially that of *Pericles*, and this suggests that it is plausible to conclude that these abstract themes in the FG's Prologue are in fact propositions (claims) that are demonstrated in the following narrative.

---

[857] Recall that we are discussing part B of the Prologue to *Pericles*.

We observed above that Michael Theobald recognizes that the Prologue of the FG "generalizes and abstracts" whereas the narrative itself has "situation-related narration, speaking and argumentation."[858] He argues that this difference is evidence that the Prologue was added after the Gospel was written.[859] We suggest, on the other hand, that themes in generalized and abstracted form conform precisely to the sorts of propositions that one would expect in a "proposition-proof" argument. Thus, we suggest that in an analogous manner that *Pericles* contains *abstract "propositions,"* the abstract "themes" contained in the FG's Prologue are actually *abstract "propositions."*

6.8 Summary

Chapters 4 to 6 of this study have presented an examination of the narrative rhetorical strategy. Chapter 4 developed a theory of narrative rhetoric that was the foundation of chapters 5 and 6. Chapters 5 and 6 argued from two dimensions that the Prologue contains propositions that are demonstrated in the Gospel proper. Chapter 5 surveyed several propositions and showed that situation-specific textual features support and demonstrate the abstract statements or propositions in the Prologue. Thus, from a textual dimension it is reasonable to conclude that the Prologue contains propositions.

The present chapter argued from a literary perspective that the FG is a rhetorical discourse that has a definite rhetorical structure consisting of (1) an introductory Prologue that contains propositions; (2) a subsequent narrative that demonstrates these propositions situationally; and (3) a conclusion. However, alone each argument is insufficient—both are required. These two dimensions are thus interlocking and work synergistically. They work in concert to support the conclusion that the Prologue includes abstract propositions that are illustrated and demonstrated situationally in the rest of the Gospel. This study suggests that such a conclusion is eminently plausible, though it does not claim the conclusion with certitude. The Prologue seems to provide the dual function of introducing the Gospel and specifying propositions that the ensuing narrative will illustrate and confirm. It bears repeating that this study is not arguing that the two remarkably similar rhetorical works of the FG and *Pericles* are speeches. But they are remarkable in their similar use of rhetorical strategies and structure, especially in terms of how they argue through means of a narrative.

---

[858] Theobald, *Fleischwerdung*, 371. So also Zumstein, "Prolog," 57, following Theobald.

[859] The primary concern of our study is not to determine the composition history of the FG.

Chapter 7. Conclusions and Avenues for Further Study

7.1 Summary and Conclusions

The following concluding remarks summarize our findings and highlight the benefits of our rhetorical investigation of the FG. At the outset of the study, we stated that an initial glance at the FG, in particular its purpose statement in 20:31, suggests that it is a highly rhetorical discourse in that it attempts to persuade its audience that Jesus is the life-giving, divine Christ, the Son of God, and that by believing, they may have life in his name. Since the FG seeks to persuade its audience, what rhetorical strategies does it employ to accomplish its persuasive intent? We suggested that classical rhetoric provides a useful heuristic tool for identifying and examining these rhetorical strategies. With the aid of classical rhetoric, we identified one such rhetorical strategy that is particularly tailored to the purpose statement: the three-part classical rhetorical genre. Further, there appeared to be a second rhetorical strategy in the FG, that of narrative rhetoric whereby a proposition is demonstrated or proven narratively.

However, the examination of these two strategies with respect to the FG has been thought to be problematic among scholars. This led to the opening discussion in chapter 1 that provided justification for the study. In chapter 1 we demonstrated that an investigation of the rhetorical genre is warranted for four reasons: (1) the tripart rhetorical genre was valid at the time of the FG; (2) rhetorical genre studies are important; (3) there are advantages to analyzing the rhetorical genre of a rhetorical discourse. For instance, an examination of the rhetorical genre promotes a more adequate understanding of the discourse's rhetorical goal or purpose. Finally, (4) a survey of previous studies of the FG's rhetorical genre showed that additional areas remain to be investigated in order to arrive at a more adequate understanding of the Gospel's rhetorical nature.

The remainder of the study investigated the two rhetorical strategies. Although the two strategies of rhetorical genre and narrative rhetoric have distinct features, the sequence of the chapters in our investigation was critical to the development of our argument. It was necessary first to establish that the FG is a highly rhetorical discourse. This was accomplished through a study of the rhetorical genre in chapters 2 and 3.

Chapter 4 developed the theory of narrative rhetoric on which chapters 5 and 6 were based.

More specifically, the second chapter examined the rhetorical genre of the PM of Jesus. Our findings there showed that the PM embodies all three classical rhetorical genres, with the dominant genre being the deliberative genre that involves a choice about a future course of action. As with any compelling deliberate rhetorical discourse, the PM presents the choice in terms of oppositions to underscore the advantages of the proposed choice. Thus, the PM presents to the audience two principal choices: one leading to the advantage of life and light and the other to remaining in death and continuing to walk in darkness (5:24; 8:12). But the choice of life and light requires a complex belief-response that consists of several aspects, including honorable actions. The epideictic and judicial genres supplement the Gospel's deliberative genre. Thus, chapter 2 provided the initial answer to our thesis question that asked what rhetorical strategies the FG employs in order to persuade its audience.

The third chapter investigated the rhetorical genre of the FD, and our findings there showed that it also is a highly rhetorical discourse. The focus of this chapter was on the deliberative rhetorical genre. We saw that the FD offers "overwhelming" advantages or benefits to the audience, but it also makes radical demands.[860] Thus, choices and actions are required in order to partake of the advantages that the FD offers. Our findings showed that these choices are indeed radical, and that failure is possible, as in the case of Peter, but restoration is also possible. Through its deliberative rhetoric, the FD offers the audience the choice to take up the mission of Jesus and be sent into the world (17:18), with the staggering advantages of being with Jesus, having his love in them, and seeing his glory (17:24, 26). But this is a radical mission that entails loving others in the same way that Jesus loved them (13:34–35), even to the extent of laying down one's life for them (15:13). It includes living in such a compelling and persuasive "complete oneness" that the world may know and be persuaded that the Father has sent Jesus and has loved them just as the Father has loved Jesus (17:21, 23). The third chapter, then, contributed further to answering our question as to the rhetorical strategies that the FG employs. The benefits of a rhetorical genre investigation are that the advantages (benefits) and actions are brought into clear focus for the audience to weigh and choose.

---

[860] Tolmie, *Jesus' Farewell*, 228–29.

The fourth to sixth chapters investigated the second rhetorical strategy. This is the narrative rhetoric, whereby a narrative provides a demonstrative proof. The fourth chapter laid the foundation for this rhetorical strategy. Although classical rhetoric seems not to have a theory of narrative, it nonetheless does contain the components from which such a theory could be constructed. The chapter went on to develop a theory of narrative rhetoric that, even though partial, seemed to account for the sorts of narratives that attempt to prove a proposition. Several cases illustrated and established that the theory functions well in showing how narratives can be persuasive in demonstrating a claim or proposition.

The fifth chapter began the two-dimensional argument that the Prologue contains propositions. This chapter argued from the textual dimension that the Prologue of the FG contains propositions for which there is evidence in the text. The chapter established that this textual evidence does demonstrate the claims of the propositions in the Prologue by examining four propositions in the Prologue and their narrative proof in the body of the Gospel. The audience, therefore, has warrant to conclude that (1) the *Logos*/Jesus is the life-giving, divine Christ, the Son of God (1:1, 18; 20:28, 31), (2) the darkness did not overcome the light (1:5), (3) people who received the *Logos*/Jesus became children of God (1:12–13), and (4) the eyewitnesses did see his glory (1:14).

The sixth chapter concluded the two-dimensional argument that the Prologue contains propositions by arguing from a literary dimension. The first part of this chapter provided further evidence that the FG is a highly rhetorical discourse by applying the theory of narrative rhetoric (developed in chapter 4) to narrative sequences in the body of the FG. This enabled us to understand the following features in the Gospel that are related to a narrative proof: (1) the theory showed how the FG demonstrates Jesus' "more-than-human knowledge,"[861] (2) it provided a more adequate understanding of how the various proleptic statements function, and (3) it showed how the FG demonstrates Jesus' claims through the narrative. This further served to confirm that the Gospel in its essence is a highly rhetorical discourse. Once this was established, we began the argument in the second part of chapter 6 regarding the literary function of the Prologue with respect to the rest of the FG. We investigated the rhetorical features of Plutarch's *Pericles*, and our findings showed that *Pericles* is remarkably similar to the FG in its rhetorical strategies and rhetorical structure. We compared these rhetorical structures to the rhetorical structure (arrangement) of Aristotle, which includes an embedded proposition-proof scheme, and found that there was close correspondence. Both *Pericles* and the FG contain abstract statements in their Prologues that are not situation specific. Since the abstract statements in the Prologue of *Pericles* provide propositions that are demonstrated through situation-specific events in the narrative of the Life, this, coupled with the coherence with Aristotle's rhetorical arrangement, suggested that the FG's Prologue's abstract statements can be viewed similarly as providing propositions. We examined other views for understanding the relationship of the FG's Prologue to the ensuing narrative, and found deficiencies in these views. Thus, it seemed plausible to conclude that the abstract statements in the FG's Prologue function to specify propositions that are demonstrated through situation-specific episodes in the ensuing narrative.

---

[861] Carson, *John*, 220.

These two rhetorical strategies, then, are used by the Evangelist to persuade the audience. Other rhetorical strategies were likely used by the Evangelist. But the benefits of examining these two specific strategies are: First, investigating the narrative rhetoric enables one to see more clearly how the narrative seeks to demonstrate or prove Jesus' life-giving, divine sonship, an aspect of the penultimate purpose of the FG (20:31a). Second, investigating the rhetorical genre enables one to understand better the ultimate purpose of the FG, which is so that the audience may have life in Jesus' name (20:31b).

This rhetorical study of the FG is not meant to supplant other approaches to the study of the Gospel. But when a discourse like the FG has an explicitly rhetorical purpose (1:7; 19:35; 20:31), an approach that has a direct concern with rhetoric ought to find a place in the study of the FG. While the FG is not a speech *per se*, it is a rhetorical discourse much like *Pericles*, as we have established. Our findings have shown that the FG is a complex rhetorical discourse, especially in how it presents a narrative that argues that Jesus is the life-giving, divine Son of God, and how it advocates a choice with concomitant honorable actions that include the overwhelming advantage (benefit) of life in his name (20:31). This is the payoff of a rhetorical analysis. This analysis enabled us to ask and answer unique questions regarding the rhetorical strategies utilized by the FG to persuade its audience (20:31).

In summary, this study has unearthed a rich treasure of rhetorical insights. It has helped to answer the question about how the FG carries out certain aspects of its rhetorical or persuasive agenda, including a better understanding of the relationship of the Prologue to the rest of the Gospel. The persuasive strategies are clearly multifaceted. Nonetheless, at a minimum, this study has uncovered and utilized the keys that unlock two primary rhetorical strategies, which are (1) the rhetorical genre that shows the benefit of eternal life; and (2) the narrative rhetoric that shows how Jesus is the life-giving, divine Messiah and Son of God.

