

John, Judaism, and “Searching the Scriptures”

Catrin H. Williams

There is an increasing awareness in Johannine studies that the widespread, often creative use of scriptural citations, themes, and motifs in the Gospel of John is to be situated within the broader context of Jewish exegetical activity during the late Second Temple period. The Fourth Evangelist did not approach the Jewish Scriptures in a vacuum; his understanding of them was indelibly shaped by a rich legacy of Jewish interpretation. Placing John’s Gospel within this context can illuminate several aspects of its engagement with the Jewish Scriptures, including its preference for certain scriptural texts and its use of well-documented Jewish exegetical methods and devices, as well as the author’s close familiarity with the ways in which the original biblical texts were being received and interpreted in Jewish circles many centuries after their composition.

Such considerations are, of course, part and parcel of what is involved in exploring the “Jewishness” of John’s Gospel. Investigating John’s distinctive engagement with Scripture belongs to the wider task of establishing the gospel’s origins through comparisons with Jewish customs, beliefs, and practices (Hengel 1999; Frey 2012a, 175–80). It can also shed light on the ways in which Johannine Christians made use of their Jewish heritage to shape their self-understanding as a group. Yet, while many attempts have been made in Johannine scholarship to illustrate how knowledge of the extant Jewish sources can inform discussion of John’s appropriation of Scripture, only on a few rare occasions has the issue been turned on its head and the question asked: how can the Jewishness of John’s Gospel help us understand the character of Jewish scriptural interpretation during and beyond the late Second Temple period? In other words: is John’s reception of the authoritative writings of Judaism, and his use of Jewish hermeneutical operations and practices, an important source of information about first-century Jewish exegetical activity?

In many respects it is understandable why scholars are reluctant to probe John's Gospel as a source for understanding Judaism. Given its strong christological orientation, with all key matters subsumed under the issue of belief in Jesus as "the Christ and Son of God," is it conceivable that Jewish elements of interpretation are recoverable from John's thoroughly Christocentric understanding of the Scriptures as witnesses finding their fulfillment in Jesus? To pose the question in this way assumes, of course, that the task involves nothing more than sifting through and separating Jewish hermeneutical methods and traditions from their remodeled Johannine counterparts. It is also a task that becomes fraught with difficulties when examining scripturally based arguments designed as rhetorical expressions of self-definition, that is, for the purpose of setting up boundaries between those on the Jewish and Johannine sides of the fence (Williams 2011). The process of recovering markedly Jewish elements is achievable to some degree, particularly if exegetical material in John can be matched, through comparative study, to existing—and in some cases later—Jewish sources. It does, however, leave open to discussion whether distinctive and otherwise unparalleled interpretative features in John's Gospel must be excluded from any such handling of the text as a potential source for understanding Judaism. What is the relationship between the "inherited" and "innovative" features of John's scriptural interpretation (see Ruzer 2007, 5–6)? Is it only the former that warrants the description of *Jewish* exegesis? Consequently, if the use of the term *Judaism* requires clarification in a venture of this kind, the same applies to the word *Johannine* when seeking to determine the contours and characteristics of Johannine exegetical traditions. As with all such projects, each potentially fruitful avenue must be explored carefully, with all possible Jewish/Johannine analogues scrutinized on a case-by-case basis.

Interpreting John's use of Scripture against a broad Jewish exegetical canvas can open up new questions and generate new interpretative possibilities, not only in relation to the Johannine text but also with a view to the rich diversity in evidence within first-century Judaism. When examined as part of a larger whole, John's Gospel has the potential to serve as a valuable witness to aspects of Jewish scriptural interpretation during the late Second Temple period (Vermes 1980, 13–14; 1985, 157: "all-inclusive approach"). Rather than being quarried for possible parallels (Vermes 1980, 13; Brooke 2005a, 69),¹ Jewish sources shed light on the wider

1. Vermes (1982, 374) offers the following assessment of the tendency among

Jewish matrix from which John’s Gospel emerged (see especially Vermes 1982, 375; Brooke 2005b, xxii, 69; Ruzer 2007, 4–6). In other words, analyzing John not so much against the *background* of Jewish exegetical trends but as part of a broader Jewish religious and cultural environment can lead to what George Brooke repeatedly describes as an opportunity for “mutual illumination.”²

This can be pursued along a number of different trajectories. First, it can involve *placing* John’s Gospel within late Second Temple Jewish interpretation in a variety of settings and contexts, thereby mapping out and drawing comparisons between its engagement with Scripture and the various techniques and traditions attested in Jewish sources such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Apocrypha, and the Pseudepigrapha, as well as Josephus and the writings of Philo. This kind of exercise does not necessarily involve the search for genealogical, historical relationships—something that has been overdone in some circles with reference to possible links between John and the Dead Sea Scrolls (as noted especially by Frey 2010, 536–38; also Aune 2003, 281–303; Frey 2004, 117–203; 2009b). The aim rather is to assess John’s Gospel within a larger body of Jewish material, taking account of their shared and distinctive features when it comes to using, interpreting, and applying the Jewish Scriptures.

Second, there may be some Jewish interpretative devices and patterns for which John’s Gospel provides the earliest attestation and which are otherwise only found in much later (rabbinic or targumic) sources. The methodological problems associated with the use of rabbinic texts for the study of the New Testament are well documented and need not be rehearsed in this essay (see especially Alexander 1983; Holtz 2009, 173–86; and, with reference to John’s Gospel, Williams 2013, 114–23). What can be noted is that comparisons with John may assist in the earlier dating of what are otherwise *rabbinic* strains, but rabbinic traditions do not automatically illuminate specific Johannine traditions other than perhaps to affirm their Jewish roots (see Segal 1994, 1–2). It is when a certain tradition or

New Testament scholars to treat Jewish sources as no more than background material for New Testament exegesis: “The New Testament is the mistress, and Jewish documents, especially of the post-biblical variety, mere ancillaries at best.” See also Schäfer (1986, 140) on what he describes as “the exploitative-apologetic” approach to Jewish rabbinic sources.

2. See the title of Brooke’s 2005 collection of essays: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament: Essays in Mutual Illumination*.

method is paralleled in first-century (or earlier) Jewish sources that more diachronically extended traditions can be brought into play (this has been affirmed with reference to John's Gospel by Visotzky 2005, 96; Reinhartz 2005a, 109).

However, as I aim to demonstrate in the second part of this essay, there is also need for greater clarity as to what is meant by *parallel*, whether with reference to Second Temple sources or later rabbinic and targumic developments. One cannot simply assert that because a midrashic technique or interpretation bears some resemblance to a pattern attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls that they must accordingly share a common exegetical pattern or tradition. Once again, a rigorous methodological approach is required when evaluating John's Gospel against the backdrop of contemporary (and later) Jewish interpreters; every possible connection must be examined individually, and the differences as well as the similarities are to be openly acknowledged,³ not only between John and the Jewish sources but also among the Jewish texts themselves.

