JEFFREY M. TRIPP

Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
493

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

493

Jeffrey M. Tripp

Direct Internal Quotation in the Gospel of John

Mohr Siebeck

Jeffrey M. Tripp, born 1978; 2010 MA University of Georgia (Religion); 2016 PhD Loyola University Chicago (New Testament and Early Christianity); 2014–18 instructor of theology at Loyola University Chicago and instructor of religious studies at Saint Xavier University; currently instructor of religious studies at Rockford University.

ISBN 978-3-16-155956-3 / eISBN 978-3-16-155957-0
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-155957-0

ISSN 0340-9570 / eISSN 2568-7484 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at *http://dnb.dnb.de*.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

To Marian and Zoey

Acknowledgements

The following study is a revision of my doctoral dissertation, submitted to the Department of Theology at Loyola University Chicago in 2016. My dissertation committee deserves special recognition. Dr. Thomas H. Tobin, SJ provided invaluable critiques of my argumentation and useful feedback on Greco-Roman texts. Dr. Robert A. Di Vito saved me by joining my committee after a member had to leave, and he provided valuable feedback on John's Jewish background. My sincerest thanks go to my dissertation director, Dr. Edmondo Lupieri. He was an incredibly generous and enthusiastic mentor since I arrived at Loyola, and he continues to be so to all his students, past and present. This project could not have been done without him.

I had the idea for this study just as I began doctoral study. I am grateful to the faculty at Loyola for allowing me to pursue projects that eventually contributed to my understanding of the Greco-Roman background of New Testament texts. In this regard, Dr. Wendy J. Cotter, CSJ deserves my special gratitude, as she recognized the potential to develop this project into a dissertation when I mentioned it to her only in passing during my first year at Loyola.

With regards to the publication of this book, I would like to thank Dr. Wayne Coppins (University of Georgia) for very generously reading through the manuscript and providing feedback, as well as for encouraging me to submit to Mohr Siebeck. I should also thank Dr. Jörg Frey for accepting my manuscript for publication, along with Henning Ziebritzki and the staff at Mohr Siebeck for guiding me through the process. A quick glance through my bibliography demonstrates how important works in this series have been to my research. I am humbled that my own work will appear alongside these.

On a more personal level, I owe the utmost gratitude to my beloved wife, Marian. She put up with stacks of books taking over our small Chicago apartment with grace, encouraging me every step of the way – or was that just to get me to finish sooner and return all those books to the library? I'm sure the two aren't related. I love you, my dearest. Marian also brought me Zoey, my constant companion while writing this book. Granted she didn't contribute materially to the research or text, but Zoey's ability to get me out of the house and make me smile would at least get her a co-author credit if I were researching in the hard sciences.

Rockford, 2019 Jeffrey M. Tripp

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Direct Internal Quotation

Who would be foolish enough to think that the meaning is not identical because the words have been changed? Also, Eliezer said, "Please let me sip," but he said, "And I said, 'Please give me to drink'."

Ibn Ezra, *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (Exod 20:1)[1]

But when did he say this to them? Something like this was spoken but not written.

Euthymius Zigabenus, *Commentary on John* (6:36)[2]

1. A Definition of Direct Internal Quotation

The character of Jesus has a lot to say in the Fourth Gospel. His speech tends to dominate in dialogue scenes,[3] and he gives discourses that can go on for long stretches at a time with little to no interruption.[4] Furthermore Jesus draws particular attention to the importance of his words by asserting that he speaks only what he has heard from his Father (John 8:26, 40; 12:49–50). One must not only *believe* his words to attain eternal life (5:24; 6:63, 68), one must *keep* them

[1] Ibn Ezra (12th century) is attempting to reconcile the variant wording of the Decalogue between Exodus and Deuteronomy (where it is quoted by Moses), and he gives several examples of direct quotations that fail to match exactly (here Gen 24:17, 45). Ibn Ezra is cited by George W. Savran (*Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative* [ISBL; Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988], 1–2) who provides the translation. Savran cites another 12th century commentator, David Kimchi, who comments on the same speech by Abraham's servant: "we cannot give any reasons for the numerous omissions and additions… These are only changes in wording; the meaning remains the same."