7.2 Avenues for Further Study

7.2.1 Appeals to Examples in Deliberative Rhetoric

One of the rhetorical "appeals" associated especially with deliberative rhetoric is the use of past examples to guide decisions about future choices.[862] We investigated this appeal when the rhetorical genre of the FD was studied in chapter 3. However, we were unable to investigate the appeal to examples in connection with the PM (chapter 2) owing to space constraints. Numerous studies have examined the function of characters in the narrative. For the most part, however, these have not drawn specific attention to how these characters figure in providing positive or negative examples for emulation or guidance for future choices that align with the deliberative rhetorical purpose of the Gospel. Several functions of these characters have been suggested, and they are probably not mutually exclusive. Most characters in the narrative world, apart from possibly John the Baptist and the Beloved Disciple, show a lack of full exemplary faith. Bennema has argued that the FG presents characters that are at times complex and show development, but in the final analysis exemplify either adequate or inadequate faith.[863] As such, one might suggest that they function as models or anti-models for emulation. However, owing to the complexity of the characters, this would be oversimplistic.

---

[862] See Mitchell (*Rhetoric*, 40n94) for a discussion of the ancient literature.

[863] See Cornelis Bennema, *A Theory of Character in New Testament Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014), 93–97.

Moreover, each of the characters that encounters Jesus has a unique situation and circumstance.[864]

Further, the Gospel portrays people whose lives have been changed for the better through their encounters with Jesus. This suggests that, irrespective of the details of their responses, the FG has highlighted these characters to showcase the goodness of God in Jesus, and that these encounters in themselves are intended to draw people to Jesus. The healing of the man sick for thirty-eight years might be such an instance. Alternately, some have suggested that Jesus himself is a paradigm of how to effectively respond when undergoing interrogation, suffering and even hatred.[865] Peter perhaps becomes a contrasting model, with failure, but also with restoration. Another view is that the characters function to model aspects of an ideal response.[866]

A further item for analysis is the function that the *Ioudaioi* have in the FG's rhetorical agenda. Do they function mainly with respect to the judicial rhetoric, or is any element of deliberative rhetoric and examples present? The above alternatives in connection with deliberative rhetoric and its appeal to examples warrant further exploration.

7.2.2 Other Appeals Associated with Deliberative Rhetoric

We pointed out in chapter 2 that the rhetorical handbooks identify several appeals associated with deliberative rhetoric. We investigated two appeals that were most prominent in the handbooks and in ancient speeches, and which seemed to apply specifically to the FG. These were the appeals to what is advantageous and what is honorable. The list of deliberative appeals contained in the rhetorical handbooks of the time of the FG generally contained the following appeals: the just, the advantageous, the possible, the easy, the necessary, the safe, the honorable, the pious, the natural, the pleasant, and the opposites of these things.[867] Additional study is warranted to determine whether any of these other appeals are present in the FG, and how they further the persuasive agenda of the Gospel.

---

[864] See Bauckham, *Gospel of Glory*, 13–17. Bauckham suggests that stories of individuals attract greater empathy or identification.

[865] See Lincoln, *Truth*, 28–29; Billington, "Paraclete," 100–1; Myers, *Characterizing*, 128.

[866] Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief*, 206.

[867] See chapter 2 of this thesis.

7.2.3 Φιλοτιμία and Unbelief

It is noteworthy that the FG highlights reasons why people were unwilling to believe or openly confess Jesus. For example, they loved *τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων* (perhaps best translated as "human approval") more than God's approval (12:43; cf. 5:44). This has affinities with some of the issues that occupied Plutarch in his treatments of φιλοτιμία in his *Parallel Lives*,[868] which approximate the date of the FG. The investigation of this and the wider reasons for the people's unresponsiveness as it pertains to rhetoric is warranted.

---

[868] See, for example, A. G. Nikolaidis, "Aspects of Plutarch's Notion of *Philotimia*," in *The Lash of Ambition: Plutarch, Imperial Greek Literature and the Dynamics of* Philotimia, edited by G. Roskam, M. De Pourcq, and L. van der Stockt, CDC 25 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), and the other essays in this volume.

APPENDIX A. Deliberative Rhetoric in the Old Testament

The purpose of this appendix is to show that the scriptures to which the Evangelist was deeply indebted, that is, the OT, were imbued with characteristics conceptualized in classical rhetoric as deliberative rhetoric. This aligns with Kennedy's statement that the OT is suffused with examples of rhetorical speeches.[869] Moreover, it shows that it should not be viewed as anomalous if these features are also present in the FG. The following is a survey of some OT texts[870] to demonstrate that they contain discourses with appeals and forms of proof that cohere with those associated with deliberative rhetoric.[871] Two principal types of texts will be surveyed. The first are texts that show deliberative rhetoric in common domestic and national matters. The second are texts that are in a covenant making or renewal context. It is common knowledge that the FG is replete with Jewish concepts (names of OT figures, feasts, scriptures, and more). Showing that the OT contains discourses that function like classical deliberative rhetoric helps to illuminate the discussion of this thesis by showing the rich rhetorical heritage of the OT that concerned decisions and choices of action in a covenant context to obtain Yahweh's blessings.

A.1 Deliberative Rhetoric in Domestic and National Affairs

Numerous deliberative discourses occur in the OT in common domestic and national affairs. The following is a brief sample: Gen 37:23–27; Exod 8:14, 17–23; Num 13–14; Judg 9:2–3; 1 Sam 17:32–39; 19:4–6; 25; 2 Chr 15; Esth 3:8; 4:5–16 and Neh 2:17–18. They consist of deliberative arguments concerning future actions and what is advantageous or beneficial, often based on what is deemed possible. Two examples from the above serve to illustrate this.

The account of the debate between the twelve spies in Num 13–14 is fundamentally a deliberative argument about a future choice of actions based on what action is deemed possible. Ten of the spies argue that the task is impossible: the people of the land are strong, the towns are large and fortified, and even the Anakites live in the land (13:33). They claim, “We are not able to go up against this people, for they are stronger than we” (13:31). Joshua and Caleb respond with a counter argument. They reason that there is no need to fear the people of the land, because “they are no more than bread for us,” their protection has been removed, and Yahweh is with Israel (14:9). Both sides present arguments concerning whether entering the land is possible. In the end, Joshua’s and Caleb’s argument proves unpersuasive, and that of the ten spies prevails.

---

[869] See Kennedy, *Interpretation*, 11.

[870] Owing to scope limitations, the texts to be surveyed here will be restricted to the OT.

[871] These appeals and forms of proof consist mainly of choices related to future actions supported by appeals to what is advantageous and honorable, and strategies showing whether proposed actions were possible, and the use of previous examples as a guide for future actions. For the most part, these are appeals that informed our discussion in chapters 2 and 3.

Another example of a deliberative argument is the exchange in 1 Sam 17:32–39 between David and Saul concerning whether David is able to defeat Goliath. The setting and its details are well known, and thus the focus here will be on the structure of the argument. The benefits or advantages that would be awarded to someone who could defeat Goliath are specified in 17:25. David volunteers to fight Goliath and allay the nation’s fears (17:32). Saul attempts to dissuade him: “You are not able to go against this Philistine to fight with him; for you are just a boy, and he has been a warrior from his youth” (17:33). Saul’s argument contains proofs contained in classical deliberative rhetoric. First, he argues from the appeal to what is possible (or not)—“you are not able.” Second, he provides a rational argument, “for you are just a boy, and he has been a warrior from his youth” (17:33). Unpersuaded, David responds with his own deliberative argument, again with features of classical rhetoric. He employs examples, a key element of deliberative rhetoric. He colorfully and artfully narrates examples of his past successes in defending his father’s sheep against a lion and a bear: when the lion or bear took a sheep from the flock, he went after it and attacked it, and rescued it from its mouth. When it turned against him, he seized it, struck it, and killed it (17:35). Second, David seeks a course of action that is both advantageous (defeat the enemy) and honorable (vindicate Yahweh’s name). In return, he will receive honorable status and benefits that include having the king’s daughter for his wife and great riches (17:25).

Several features of classical rhetoric can be observed in Saul’s and David’s arguments. First, they occur within the context of a monarchy, one of the political constitutions addressed in deliberative rhetoric according to Aristotle (*On Rhetoric*, 1.8.3–4). Second, the argument is a deliberative argument debating what is advantageous for the nation (*On Rhetoric*, 1.3.5): defeat of the enemy and security and honor (and for David, the additional advantages of wealth and the honorable status of having the king's daughter for a wife).[872] Third, the argument debates whether a course of action is possible (*On Rhetoric*, 1.6.27). Fourth, the debate is about two of the standard political topics, (1) war and peace and (2) national defense (*On Rhetoric*, 1.4.7). Finally, it contains narrated examples of past actions that enable the audience to "take better counsel about what is to come" (Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, 3.16.11 [Kennedy]), observing that examples are most appropriate to deliberative speech as a means of proof (*On Rhetoric*, 3.17.5). It may also be possible to detect an emotional appeal to pity: a sheep in the mouth of a lion desperately in need of rescue (*On Rhetoric*, 2.8). This shows that features found in classical deliberative rhetoric also occur in an OT discourse.

The examples surveyed above establish that speeches in the OT narratives could evince features of classical rhetoric. In situations where deliberation between one or more choices regarding future action was required, appropriate arguments were employed that contained appeals to what was beneficial or advantageous, whether a proposed course of action was deemed possible, and the use of narrated past examples.

A.2 Choice in Covenant Commitments and Deliberative Rhetoric

The purpose of this section is to show that covenant initiation and renewals in the OT have points in common with classical deliberative rhetoric. Several features of deliberative rhetoric occur in the covenant initiations and renewals, such as the choice of future actions and benefits. Both the initiation and the renewals of the covenant contain a choice whether to follow the stipulations of the covenant. This section will show that the element of choice or decision is an important feature of the covenants. It will survey two key representative covenant discourses and a covenant-like discourse.

At the inauguration of the covenant at Mount Sinai, Yahweh provided the covenant's conditions and promises: "if you obey my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my treasured possession out of all the peoples" (Exod 19:5). Thus, this involved a decision or choice, and the people chose to commit to obeying what was commanded: "Everything that the LORD has spoken we will do" (19:8). The subsequent covenant renewals repeat the initial terms and conditions.[873] The renewal of the covenant in Deuteronomy on the plain of Moab also contained a choice, "an existential moment of decision"[874]—"Choose life so that you and your descendants may live" (30:19; see 29:1 [28:69, MT]).

---

[872] *Rhet. Her.* 3.2.3 states that the two components of advantage are security and honor.