Mapping Out Shared Exegetical Methods: The Case of Catchword Links

The task of setting John's Gospel within a wider Jewish matrix will now be explored with reference to some shared exegetical principles and devices. I will focus more on interpretative techniques than traditions, for the reason that the former allows comparisons to be drawn with a broader range of Jewish sources, which, in turn, can lead to a preliminary mapping out of specific exegetical trends. A profiling of this kind, one that inevitably involves a fairly wide casting of the net, can provide a helpful framework for assessing certain exegetical practices attested in both Jewish and Johannine material. The aim is to determine how their hermeneutical assumptions and strategies can offer illumination not only in one but in both directions.

The exegetical device selected for closer scrutiny is one that is frequently cited in discussions of possible links between John's Gospel and Jewish scriptural exegesis, namely, the technique whereby analogous scriptural passages sharing the same words or phrases are interpreted in relation to each other. This involves "searching the Scriptures" for lexical

3. See the insightful comments on "comparison" ("a mixture of identity and difference") by Doering (2006, 20–22), drawing on J. Z. Smith 1990.

links or overlaps between what are often “distant” texts and then combining them for the purpose of “keying.”⁴ The technique can be labeled in a variety of ways—catchword assimilation, associative/analogical exegesis, lexematic association. However, given that it is more commonly known by the term *gezerah shavah* (inference by analogy, or, literally, “equal ordinance”), some comments are necessary about its status as a technical rabbinic term.

The Matter of *Gezerah Shavah*

This exegetical device is mentioned in all three rabbinic lists of *middot* (or hermeneutical rules): it is the second interpretative technique to be included in the lists attributed to Rabbi Hillel (t. Sanh. 7:11), Rabbi Ishmael (prologue of Sifra Wayyiqra), and then, from a much later period, Rabbi Eliezer ben Yose ha-Gelili (Mishnah of Rabbi Eliezer 1–2). The links that David Daube, Saul Lieberman, and others have recognized, albeit focusing more on terminology than on any shared substance,⁵ between some of the *middot* and Greco-Roman rhetorical techniques do not in any way lessen the value of these hermeneutical methods as a source for understanding Judaism. Possible cross-fertilization between classical and rabbinic exegetical techniques attests rather to the character of Judaism during this period

4. *Keying* is the term favored by Samely (2002, 214): “The meaning of the term in one co-text is being ‘keyed’ (or: unlocked) according to the other co-text, in a manner of speaking.”

5. See David Daube (1949, esp. 241 n. 7, 251, 259), where he argues that Hillel’s hermeneutical method of *gezerah shavah* was derived from Hellenistic rhetorical techniques. Saul Lieberman (1950, 59–60) proposes that the Greek rhetorical equivalent, indeed the likely origin, of the strange term *gezerah shavah* was σύγκρισις πρὸς ἴσον (“a comparison with what is equal”)—a “favorite tool” in the *progymnasmata* (62; but see Alexander 1984, 113)—although he notes that in Hillel’s hermeneutical rules the analogy is based on identical words not (more general) content (Lieberman 1950, 61). Lieberman therefore offers a more cautious assessment than Daube, in that he emphasizes the difference between the definition of the method (that is, the terminology that the rabbis may have borrowed from Hellenistic rhetoric) and the content of the method itself (logical and verbal analogy, as applied in halakic contexts). See now Myers (2012, esp. 12, 14–16), whose own analysis of the ancient rhetorical technique of σύγκρισις with reference to John’s Gospel focuses on comparisons/exemplars for the purpose of characterization rather than on verbal analogies between scriptural texts.

Myers 2012a
or 2012b?

as functioning actively in relation to its wider Greco-Roman environment (Alexander 1990, 117).

In the rabbinic sources *gezerah shavah* functions more often than not as an important exegetical device in legal or halakic interpretation: the juxtaposition of lexically overlapping scriptural passages allows certain details absent from one biblical injunction to be supplied from another. This “analogical transfer” (Samely 2002, 214–15) is underpinned by the principle that both scriptural texts are concerned with the same legal matters but that one text provides the framework for the other (see further Mielziner 1925, 142–52; Instone-Brewer 1992, 17–18). Lexical analogues thus provide the scriptural warrant for texts to be read in a way that brings new meaning to them. One such example is the halakic discussion on divorce and witnesses in m. Sotah 6:3:

There is an inference to be drawn from the less to the more stringent concerning the first testimony from this very fact [that only one witness is necessary]: Just as the last testimony which renders her forbidden for ever, behold, is established by one witness [only], should not the first testimony which does not render her forbidden for ever also be capable of being established by one witness [only]? In this regard it is instructive that Scripture says: “For he has found in her the indecency of a *matter* [דבר] [and he writes for her a bill of divorce]” [Deut 24:1], and above it says, “According to two witnesses [or according to three witnesses] shall the *matter* [דבר] be established” [Deut 19:15]. Just as the “matter” enunciated above is [established] according to two witnesses, so the “matter” enunciated here is according to two witnesses also.⁶

The second half of this discussion presents an analogy arguing that more than one witness is required in the case of a wife suspected of adultery (see Num 5). The ambiguous phrase “indecency of a matter” (Deut 24:1) is interpreted here to include adultery, whereas Deut 19:15 stipulates that two or three witnesses are necessary for the purpose of prosecution. The connecting link between the two scriptural passages is the word “matter” (דבר), which becomes the lexical lever to enable the transference of the reference to two/three witnesses from Deut 19:15 to 24:1. As there are no further links in terms of subject matter between these two passages, it appears that the presence of the word דבר in Deut 24:1 is interpreted as somehow being

6. For the translation and analysis that follows I am indebted to Samely 2002, 215–17.

able to appropriate the specific function of its occurrence in the other scriptural citation (19:15, i.e., a matter proven by two witnesses).

The phrase *gezerah shavah* does not occur in this mishnaic unit; indeed it is only found once in the Mishnah (m. Arakh. 4:4). Nevertheless, the exegetical illustrations tied directly to the *middot* of Hillel and Ishmael similarly juxtapose two scriptural texts whose combination leads to the required clarification, for halakic purposes, of the implicit (hidden) meaning of one of the two cited passages. In other words, this process of semantic “gap filling” represents a very specific application of associative/ analogical exegesis as tied to the term *gezerah shavah*—one that certainly does not characterize all cases of lexical association in (later) midrashic exegesis.⁷ Furthermore, given the problems associated with the lists of *middot*—the uncertain dating of the lists, their incompleteness, and lack of clear definition as to what these principles encompass (especially Alexander 1984, 99–115; see Alexander 1983, 242–43; Samely 2002, 12, 26–27, 220–21; Porton 2004)—it cannot be assumed, as is often done in New Testament scholarship, that they represent a comprehensive, indeed the definitive, template of rabbinic exegetical principles and techniques.