[2] PG 129:604 col. 1248 (my translation), cited in T. Francis Glasson, "Inaccurate Repetitions in the Fourth Gospel," *ExpT* 57 (1946): 111–12. Euthymius, also 12th century, moves on quickly and gives little indication that Jesus' lack of verbal precision is a cause for concern.

[3] Even in Pilate's final private scene with Jesus (John 19:8–12), in which he asks Jesus, "Are you not speaking to me?" Jesus gets 21 words to Pilate's 18.

[4] Among the longest are the forensic monologue in John 5:19–47, the homily in 6:26–58, and the farewell discourse(s) (13:31–17:26 with several interruptions that will draw our attention, including 14:8 and 16:17–18).

(8:51–52; 14:23–24).[5] In its strongest sense, the gospel declares the importance of Jesus' spoken message by portraying him as the incarnation of God's Word from the opening verses (1:1–4, 14).

A separate, stylistic feature of the Gospel of John is the tendency toward repetition, often coupled with variation. In John 6, for example, Jesus repeats the refrain "I will raise him/it on the last day" four times in close succession with minor variations (6:39, 40, 44, 54). Pilate declares Jesus to be innocent three times (18:38; 19:4, 6). Peter not only denies Jesus three times (18:15–18, 25–27), he must answer the question posed by Jesus, "Do you love me?" three times before Jesus allows him back into the fold and in fact makes him shepherd (21:15–19). On the final occasion the narrator acknowledges that it is the third time that Jesus asks this question (He said to him a third time), and furthermore takes the time to comment on Peter's grief that Jesus has asked him so many times (Peter was grieved that he said to him a third time, "Do you love me?").[6] We will return to this verse in more detail later.

Indeed John is highly self-referential, with frequent reflections on what Jesus and other characters have already said or done.[7] Often this is accomplished through the narrator, as in the example just given. Two famous reflections on what Jesus has already done are the numbering of two of the signs in Galilee (2:11; 4:54). At other times the narrator reflects on what Jesus has *said*, interpreting his words for the audience. One of these so-called Johannine parentheses applies seemingly unrelated words of Jesus to his passion, as his prediction about the destruction and rebuilding of the temple (2:19) is reinterpreted as a prediction about his own death and resurrection (2:21): "he was speaking concerning the sanctuary of his body."[8] The phrase itself is left to stand while the narrator provides an authoritative interpretation. Another case occurs after Jesus predicts that he will be lifted up from the earth (12:32), and the narrator

---

[5] On the importance of Jesus' words as a witness to him in the structure of the Fourth Gospel, see Urban C. von Wahlde, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (ECC; 3 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 2:256–64.

[6] In fact Jesus has not said φιλεῖς με; three times, as he is quoted in 21:17, since the first two times he asked, ἀγαπᾷς με; However, Peter replies in each case with φιλῶ σε and Jesus picks up his verb. The change in wording does not prevent the narrator from labeling 21:17 as the third time that Jesus asked, φιλεῖς με;

[7] "John" is used throughout as an abbreviated title of the Gospel of John. I refer to "the authors" without any claims about their identity or indeed their number. There are indications, detailed by von Wahlde (*John*) and others, that multiple real authors contributed to the formation of the gospel, not to mention the contributions that were probably made by the social group around them as stories were told and retold. I leave the question open.

[8] On the Johannine parentheses, see Gilbert van Belle, *Les parenthèses dans l'évangile de Jean: Aperçu historique et classification. Texte grec de Jean* (SNTA 11; Leuven: Leuven University, 1985) and "L'accomplissement de la parole de Jésus: La parenthèse de Jn 18,9," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL 131; C.M. Tuckett, ed.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1987), 515–21.

jumps in to explain (12:33; cf. 21:19): "but he said *this* (τοῦτο) signifying what kind of death he was about to die." Jesus himself occasionally explains the purpose of his speech, as he does after claiming the role of the true vine and elaborating what it means to remain in him (15:11): "I have said *these things* (ταῦτα) to you so that my joy might remain in you."