Joshua 24 narrates the covenant renewal at Shechem after the successful conquest. The concept of choice is explicit: "choose this day whom you will serve" (v. 15). If the people choose to serve Yahweh,[875] they will continue to enjoy the land and its fruitfulness. Conversely, if they choose to serve other gods, they will suffer harm and will be consumed (v. 20). Joshua commands (the following verbs are all imperatives) the people to "revere" Yahweh, "serve" him, "put away the gods that [their] ancestors served," "serve" Yahweh, and "choose" whom they will serve (vv. 14–15). They respond in the affirmative, expressing their absolute loyalty with a three-fold "we will serve" (vv. 18, 21, 24) and "obey" (v. 24). From a rhetorical perspective, the people freely chose to serve and obey Yahweh.[876]

Finally, although not strictly a covenant renewal, Jer 44 is an example of the prophetic call to return to Yahweh but with a rebuttal. Jeremiah 44:15–19 is the response from Jeremiah's people that is essentially an instance of deliberative rhetorical argumentation. It includes examples from the past, choices that relate to future actions, and a course of action that is deemed advantageous.[877]

Other examples of covenant choice include 2 Kgs 22–23; 2 Chr 29:5–11; 30:8–9, 20; Isa 55; 56:4–7; Joel 2:13; and Amos 5:6. Both Isa 55 and 56 appear to have a rhetorical function approximating that of deliberative discourse. They each contain the requirement to choose to act in accordance with Yahweh's ways and will, which comports well with the deliberative rhetoric's focus on a choice of future action.

---

[873] For a list of the some of the subsequent covenant renewals, see David Noel Freedman, "Divine Commitment and Human Obligation, the Covenant Theme," *Int* 18 (1964): 426. See Deut 29:1 [ET 28:69], Josh 24:25 at Shechem, 2 Kgs 11:17 (cf. 2 Chr 29:10) with Jehoiada, 2 Kgs 23:3 with Josiah, and Ezra 10:3. See also Ezek 16.

[874] Eugene H. Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, The New American Commentary 4 (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 380, regarding Deut 29:12 and 14. Although 29:12 [MT 11] speaks of "entering into the covenant," this is best viewed as a renewal of the original covenant at Horeb. Each successive generation was required to enter and commit to the covenant (Merrill, *Deuteronomy*, 379).

[875] Klaus Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings*, trans. David E. Green (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 23, notes the "free consent" associated with this choice.

[876] Whether they continue in their choice is another matter. Joshua is doubtful.

[877] For the historical background and discussion, see the classic article by David Noel Freedman, "The Biblical Idea of History," *Int* 21 (1967): 32–49.

Further, the texts furnish explicit advantages (cf. the appeal to what is advantageous in classical rhetoric) in terms of promised benefits, such as life (55:3), a covenant relationship with Yahweh (55:3), enjoyment of the presence of God, joy, and answered prayer. Thus, these sections seem to offer an instance of deliberative rhetoric.

A.3 Summary

The surveys above provide evidence that the appeals and strategies associated with classical deliberative rhetoric functioned in discourses of domestic and national matters in ancient Israel as well as in the inauguration and renewals of Yahweh's covenant with Israel. These discourses included a choice of future action, and appeals to what was advantageous, to what was possible, and to past examples. The people chose what they considered to be beneficial, and even chose to argue and act concerning the covenant. Thus, a type of rhetoric is found both in domestic discourse and in connection with the covenant that functionally resembled classical deliberative rhetoric. As Rekha Chennattu points out, "This [OT covenant] relationship was not a static 'status' but a vocation that calls for ongoing choices and decisions on the part of Israel for Yahweh."[878] The significance of this for the study here lies in the fact that the FG frequently presents appeals to what is beneficial or advantageous, primarily in terms of eternal life, and to what is honorable, which is similar to the sorts of everyday and covenant-making appeals found in the OT, which is the textual tradition used by the Evangelist. Further, the Gospel offers choices of future actions that the audience must choose in order to partake of those advantages.

---

[878] Chennattu, *Johannine Discipleship*, 42. She refers to E. W. Nicholson, *God and His People: Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1986), 147–48. For the covenant concept in the FG, see also Pryor, *John*, esp. 157–80.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aristotle. *Art of Rhetoric*. Translated by J. Freese and edited by G. Striker. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2020.

———. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B.C – A.D. 300*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.

———. *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Translated by George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

———. *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. Translated by David C. Mirhady. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.

———. *Topica*. Translated by E. S. Forster. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Chrysostom. *Homilies on the Gospel of St. John*. NPNF. 1st ser., 14.1–334. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Cicero. *On Duties*. Translated by W. Miller. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913.

———. *On Invention*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

———. *On the Orator*. Translated by E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham. 3 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

———. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Demosthenes. *Selected Speeches*. Translated by Robin Waterfield. Oxford World Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

———. *Orations, Volume 1*. Translated by J. H. Vince. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus. *Critical Essays*. Translated by S. Usher. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

———. *Roman Antiquities*. Translated by E. Carey. Loeb Classical Library. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940.

[Dionysius of Halicarnassus]. *Ars Rhetorica*. Translated by W. H. Race. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2019.

Halliwell, Stephen. *Aristotle's Poetics*. 2nd ed. London: Duckworth, 1998.

Isocrates. *Volume 1*. Translated by G. Norlin. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Juvenal. *The Satires*. Translated by Niall Rudd, notes by William Barr. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: OUP, 2008.

Kennedy, George A., trans. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 10. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Mellor, Ronald. *Tacitus*. London: Routledge, 1993.

Menander Rhetor. *Treatise I and II*. Translated by W. H. Race. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2019.

Origen. *Hexapla*. Edited by Frederick Field. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1875.

Pantelia, Maria. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: A Digital Library of Greek Literature*, 2001.

Philo. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929-62.

[Philo]. *Biblical Antiquities*. Translated by M. R. James. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1917. [Bibleworks.].

Plutarch. *Moralia. Precepts of Statecraft*. Translated by H. N. Fowler. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

———. *Plutarch's Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967–75.

———. *Plutarch's Lives*. Edited by Arthur Hugh Clough. Translated by John Dryden, introduction by James Atlas. 2 vols. New York: Modern Library, 2001.

Pseudo-Aelius Aristide. *Arts Rhétoriques*. Translated by Michel Patillon. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002.

Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. Translated by D. A. Russell. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Tacitus. “Histories.” In *Histories: Books 1–3*, translated by Clifford H. Moore. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Secondary Sources

Ahlström, Gösta W. *Joel and the Temple Cult of Jerusalem*. VTSup 21. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

Ahn, Sanghee M. *The Christological Witness Function of the Old Testament Characters in the Gospel of John*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2014.

Albrecht, Evelin. *Zeugnis durch Wort und Verhalten: Untersucht an ausgewählten Texten des Neuen Testaments*. Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt, 1977.

Andersen, F. I., and & D. N. Freedman. *Micah: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Yale Bible Vol 24E. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.

Andersen, Francis I. “Yahweh, The Kind and Sensitive God.” In *God Who Is Rich In Mercy: Essays Presented to D. B. Knox*, edited by P. T. O’Brien and D. G. Peterson, 41–88. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1986.

Anderson, Paul N. *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997.

———. “Gradations of Symbolism in the Johannine Passion Narrative: Control Measures for Theologizing Speculation Gone Awry.” In *Imagery in the Gospel of John*, edited by Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann. WUNT 200, 157–94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

———. “John and Qumran: Discovery and Interpretation Over Sixty Years.” In *John, Qumran, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Sixty Years of Discovery and Debate*, edited by Mary L. Coloe and Tom Thatcher, 15–50. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.

———. *The Riddles of the Fourth Gospel: An Introduction to John*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011.

Anderson, R. Dean, Jr. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Rev. ed. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.

Ap-Thomas, D. R. “Some Aspects of the Root ḤNN in the OT.” *JSS* 2 (1957): 128–48.

Arnhart, Larry. *Aristotle on Political Reasoning: A Commentary on "the Rhetoric."* DeKalb: Northern Illinois University, 1981.

Ashton, John. "Really the Prologue?" In *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological, and Philosophical Contexts*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt, R. Alan Culpepper, and Udo Schnelle. WUNT 359, 27–44. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

———. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Attridge, Harold W. "An 'Emotional' Jesus and Stoic Tradition." In *Essays on John and Hebrews*, 122–36. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2010.

———. "Argumentation in John 5." In *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*, edited by Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker. ESEC 8, 188–99. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002.

———. "Genre Bending in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 121 (2002): 3–21.

———. "The Gospel of John: Genre Matters?" In *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic*, edited by Kasper Bro Larsen. SANt 3, 27–45. Göttingen: Ruprecht & Vandenhoeck, 2015.

———. *History, Theology, and Narrative Rhetoric in the Fourth Gospel*. The Père Marquette Lecture Series 2019. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2019.

Attridge, Harold, Warren Carter, and Jan G. van der Watt. "Quaestiones disputatae: Are John's Ethics Apolitical?" *NTS* 62 (2016): 484–97.

Aune, David E. "Mixtum compositum." In *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, 307–7. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

———. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. LEC 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.

———. "Rhetorical criticism." In *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, 416–18. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

———. “Rhetorical genres.” In *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, 418–20. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

———. “Rhetorical handbooks.” In *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, 420–22. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

———. “The Use and Abuse of the Enthymeme in New Testament Scholarship.” *NTS* 49 (2003): 299–320.

Bakke, Odd Magne. *“Concord and Peace”: A Rhetorical Analysis of the First Letter of Clement with an Emphasis on the Language of Unity and Sedition*. WUNT 2/143. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Ball, David Mark. *“I Am” in John’s Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications*. JSNTSup 124. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Baltzer, Klaus. *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings*. Translated by David E. Green. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.

Barrett, C. K. *Essays on John*. London: SPCK, 1982.

———. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.

———. *The Prologue of St John’s Gospel*. London: Athlone, 1971.

Barton, Stephen C. “Johannine Dualism and Contemporary Pluralism.” In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 3–18. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. *The Spirituality of the Gospels*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1992.

Bauckham, Richard. “For Whom Were Gospels Written.” In *The Gospel for All Christians*, edited by Richard Bauckham, 9–48. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *God Crucified. Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

———. *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

———. “Historiographical Characteristics of the Gospel of John.” *NTS* 53 (2007): 17–36.

———. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitnesses Testimony*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

———. *The Testimony of the Beloved Disciple: Narrative, History, and Theology in the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Gospel of Life: Theology of the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

———. *John*. 2nd ed. WBC 26. Waco, TX: Word, 1999.

Beck, Mark. "Anecdote and the Representation of Plutarch's Ethos." In *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*, edited by L. van der Stockt. CDC 11, 15–32. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Belser, J. E. *Das Evangelium des heiligen Johannes*. Freiburg: Herder, 1905.

———. "Der Prolog des Johannesevangeliums." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 85 (1903): 483–519.

Bennema, Cornelis. "The Character of John in the Fourth Gospel." *JETS* 52 (2009): 271–84.

———. *Encountering Jesus: Character Studies in the Gospel of John*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

———. *Excavating John's Gospel: A Commentary for Today*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008.

———. *Mimesis in the Johannine Literature: A Study in Johannine Ethics*. LNTS 498. London: Bloomsbury, 2017.

———. *The Power of Saving Wisdom: An Investigation of Spirit and Wisdom in Relation to the Soteriology of the Fourth Gospel*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007.

———. *A Theory of Character in New Testament Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

———. "Virtue Ethics in the Gospel of John: The Johannine Characters as Moral Agents." In *Rediscovering John: Essays on the Fourth Gospel in Honour of Frédéric Manns*, edited by L. Daniel Chrupcala. SBFA 80, 167–81. Milan: Edizioni Terra Santa, 2013.