Some Johannine scholars continue to use—indeed give prominence to—the term *gezerah shavah* in their analyses of John’s exegetical practices, most recently Richard Bauckham in his 2015 book *Gospel of Glory: Major Themes in Johannine Theology*.⁸ However, the late but also highly precise applica-

7. See also Chernick (1990), who argues that postmishnaic (Amoraic) *gezerah shavah* interpretations in the halakic midrashim “place strict formulary requirements on the verses which they will accept as their sources” (255–56), whereas these restrictions do not necessarily apply to word-comparison interpretations that lack the *gezerah shavah* designation. The application of the exegetical technique of *gezerah shavah* must, as a result, conform to the following requirements: (1) “simple” cases of *gezerah shavah* are limited to comparisons of words, phrases, or formulas that appear only twice in the Pentateuch; (2) *gezerah shavah mufnah* (“free”) compares only “extraneous” terms to similar ones in the same pentateuchal passage or in a different pentateuchal text that shares a similar legal rubric. See further Mielziner 1925, 150–52; Avemarie 2009, 83 n. 2.

8. See, e.g., the repeated references to examples of *gezerah shavah* in John’s Gospel noted by Bauckham (2015, 96 n. 81, 154 [“the Jewish exegetical principle that the rabbis later called *gezerah shavah*”], 156, 158, 167, 168 n. 90). Note also Menken (1996, 52): “[the technique] is very similar to the later rabbinic hermeneutical rule of *gezerah shavah*.” Although displaying clear awareness of the dating issues, Menken does not consider the specificity of the use and application of the term *gezerah shavah* in the rabbinic sources. See also Manns 1991, 314–15.

tion of this term in rabbinic sources suggests that, unless it is used with greater specificity, it should—like the term *peshet* (Witmer 2006; see Myers 2015, 10–11)—be abandoned in Johannine studies in favor of a designation that more aptly and comprehensively captures the range of lexical associative techniques that are found in much earlier sources (see Avemarie 2009, 83–86), including John’s Gospel. As a result, due weight must be given to the broad similarities but also to the striking differences between the application of *gezerah shavah* in rabbinic sources and the more widely established use of catchword links in a variety of patterns, and for diverse exegetical purposes, in the New Testament, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and other postbiblical writings.

For that reason, Johannine exegetical techniques will now be examined against a broad canvas of analogical exegesis or catchword association in late Second Temple Judaism, that is, outside—and prior to—the rabbinic sources.⁹ A rich diversity of such interpretative practices—albeit without the later terminological categorization—is widely attested before and during the first century CE (see Brooke 1985, 8–44), early traces of which, as Michael Fishbane has convincingly demonstrated, are already visible in the Hebrew Bible itself.¹⁰ Of particular significance is the comparative material provided by the Dead Sea Scrolls, the writings of Philo, and some of the texts in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. As will now be shown, all related techniques follow the overarching principle that (new) meaning is produced when texts are brought into exegetical conversation with others; the use of analogy in such conversations has the ability to restrict, expand, and, above all else, to explain the meaning of sacred texts.

The practice of searching the Scriptures for analogies—that is, for catchword links—has the capacity to be a valuable candidate for the

9. It is interesting to note in this respect that Samely (2002, 11–12) opts for the term “resources of interpretation” rather than “techniques” or “methods” to denote rabbinic hermeneutics, because “resource” suggests something that is available but in an undefined form or can appear in many forms. He notes: “The nature of reading itself mitigates against any purely instrumental or mechanical application of hermeneutic rules to textual phenomena” (12).

10. See Fishbane (1985, 155–57, 247–50), who proposes that analogy by extension in innerbiblical exegesis can involve the specification of certain characteristics that are ambiguous or potentially problematic in nature, or an extension by examples in order to make the original rule more comprehensive or explicit; expansion by a new topic to bring about a shift of legal categories or principles; and transformation of meaning and intent to the original rule (see further 1985, 99, 160–62, 183, 210–11, 218–20, 298, 313, 525).

description, investigation, and even classification of certain Jewish exegetical techniques and devices. For that purpose, the following preliminary attempt at categorizing broadly contemporaneous methods of scriptural interpretation seeks to draw together Johannine and Jewish examples of link-word combinations under two main headings: serial quotations and composite quotations. As we shall see, these two categories have the capacity to capture several cases of associative scriptural exegesis in Jewish and early Christian sources, and the second category in particular (composite citations) is now becoming the subject of detailed scrutiny (Adams and Ehorn 2016b). The content of Jewish and Johannine serial/composite scriptural quotations may be very different from each other, with several distinctive characteristics coming to light in individual texts, but the techniques undergirding the use of analogy or association through catchword for exegetical purposes often share a number of striking features. It must nevertheless be acknowledged that focusing on serial/composite *quotations* does not exhaust the range of catchword combination techniques attested in ancient Judaism and the New Testament writings (including John’s Gospel), and, where significant for this study, attention will also be drawn to other exegetical practices such as the importance of catchword links for interpretative purposes in translations of the Hebrew Scriptures.

Serial Quotations

Associative exegesis through catchword links can take numerous forms, the most recognizable of which—as the earlier example from the Mishnah has demonstrated—is the deliberate juxtaposition of two or more scriptural passages that have at least one common word through their explicit citation in serial fashion (to form what can be termed “serial quotations”). While the scriptural passages in question may also have similar content, this is not always the case, and the connection between them may or may not be accompanied by an explanatory comment. Delineating the various forms of and the strategies underpinning this method of scriptural juxtaposition is greatly assisted by the fact that numerous examples of this hermeneutical procedure can be found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹¹

11. See esp. 4Q174 1 I, 1–3; 1 I, 10–13, 14–16; 1 II, 1–4; 1QM X, 6–8; 1QS II, .2–4; CD VII, 15–19. See further Slomovic (1969, 5–10); Brooke (1985, 166, 294–95, 297–98, 306–7); and, with reference to legal material (e.g., 11QT XVII, 6–8; LI, 11–18), see Bernstein (2013, 471–73).

