Elizabeth W. Mburu

Qumran and the Origins of Johannine Language and Symbolism

Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies

Series

Executive Editor
James H. Charlesworth

This page intentionally left blank

Qumran and the Origins of Johannine Language and Symbolism

Elizabeth W. Mburu

t & t clark

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

An educational endeavor such as this would scarcely be possible without the support of numerous individuals. I would like to acknowledge Dr. Andreas J. Köstenberger for his guidance during my educational journey here at Southeastern, as well as during the writing of this Dissertation. Thank you for your timely advice and the suggestions and recommendations that helped clarify my thinking and improve the end product. Many thanks to Dr. David Beck and Dr. James Charlesworth who took time out of their busy schedules to serve on my committee. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Craig Blomberg and Dr. James VanderKam who provided valuable input in the beginning stages of this project. Many thanks go to Dr. Shawn Madden and Dr. Mark Rooker for their willingness to answer my questions on various aspects of Hebrew syntax, as well as the faculty members under whom I studied during the duration of my program, and who helped to prepare me for this stage of my academic life. Your input in my life is much appreciated. Any errors are entirely my own.

I am indebted to the library staff and assistants, who ensured that not only were resources made available as I needed them, but also kept me updated on new resources. I owe a debt of gratitude to my colleagues at Northwest Baptist Seminary, Tacoma, WA. Thank you for your encouragement and guidance. My deepest thanks go to my family and friends, whose spiritual, emotional, and financial support made this endeavor possible. Most of all, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my husband, Caxton, and our children, Bryan, Michelle and Paul, who continually cheered me on and encouraged me to keep going.

DEDICATION

For Caxton.

All glory belongs to our heavenly Father.

ABSTRACT

This work analyses the linguistic parallels between the Gospel of John and the sectarian Qumran document, the *Rule of the Community* (hereafter referred to as the *Rule*), and investigates the degree of semantic continuity in their respective uses of truth terminology. The major premise is that the *Rule* provides linguistic clues which illuminate our understanding of how the author of the Fourth Gospel used truth terminology and expected it to be understood. A corollary question that is investigated is whether this continuity could be attributed merely to a general shared milieu or whether it stems from a common dependence on a shared tradition, as well as knowledge of the terminology found in the linguistic matrix of the Qumran literature.

The first chapter establishes the notable failure to arrive at a consensus of how truth terminology is used in the history of interpretation of the Gospel of John. The major factors contributing to this lack of consensus are identified and semantic principles arising from the particular problems noted in the history of interpretation of ἀλήθεια expounded on. This is followed by a survey of Qumran and New Testament research that establishes the current position in this field of study and provides a rationale for the comparative approach adopted in this work. Finally, this chapter concludes with a discussion of methodological considerations related to the respective roles of genre, history, literature, and theology, as well as principles that need to be kept in mind when dealing with parallels.

Chapters 2 and 3 consist of an exegetical survey of all the instances of ἀλήθεια in the Gospel and אמת in the *Rule* in their various contexts and linguistic combinations. The purpose of these two chapters is to explore the use of truth terminology as it relates to authorial intent.

Chapter 4 discusses the background behind the Gospel in order to determine the parameters within which possible linguistic influences on the Gospel are to be sought. The second part of this chapter is an investigation of the use of truth terminology in its various combinations in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, as well as current usage of the term in the period between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100, via a selective survey of passages. This establishes whether the general Jewish and early Christian milieu spanning this period reveals a similar use of this terminology, or whether some kind of development is reflected in

John's Gospel and the *Rule*, either in terms of increased use, new combinations or different use.

Chapter 5 evaluates the possible impact of the *Rule* on the Gospel through a comparative analysis, and specific areas of overlap between the two documents that cannot be accounted for by influence from the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint or current use as found in the surveyed Jewish literature and the writings of the New Testament are determined and assessed. The chapter concludes that both John's Gospel and the *Rule* use truth terminology in ways that reflect differences with regard to their respective theologies and referents, but also striking similarities with respect to linguistic combinations and certain uses.