Beutler, Johannes. *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Translated by Michael Tait. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

———. *Do Not Be Afraid: The First Farewell Discourse in John's Gospel*. NTSCE 6. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2011.

———. "Friedenssehnsucht – Friedensengagement nach dem Neuen Testament." *StZ* 200 (1982): 291–306.

Bianchi, Ugo. "Dualism." In *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Mircea Eliade, IV, 206–12. New York: Macmillan, 1987.

Billington, Antony. "The Paraclete and Mission in the Fourth Gospel." In *Mission and Meaning: Essays Presented to Peter Cotterell*, edited by Antony Billington, Tony Lane, and Max Turner, 90–115. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.

Black, C. Clifton. "Kennedy and the Gospels: An Ambiguous Legacy, a Promising Bequest." In *Words Well Spoken: George Kennedy's Rhetoric of the New Testament*, edited by C. Clifton Black and Duane F. Watson, 63–80. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.

———. *The Rhetoric of the Gospel: Theological Artistry in the Gospels and Acts*. 2nd ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2013.

———. "Rhetorical Criticism." In *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation*, edited by Joel B. Green, 256–77. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

———. "'The Words That You Gave Me I Have Given to Them': The Grandeur of Johannine Rhetoric." In *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black, 220–39. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

Black, Edwin. *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1978.

Blank, Josef. *Krisis: Untersuchungen zur johanneischen Christologie und Eschatologie*. Freiburg: Lambertus, 1964.

Blomberg, Craig L. *The Historical Reliability of John's Gospel*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2001.

———. *Matthew*. New American Commentary 22. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1992.

Blumhofer, Christopher M. *The Gospel of John and the Future of Israel*. SNTSMS 177. Cambridge: CUP, 2020.

Boice, James M. *Witness and Revelation in the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970.

Boismard, M.-E. *Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology*. Translated by B. T. Viviano. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

———. *St. John's Prologue*. Westminster, MD: Newman, 1957.

Bond, Helen K. *The First Biography of Jesus: Genre and Meaning in Mark's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020.

Booth, Wayne. "Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation." *Critical Inquiry* 5 (1978): 49–72.

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, 1965.

Boring, M. Eugene. "Mark 1:1–15 and the Beginning of the Gospel." *Semeia* 52 (1991): 43–81.

Botterweck, G. J., Ringgren, H., & Fabry, and H.-J., eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley by J. T. Willis, D. E. Green. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977–2012.

Bowe, B. E. *A Church in Crisis: Ecclesiology and Paraenesis in Clement of Rome*. HDR 23. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1988.

Brandt, William J. *The Rhetoric of Argumentation*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970.

Brant, Jo-Ann A. *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.

———. *John*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.

Brodie, Thomas L. *The Gospel According to John: A Literary and Theological Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Brower Latz, Andrew. "A Short Note toward a Theology of Abiding in John's Gospel." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 4 (2010): 161–68.

Brown, R. E. *A Coming Christ in Advent: Essays on the Gospel Narratives Preparing for the Birth of Jesus: Matthew 1 and Luke 1*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1988.

———. *The Gospel According to John: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. 2 Vols. AB 29/29a. New York: Doubleday, 1966, 1970.

Brox, Norbert. *Der Glaube als Zeugnis*. Kleine Schriften zur Theologie. München: Kösel, 1966.

Bruce, F. F. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.

———. *The Message of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. JMS 1. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014.

———. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951, 1955.

Burge, Gary M. *The Anointed Community: The Holy Spirit in the Johannine Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Byers, Andrew J. *Johannine Theosis: The Fourth Gospel's Narrative Ecclesiology of Participation and Deification*. Durham University, 2014. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10908/.

Caird, George. "The Glory of God in the Fourth Gospel: An Exercise in Biblical Semantics." *NTS* 15 (1969): 265–77.

Carey, Christopher. "Epideictic Oratory." In *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington, 236–52. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

———. "Rhetorical Means of Persuasion." In *Persuasion. Greek Rhetoric in Action*, edited by Ian Worthington, 26–45. Routledge: London, 1994.

Carpenter, Eugene. *Exodus 19–40*. Evangelical Exegetical Commentary. Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2016.

Carson, D. A. *Divine Sovereignty and Human Responsibility*. London: Marshall Pickering, 1994.

———. *The Farewell Discourse and Final Prayer of Jesus: An Exposition of John 14–17*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988.

———. "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7–11." *JBL* 98 (1979): 547–66.

———. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

———. *Love in Hard Places*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2002.

———. “The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered.” *JBL* 106 (1987): 639–51.

———. “The Puzzle of Grace and Truth in John 1.14,17.” Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society. Providence, RI, 17 November 2017.

———. “Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20:30–31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel.” *JBL* 124 (2005): 693–714.

Charlesworth, James H. “A Critical Comparison of the Dualism of 1QS 3:13–4:26 and the ‘Dualism’ Contained in the Gospel of John.” In *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, 76–106. New York: Crossroad, 1972.

Chennattu, Rekha M. *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship*. With a foreword by Francis J. Moloney. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.

Chibici-Revneanu, Nicole. *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten: Das Verständnis der δόξα im Johannesevangelium*. WUNT 2/231. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Cho, Sukmin. *Jesus as Prophet in the Fourth Gospel*. NTM 15. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.

Classen, Carl Joachim. *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*. WUNT 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Clouston, Eric. *How Ancient Narratives Persuade: Acts in Its Literary Context*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield, 2020.

Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Collins, Matthew S. “The Question of *Doxa*: A Socioliterary Reading of the Wedding at Cana.” *BTB* 25 (1995): 100–109.

Collins, Raymond F. “‘A New Commandment I Give to You, that You Love One Another…’ (Jn 13:34).” *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 35 (1979): 235–61.

———. “The Oldest Commentary on the Fourth Gospel.” In *These Things Have Been Written: Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, 151–57. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Conrad, Edgar W. *Fear not Warrior: A Study of ‘al Tîrā’ Pericopes in the Hebrew Scriptures*. BJS 75. Chico: Scholars, 1985.

Cooper, Craig. “Forensic Oratory.” In *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington, 203–19. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Cooper, John M. *Ethical-Political Theory in Aristotle’s* Rhetoric. *Aristotle’s* Rhetoric*: Philosophical Essays*. Edited by D. Furley and A. Nehamas, 192–210. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Cox, J. Robert. “The Die Is Cast: Topical and Ontological Dimensions of the Locus of the Irreparable.” In *The New Rhetoric of Chaim Perelman: Statement and Response*, edited by Ray D. Dearin, 121–39. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1989.

Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

———. “The Johannine *Hypodeigma*: A Reading of John 13:1–38.” *Semeia* 53 (1991): 133–52.

———. “The Plot of John’s Story of Jesus.” *Int* 49 (1995): 347–58.

Culy, Martin M. *Echoes of Friendship in the Gospel of John*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010.

Davies, Margaret. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTSup 69. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992.

Davies, W. D. “Reflections on Aspects of the Jewish Background of the Gospel of John.” In *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black, 43–64. Louisville: WJKP, 1996.

de Brauw, Michael. “The Parts of the Speech.” In *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington, 187–202. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

de Jonge, Marinus. *Jesus: Stranger from Heaven and Son of God*. Translated by J. E. Steely. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977.

Denaux, Adelbert. “The Twofold Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: A Reading of the Conclusion to John’s Gospel (20,30–31).” 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. BETL 265, 519–36. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.

Dennis, John A. *Jesus' Death and the Gathering of True Israel: The Johannine Appropriation of Restoration Theology in the Light of John 11:47–52*. WUNT 2/217. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Dentan, Robert C. "The Literary Affinities of Exodus XXXIV 6f." *VT* 13 (1963): 34–51.

deSilva, David A. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2000.

———. *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.

———. "Investigating Honor Discourse Guidelines from Classical Rhetoricians." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1997 Seminar Papers*, 491–525. Atlanta: Scholars, 1997.

———. *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews."* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. "The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Honor, Shame, and the Maintenance of the Values of a Minority Culture." *CBQ* 58 (1996): 433–55.

Dettwiler, Andreas. *Die Gegenwart des Erhöhten: Eine exegetische Studie zu den johanneischen Abschiedsreden (Joh 13,31–16,33) unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Relecture-Charakters*. FRLANT 169. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995.

Dillard, Raymond. "Joel." In *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*, edited by Thomas Edward McComiskey. Volume 1, 239–313. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.

Dodd, C. H. *The Bible and the Greeks*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935.

———. *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1963.

———. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: CUP, 1953.

———. "The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Christian Worship." In *Studies in the Fourth Gospel*, edited by F. L. Cross, 9–22. London: Mowbray, 1957.

Dominik, William J. "Rev. of Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction by George A. Kennedy." *Classical Philology* 91 (2001): 92–98.

Donfried, Karl. “The Theology of 1 Thessalonians.” In *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters*, edited by Karl P. Donfried and I. Howard Marshall. New Testament Theology, 28–63. Cambridge: CUP, 1993.

Duff, Timothy E. “Life of Themistokles.” *GRBS* 48 (2008): 159–79.

———. “Plutarch on the Childhood of Alkibiades (Alk. 2–3).” *PCPS* 49 (2003): 89–117.

———. “Plutarch’s *Lives* and the Critical Reader.” In *Virtues for the People: Aspects of Plutarchan Ethics*, edited by Geert Roskam and Luc Van der Stockt, 59–82. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2011.

———. *Plutarch’s Lives: Exploring Virtue and Vice*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

———. “Plutarch’s Readers and the Moralism of the *Lives*.” *Ploutarchos* n.s. 5 (2007–8): 3–18.

———. “The Prologues.” In *A Companion to Plutarch*, edited by Mark Beck, 339–49. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2014.

———. “The Structure of the Plutarchan Book.” *Classical Antiquity* 30 (2011): 213–78.

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

Duke, Rodney K. *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis*. JSOTSup 88. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.

———. “The Strategic Use of Enthymeme and Example in the Argumentation of the Books of Chronicles.” In *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*, edited by Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker. ESEC 8, 127–40. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002.

Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry Into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

———. “Let John Be John: A Gospel for Its Time.” In *The Gospel and the Gospels*, edited by Peter Stuhlmacher, 293–322. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Ebner, Martin. “Von gefährlichen Viten und biographisch orientierten Geschichtswerken. Vitenliteratur im Verhältnis zur Historiographie in hellenistisch-römisher und urchristlicher Literatur.” In *Historiographie und*

Biographie im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt, edited by Thomas Schmeller, 34–61. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.

Eichrodt, Walther. *Ezekiel: A Commentary*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970.

———. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.

Enos, Richard Leo. *Greek Rhetoric Before Aristotle*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, 1993.

Erard, Michael. "Rev. of Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction by George A. Kennedy." *Language* 75 (1999): 634.

Estes, Douglas. "The Rhetoric of John 3: Antithetical Argumentation from Jesus and John." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, 2020.

Evans, Craig A. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue*. JSNTSup 89. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Fairweather, Janet. "The Epistle to the Galatians and Classical Rhetoric." *Tyndale Bulletin* 45 (1994): 1–38.