In 4Q Florilegium (4Q174 1 I, 10–13) one such example involves the juxtaposition of 2 Sam 7:11c–14a and Amos 9:11 because of the presence in both texts of the phrase “and I will raise up” (והקימותי), which leads to the following interpretation:

(10) “And the Lord de[clares] to you that he will build you a house. I will raise up [והקימותי] your seed after you and establish the throne of his kingdom (11) [for ev]er. I will be as a father to him, and he will be as a son to me” [2 Sam 7:11c, 12b, 13b–14a]: This [refers to the] branch of David, who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law, who (12) [will rise up] in Z[ion in] the last days, as it is written, “I will raise up [והקימותי] the booth of David which has fallen” [Amos 9:11]: This [refers to] the booth [or, branch] of (13) David which was fallen, who will arise to save Israel.¹²

The quotation from 2 Sam 7:11c–14a has been significantly edited, with only key components being cited in order to align it more closely with the explanation that follows; this, in turn, is supported by the quotation from Amos 9:11 (see Brooke 1985, 111–12, 138–39). In this respect, the shared catchword found in the prophetic excerpt not only triggers an intertextual link in the form of a lexical match¹³ but also offers “added value” by clarifying that the promise in 2 Sam 7 will be fulfilled despite the possibility of adverse circumstances: that is, even if the “throne of his kingdom” that was established for ever has fallen, God—through the messianic booth/branch of David—will raise it up in order to save Israel (see Avemarie 2009, 89). A similar example of catchword association follows immediately, in a new section, in 4QFlor 1 I, 14–16:

(14) Midrash of “Blessed the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked” [Ps 1:1a]. The interpretation of this sa[ying: they are those who turn] aside from the path [דרך] of [the wicked,] (15) as it is written in the book of Isaiah, the prophet, for the last days, “And it happened that with a strong [hand he turned me aside from walking on the path [דרך] of] (16) this people” [Isa 8:11]. This [refers to] those about whom

12. This translation is a slightly modified version of García Martínez 1994, 136.

13. The presence of the verbal form והקימותי in Amos 9:11 is possibly as a result of scribal assimilation with 2 Sam 7:12 (since MT Amos 9:11 reads אקים), although it also occurs in the quotation of the same verse from Amos in CD VII, 16 (see Avemarie 2009, 88–89).

it is written in the book of Ezekiel the prophet that “[they should] not [defile themselves any more with all] (17) of their idols” [Ezek 37:23]. This [refers to] the sons of Zadok and to the men of his council, those who seek jus[tice] eagerly, who will come after them to the council of the community.¹⁴

Once again, a second—prophetic—citation (Isa 8:11) provides the “missing” explanatory component of the base text’s declaration about not walking in “the counsel of the wicked” (Ps 1:1a), although in this particular case, as indeed in others,¹⁵ the link-word (ךך) is assumed rather than cited in the psalm text. This is confirmed by its occurrence in the immediately subsequent “interpretation of this saying.” This variation of the analogical-associative technique demonstrates that such exegetical combinations can be based on elements that are close to the quotation without themselves being actually cited.

The notion of one scriptural passage providing information that is missing from another (analogous) text is not, however, a fixed feature of catchword exegesis, particularly in Jewish sources outside the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus, in *On Agriculture* (72–84, especially 78–82), Philo quotes two passages that feature the phrase “horse and rider” (ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην; Deut 20:1 and Exod 15:2), although the one passage is not intended to clarify the other; indeed, their function is to provide verbal cues that will enable Philo to proceed, in chain-like fashion, to the next stage of his allegorical argument by providing additional, illustrative scriptural support in relation to the central topic.¹⁶ Philo, particularly in his allegorical treatises, makes frequent use of the analogical technique of “verbal mode of transition” to link together scriptural quotations drawn from the Pentateuch (Runia 1984, 239; 2010, 95), and it thus represents one particular

14. Again, this is a slightly modified version of the translation in García Martínez 1994, 136.

15. E.g., in CD-A VII, 14–19, Amos 5:26–27 and Num 24:17 are combined because of the presence of the word “star” in both passages (= the Interpreter of the Law), even though this term is only explicitly quoted in the second scriptural citation.

16. See esp. Hamerton-Kelly 1976, 55–56. See Brooke (1985, 22–24), where attention is also drawn to the similar function of catchword association in *Sacrifices* 1–10, and, more recently, Runia 1984, 239–45; 1987, 119–20, 130–31; 2010, 92–93, 95–96, 100–104.

model of how catchword combinations were put into practice in late Second Temple Judaism.¹⁷

Various features of catchword-based serial quotations in Jewish sources relate, in this respect, to cases of double scriptural citations in the Gospel of John. The two quotations cited and enacted in the account of Jesus's entry into Jerusalem (12:13–15) are bound together by their shared use of the verb *ἔρχομαι*, which is now interpreted with reference to Jesus: “the one who comes [*ὁ ἐρχόμενος*] in the name of the Lord” (Ps 117[118]:26 LXX), “the king who comes [*ἔρχεται*] sitting on a donkey's colt” (Zech 9:9). The inclusion of the additional words *ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* at the end of the psalm citation (see Isa 44:2; Zeph 3:15 LXX) heightens the lexical match between the two scriptural references, so that Jesus's act of sitting on a donkey to manifest his kingly identity (Zech 9:9) serves as a corrective interpretation of his acclamation as “king of Israel” by the crowd (Manns 1991, 314; Daly-Denton 2000, 178–79).

Yet another passage in John's Gospel whose combination of scriptural citations is widely regarded as derived from similar exegetical principles is the juxtaposition of Isa 53:1 and 6:10 in the summary reflections on Jesus's public ministry in John 12:37–40(41), even though their analogous features are not to be found in the quotations themselves. The bringing together of these two Isaianic passages in John 12 has prompted the identification of several distinctive verbal and thematic links between their wider contexts, both in the opening verses of Isaiah's temple vision (6:1–13) and in the introduction to the fourth Servant Song (52:13–53:12; see esp. Evans 1987, 230–32; Bauckham 1998, 49–51; Frey 2008, 385–86; Lett 2016, 169–72). These catchword links have the capacity to activate a profound intratextual connection that, in turn, shapes and directs John's understanding of both passages.

With regard to the Hebrew text, the most remarkable verbal connection between the two passages is the use of the distinctive phrase “high and lifted up” to describe the divine throne in the temple (Isa 6:1: *רם ונשא*) as well as the future exaltation and lifting up of the Servant (52:13: *יִרָם וְנִשָּׂא*). In addition, according to the Septuagint, Isaiah sees the glory (*δόξα*) that fills the temple (6:1 LXX) and distinctively speaks of the glorification (*δοξασθήσεται*) of the Servant (52:13 LXX; see Chibici-Revneanu 2007,

17. Runia (2010, 96): “It is this feature of his [Philo's] exegesis that recalls the use of the method of *gezerah shawa* by the scribes and rabbis, though I would maintain that what Philo does cannot be reduced to that method” (see Runia 1987, 119, 120).

Bauckham
1998a or
1998b?