These three characteristics of the Fourth Gospel – its tendency to be self-referential and repetitious, as well as the importance of speech, especially by Jesus – come together in a device that I will label *direct internal quotation* (or DIQ): the direct quotation of a character's speech act that has previously occurred in the story world, whether by the same character, another character, or by the narrator. Since the majority of the speech in the Fourth Gospel is made by Jesus, he is frequently the character who is re-quoted. In doing so, focus is placed on Jesus' *word* in a *self-referential* and often *repetitious* manner. An example where Jesus quotes himself happens during his last meal and in the discourse that follows:

John 13:16: "Amen, amen I say to you, a slave is not greater than his master…"

John 15:20: "Remember the word that I told you, 'A slave is not greater than his master'."

First we might notice that the characteristically Johannine introduction, "Amen, amen *I say to you*," underlines the words of Jesus as speech acts with authority and gravity.[9] At the second occurrence, though, Jesus does not merely restate the aphorism given earlier in the meal: he specifically draws attention to a previous speech act, i.e. to the fact that he has already said it, before expanding on its message.

At other times Jesus does seem simply to repeat what he has already said, as he does in 7:34 and 8:21 (note the use of "he said again" [εἶπεν πάλιν] in the latter verse), yet in each of these cases other characters immediately quote him in a way that exposes their failure to understand:

John 7:34 (Jesus): "You will seek me and you will not find [me]; and where I am you cannot come."

John 7:36 (the Jews): "What is this word that he said, 'You will seek me and you will not find [me]; and where I am you cannot come'?"[10]

---

[9] Similar constructions appear in the Synoptic Gospels, either with a single amen or with a Greek equivalent (e.g. Luke 9:27, λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς), although John has nearly twice as many such sayings as the nearest Synoptic text (25 cases in John, 13 cases in Mark), and the *double* amen is unique to John.

[10] Adolf Schlatter (*Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt: Ein Kommentar zum vierten Evangelium* [2nd ed.; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1948], 199) argues that the question asked by the Jews, "What is this word he said…?" is a rabbinic form. The only close example he gives, however, *Ab. R. Nat.* 67, is much later than John (8th century), even if asked by disciples of Johanan ben Zakkai.

The Jews do not just quote what Jesus has said, they find a reasonable if incorrect interpretation of his actual words (that he will go and teach among the Greeks, 7:35). When Jesus repeats this statement in a slightly modified form, they will again misunderstand him while quoting his words:

John 8:21 (Jesus): "I am going and you will seek me, and you will die in your sin; where I am going you cannot come."

John 8:22 (the Jews): "He is not going to kill himself, is he? Because he says, 'Where I am going you cannot come'?"

Jesus will later invert this pattern with the same phrase when he first *quotes* what he said to the Jews (13:33, citing 8:21 exactly) before *repeating* it a third time (13:36):[11]

John 13:33: "Children, I am with you still a little while. You will seek me, and just as I said to the Jews, 'Where I am going you cannot come'."

John 13:36: "Where I am going you cannot follow me now, but you will follow later."

In a certain sense, every speech act in the gospel is the quotation of a character by the narrator.[12] Still, there are cases where the narrator reports a single speech act directly multiple times, as happens when Jesus is arrested:

John 18:5–6: He [Jesus] said to them, "I am." Then when he said to them, "I am," they drew back and fell to the ground.

The narrator could comment on Jesus' speech act without re-quoting it in direct speech (as he does in the parentheses); in this case, we would expect something like, "When he said *this*, they drew back." Another option would be to quote Jesus indirectly, but to do so here would distract from the importance of Jesus' particular choice of words. Although his statement can be read as Jesus simply declaring, "I am he" or "It is I," the DIQ highlights the fact that Jesus has invoked the divine ἐγώ εἰμι in a way that "He told them *that he is*…" does not.[13]

---

[11] Note that Jesus *repeats* the question, "Do you love me?" three times as three separate speech acts reported by the narrator (21:15–17), but the narrator *re-quotes* him only once while noting that it is the third time that he said it (21:17).

[12] This has led Savran (*Telling and Retelling*, 20) to eliminate re-quotations by the narrator from his examination of this device in the narrative books of the Hebrew Bible (see below). I have included them because in either case a single speech act is reported multiple times; that both instances are reported by the narrator makes these cases similar to those where a character quotes himself, in which case the character acts as another (sub-)narrator within the story. See also Savran's "The Character as Narrator in Biblical Narrative," *Prooftexts* 5/1 (Special Issue on Storytelling, 1985): 1–17. However, his point that the narrator's second recitation only functions at the level of the discourse and not at the level of the story is well taken (i.e. the gospel's audience can examine and compare both quotations of the statement but none of the characters can).