The final chapter concludes that while these similarities may be attributed to a development of the common tradition shared by both the Gospel and the Qumran literature, as well as the influence of ideology, the semantic continuity with the *Rule* makes it likely that the author of the Fourth Gospel was familiar with the mode of thought represented in the linguistic matrix of the Qumran literature and that he followed this in articulating his ideas in certain parts of his Gospel. The work ends with implications that relate to the interpretation of the Gospel of John.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

This page intentionally left blank

1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose and Significance of the Study

The search for the meaning of words is by no means new. The ancient Greeks already speculated about this issue. The example of Plato's *Cratylus,* whose emphasis was to try answer the question of whether meaning was inherently conveyed in a word or was merely a matter of convention (i.e. the relationship between word and object) is cited by numerous authors to illustrate this.[1] Thus, part of the difficulty that arises in trying to answer the question of meaning is that 'meaning' is understood in different ways by different people. To date, no consensus on the definition of the term 'meaning' has been reached. This issue is further complicated by the fact that dictionaries, by their very nature, seem to suggest that meaning is an inherent property of words.[2]

In the history of interpretation of the Gospel of John numerous interpretations have been given for the meaning of the word ἀλήθεια, reflecting a notable failure to arrive at a consensus of how truth terminology should be understood in this Gospel. The purpose of this work is to demonstrate that truth terminology in the Gospel of John has not been adequately explored, and that the parallels which exist between this Gospel and the sectarian Qumran document, the *Rule of the Community* (hereafter referred to as the *Rule*), provide linguistic clues which illuminate our understanding of how the author of the Fourth Gospel used truth terminology and expected it to be understood.[3] The perspective of this work is that word usage is the determinant of meaning. Hence when one speaks of 'word meaning,' this refers to 'meaning in context.'

This work will not attempt to definitively define the nature of the relationship between these two corpora, particularly given the obvious link with biblical and post-biblical traditions for both and the difficulty in establishing an undisputed theory of a relationship between the two. Rather, this work will investigate the degree of semantic continuity in their respective uses of truth terminology. A corollary question that will be investigated is whether any such continuity could

be attributed merely to a general shared religious milieu, a common dependence on a shared tradition, or perhaps to a knowledge of the terminology found in the linguistic matrix of the Qumran literature.

One limitation is that even while the Greco-Roman context constitutes the setting in which the Gospel was penned and the readers situated, its literature will not be surveyed since this is beyond the intended scope. Hence, the works of Jewish writers influenced by Greco-Roman thought and literary conventions, such as Josephus and Philo, will provide the only resource through which any linguistic influence on truth terminology from this environment will be observed. A second limitation is that due to the magnitude of the task, an in-depth contextual study of texts containing this terminology in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, the literature of the Second Temple period, as well as the New Testament writings will not be conducted—a selective survey will have to suffice.

It is hoped that the findings of this work will be of significance to the interpretation of the Gospel of John through providing new data that may help to clarify problematic texts and/or contexts and enhance the understanding of the language and symbolism of this Gospel, particularly as related to its use of truth terminology. In addition, it is hoped that this work will provide concrete linguistic evidence of Johannine dependence on some aspects of Qumranic modes of expression.

Statement of the Problem

In the history of interpretation of the Gospel of John, numerous articles, theses, dissertations, and commentary sections on the topic of truth have been written.[4] These works reveal numerous interpretations for the word ἀλήθεια, reflecting a notable failure to arrive at a consensus of how truth terminology should be understood in this Gospel. The major factors contributing to this include an overemphasis on a particular conceptual background, a misuse of etymology, a failure to recognize the polysemic nature of words, and a general lack of integration of semantic principles in the exegetical process. Hence, while some of the conclusions arrived at reflect a sensitivity to linguistic and semantic concerns, most of the interpretive options offered for the meaning of ἀλήθεια reflect the undue emphasis that interpreters place on certain philosophical and/or theological issues, generally above semantic and linguistic considerations.[5]

The section that follows will therefore lay out semantic principles arising from the particular problems noted in the history of interpretation of ἀλήθεια. Before identifying the particular semantic principles, however, a brief clarification of the relationship between author, text and reader, and their relationship to meaning, is necessary.