196–98). Both Isaianic passages also contain strong visual emphasis, and one of their most striking connections is the link between Isaiah “seeing” the Lord (6:1, 5 LXX: εἶδον; see 6:9–10 LXX) and the “seeing” of the glorification of the Servant (52:13 LXX: ἰδοὺ; see 52:15 LXX: many nations and kings will see [ὄψονται] the Servant). With regard to the quotation of these passages in John 12, there are significant clues within, and in the lead-up to, this unit (12:37–41) that they are not simply linked together by their focus on obduracy and unbelief. Rather, if John 12:41, as seems likely, acts as a commentary on both Isaiah quotations—“Isaiah said these things [ταῦτα]¹⁸ because he saw his glory and spoke about him”—two Isaianic “events” or “acts” of seeing are mutually clarified and linked together in the closest possible terms by being subsumed under the single reference to glory: the Fourth Evangelist interprets Isaiah’s call-vision in terms of him seeing Jesus as the glorious figure in the temple but also as the occasion for the prophet having seen, ahead of time, the glory manifested by Jesus during his earthly life, and whose rejection ultimately leads to his enthronement (“lifting up”; see John 12:32–33) and glorification (12:23) on the cross (see Frey 2008, 386).

Despite significant differences in terms of content and aims when compared to other examples in the Jewish sources, several features of John 12:37–41 support its inclusion in the broad Jewish exegetical category of “catchword links” within serial quotations. While this particular Johannine case of scriptural combination does not involve a close lexical match between the two explicit quotations from Isaiah, the textual form and sequence of the two citations in John 12 strongly indicate that the relationship between them, on a verbal level, is one of implied or inferential clarification rather than the accumulation of shared motifs: the first scriptural text expresses the reality of unbelief (Isa 53:1), and the second outlines the reasons for it (6:10). The lexical parallels between the two passages are to be identified in their wider literary context, with the result that John’s accompanying explanatory remarks (John 12:41) indicate that the hidden implications of the one passage also apply to the other in a process of dynamic interaction through the analogical transfer of meaning. The other factor to be taken into consideration in this particular case is that John is building on a long history of associative

18. Although ταῦτα can be used in John’s Gospel to refer to an earlier single statement (e.g., 9:22, 40), it is more commonly used to denote a series of preceding statements (e.g., 6:59; 8:30; 12:16; 13:21; 14:25).

exegesis with reference to Isa 6 and 52–53: connections between them are already established at a compositional level in the Hebrew text (Gosse 1991; Sommer 1998, 93–96), and, as recent studies have shown (Ekblad 1999, 179; see Koenig 1982, 47–52; Frey 2008, 385 n. 53), these intratextual links are developed further in the Septuagint of Isaiah to strengthen the mutually interpretative relationship of these two scriptural passages. Regardless, therefore, of John’s christological interpretation of the Isaiah texts, his exegetical strategy in John 12:37–41 is not an innovation but an elaboration of what was already at his disposal in the Hebrew and Greek versions of this prophetic text.

Composite Quotations

I now move on to consider another category of scriptural citations that displays signs of operating according to the exegetical procedure of catchword links, but a category where the juxtaposition of texts is far less overt than in the case of serial quotations. Instead of stringing together two or more citations but separating them from each other with brief comments (such as a connective *καὶ* or *πάλιν*), in this particular category of explicit quotations “an author, although apparently only citing one text, is actually drawing one or more source texts together into a single, composite citation” (Adams and Ehorn 2016a, 1).¹⁹ This can be a creative and highly complex exegetical process, frequently triggered by lexical parallels in different scriptural passages, but a process in which it is often difficult to pin down the “new element” to a single scriptural source.

The presence of composite citations in New Testament writings has long been acknowledged,²⁰ particularly in Hebrews and the letters of Paul, and this textual feature has figured prominently in source- and redaction-critical investigations of some of the explicit quotations in John’s Gospel (Schuchard 1992; Menken 1996). What has not so far been undertaken is a comparative analysis of composite citations in the Jewish sources of

19. The following working definition is offered by Adams and Ehorn (2016a, 4): “A text may be considered a composite citation when literary borrowing occurs in a manner that includes two or more passages (from the same or different authors) fused together and conveyed as though they are only one.”

20. Building on Stanley (1992), the two-volume project led by Adams and Ehorn (2016b; 2017) seeks to situate this citation technique within the broader Jewish, Greco-Roman and early Christian contexts.

the late Second Temple period with those in John’s Gospel that are best described as the amalgamation of multiple texts in a single citation to produce *one* scriptural witness. To demonstrate that John’s practice of this hermeneutical procedure fits comfortably within ancient Jewish exegetical activity, some examples from the relevant Jewish sources will now be examined. The examples in question are drawn from two different types of composite citations as identified by Christopher Stanley (1992, 258–59, 342; 2016, 204–5), namely, combined quotations and conflated quotations.

1. Combined Citations

In the case of combined quotations, excerpts from two or more separate scriptural passages are joined back-to-back under a single citation formula (or other explicit marker); while an uninformed audience could easily regard the citation as drawn from a single source, its textual form evinces two components that are, to some degree, “separable” from each other. Several examples of combined citations can be identified in Jewish exegetical literature (e.g., 4 Macc 18:18–19; 1 Esd 1:55),²¹ including the following case attested in the Damascus Document (CD-A VIII, 14–15) where two excerpts from the book of Deuteronomy are combined in reverse sequence (9:5a; 7:8a) under a single citation (“and Moses said”): “And Moses said, ‘It is not because of your righteousness or the uprightness of your heart that you are going to possess these nations [Deut 9:5a], but [it is] because [כִּי] of his love for your ancestors that he is keeping the oath’ [7:8a].”

In the wider context of both of these scriptural passages Moses addresses Israel and outlines God’s grace toward his people since the exodus and before their entry into the land: faithfulness to God and his commandments will lead to prosperity. Here, in the Damascus Document, the combined quotation is applied to the Qumran sect: they are the heirs to the true covenant because of God’s love for “the ancestors” and his faithfulness to his promises (Campbell 1995, 148; Norton 2016, 108–9). The linking together of the two excerpts is brought about by the connecting word “because” (כִּי), a term that they both share, as well as a number of other phrases and concepts (“oath to the ancestors” in the uncited part of

Is this quotation also a modified version of Garcia-Martinez?

21. See Adams and Ehorn 2016a, 119–30; 4 Macc 18:18–19 combines Deut 32:39c LXX and Deut 30:20c LXX in this sequence with reference to death followed by life (see deSilva 2006, 264–65); 1 Esd 1:55 combines elements from Lev 26:34–35 and Jer 25:11–12.

Deut 9:5 as well as in the cited part of Deut 7:8; “it is not because of ... but because of...”);²² the citations are also condensed to remove references to the wickedness of the nations (Deut 9:5) and to Israel’s election and the exodus (7:8; see Dimant 2014, 108). The shift to Deut 7:8 takes place, nevertheless, in order to include an explicit reference to God’s love toward the ancestors, a motif that is absent from the other Deuteronomic passage but, by extension, is then applied to members of the Qumran sect (CD-A VIII, 18: “the Penitents of Israel”).