[13] See Catrin H. Williams, *I Am He: The Interpretation of* 'Anî Hû' *in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (WUNT II.113; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 287–303, and more

However, the examples given so far are among the relatively few cases where the previous speech act is quoted literally, barring abridgments. As in the third case, truly exact quotations are quite short (see also 4:10/4:7). Instead, the statements are almost always modified when re-quoted, whether characters are quoting themselves, being quoted by others, or being quoted by the narrator. Sometimes the changes are quite small: in 8:21, for example, Jesus tells the unbelieving Jews that they will die in their *sin* (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ); in 8:24, he claims that he told them they will die in their *sins* (ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις). The grammatical structure of this second claim, as well as the combination of persons involved, allows us to read it as an indirect quote,[14] but that is not the case later in the chapter when the Jews comment on something Jesus has just said:

John 8:51–52: "Amen, amen, I say to you, if anyone keeps my word, he will never see death." [So] the Jews said to him, "Now we know that you have a demon. Abraham and the prophets died, and you say, 'If anyone keeps my word, he will never taste death'!"

There are grammatical changes accompanying changes in word order which will be examined below, but more importantly the Jews alter the verb from *seeing* death to *tasting* it. They have gotten the gist of what he says, yet they have misunderstood Jesus to be saying that keeping his words will ward off physical death. That they also modify his wording has led some to conclude that there is a connection between misunderstanding and misquotation, as Jerome Neyrey does when he comments: "The crowd's error concerning Jesus' words is courtroom evidence that they do not 'keep my words'."[15]

How the Jews modify Jesus' statement is potentially significant. *That* they do is not necessarily the case. This can be demonstrated negatively and positively within the same discourse. The Jews have misunderstood Jesus on multiple occasions, several of which involve DIQ. As we have seen, the Jews quote Jesus when he tells them that where he is (going) they cannot come (7:36/7:34 and 8:22/8:21 [quoted above]). In neither case do they alter his wording, at least so far as they quote him. Their misunderstanding does not arise from

---

genderally, David M. Ball, *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background, and Theological Implications* (JSNTSup 124; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996). By way of comparison, see Plato, *Rep.* 393e–394a for a consciously indirect retelling of *Iliad* 1.1–50, meant to highlight how Homer's choice to use direct speech allows him to speak as if he were Chryses, i.e. as if Chryses were present again in the performance, just as John's narrator does in close re-quotation.

[14] One may read 8:24 as "Therefore I told you, 'You will die in your sins'," or "Therefore I told you *that* you will die in your sins" (see the NA[28], SBLGNT, and UBS critical editions, as well as the NASB, NET, NIV, NKJV, and NRSV). However, the German HOF gives a direct quotation, as does the French BDS. On distinguishing direct from indirect quotations in the Greek text, see the Appendix.

[15] Jerome H. Neyrey, *The Gospel of John* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 166.

keeping the wrong words but from *providing the wrong interpretation*.[16] In the latter case, however, Jesus 'misquotes' himself soon after (8:24). While interpreters have found significance in Jesus' change from "sin" to "sins,"[17] they have not concluded that Jesus misunderstands himself or that he changes the wording in error. Indeed both Jesus and the narrator, *whose interpretations are authoritative*, 'misquote' far more often than they give verbatim quotations. Therefore inexact quotations are neither necessary nor sufficient to signify error and misunderstanding. This should warn us about putting too much weight on the mere fact of non-literal quotation, but as we will soon see, the inexactness of John's direct internal quotations has drawn a great deal of attention.

This lack of exactness in cases of verifiable DIQ leads to some difficulty in cases where a character is apparently re-quoted as saying something that has never been reported in the narrative.[18] For example, the narrator cites something Jesus has said in formulaic language generally reserved for scriptural citations:

John 18:9: …in order that the word which he spoke might be fulfilled, "I did not lose one of those whom you have given me (οὓς δέδωκάς μοι, οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα)."

The only problem is that Jesus has never used these exact words in John. Three verses have been suggested as possible antecedents for the quotation:

John 6:39: "This is the will of the one who sent me, that *I should not lose from everything that he has given me* (πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ), but I should raise it on the last day."