Semantic Principles

'Meaning' and How it Relates to Author, Text and Reader

Cotterell and Turner note that meaning must be related to the human communication process. Consequently, there are at least three aspects to meaning: the author's meaning; the receptor's meaning or *perceived* meaning, which both have a subjective element; and sentence meaning or *textual* meaning, which has an objective element.[6] A crucial perspective of this work is that meaning is directly related to authorial intent.[7]

Granted, it is difficult to determine authorial intent with complete accuracy and confidence. Nevertheless, it is this that must guide all interpretation. The statement made by E. D. Hirsch continues to hold true: "a text cannot be *interpreted* from a perspective different from the original author's. Meaning is understood from the perspective that lends existence to meaning. Any other procedure is not interpretation but authorship."[8] Therefore, even while the text is what communicates to a reader via an arrangement of verbal symbols, what it communicates can only be what the author intends since any text is willed by its author.[9] The task of interpretation is to uncover the probable meaning intended by the author as it is communicated in the text that is available to the reader. Naturally, in the case of several authors/redactors, this is a more complex task.[10]

One outcome of this understanding is the determinacy of meaning.[11] In general, contemporary literary theory accepts the indeterminacy of meaning and rejects the notion of a privileged interpretive context. Contrary to this view, this work proposes that meaning is not relative to the encounter of text and reader. As Vanhoozer rightly argues, "[t]exts without authors count neither as historical nor as communicative action. Texts without historical authors are texts without meaning."[12] A significant theological implication, particularly relevant for Gospel studies, arises from this understanding. If one understands the Gospel texts as mediating "a determinate communication concerning the definitive divine self-disclosure," as Watson astutely observes, then "the current emphasis on textual indeterminacy is theologically unacceptable in all its forms, whether it postulates an inherent instability in the texts themselves or hands over to readers responsibility for the construction of meaning. What these texts mediate is not the indeterminacy of the world or the self-image of their readers but the truth of God."[13]

Fowl rightly points out the contextually embedded nature of utterances, as well as the fact that a knowledge and operation of linguistic and social conventions is what leads to successful communication. However, he contends that one cannot argue for textual determinacy, or even a theory of meaning, as speech-act theory proponents claim. His argument is that 'meaning' is itself not uniformly understood and one undermines other interpretive interests by claiming that there is one determinate meaning.[14] He goes on to say that Scripture must be

interpreted in light of the larger ends of the Christian life, namely faithful living and worship as well as a deepening communion with God and others.[15]

While it is true that these ends are important and that interpreters must not lose sight of the fact that Scripture is meant to initiate faith and foster growth, Fowl's proposed approach introduces its own unique set of problems. Even while the meaning of 'meaning' remains elusive, it is nevertheless true that communication remains possible and the biblical authors doubtless expected that their readers would understand their written communication in a particular way. To claim otherwise would be to deny the very possibility of communication and the effectiveness of language as a valid medium of communication. Granted, Fowl himself affirms the possibility of successful communication given contextual factors and shared linguistic and social conventions. However, suggesting that interpreters approach texts with their differing interpretive interests undermines this understanding of communication. If the questions that a modern interpreter asks of the text are meant to answer the questions of his generation, culture or subculture, gender, or even economic group, the answers that one gets will not be those that would have had much relevance for a first-century writer or audience. Rather than attempt to uncover what the text has to say in its own right (assuming that the author had a specific message to communicate), one imposes his or her own questions on the text and allows his or her agenda to determine what the text 'means.'

Gadamer, in discussing language as the medium of hermeneutical experience, begins with the proposition that language is already interpretation. This has serious implications for a theory of authorial intention and determinacy of meaning. Arguing for the fusion of horizons, he states the following:

> Thus the reference to the original reader, like that to the meaning of the author, seems to offer only a very crude historico-hermeneutical criterion which cannot really limit the horizon of a text's meaning. What is fixed in writing has detached itself from the contingency of its origin and its author and made itself free for new relationships. Normative concepts such as the author's meaning or the original reader's understanding represent in fact only an empty space that is filled from time to time in understanding.[16]

Gadamer raises a valid point, and indeed his approach appears to be slightly more nuanced than other radical reader-response approaches. Nevertheless, his approach also undermines the goal of communication in that it eliminates authorial intent and consequently the determinacy of meaning. However, on a positive note, it is a reminder that even as the reader seeks to draw out the probable meaning of the text, his or her role is by no means passive. Every reader comes to a text with his or her own set of presuppositions, whether these are consciously acknowledged or not.