A similar procedure, but one that draws from more distant scriptural texts, is adopted by Philo in *Sacrifices* 87:

Yet even if we are slow to do this, he [God] himself is not slow to take to himself those who are fit for his service. “I will take you,” he says, “to be my people [Exod 6:7] and I will be your God [καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός Exod 6:7/Lev 26:12–13], and you shall be to me a people. I am the Lord” [Lev 26:12–13].

Is this quotation a slightly modified version of Colson 1954?

As in the combined quotation noted in the Damascus Document, Philo here quotes two scriptural passages that share a common phrase (καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός) to form a single citation that runs seamlessly from one excerpt to the other. Indeed, since the shared words “I will be your God” occur at the end of the excerpt from Exod 6:7 but also at the beginning of the quotation from Lev 26:12(–13), it could be drawn from either text but in all probability acts as a catchword phrase linking the two together to form a composite quotation. Philo’s reason for quoting both excerpts is that each one offers scriptural support for different aspects of Philo’s argument (Royse 2016, 83): the first emphasizes God’s initiative (“I will take you to be my people”), while the second highlights the close reciprocity between God and his people.

In both these cases of (combined) composite citations, sound exegetical reasons can be forwarded to support the view that the textual form of the quotation is not because of a lapse of memory on the part of the author but as a result of the skillful weaving together of distinct scriptural components whose fusion can be legitimated on the basis of their analogous, here complementary-expansive, features. These components

22. “Verbal commonalities” between three scriptural passages (Ezek 44:7, 13, 15) also characterize the other example of a composite quotation in CD-A (III, 21) examined in Norton 2016, 103–7.

were not randomly selected but betray the interpreters’ awareness of and respect for the literary context from which these quotations were taken.

2. Conflated Quotations

There are fewer identifiable cases in Jewish sources of what can be described as “conflated quotations,” that is, scriptural citations where one text is dominant but a word or phrase from another scriptural passage has deliberately, albeit without explicit signaling, been inserted into the quotation. Thus, in *Names* 187, and with reference to Jacob’s wrestling, Philo provides a conflated citation in which one word from Gen 32:32 LXX (ἐπέσκαζεν), set in place with the aid of a connecting phrase (ὃ καὶ), is included at the end of the quotation from Gen 32:25 LXX to explain the consequence of touching Jacob’s thigh: “And [it] became numb,” it is said, “[that is], the flat part of his thigh upon which he was limping” (τὸ πλάτος τοῦ μηροῦ, ὃ καὶ ἐπέσκαζεν). Once again, this exegetical maneuver can be justified on the grounds that the word “thigh” (μηρός) occurs in both verses drawn from Gen 32 LXX, although in this particular case the positioning of the “foreign” word at the end of the quotation points to the fluidity of the given categorizations, in that it could be defined both as a conflated and combined composite citation.

In contrast to this short and relatively straightforward example from the writings of Philo, other extant cases of conflated quotations are often highly intricate (e.g., Bar 2:28–35; 2 Macc 2:11; Jub. 2:26–27),²³ in which the additional (or replacement) scriptural excerpt functions more like an allusion than a clearly identifiable citation. They can occur in exegetical texts of various genres, but conflated interpretations—rather than “citations” in the technical sense—are particularly prevalent in various LXX translations, thus highlighting the status of the Septuagint as a rich deposit of Jewish scriptural interpretation during the late Second Temple period. One frequently cited example is the Septuagint’s rendering of Exod 15:3, where the anthropomorphic connotations of the designation of God as “man of war” (15:3) in the Hebrew text (יהוה איש מלחמה) are toned down in the Greek translation: “The Lord, the one who shatters wars, the Lord is his name” (κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους κύριος ὄνομα

Please confirm that LXX translations are yours.

23. The difficulty of determining precise scriptural references in passages such as 2 Macc 2:11 (and hence their *composite* character) is highlighted in Adams and Ehron 2016a, 130–34, 135–39; Allen 2016, 145–49.

αὐτῷ). This substitution occurs, in all likelihood, under the influence of the Hebrew text of Ps 76:4 and Hos 2:20, where God is said to have shattered (or will shatter) war (שֹׁכֵר מִלְחָמָה),²⁴ and for which the same Greek verb as in Exod 15:3 LXX (συντρίβειν) is used to describe God as the one who “shatters war.” As a result, the catchword shared by all three passages, מִלְחָמָה (“war”), acts as an interpretative bridge that generates the innovative translation encountered in Exod 15:3.

Similarly, the most plausible explanation of the curious rendering “just like in your promise” (ὡς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐπαγγελίᾳ σου) for the Hebrew words “is it not in your ledger?” (הֲלֹא בִסְפָרֶתְךָ) in Ps 55[56]:9c LXX is as follows: the Greek translator is alluding to Isa 25:8 LXX, a passage that—like Ps 55[56]:9b LXX—describes how God takes pity on his people and their tears:

Isa 25:8 LXX: God has again wiped away every tear (πᾶν δάκρυον) from every face.

Ps 55:9bc LXX: You have put my tears (τὰ δάκρυά μου) before yourself, *just like in your promise*.

In this particular case, the catchword link (“tear[s]”) between these two scriptural passages does not bring about the lexical transfer of an identical word from the prophetic passage to the psalm text but rather triggers a deliberate allusion, in the final clause of Ps 55:9, to God’s “earlier” promise (Isa 25:8) of eschatological intervention on behalf of his people and which involves him displaying pity on their tears (Schaper 1995, 63–64; see Aitken 2015, 325–26). It therefore represents yet another instance of the wide range of exegetical maneuvers underpinned by catchword assimilation that can be identified in late Second Temple Jewish texts, including the various Septuagint translations.²⁵

24. Koenig 1982, 59–63; Menken 1996, 52–53. See also Isa 42:13 LXX, where the description of God “like a man of wars” (כְּאִישׁ מִלְחָמָה) becomes “and he shall shatter war” (καὶ συντρίψει πόλεμον), probably under the influence of Exod 15:3 LXX and possibly Ps 75(76):4 LXX and Hos 2:20(18) LXX (see Baer 2001, 88–95).

25. For analyses of other examples of catchword/associative exegesis in LXX translations, see Joosten 2003, 359–63; 2012, 153–54; Theodorou 2012, 107–48. On the use of this exegetical technique in 1QIsa^a (noting the influence of Isa 59:3 on the rendering of Isa 1:15), see Mackie 2015, 60–61.