John 10:28: "And I give (δίδωμι) eternal life to them, and *they will not perish* (οὐμὴ ἀπόλωνται) forever…"

John 17:12: "When I was with them I kept them in your name, which *you have given me* (ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι), and I guarded [them], and *not one of them was lost* (οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο) except the son of perdition, so that scripture may be fulfilled."

---

[16] In light of the previous example, it is tempting to think of *Gos. Thom.*: Whoever finds the interpretation of these words will not taste death.

[17] For example, Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (BNTC 4; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 268: "The shift in terminology to the plural 'sins' (cf. v. 21) may be no more than stylistic but also indicates that the primary sin of unbelief is exhibited in a variety of actions."

[18] For the sake of clarification, it might be best to distinguish narrative from story at this point: "The 'narrative' is the text (the signifier, the discourse, or the 'how') which conveys the 'story' (the signified, the content, or the 'what')" (R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983], 53). In the case of trustworthy characters like Jesus (14:2) or the narrator (18:9), we are confident that something like this has been previously said *in the story world* even if the speech act to which they refer has not appeared *in the narrative*. In the case of untrustworthy characters such as the chief priests (19:21), we may not.

The first statement is structurally the closest (even if shifted into the neuter and third person), while the last case comes the closest in meaning. Yet at no point in John does Jesus literally say what he is quoted as saying – a word that the narrator nonetheless indicates must be fulfilled.

Other cases present similar difficulties, where the quoted phrase is either heavily paraphrased or entirely absent. Sometimes it is easier to accept that the line was spoken outside of the narrative, as is the case with John the Baptist's citation of something God has told him (1:33):

John 1:33: "I also did not know him, but the one who sent me to baptize in water told me, 'The one on whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, this is the one who baptizes in Holy Spirit'."

Since John appears in the story so briefly, a story that the audience enters after these events, scholars tend to accept that the Baptist was told this at *some* earlier point that the author has chosen not to narrate.[19] In other cases, phrases that are 'close enough' or that match in sense but not in wording are sought out, as with Jesus' fulfilled word in John 18:9. Both scribes and translators have struggled with the unverifiable quotation in John 14:2, sometimes doing their utmost to eliminate a self-quotation by Jesus that seemingly has no antecedent.[20]

The possibility remains that Jesus quotes something that the gospel has simply failed to report. In this case, the quotation becomes a sort of completing analepsis, a 'flashback' to an event that has not been narrated.[21] These *unverifiable quotations* can still be considered direct internal quotations, although they are internal to the *story* but not to the *narrative*. Such a phenomenon is not unheard of in the Synoptic Gospels (e.g. Matt 11:18–19 // Luke 7:33–34) and Acts (e.g. 27:24), and common in the Hebrew Bible (e.g. 1 Kings 22:20–22).[22] Going forward, recognition of John's tendency to vary quotations (so

[19] In a fashion similar to his rhetorical question on 6:36 (see above), Euthymius asks when God told this to John. He concludes simply that it must have been as the baptism approached, so that what was revealed to him would soon be demonstrated (PG 129:548 col. 1136). The previous scene's absence in the narrative does not seem to bother him.

[20] There seems to be confusion in the manuscripts over the presence of both the ἄν and the ὅτι that mark the quotation (e.g. for the ὅτι, P^{66} is corrected to include it while C is corrected to eliminate it). For more detail, see the Appendix.

[21] Jerome T. Walsh (*Old Testament Narrative: A Guide to Interpretation* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2009], 58) refers to narrative analepsis simply as "flashback" and prolepsis as "foreshadowing." Although rare, it is possible for DIQ to be proleptic (cf. 1:15/1:30/1:27; 9:19–20 [?]). The message that Jesus gives to Mary Magdalene in 20:17 to give to the disciples can be viewed as a completing prolepsis, where the actual recitation takes place outside of the narrative (cf. 20:18). Although messages are a common source of DIQ in the Hebrew Bible, they are absent in John.

[22] For NT texts, see Table 2. In 1 Kings 22:20–22, the prophet Micaiah condemns the prophets who encourage Jehoshaphat by narrating a dialogue between Yhwh and a lying spirit who takes responsibility for their prophecies. When exactly Micaiah witnessed this

that a statement may be dramatically altered in recitation) will sit alongside the possibility that the narrator reports the quotation but never the original statement.