Fanning, Buist M. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford Theological Monographs. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Feldman, Louis H. "Hengel's Judaism and Hellenism in Retrospect." *JBL* 96 (1977): 371–82.

Feldman, Martha S., Kaj Sköldberg, Ruth Nicole Brown, and Debra Horner. "Making Sense of Stories: A Rhetorical Approach to Narrative Analysis." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 14 (2004): 147–70.

Feuillet, André. "The Structure of First John: Comparison with the Fourth Gospel. The Pattern of Christian Life." *BTB* 3 (1973): 194–216.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians." *NTS* 33 (1987): 386–403.

Fischer, David H. *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*. New York: Harper, 1970.

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

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

Fox, Michael V. “Ancient Egyptian Rhetoric.” *Rhetorica* 1 (1983): 9–22.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

Franz, Matthias. *Der barmherzige und gnädige Gott. Die Gnadenrede vom Sinai (Exodus 34, 6–7) und ihre Parallelen im Alten Testament und seiner Umwelt*. BWANT 160. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2003.

Freed, Edwin D. “Who or What Was Before Abraham in John 8:58?” *JSNT* 5 (1983): 52–59.

Freedman, David Noel. “The Biblical Idea of History.” *Int* 21 (1967): 32–49.

———. “Divine Commitment and Human Obligation, the Covenant Theme.” *Int* 18 (1964): 419–31.

Frey, Jörg. “Between Torah and Stoa: How Could Readers Have Understood the Johannine Logos?” In *The Prologue of the Gospel of John: Its Literary, Theological, and Philosophical Contexts*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt, R. Alan Culpepper, and Udo Schnelle. WUNT 359, 189–234. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

———. “Bodiliness and Resurrection in the Gospel of John.” In *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 199–236. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.

———. “The Death of Jesus in the Gospel of John.” In *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 171–97. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.

———. “The Glory of the Crucified One.” In *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 237–58. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.

———. “Heil und Geshichte im Johannesevangelium.” In *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten: Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften I*. Herausgegeben von Juliane Schlegel, 585–637. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

———. *Die johanneische Eschatologie II: Das johanneische Zeitverständnis*. WUNT 110. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

———. *Die johanneische Eschatologie III: Die eschatologische Verkündigung in den johanneischen Texten*. WUNT 117. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

———. “Johannine Dualism: Reflections on Its Background and Function.” In *The Glory of the Crucified One: Christology and Theology in the Gospel of John*, translated by Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 101–67. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.

———. “Love Relations in the Fourth Gospel: Establishing a Semantic Network.” In *Die Herrlichkeit des Gekreuzigten: Studien zu den johanneischen Schriften I*. Herausgegeben von Juliane Schlegel, 739–65. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Frickenschmidt, Dirk. *Evangelium als Biographie: Die vier Evangelien im Rahmen antiker Erzählkunst*. Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter 22. Tübingen: Francke, 1997.

Frost, Frank J. *Plutarch’s Themistocles: A Historical Commentary*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

Galaz, M. “Rhetorical Strategies of Feminine Speech in Plutarch.” In *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*, edited by L. Van der Stockt. CDC 11, 203–9. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Gammie, John G. “Spatial and Ethical Dualism in Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic Literature.” *JBL* 93 (1974): 356–85.

Genette, Gérard. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980.

Gese, Hartmut. “The Prologue to John’s Gospel.” In *Essays on Biblical Theology*, edited by H. Gese, 167–222. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.

Glicksman, Andrew T. “Beyond Sophia: The Sapiential Portrayal of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel and Its Implications for the Johannine Community.” In *Rethinking the Ethics of John: “Implicit Ethics” in the Johannine Writings*, edited by Jan G. van der Watt and Ruben Zimmermann. WUNT 291, 83–101. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Gorman, Michael J. *Abide and Go: Missional Theosis in the Gospel of John*. The Didsbury Lectures 2016. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2018.

———. *The Death of the Messiah and the Birth of the New Covenant: A (Not So) New Model of the Atonement*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2014.

Gourgues, Michel. "Marie, la «Femme» et la «Mère» en Jean." *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 108 (1986): 174–91.

Gregg, Richard B. *Symbolic Inducement and Knowing: A Study in the Foundations of Rhetoric*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1984.

Gross, Alan. "Rhetoric as a Technique and a Mode of Truth: Reflections on Chaïm Perelman." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 33 (2000): 319–35.

Guest, Steven W. "Deuteronomy 26:6–19 as the Central Focus of the Covenantal Framework of Deuteronomy." PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2009.

Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1–13*. WBC 33a. Dallas: Word, 1993.

Hanson, Anthony Tyrrell. *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011. [Originally published: London: SPCK, 1980.].

———. *The Prophetic Gospel: A Study of John and the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

Harnack, Adolf von. "Über das Verhältnis des Prologs des vierten Evangeliums zum ganzen Werk." *ZTK* 2 (1892): 189–231.

Harris, Elizabeth. *Prologue and Gospel: The Theology of the Fourth Evangelist*. JSNTSup 107. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.

Harris, Murray J. *Jesus as God: The New Testament Use of Theos in Reference to Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.

Harris, R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer, Jr., and Bruce K. Waltke, eds. *Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Chicago: Moody, 1980.

Harrison, George W.M. "Rhetoric, Writing and Plutarch." *AS* 18 (1987): 271–79.

Harvey, Anthony E. *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel*. London: SPCK, 1976.

Hay, David M. "What is Proof? Rhetorical Verification in Philo, Josephus and Quintilian." *SBL Seminar Papers* 2 (1979): 87–100.

Hayman, Henry. "On Some Textual Questions in the Gospel of John." *BSac* 40 (1883): 139–52.

Heath, Malcolm. “Codifications of Rhetoric.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, edited by Erik Gunderson, 59–73. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.

Heil, John Paul. *Jesus Walking on the Sea: Meaning and Gospel Functions of Matt 14:22–33, Mark 6:45–52 and John 6:15b–21*. AnBib 87. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1981.

Heiligenthal, Roman. *Werke als Zeichen: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung der menschlichen Taten im Früjudentum, Neuen Testament und Frühchristentum*. WUNT 2/9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.

Hengel, Martin. “The Prologue of the Gospel of John as the Gateway to Christological Truth.” In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 265–94. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Hengstenberg, E. W. *Commentary on the Gospel of St John*. Vol. 1. Edinburgh; London; Dublin: T&T Clark, 1865.

Hesk, Jon. “Types of Oratory.” In *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, edited by Erik Gunderson, 145–61. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.

Hill, David. “The Background and Biblical Usage of *Zōē* and *Zōē Aiōnios.” In Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*, 163–201. Cambridge: The University Press, 1967.

Hindley, J. C. “Witness in the Fourth Gospel.” *SJT* 18 (1965): 319–37.

Hinrichs, Boy. *“Ich Bin”: Die Konsistenz Des Johannes-Evangeliums in der Konzentration auf das Wort Jesu*. SBS 133. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988.

Holloway, Paul A. “Left Behind: Jesus’ Consolation of His Disciples in John 13,31–17,26.” *ZNW* 96 (2005): 1–34.

Holtzmann, H. J. *Evangelium, Briefe, und Offenbarung des Johannes*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1908.

Hooker, Morna D. “Beginnings and Endings.” In *The Written Gospel*, edited by Markus Bockmuehl and Donald A. Hagner, 184–202. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.

———. *Beginnings. Keys That Open the Gospels*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.

———. “The Johannine Prologue and the Messianic Secret.” *NTS* 21 (1974): 40–58.

———. “John the Baptist and the Johannine Prologue.” *NTS* 16 (1970): 354–58.

———. *Not Ashamed of the Gospel: New Testament Interpretations of the Death of Christ*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Hoskyns, Edwyn. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by Francis Noel Davey. London: Faber and Faber, 1947.

Hughes, Frank W. “The Gospel and Its Rhetoric in Galatians.” In *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*, edited by L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson. JSNTSup 108, 210–21. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Ibuki, Yu. *Die Wahrheit im Johannesevangelium*. BBB 39. Bonn: Hanstein, 1972.

Jamieson, K. H., and K. K. Campbell. “Rhetorical Hybrids: Fusions of Generic Elements.” *QJS* 68 (1982): 146–57.

Jamieson, Kathleen M. Hall. “Generic Constraints and the Rhetorical Situation.” *Ph&Rh* 6 (1973): 162–70.

Jepsen, Alfred. “Gnade und Barmherzigkeit im AT.” *KD* 7 (1961): 261–71.

Johns, Loren L., and Douglas B. Miller. “The Signs as Witnesses in the Fourth Gospel: Reexamining the Evidence.” *CBQ* 56 (1994): 519–35.

Jones, C. P. “Towards a Chronology of Plutarch’s Works.” *JRS* 56 (1966): 61–74.

Just, Felix. “From Tobit to Bartimaeus, From Qumran to Siloam: The Social Role of Blind People and Attitudes Toward the Blind in New Testament Times.” Yale University. PhD diss., Yale University, 1997.

Keck, Leander E. “Derivation as Destiny: ‘Of-Ness’ in Johannine Christology, Anthropology, and Soteriology.” In *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black, 274–88. Louisville: WJKP, 1996.

Keener, Craig S. *Christobiography: Memory, History, and the Reliability of the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2019.

———. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.

———. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

Keil, C. F., and F. Delitzsch. *Commentary on The Old Testament in Ten Volumes: The Pentateuch*. Translated by J. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975; reprinted 1983.

Kennedy, George A. “Aristotle on the Period.” *HSCP* 63 (1958): 283–88.

———. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. 2nd ed. rev. and enl. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

———. *Comparative Rhetoric: An Historical and Cross-Cultural Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

———. “Focusing of Arguments in Greek Deliberative Oratory.” *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 90 (1959): 131–38.

———. “The Genres of Rhetoric.” In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 43–50. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

———. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. Studies in Religion. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Kiefl, Franz Xaver. “Review of Das Evangelium des Heiligen Johannes. J. E. Belser.” *Biblische Zeitschrift* 4 (1906): 410–17.

Kierspel, Lars. *The Jews and the World of the Fourth Gospel*. WUNT 2/220. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Kinneavy, James L. *Greek Rhetorical Origins of Christian Faith: An Inquiry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76.

Knudsen, Rachel Ahern. *Homeric Speech and the Origins of Rhetoric*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014.

Koester, Craig R. *The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament*. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989.

———. “Hearing, Seeing, and Believing in the Gospel of John.” *Bib* 70 (1989): 327–48.

———. “Messianic Exegesis and the Call of Nathanael (John 1:45–51).” *JSNT* 39 (1990): 23–34.

———. *Symbolism in the Fourth Gospel: Meaning, Mystery, Community*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Konstan, David. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.

———. *Pity Transformed*. London: Duckworth, 2001.

Kovacs, Judith L. “‘Now Shall the Ruler of This World Be Driven Out’: Jesus’ Death as Cosmic Battle in John 12:20–36.” *JBL* 114 (1995): 227–47.

Köstenberger, Andreas J. *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel: With Implications for the Fourth Gospel’s Purpose and the Mission of the Contemporary Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *A Theology of John’s Gospel and Letters*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

———. “The Two Johannine Verbs for Sending: A Study of John’s Use of Words with Reference to General Linguistic Theory.” In *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*. JSNTSup 168, 125–43. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Kruse, Colin G. *John*. Rev. ed. TNTC. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 2017.