3. Composite Citations in John’s Gospel

The principle, then, behind all of these examples of composite quotations drawn from Jewish sources is that when two or more scriptural passages are fused to form a composite text (either combined or conflated) they enter into a mutually interpretative relationship. In this respect they supply significant comparative material for the explicit quotations in John’s Gospel, many of which can also most plausibly be viewed as composite citations drawn from more than one scriptural source.²⁶ In comparison with other Jewish analogues, the Johannine composite quotations are, more often than not, to be categorized as belonging to the *conflated type*, in which short excerpts from analogous scriptural resources are inserted, through a process of expansion (additional element) or contraction (replacement element), to the primary source text. Admittedly, every individual citation must be analyzed on a case-by-case basis, but, as Maarten Menken (1996, 14, 206–9) has repeatedly emphasized, arguments about textual pluriformity and fluidity during the Second Temple period must only be drawn on when it is not possible to build a strong case for identifying exegetical motives behind the form of John’s explicit quotations, that is, the identification of textual features that can be legitimated on the grounds of what is consistent with Jewish biblical exegesis.

The evidence so far surveyed does, however, offer a firm foothold for pursuing links between Jewish and Johannine hermeneutical methods, not only for the purpose of clarifying John’s techniques but also for expanding our understanding of Jewish scriptural interpretation. The identification of catchword combinations behind some of John’s explicit quotations provides a viable explanation of their textual form, and it also affords valuable exemplars of the ways in which this exegetical technique could be put into practice.

A few examples can be adduced to illustrate this point. In the Johannine account of Jesus’s entry into Jerusalem, the second scriptural quotation, “Do not fear, daughter of Zion; behold, your king is coming, sitting on a donkey’s colt” (12:15)—though clearly identifiable as a condensed cita-

26. For a detailed examination of all the composite citations in John’s Gospel, see Williams forthcoming. See esp. John 6:31 (Exod 16:4, 15; Ps 78:24); John 7:38 (Ps 77:16, 20 LXX; Zech 14:8; Ps 114:8); John 12:15 (Zech 9:9; Isa 40:9; Zeph 3:16); John 13:18 (Ps 41:10; 2 Sam 18:28); John 19:36 (Ps 34:21; Exod 12:10 [LXX], 46; Num 9:12).

Please
confirm
that Bible
translations
throughout
are yours.

tion of Zech 9:9²⁷—also includes elements that cannot be traced to this prophetic text.²⁸ The seemingly curious replacement of the words “rejoice greatly” with “do not fear” (μὴ φοβοῦ) is undoubtedly striking, and, for readers/hearers who would be able to identify the phrase as a deviation from Zech 9:9, it marks itself out as an intentional allusion to a different scriptural passage with the aim of bringing the meaning of both texts together to describe the arrival of Jesus as king (see Mackie 2015, 66–67, on the function and effect of “intentional allusions”). As far as its new Johannine context is concerned, the christological motivation for this change to “do not fear” may lie in the evangelist’s attempt to align this scriptural quotation more closely with the fact that Jesus will ultimately manifest his kingship by means of his death, with which an exhortation to rejoice would appear incompatible (Bynum 2015, 59). Of particular significance, moreover, is the long scriptural—particularly Isaianic (35:4; 41:10, 13, 14; 43:1, 5; 44:2; 51:7; 54:4; see Zeph 3:15–16)—heritage of associating the phrase “do not fear” with the assurance of God’s eschatological coming and presence and the proclamation of his salvation, now actualized through Jesus’s entry into Jerusalem (Obermann 1996, 208–9; Brunson 2003, 236–39). These proposals provide more satisfactory explanations of the motive behind the modification to this quotation, particularly in view of its function as a retrospective reflection, than that it serves to allay the fear of the crowd, which, after the Lazarus miracle (see 12:18), misinterprets Jesus as a national king whose divine power is “frightening” (Menken 1996, 85–88).

The phrase “do not fear” is, of course, attested in a large number of texts in the Jewish Scriptures, including as an address to Israel in the already-noted passages from the prophecies of Isaiah, but its inclusion in the quotation of John 12:15 has not been randomly selected from any such source but is drawn specifically—in all probability—from another prophetic passage whose mutually interpretative relationship with the Zechariah text is supported by striking contextual similarities, including shared verbal and thematic patterns. Both Zeph 3:16 and Isa 40:9, which proclaim the eschatological coming of God or the messianic king, are pos-

27. The following elements in Zech 9:9 that are missing from John 12:15 are noted by Menken (1996, 79): (1) the second half of the appeal to rejoice as addressed to “daughter Jerusalem”; (2) the words “to you” in the next line, which describes the coming of the king; and (3) references to the king as “righteous and triumphant” and “humble.”

28. In addition to the replacement of “rejoice greatly” with “do not fear,” the king is said to be “sitting” (rather than “riding”) on the donkey’s colt.

sible contenders because of the decisive keywords that they share with Zech 9:9 in their wider context. Some of these link-words, in the Hebrew and/or the Greek text, are found in Zeph 3:14–17 (“daughter Zion,” “rejoice,” “king [of Israel]”), others in Isa 40:9–10 (“behold,” “Zion,” “come”), whereas the phrase “do not fear” occurs in the plural form in Isa 40:9 LXX (μὴ φοβεῖσθε) and in the singular in the Hebrew text of Zeph 3:16 (לֹא יִירָא; LXX: θάρσει). Indeed, it may not be necessary to decide between Zeph 3:16 and Isa 40:9 as the relevant lexical resources, since—both individually and collectively—they are closely aligned with the primary text (Zech 9:9). The exegetical trigger, in this respect, should be described as one of mutual activation: the textual change to the quotation is *motivated* by the need to identify a scriptural phrase (“do not fear”) that fits its new Johannine context, but it is *legitimated* by the fact that the fusion of two or more scriptural texts that share common catchwords would be permissible within a Jewish exegetical milieu. It also points, as with the Isaianic quotations in chapter 12,²⁹ to John’s sensitivity to the immediate and sometimes wider literary context of the primary and secondary scriptural sources of the citation.

Similar conclusions can be drawn about other quotations in John’s Gospel, including the scriptural words cited after Jesus’s death: “Not one of his bones shall be broken” (19:36: ὅστων οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτοῦ). Whereas the primary text in this case is a pentateuchal regulation about eating the Passover lamb (Exod 12:46: “and you shall not break [LXX: συντρίψετε] a bone of it”; see Exod 12:10 LXX; Num 9:12), the future passive verbal form (συντριβήσεται) can once again, despite the different contexts, be legitimately viewed—on the basis of lexical association—as drawn from Ps 33(34):21 LXX: “he [the Lord] guards all his bones; not one of them shall be broken.” Here, as a result, catchword assimilation enables John to present a deliberately composite portrayal of Jesus: he is not only the righteous sufferer of the Psalms who is protected and vindicated by God,³⁰ but, at the

29. Frey (2009a, 490): John demonstrates knowledge of the whole manna episode, and although only Isa 53:1 is explicitly quoted, the immediate setting of the fourth Servant Song, and indeed other Servant sayings, is evoked in Jesus’s speech about his exaltation and glorification (see Isa 52:13 LXX) and as light of the world (see Isa 42:6; 49:6).