The commentaries occasionally note John's tendency to re-quote material, or struggle to find precedents for paraphrased quotations.[23] However, the comments often amount to little more than a parenthetical remark. This is quite an oversight since DIQ appears so frequently in John (arguably almost five dozen times; see Table 1), overlapping with other well-noted Johannine devices such as dramatic misunderstandings. More to the point, *John uses DIQ more than twice as often as any other New Testament narrative*, making it not only a *significant* Johannine device, but also a *characteristic* one! This raises some questions: what does John accomplish by returning to such a redundant device, over and over again? How does it contribute to the narrative? Does it tell us anything about how John transmits its traditions, particularly words of Jesus?

Often when DIQ has been examined, it is in studies on the style of the Fourth Gospel. This suggests that DIQ is viewed as a mere stylistic affect (or defect), perhaps one on which John relies too often. Still, we might expect stylistic studies of John to offer some insight into what the Fourth Gospel is doing with its abundance of direct quotations. However, many are simply catalogues of verses with DIQ embedded in discussions of authorial unity, repetition and variation, or John's (lack of) historicity. Nonetheless, a growing appreciation of the function and complexity of DIQ in John (and elsewhere) is apparent in discussions of the device, which merit some brief examination.

2. Previous Works on Direct Internal Quotation

2.1 Direct Internal Quotation in Early Johannine Scholarship

Apart from two superficial and incomplete examinations of DIQ in the context of Johannine repetition given by Johann D. Schulze (1811) and Christian G. Wilke (1843), it is a seemingly offhand comment by Julius Wellhausen that spurred more in-depth study of internal quotation.[24] Wellhausen offers internal

---

scene, as he claims to have (1 Kings 22:19), is unclear since it has not been narrated until Micaiah presents the story here.

[23] In a note on John 6:65, Raymond E. Brown (*The Gospel According to John: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [AB 29–29A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1966], 1:297) remarks that there are places "where Jesus cites his own words quite exactly" (giving 8:24/8:21; 13:33/8:21; 15:20/13:16; and 16:15/16:14 as examples, although later [p. 350] he acknowledges the change from "sin" to "sins" in the first case), while for 6:65 he views it as a composite of 6:37 and 6:44.

[24] See Johann D. Schulze, *Der schriftstellerische Charakter und Werth des Johannes* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1811), and Christian G. Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik,*

quotations as a possible means of differentiating material by the evangelist from that of an editor: "the proof texts all belong to [editorial material], as do Jesus' curious literary returns to words which he has already said earlier."[25] He does not follow up on this claim, which is presented only to support by analogy the argument that all of John's *scriptural* citations derive from the editor.

Yet it proves to be an important comment since three German studies attempt to use internal citations to support the authorial unity of the Fourth Gospel in response to Wellhausen. Erich Stange's *Die Eigenart der johanneischen Produktion* (1915) is a direct, psychological rebuttal to source-critical theories of the Gospel of John. Stange attempts to demonstrate that DIQ appears in material that is labelled both original and editorial, so that aporias cannot be explained away by theories of redaction. Instead they must be explained by appeal to the psychological character of the author. He focuses on repetitions in John in over two dozen categories, several of which involve DIQ (most pointedly "the cumbersome quotation/recapitulation of the statement by the previous speaker" and "self-quotations").[26] At one point John's quotations are attributed to a tendency toward stagnancy coupled with a fondness for dialogue.[27] At other points, they are portrayed as spontaneous eruptions of earlier thoughts brought on not through deliberate (*absichtliche*) associations, but through involuntary (*unwillkürliche*) ones.[28] Non-literal quotations are credited to the author's tendency to cite from memory.[29] Stange does not clarify why so many of the quotations that are (nearly) consecutive in the text are then quoted inaccurately a moment or two later.[30]

Three years later, Teofil Bromboszcz again uses the consistent employment of repetition throughout John to prove its authorial unity.[31] Although he refers to "the repetition of a question or statement in the subsequent response," the

---

ein Seitenstück zur Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms (Dresden Leipzig: Arnold, 1843).