Kwon, Jongseon. “A Rhetorical Analysis of the Johannine Farewell Discourse.” PhD diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993.

Kysar, Robert. *The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel: An Examination of Contemporary Scholarship*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1975.

Lacomara, A. “Deuteronomy and the Farewell Discourses (Jn 13:31–16:33).” *CBQ* 36 (1974): 65–84.

Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Lagrange, M.-J. *L’Evangile selon Saint Jean*. 3rd ed. Paris, 1947.

Larsen, Kasper Bro. “Introduction: The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic.” In *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic*, edited by Kasper Bro Larsen. SANt 3, 15–24. Göttingen: Ruprecht & Vandenhoeck, 2015.

LaSor, William Sanford, David Allan Hubbard, Frederic William Bush, and Leslie C. Allen. *Old Testament Survey: The Message, Form, and Background of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Der Johannes-Prolog: Rhetorische Befunde zu Form und Sinn des Textes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Leaney, A. R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning*. London: SCM, 1966.

Lee, Dorothy A. *The Symbolic Narratives of the Fourth Gospel: The Interplay of Form and Meaning*. JSNTSup 95. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.

Lenchak, Timothy A. *Choose Life! A Rhetorical-Critical Investigation of Deuteronomy 28, 69–30, 20*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1993.

Lieu, Judith. “How John Writes.” In *The Written Gospel*, edited by Markus Bocknuehl and Donald A. Hagner, 171–83. Cambridge: CUP, 2005.

Lincoln, Andrew T. “‘I Am the Resurrection and the Life’: The Resurrection Message of the Fourth Gospel.” In *Life in the Face of Death*, edited by Richard N. Longenecker, 122–44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. BNTC. London: Continuum, 2005.

———. “The Lazarus Story: A Literary Perspective.” In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 211–32. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit Motif in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.

Lindars, Barnabas. *The Gospel of John*. NCB. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Lindsay, Dennis R. “What Is Truth? Alētheia in the Gospel of John.” *RQ* 35 (1993).

Loader, William. *Jesus in John’s Gospel: Structure and Issues in Johannine Christology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017.

Longenecker, R. N. *Galatians*. WBC 41. Dallas: Word, 1990.

Lunsford, Andrea Abernethy, Kermit E. Campbell, Catherine Hobbs, D. Diane Davis, and J. Rocky Colavito. “Review Essays.” *Rhetoric Review* 17 (1998): 167–87.

Lyons, George. *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding*. SBLDS 73. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

MacBride, Tim. *Preaching the New Testament as Rhetoric: The Promise of Rhetorical Criticism for Expository Preaching*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014.

Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship New Testament. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Malatesta, Edward. *Interiority and Covenant*. AnBib 69. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1978.

Malina, Bruce J, and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1998.

Manning, Gary T., Jr. "The Disciples of John (the Baptist): Hearers of John, Followers of Jesus." In *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John*, edited by Steven A Hunt, D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann, 127–32. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016 [originally published: Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013].

———. *Echoes of a Prophet: The Use of Ezekiel in the Gospel of John and in Literature of the Second Temple Period*. JSNTSup 270. London; New York: Continuum, 2004.

———. "The Reluctance of Jesus in the Gospel of John." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society. Fort Worth, TX, 17 November 2021.

Manson, T. W. *On Paul and John: Some Selected Theological Themes*. SBT 38. London: SCM, 1963.

Martin, Hubert, Jr. "The Concept of *Praotes* in Plutarch's Lives." *GRBS* 3 (1960): 65–73.

———. "Moral Failure Without Vice in Plutarch's Athenian *Lives*." *Ploutarchos* 12 (1995): 13–18.

Martin, Josef. *Antike Rhetoric: Technik und Methode*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft. Vol. 2.3. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1974.

Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians*. WBC 40. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1986.

Martin, Troy W. "Invention and Arrangement in Recent Pauline Rhetorical Studies: A Survey of the Practices and the Problems." In *Paul and Rhetoric*, edited by J. Paul Sampley and Peter Lampe, 48–118. New York: Continuum, 2010.

Mastin, B. A. "A Neglected Feature of the Christology of the Fourth Gospel." *NTS* 22 (1975): 32–51.

Matera, Frank J. *New Testament Christology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1999.

———. *New Testament Ethics: The Legacies of Jesus and Paul*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.

McCullagh, C. Behan. *Justifying Historical Descriptions*. Cambridge: CUP, 1984.

McGrath, James F. "Prologue as Legitimation: Christological Controversy and the Interpretation of John 1:1–18." *IBS* 19 (1997): 98–120.

McKay, K. L. *A New Syntax of the Verb in New Testament Greek: An Aspectual Approach*. SBG 5. New York: Lang, 1994.

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

Merrill, Eugene H. *Deuteronomy*. The New American Commentary 4. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.

Meyer, Paul W. "'The Father': The Presentation of God in the Fourth Gospel." In *Exploring the Gospel of John: In Honor of D. Moody Smith*, edited by R. Alan Culpepper and C. Clifton Black, 255–73. Louisville: WJKP, 1996.

Michaels, J. Ramsey. *The Gospel of John*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Miller, Douglas B. "What the Preacher Forgot: The Rhetoric of Ecclesiastes." *CBQ* 62 (2000): 215–35.

Miranda, Juan Peter. *Der Vater, der mich gesandt hat. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den johanneischen Sendungsformeln. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur johanneischen Christologie und Ekklesiologie*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1972.

Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.

———. "Rhetorical Handbooks in Service of Biblical Exegesis: Eustathius of Antioch Takes Origen Back to School." In *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context: Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*, edited by John Fotopoulos. SNT 122, 349–67. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Mlakuzhyil, George. *Christocentric Literary-Dramatic Structure of John's Gospel*. 2nd ed. AnBib 117. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical, 2011.

Mollat, D. "Le conversion chez saint Jean." *Lumière et Vie* 47 (1960): 95–114.

Moloney, Francis J. *Belief in the Word: Reading the Fourth Gospel, John 1–4*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

———. *Glory not Dishonor: Reading John 13–17*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.

———. *The Gospel of John*. SP 4. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.

———. *The Johannine Son of Man*. 2nd ed. BibSciRel 14. Rome: LAS, 1978.

———. *Love in the Gospel of John: An Exegetical, Theological, and Literary Study*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2013.

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John*. Rev. ed. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

———. *Jesus is the Christ: Studies in the Theology of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

Motyer, Stephen. "Bridging the Gap: How Might the Fourth Gospel Help Us Cope with the Legacy of Christianity's Exclusive Claim Over Against Judaism?" In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 143–67. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. *Your Father the Devil? A New Approach to John and 'the Jews.'* Paternoster Biblical and Theological Studies. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997.

Mowvley, Henry. "John 1:14–18 in the Light of Exodus 33:7–34:35." *ExpTim* 95 (1984): 135–37.

Muilenburg, James. "Literary Form in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 51 (1932): 40–53.

Munck, Johannes. "Discours d'adieu dans le Nouveau Testament et dans la literature biblique." In *Aux Sources de la Tradition Chrétienne: Mélanges Offerts à M. Maurice Goguel*, 155–70. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950.

Mussner, Franz. *ZΩH: Die Anschauung vom "Leben" im vierten Evangelium unter Berücksichtigung der Johannesbriefe*. Munich: Karl Zink, 1952.

Myers, Alicia D. *Characterizing Jesus: A Rhetorical Analysis on the Fourth Gospel's Use of Scripture in Its Presentation of Jesus*. LNTS 458. London: Bloomsbury, 2012.

———. "'Jesus Said to Them…': The Adaptation of Juridical Rhetoric in John 5:19–47." *JBL* 132 (2013): 415–30.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "Encomium Versus Vituperation: Contrasting Portraits of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." *JBL* 126 (2007): 529–52.

———. *The Gospel of John*. NCBC. Cambridge: CUP, 2007.

———. *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

———. “Jesus the Judge: Forensic Process in John 8:21–59.” *Bib* 68 (1987): 509–42.

———. “The ‘Noble Shepherd’ in John 10: Cultural and Rhetorical Background.” *JBL* 120 (2001): 267–91.

Nicol, W. *The Sēmeia in the Fourth Gospel*. NovTSup 32. Leiden: Brill, 1972.

Nielsen, Jesper Tang. “The Lamb of God: The Cognitive Structure of a Johannine Metaphor.” In *Imagery in the Gospel of John*, edited by Jörg Frey, Jan G. van der Watt, and Ruben Zimmermann. WUNT 200, 217–56. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.

Nikolaidis, A.G. “Aspects of Plutarch’s Notion of *Philotimia*.” In *The Lash of Ambition: Plutarch, Imperial Greek Literature and the Dynamics of* Philotimia, edited by G. Roskam, M. De Pourcq, and L. van der Stockt. CDC 25, 31–53. Leuven: Peeters, 2012.

Nongbri, Brent. “The Use and Abuse of P52: Papyrological Pitfalls in the Dating of the Fourth Gospel.” *HTR* 98 (2005): 23–48.

Nussbaum, Martha C. “The ‘Morality of Pity’: Sophicles’ *Philoctetes*.” In *Rethinking Tragedy*, edited by Rita Felski, 148–69. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press University Press, 2008.

———. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University of Cambridge, 2001.

———. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

———. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 2001.

O’Brien, Kelli S. “Written That You May Believe: John 20 and Narrative Rhetoric.” *CBQ* 67 (2005): 284–302.

O’Day, Gail R. *The Gospel of John*. NIB 9. Nashville: Abingdon, 1995.

———. “John 6:15–21: Jesus Walking on Water as Narrative Embodiment of Johannine Christology.” In *Critical Readings of John 6*, edited by R. A. Culpepper. BIS 22, 149–59. Leiden/New York/Köln: Brill, 1997.

———. *Revelation in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Mode and Theological Claim*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

Odiam, Alan Richard. "The Rhetoric of the Fourth Gospel: A Key to Preaching." PhD diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1989.

Okure, Teresa. *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1–42*. WUNT 2/31. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988.

Olbricht, Thomas H. "The Foundations of the Ethos in Paul and in the Classical Rhetoricians." In *Rhetoric, Ethic and Moral Persuasion in Biblical Discourse*, edited by Thomas H. Olbricht and Anders Eriksson, 138–59. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005.

———. "Wilhelm Wuellner and the Promise of Rhetoric." In *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and His Influence*, edited by James D Hester and J. David Hester (Amador). ESEC 9, 78–104. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Otzen, Benedikt. "Old Testament Wisdom Literature and Dualistic Thinking in Late Judaism." In *Congress Volume Edinburgh 1974*, 146–57. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Pamment, Margaret. "The Meaning of *Doxa* in the Fourth Gospel." *ZNW* 74 (1983): 12–16.

Pancaro, Severino. *The Law in the Fourth Gospel*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Parsenios, George L. "The 'Man at the Pool' and the 'Man Born Blind': Comparison in the Lives of Plutarch and the Gospel of John." In *Signs and Discourses in John 5 and 6 Historical, Literary, and Theological Readings from the Colloquium Ioanneum 2019 in Eisenach*, edited by Jörg Frey and Craig R. Koester. WUNT 463, 1–13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.