30. On other traces of the influence of “righteous sufferer” motifs on the Johannine presentation of Jesus, see, e.g., John 2:17 (Ps 69:10); 13:18 (Ps 41:10); 15:25 (Ps 35:19); 19:24 (Ps 22:19).

same time, he is the Passover lamb whose bones will not be broken upon his death (see John 1:29, 36; 18:28; 19:14, 28).³¹

Another potentially fruitful avenue, which must nevertheless be pursued in a separate study, is the possibility that the models of associative or analogical exegesis surveyed in this essay can assist in assessing composite allusions in the Gospel of John.³² The exegetical maneuvers identifiable in the composite citations can serve as a helpful hermeneutical guide for mapping out the mechanics of but also some of the restrictions demanded by the technique of catchword association. As commentators repeatedly note, it is often difficult to pin down John's rich deposit of scriptural allusions to individual references and single meanings. Some motifs bear traces of several scriptural sources, recalling not one but a configuration of passages from the Jewish Scriptures (see Lincoln 2005, 79–80). However, in many such cases, it may not be necessary to trace the motif to a single source, as association through catchwords may deliver the necessary exegetical lever to enable allusions to function as metonymic scriptural markers that have the capacity to fulfill an innovative—even kaleidoscopic—function within the new text. Metaphorical images such as shepherd (John 10:1–18) and the vine (15:1–10) gather in themselves not one but a variety of mutually interpretative passages,³³ and the exegetical procedure of catchword assimilation can provide the necessary legitimating interpretative key. This kind of process is certainly not unique to John's Gospel; one need only consider the clustering of metaphorical images from a variety of scriptural sources attested, for example, in the Qumran Hodayot (Hughes 2006, 150–73; see

31. Cf. especially Schuchard 1992, 136–40; Menken 1996, 166; Bauckham 2015, 154 n. 61. The fusion of Passover and righteous sufferer traditions also has Jewish analogues (e.g., Jub. 49:13), as noted by Lincoln 2005, 481.

32. See also John 7:38, which uses an introductory citation formula, although what follows cannot be linked to one clear, primary scriptural source. It appears to bring together the water from the rock struck by Moses (Exod 17:6; Ps 78:16, 20; Isa 48:21 LXX), the water in the time of future salvation (Isa 43:20; 44:3), the water flowing from the temple (Ezek 47:1–12; Zech 14:7–8), and *living* water (Song 4:15; Zech 14:8; Jer 2:13). The phenomenon of “composite allusions” is acknowledged but not investigated by Adams and Ehorn (2016b, 2).

33. For scriptural analogues to the image of the shepherd in John 10:1–18, see, e.g., Num 27:12–23; 2 Sam 7:7–8; Pss 23:1; 78:70–71; Isa 40:11; Ezek 34:1–31; 37:24; Mic 5:2–4; Zech 11:3–17; and for the image of the vine (John 15:1–17), see, e.g., Ps 80:8–19; Isa 5:1–7; 27:2–6; Jer 2:21; 6:9; Ezek 15:1–8; 17:1–10; 19:10–14; Hos 10:1.

Manning 2004, 52–59) to be able to claim that this feature again places John’s engagement with Scripture firmly within a Jewish environment.

An examination of John’s composite quotations also reveals that shared catchwords do not necessarily have to be derived from the same text-type but can be drawn from the Hebrew text and the Septuagint translation. For this reason, it may not be necessary to pin down a metaphorical image such as “lamb of God” to an individual scriptural source or indeed to a single text-type (e.g., Nielsen 2006, 226–56; Bauckham 2015, 154–57). Thus, when John the Baptist sees Jesus coming toward him and declares, “Behold the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (1:29; see 1:36), the most likely interpretation is that Passover lamb imagery, which is later unfolded to play a significant role in the passion narrative (see 19:14, 29, 36), has been combined—through a lexical match—with echoes of the description of the Servant of God in the Septuagint version of Isa 53. The Servant, “like a lamb [ὡς ἀμνός] before the shearer” (53:7), is one who “bears [φέρει] our sins” (53:4) and “bore the sins of many” (53:12; Hebrew text: singular, “sin”), although, for the purpose of this composite allusion in its new Johannine context, the verb “to bear” (ἀναφέρειν) is replaced by the verb “to take away” (αἶρειν), whose scope is expanded to include “the sin of the world.” Once again, a metaphorical description—like a composite citation—can act as the “carrier” of several scriptural sources at the same time, with clues supplied in the immediate context as to the particular contribution of each source through their innovative transfer to Jesus.

Concluding Comments

The aim of this essay has been to bring together the terms *John* and *Judaism* by focusing on some shared hermeneutical principles and methods. More specifically, I have attempted to demonstrate that a mutual exegetical interest in catchword combinations helps to position John’s Gospel as a significant participant in and valuable witness to the range of interpretative possibilities within Jewish exegetical activity during the first century CE. It inevitably follows, from John’s christological hermeneutic, that his interpretative aims are radically different from those of his Jewish contemporaries, but the methods whereby his conclusions are reached are the product of his rootedness in a rich tradition of Jewish scriptural interpretation. Some specific aspects of his hermeneutical methods may be unique to the Fourth Gospel, such as some of the interpretative maneuvers behind his composite quotations, but they may also be regarded

as an elaboration or variation of existing patterns and trends that are sometimes more obliquely attested in the Jewish sources. A comparative analysis of the relevant Jewish and Johannine evidence certainly suggests that the exegetical procedures followed by John, if not the motives and results, would be deemed acceptable and hermeneutically valid in a wider Jewish context.

It has also been proposed that associative exegesis—or analogy through the use of link-words—was more widespread and varied in first-century Judaism than is generally thought. It certainly finds its most detailed—but highly specific—articulation in later rabbinic traditions, but it is also found in a variety of forms in much earlier texts. It is important, therefore, to recognize that, traditionally, a wide range of exegetical operations has been subsumed under the term *gezerah shavah*, whereas the evidence surveyed in this study—both from the Jewish sources and from John’s Gospel—has demonstrated the need to look beyond surface resemblances in order to acquire a better understanding of the similarities *and* differences between early Jewish hermeneutical trends and later rabbinic practices. What John’s Gospel brings to the table is a rich selection of hermeneutical “catchword” patterns that can sharpen our awareness and deepen our understanding of Jewish scriptural interpretation during the first century CE and beyond.