[25] Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Johannis* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1908), 106–7 (my translation). This passage is directly refuted in Erich Stange, *Die Eigenart der johanneischen Produktion* (Dresden: C.L. Ungelenk, 1915), 42 n. 1.

[26] In the original: "die umständliche Rekapitulation der Aussage des Vorredners" and "Selbstzitate" (*Eigenart*, 17).

[27] Stange, *Eigenart*, 28.

[28] Stange, *Eigenart*, 41–43.

[29] Stange, *Eigenart*, 43.

[30] There are arguably 21 quotations within two verses of the original statement, including Jesus quoting others (e.g. 4:17), Jesus quoting himself (e.g. 16:15/16:14), and the narrator re-quoting characters (e.g. 13:11/13:10). Of these only eight are exact (excluding abridgements, which would lower the number further). Even if the author were quoting from memory with not so much as a glance up to check what was written, it would be a poor memory indeed to fail so quickly and, in some cases, so dramatically.

[31] Bromboszcz published the dissertation as *Die Einheit des Johannesevangeliums* in 1927.

analysis amounts to little more than a catalogue of repetitions and variations that include DIQ and examples of self-quotation.[32] Gerhard Hoffmann, in *Das Johannesevangelium als Alterswerk* (1933), builds much more thoroughly and directly on Stange's psychological approach. Whereas Stange used psychological coherency to argue for authorial unity, however, Hoffmann assumes authorial unity to build a psychological profile of the author as a man in his 80s who is showing signs of his age in the text.[33] Sometimes the elderly author forgets the narrative situation he has crafted.[34] The author's mind is especially slow (*langsam*), in part because he gets distracted and returns to earlier thoughts on which he dwells but does not develop in a coherent fashion.[35] In the case of unverifiable or proleptic quotations (e.g. John 1:15), the confused author simply does not realize that he has failed to tell this part of the story yet.[36] Hoffmann's interpretation of the Fourth Gospel virtually requires that we have before us the verbatim dictation of an old man rambling as he tells a long story with little structure or development.[37] This seems an unlikely scenario for the development of a text in the 1st century, one which does not harmonize with Hoffmann's own admission that there are signs of pre-'publication' editing.

Two decades later, Bent Noack returned to the study of DIQ in the context of Johannine style (*Zur johanneischen Tradition* [1954]). In distinction from the previous tendency to study DIQ as a form of repetition, Noack's interest is in John's fondness for direct speech. However, he makes it clear at the outset that he considers DIQ to derive not from theological intent, but from the influence of oral tradition.[38] This leaves Noack's study valuable regarding John's grammatical constructions when introducing direct speech, but the analysis is rather superficial when it comes to why John uses DIQ (it can always be credited to oral tradition) or why variations are introduced (a literal rendering is simply not important to John).[39] In one sense Noack breaks from German concerns, which have used DIQ to argue over the number of authors of John. In another sense, however, although he understands variation more positively

[32] Bromboszcz, *Einheit*, 83–86 (my translation).

[33] The question of authorial unity is addressed by Gerhard Hoffmann, *Das Johannesevangelium als Alterswerk: Eine psychologische Untersuchung* (Neutestamentliche Forschungen 4/1. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1933), 20–25, although he admits that some editing has occurred: post-'publication' editing is evident in the manuscripts (e.g. John 7:53–8:11) but limited by Hoffmann to those cases that have left such evidence; he argues that there is no reason to believe that pre-'publication' editing was not carried out by the author and is therefore still relevant for drawing a psychological profile of the evangelist.

[34] Hoffmann, *Alterswerk*, 91.

[35] Hoffmann, *Alterswerk*, 114–15; this category has the majority of cases of DIQ.

[36] Hoffmann, *Alterswerk*, 134–35.

[37] On this last point, see Hoffman, *Alterswerk*, 134.

[38] Bent Noack, *Zur johanneischen Tradition: Beiträge zur Kritik an der literarischen Analyse des vierten Evangeliums* (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger, 1954), 134.

[39] E.g. Noack, *Tradition*, 143.

Index of Ancient Sources

Old Testament

Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha

Ancient Jewish Writers

New Testament

Early Christian Writings

Greco-Roman Texts

Rabbinic Texts

Index of Modern Authors