———. *Departure and Consolation: The Johannine Farewell Discourses in Light of Greco Roman Literature*. NovTSup 117. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

———. *Rhetoric and Drama in the Johannine Lawsuit Motif.* WUNT 258. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.

Parsons, Mikeal C., and Michael Wade Martin. *Ancient Rhetoric and the New Testament: The Influence of Elementary Greek Composition*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018.

Patrick, Dale, and Allen Scult. *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation*. JSOTSup 82. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press and Almond, 1990.

Pelling, Christopher. "Aspects of Plutarch's characterization." In *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*, 283–300. Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011.

———. "Childhood and personality in Greek biography." In *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*, 301–38. Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011.

———. "The moralism of Plutarch's Lives." In *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*, 237–51. Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011.

———. "Plutarch's adaptation of his source material." In *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*, 91–115. Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011.

———. "*Synkrisis* in Plutarch's Lives." In *Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies*, 349–63. Wales: Classical Press of Wales, 2011.

Pemberton, Glenn D. "The Rhetoric of the Father: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Father/Son Lectures in Proverbs 1–9." PhD diss., The Iliff School of Theology, 1999.

Penner, Todd. *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography*. ESEC 10. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Pepe, Cristina. *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. International Studies in the History of Rhetoric 5. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Perelman, Ch., and L. Olbrichts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame +Press, 1969.

Pernot, Laurent. *Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2015.

———. *Review of Homeric Speech and the Origins of Rhetoric by Rachel Ahern Knudsen*. College: Bryn Mawr Classical Review, 2014.

———. *Rhetoric in Antiquity*. Trans. by W. E. Higgins. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2005.

Peterson, Brian Neil. *John's Use of Ezekiel: Understanding the Unique Perspective of the Fourth Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.

Phillips, Peter M. *The Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: A Sequential Reading*. LNTS 294. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Popkes, Wiard. "Zum Verständnis der Mission bei Johannes." *Zeitschrift für Mission* 4 (1978): 63–69.

Porsch, Felix. *Pneuma und Wort. Ein exegetischer Beitrag zur Pneumatologie des Johannesevangeliums*. FTS 16. Frankfurt: J. Knecht, 1974.

Porter, Stanley E. *Idioms of the Greek of the New Testament*. Languages: Greek 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.

———. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*. SBG 1. New York: Lang, 1993.

Preuss, Horst Dietrich. "… ich will mit dir sein!" *ZAW* 80 (1968): 139–73.

Pryor, John W. *John: Evangelist of the Covenant People. The Narrative & Themes of the Fourth Gospel*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1992.

Rae, Murray. "The Testimony of Works in the Christology of John's Gospel." In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 295–310. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Ragsdale, Donald. "Brevity in Classical Rhetoric." *Southern Speech Journal* 31 (1966): 21–28.

Rainbow, Paul A. *Johannine Theology: The Gospel, the Epistles and the Apocalypse*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014.

Rashwan, Hany. "Arabic Jinās is not Pun, Wortspiel, Calembour, or Paronomasia: A Post-Eurocentric Approach to the Conceptual Untranslatability of Literary Terms in Arabic and Ancient Egyptian Cultures." *Rhetorica* 38 (2020): 335–70.

Ravens, David. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. JSNTSup 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Redelings, David A. *The Epistemological Basis for Belief According to John's Gospel: Miracles and Message in Their Essentials as Nonfictional Grounds for Knowledge of God*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2011.

Reinhartz, Adele. *Cast Out of the Covenant: Jews and Anti-Judaism in the Gospel of John*. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2018.

———. "Jesus as Prophet: Predictive Prolepses in the Fourth Gospel." *JSNT* 36 (1989): 3–16.

———. "The Johannine Community and Its Jewish Neighbors: A Reappraisal." In *"What Is John?" Volume II Literary and Social Readings of the Fourth Gospel*, edited by Fernando F. Segovia, 111–38. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.

Réville, Jean. *Le Quatrième Évangile: son Origine et sa Valeur Historique*. Paris: Leroux, 1901.

Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*. Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Riga, Peter. "Signs of Glory. The Use of *Sēmeion* in St. John's Gospel." *Int* 17 (1963): 402–24.

Robinson, J. A. T. "The Relation of the Prologue to the Gospel of St. John." In *Twelve More New Testament Studies*, 65–80. London: SCM, 1984.

Rodden, John. "How Do Stories Convince Us? Notes Towards a Rhetoric of Narrative." *College Literature* 35 (2008): 148–73.

Romerowski, S. "Que signifie le mot ḥesed?" *VT* 40 (1990): 89–103.

Ronning, John L. *The Jewish Targums and John's Logos Theology*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2010.

Russell, D. A. "Plutarch, 'Alcibiades' 1–16." *PCPS* 192 (1966): 37–47.

Sakenfeld, Katharine Doob. *Faithfulness in Action: Loyalty in Biblical Perspective*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.

———. *The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002. First published 1978 by The Harvard Semitic Museum.

Salier, W. H. *The Rhetorical Impact of the Sēmeia in the Gospel of John*. WUNT 2/186. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Scharbert, Josef. "Formgeschichte und Exegese von Ex 34,6f und seiner Parallelen." *Bib* 38 (1957): 130–50.

Scheffler, Eben. "Jesus' Non-Violence at His Arrest: The Synoptic and John's Gospel Compared." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 17 (2006): 312–26.

Schepens, G. "Rhetoric in Plutarch's *Life of Pyrrhus*." In *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*, edited by L. Van der Stockt. CDC 11, 413–41. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.

Schlier, Heinrich. "Im Anfang war das Wort. Zum Prolog des Johannesevangeliums." *Wort und Wahrheit* 9 (1954): 169–80.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John*. 3 vols. London: Burns & Oates; New York: Crossroad, 1968–82.

Schneiders, Sandra Marie. “Death in the Community of Eternal Life: History, Theology, and Spirituality in John 11.” *Int* 41 (1987): 44–56.

Schnelle, Udo. *Antidocetic Christology in the Gospel of John: An Investigation of the Place of the Fourth Gospel in the Johannine School*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

———. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. 5th ed. ThHNT 4. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2016.

———. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Scholtissek, Klaus. “Abschied und neue Gegenwart: Exegetische und theologische Reflexionen zur johanneischen Abschiedsrede 13,31–17,26.” *ETL* 75 (1999): 332–58.

Schulz, Siegried. *Komposition und Herkunft der Johanneischen Reden*. BWANT 81. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960.

Schwankl, Otto. *Licht und Finsternis. Ein metaphorisches Paradigma in den johanneischen Schriften*. HBS 5. Freiburg: Herder, 1995.

Searle, John R. *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: CUP, 1969.

Seglenieks, Chris. *Johannine Belief and Graeco-Roman Devotion. Reshaping Devotion for John’s Graeco-Roman Audience*. WUNT 2/528. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020.

Segovia, Fernando F. *The Farewell of the Word: The Johannine Call to Abide*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1991.

Senior, Donald, and Carroll Stuhlmueller. *The Biblical Foundations for Mission*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1983.

Sheppard, Beth M. “The Gospel of John: A Roman Legal and Rhetorical Perspective.” PhD diss., The University of Sheffield, 1999.

Sheridan, Ruth. “John’s Gospel and Modern Genre Theory: The Farewell Discourse (John 13–17) as a Test Case.” *ITQ* 75 (2010): 287–99.

———. “John’s Prologue as Exegetical Narrative.” In *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic*, edited by Kasper Bro Larsen. SANt 3, 171–90. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.

———. “Persuasion.” In *How John Works: Storytelling in the Fourth Gospel*, edited by Douglas Estes and Ruth Sheridan, 205–23. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016.

Shiner, Whitney. “Creating Plot in Episodic Narratives: *The Life of Aesop* and the Gospel of Mark.” In *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*. SBLSS 6, 155–76. Atlanta: Scholars, 1998.

Shively, Elizabeth E. “Recognizing Penguins: Audience Expectation, Cognitive Genre Theory, and the Ending of Mark’s Gospel.” *CBQ* 80 (2018): 273–92.

Silva, Moisés, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2014.

Simoens, Yves. *La gloire d’aimer: Structures stylistiques et interprétatives dans le Discours de la Cène (Jn 13–17)*. AnBib 90. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1981.

Skinner, Christopher W. “Narrative Readings of the Religious Authorities in John: A Response to Urban C. von Wahlde.” *CBQ* 82 (2020): 424–36.

———. “The World: Promise and Unfulfilled Hope.” In *Character Studies in the Fourth Gospel: Narrative Approaches to Seventy Figures in John*, edited by Hunt, Steven A., D. Francois Tolmie, and Ruben Zimmermann, 61–70. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016 [Originally published: Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013].

Smalley, S. S. *John: Evangelist and Interpreter*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.

Smith, D. Moody. *John*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.

———. “The Setting and Shape of a Johannine Narrative Source.” *JBL* 95 (1976): 231–41.

———. *The Theology of the Gospel of John*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: CUP, 1995.

Smith, Dennis E. “Narrative Beginnings in Ancient Literature and Theory.” *Semeia* 52 (1991): 1–9.

Sosa Siliezar, Carlos R. *Creation Imagery in the Gospel of John*. LNTS 546. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Spieckermann, H. “Barmherzig und gnädig ist der Herr…” *ZAW* 102 (1990): 1–18.

Stadter, Philip A. “Before Pen Touched Paper: Plutarch’s Preparations for the *Parallel Lives*.” In *Plutarch and His Roman Readers*, 119–29. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

———. *A Commentary on Plutarch's Pericles*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1989.

———. "Mirroring Virtue in Plutarch's *Lives*." *Ploutarchos* n.s. 1 (2003–4): 89–95.

———. "Plutarch's Comparison of Pericles and Fabius Maximus." *GRBS* 16 (1975): 77–85.

———. "The Rhetoric of Plutarch's *Pericles*." *AS* 18 (1987): 231–69.

———. "The Rhetoric of Virtue in Plutarch's *Lives*." In *Plutarch and His Roman Readers*, 231–45. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

———. "Should We Imitate Plutarch's Heroes?" In *Plutarch and His Roman Readers*, 331–40. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Stamps, Dennis L. "The Johannine Writings." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.—A.D. 400*, edited by Stanley E. Porter, 609–32. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Standhartinger, Angela. "'And All Ate and Were Filled' (Mark 6.42 par.): The Feeding Narratives in the Context of Hellenistic-Roman Banquet Culture." In *Decisive Meals: Table Politics in Biblical Literature*, edited by Kathy Ehrensperger, Nathan MacDonald, and Luzia Sutter Rehmann. LNTS 449, 62–82. London: T&T Clark, 2012.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. *New Testament Theology*. Translated by John Marsh. London: SCM, 1955.

Steegen, Martijn. "To Worship the Johannine 'Son of Man': John 9:38 as Refocusing on the Father." *Biblica* 91 (2010): 534–54.

Steel, Catherine. "Divisions of Speech." In *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, edited by Erik Gunderson, 77–91. Cambridge: CUP, 2009.

Sternberg, Rachel Hall. "Pity and Pragmatism: A Study of Athenian Attitudes Toward Compassion in 5th- and 4th-Century Historiography and Oratory." PhD diss., Bryn Mawr College, 1998.

Stibbe, Mark W. G. *John as Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: CUP, 1992.

———. *John's Gospel*. NTR. London: Routledge, 1994.

———. *John*. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993.

Stoebe, Hans Joachim. “Anmerkungen zur Wurzel pl’ im Alten Testament.” *TZ* 28 (1972): 13–23.

———. “Die Bedeutung des Wortes ḥäsäd im Alten Testament.” *VT* 2 (1952): 244–54.

Stowers, Stanley K. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. LEC 5. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.

Strong, John. “Ezekiel’s Use of the Recognition Formula in His Oracles Against the Nations.” *PRSt* 22 (1995): 115–33.

Stube, John Carlson. *A Graeco-Roman Rhetorical Reading of the Farewell Discourse*. LNTS 309. London: T&T Clark, 2006.

Talbert, Charles H. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles*. Rev. ed. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2005.

———. *What is a Gospel?* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Theobald, Michael. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes: Kapitel 1–12*. RNT. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 2009.

———. *Die Fleischwerdung des Logos. Studien zum Verhältnis des Johannesprologs zum Corpus des Evangeliums und zu 1 Joh*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1988.

———. *Herrenworte im Johannes-Evangelium*. HBS 34. Freiburg: Herder, 2002.

Thomas, John Christopher. *Footwashing in John 13 and the Johannine Community*. 2nd ed. Cleveland, TN: CPT, 2014.

Thompson, Marianne Meye. “‘Many of His Disciples Turned Back’: The Offense of Jesus’s Death in the Gospel of John (John 6:60–71).” In *Signs and Discourses in John 5 and 6 Historical, Literary, and Theological Readings from the Colloquium Ioanneum 2019 in Eisenach*, edited by Jörg Frey and Craig R. Koester. WUNT 463, 275–88. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.

———. “Eternal Life in the Gospel of John.” *Ex Auditu* 5 (1989): 35–55.

———. *The God of the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

———. *The Incarnate Word: Perspectives on Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993.

———. *John: A Commentary*. NTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2015.

———. “The Raising of Lazarus in John 11: A Theological Reading.” In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 233–44. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

———. “Signs and Faith in the Fourth Gospel.” *BBR* 1 (1991): 89–108.

Thonssen, Lester, A. Craig Baird, and Waldo W. Braden. *Speech Criticism*. 2nd ed. Malabar, FL: Krieger, 1981.

Thüsing, W. *Die Erhöhung und Verherrlichung Jesu im Johannesevangelium*. 2nd ed. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 21.1. Münster: Aschendorff, 1970.

Thyen, Hartwig. *Das Johannesevangelium*. 2. Auflage. HNT 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.

———. “Johannesevangelium.” In *Theologische Realenzyklopädie 17*, edited by G. Müller, H. Balz, and G. Krause, 200–25. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1988.

Toker, Leona. “Narrative Enthymeme: The Examples of Laurence Sterne and James Joyce.” *Partial Answers* 4 (2006): 163–74.

Tolmie, D. F. *Jesus’ Farewell to the Disciples: John 13:1–17:26 in Narratological Perspective*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Tovey, Derek. *Narrative Art and Act in the Fourth Gospel*. JSNTSup 151. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997.

Trites, Allison A. *The New Testament Concept of Witness*. SNTSMS 31. Cambridge: CUP, 1977.

Trozzo, Lindsey M. *Exploring Johannine Ethics*. WUNT 2/449. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.

Trudinger, L. Paul. “Prologue of John’s Gospel: Its Extent, Content and Intent.” *RTR* 33 (1974): 11–17.

Tsutserov, Alexander. *Glory, Grace and Truth: Ratification of the Sinaitic Covenant According to the Gospel of John*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2009.

Turner, Max. “Atonement and the Death of Jesus in John – Some Questions to Bultmann and Forestell.” *EQ* 62 (1990): 99–122.

———. “The Spirit of Christ and ‘Divine’ Christology.” In *Jesus of Nazareth Lord and Christ: Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, edited by Joel B. Green and Max Turner, 413–36. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Twelftree, Graham H. *Jesus the Miracle Worker: A Historical & Theological Study*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1999.

Unnik, W. C. van. "Studies on the So-Called First Epistle of Clement: The Literary Genre." In *Encounters with Hellenism: Studies on the First Letter of Clement*, edited by Cilliers Breytenbach and Laurence L. Welborn, translated by L. L. Welborn, 115–81. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Usher, Stephen. "Symbouleutic Oratory." In *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, edited by Ian Worthington, 220–35. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.

Van der Watt, Jan. *Family of the King: Dynamics of Metaphor in the Gospel According to John*. BIS 47. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

———. "Reciprocity; Mimesis and Ethics in 1 John." In *Erzählung und Briefe im johanneischen Kreis*, herausgeben von Uta Poplutz und Jörg Frey. Herausgegeben von Uta Poplutz und Jörg Frey, 257–76. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016.

Verdegem, Simon. *Plutarch's* Life of Alcibiades*: Story, Text and Moralism*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010.

Vistar, Deolito V., Jr. *The Cross-and-Resurrection: The Supreme Sign in John's Gospel*. WUNT 2/508. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.

Volf, Miroslav. "Johannine Dualism and Contemporary Pluralism." In *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, 19–50. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Von Wahlde, Urban C. *The Gospel and Letters of John*. Volume 1. Introduction, Analysis, and Reference. ECC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Voorwinde, Stephen. *Jesus' Emotions in the Fourth Gospel: Human or Divine?* London: T&T Clark, 2005.

———. *Jesus' Emotions in the Gospels*. London: Continuum, 2011.

Waltke, Bruce K. "Micah." In *The Minor Prophets: An Exegetical and Expository Commentary*, edited by Thomas Edward McComiskey. Volume 2, 591–764. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993.

Wardman, Alan. *Plutarch's Lives*. London: Elek, 1974.

Warner, Martin. “The Fourth Gospel’s Art of Rational Persuasion.” In *The Bible as Rhetoric*, edited by Martin Warner. Warwick Studies in Philosophy and Literature, 153–77. London: Routledge, 1990.

Washington, Harold C. “The Lord’s Mercy Endures Forever: Toward A Post-Shoah Reading of Grace in the Hebrew Scriptures.” *Int* 54 (2000): 135–45.

Watson, Duane F. *Invention, Arrangement, and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*. SBLDS 104. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

———. “The Three Species of Rhetoric and the Study of Pauline Epistles.” In *Paul and Rhetoric*, edited by J. Paul Sampley and Peter Lampe, 25–47. New York: Continuum, 2010.

———. “1 Corinthians 10:23–11:1 in the Light of Greco-Roman Rhetoric: The Role of Rhetorical Questions.” *JBL* 108 (1989): 301–18.

Watson, Duane F., and Alan J. Hauser. *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*. BIS 4. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Wead, David W. *The Literary Devices in John’s Gospel*. Edited by Paul N. Anderson and R. Alan Culpepper. JMS 7. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2018.

Webb, Ruth. “The *Progymnasmata* in Practice.” In *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, edited by Yun Lee Too, 289–316. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Weber, M. “Compassion and Pity: An Evaluation of Nussbaum’s Analysis and Defense.” *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 7 (2005): 487–511.

Weder, Hans. “Die Asymmetrie des Rettenden. Überlegungen zu Joh 3, 14–21 im Rahmen johanneischer Theologie.” In *Einblicke ins Evangelium: Exegetische Beiträge zur neutestamentlichen Hermeneutik; gesammetle Aufsätze aus den Jahren 1980–1991*, 435–65. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992.

Wesley, Margaret. *Son of Mary: The Family of Jesus and the Community of Faith in the Fourth Gospel*. ACTMS. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015.

Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel according to St. John*. London: Murray, 1908.

Whitacre, Rodney A. *Johannine Polemic: The Role of Tradition and Theology*. SBLDS 67. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982.

Wilder, Amos N. *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospels*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999; London: SCM, 1964.

Willcock, M. M. “Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*.” *The Classical Quarterly* 14 (1964): 141–54.

Williams, Catrin H. *I Am He*. WUNT 2/113. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Williams, P. “Not the Prologue of John.” *JSNT* 33 (2011): 375–86.

Wilson, R. Ward, and Craig L. Blomberg. “The Image of God in Humanity: A Biblical-Psychological Perspective.” *Themelios* 18 (1993): 8–15.

Wiseman, D. J. “‘Is It Peace?’: Covenant and Diplomacy.” *VT* 32 (1982): 311–26.

Witherington, Ben, III. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

———. *Grace in Galatia: A Commentary on Paul’s Letter to the Galatians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *John’s Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995.

———. *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2009.

———. *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

Wolfson, H. A. *Philo*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.

Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. London: SPCK, 1992.

———. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Wuellner, Wilhelm. “Putting Life Back Into the Lazarus Story and Its Reading: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11 as the Narration of Faith.” *Semeia* 53 (1991): 113–32.

———. “Rhetorical Criticism and Its Theory in Culture-Critical Perspective: The Narrative Rhetoric of John 11.” In *Text and Interpretation*, 171–85. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Yee, Gale A. *Jewish Feasts and the Gospel of John*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2007.

Young, Franklin W. “A Study of the Relation of Isaiah to the Fourth Gospel.” *ZNW* 46 (1955): 215–33.

Zhakevich, Mark. *Follow Me: The Benefits of Discipleship in the Gospel of John*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield, 2021.

Zimmermann, Heinrich. “Das absolute ’Εγώ εἰμι als die neutestamentliche Offenbarungsformel.” *BZ* 4 (1960): 54–69.

Zimmermann, Ruben. *Christologie der Bilder im Johannesevangelium. Die Christopoetik des vierten Evangeliums unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Joh 10*. WUNT 171. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

———. “Metaphoric Networks as Hermeneutic Keys in the Gospel of John: Using the Example of Missionary Imagery.” In *Repetitions and Variations in the Fourth Gospel: Style, Text, and Interpretation*, edited by Gilbert van Belle, Michael Labahn, and P. Maritz, 381–402. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Zimmermann, Ruben, and Zacharias Shoukry. “*Creatio Continua* in the Fourth Gospel: Motifs of Creation in John 5–6.” In *Signs and Discourses in John 5 and 6 Historical, Literary, and Theological Readings from the Colloquium Ioanneum 2019 in Eisenach*, edited by Jörg Frey and Craig R. Koester. WUNT 463, 87–115. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021.

Zulick, Margaret D. “The Active Force of Hearing: The Ancient Hebrew Language of Persuasion.” *Rhetorica: A Journal of the History of Rhetoric* 10 (1992): 367–80.

Zumstein, Jean. *Das Johannesevangelium*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.

———. “Der Prolog, Schwelle zum vierten Evangelium.” In *Der Johanneprolog*, edited by Günter Kruck, 49–75. Darmstadt: WBG, 2009.

Zyskind, Harold. “A Rhetorical Analysis of the Gettysburg Address.” *JGE* 4 (1950): 202–12.