This brings us to a significant point. There is a distinction between the two horizons of 'what it meant' and 'what it means,' between meaning and

significance. Hirsch defines this as follows: "[a]n interpreted text is always taken to represent something, but that something can always be related to something else. Significance is meaning-as-related-to-something-else."[17] The important feature of meaning as distinct from significance is that meaning is the determinate representation of a text for an interpreter. Contrary to Gadamer's proposal, these two horizons should not be fused, as this distinction ensures that textual objectivity is maintained. This means that while the meaning of the text remains consistent, the significance or present relevance for different generations, cultural groups and even individuals does not. Watson argues that this meaning/significance distinction is problematic, particularly in cases where meaning may be inherently and therefore trans-contextually significant.[18] However, his objection is easily countered when one recognizes that even when meaning and significance appear to overlap, it may only be illusory. The contextually relevant meaning of the text from the perspective of the author may actually have the same significance for modern interpreters.

Overview of the General Semantic Approach Adopted

Simply defined, semantics is the branch of linguistics that is concerned with meaning.[19] In an article that surveys the three major technical tools that have emerged in the twentieth century to study language and meaning, namely symbolic logic, structural linguistics and translation theory, Poythress notes the tendency toward reductionism that accompanies all these approaches. Of relevance to this work is his criticism against the omission of reference in the field of structural linguistics as outlined by Saussure. He rightly points out that Saussure's approach ignores the reality that the learning of language by children is largely through associations to real world objects.[20] In addition, as Vanhoozer also points out, it takes one only as far as *langue*.[21] Poythress therefore suggests that these approaches be understood as one dimension in the search for meaning.[22] His caution is well taken. Any attempt to devise a system that works must take into consideration the complex and multidimensional nature of language. Hence, while these methods should be used since they allow us to implement consistent principles and a measure of objectivity, one should not assume that one's system gives access to the totality of meaning.

Taking into consideration the above caution, this work is built on the categories established by Saussure, who was the first to make a distinction between the language system (*la langue*) and the manifestation of that system in the speech of particular individuals (*la parole*).[23] Whereas the predominant attention of the time was given to the psychological shape of language, Saussure identified linguistics with a social institution, proposing that language is socially sanctioned. He argued against the analysis of language on the basis of its developmental history, proposing instead that primary consideration be given to the

observable workings of a language at a specific stage. Consequently, he defined language as a system of arbitrary signs with no direct relationship to their referents. He demonstrated his principles via the analogy of a chess game and the placement of its pieces during the game.[24]

As a result of his work, a major position amongst semanticists today is that words do not carry meaning in themselves, but are arbitrary markers which must be studied with respect to convention and their use in the particular community in which they have developed.[25] Louw and Nida argue as follows:

> The meaning of verbal symbols has traditionally been regarded as some kind of attribute or inherent property belonging to words. In large measure this opinion may be due to such expressions as "the word has this meaning …" or "this word's meaning is …" But meaning is not a possession, it is a set of relations for which a verbal symbol is a sign.[26]

Osborne goes so far as to say, "[i]n itself the word has no single meaning but only meaning potential. It is a symbol waiting for a context, when its meaning will be decided by interaction in a sentence."[27] However, this should not be taken to suggest that a word, because it is conditioned by context, can 'mean' anything. Words only stretch as far as their semantic range allows. As Cotterell and Turner point out, even as they note that sometimes a writing may contain accidental or even deliberate ambiguity, "[t]he context of the utterance usually singles out (and perhaps modulates) the *one* sense, which is intended, from amongst the various senses of which the word is potentially capable."[28]

This brings us to another significant and potentially confusing issue in determining word meanings—the distinction between sense and referent. Cotterell and Turner caution: "[o]ur knowledge of the *referent* of an utterance is usually important, even vital, for understanding the intended *sense* of what is said. But we must not allow this to lead us into a confusion of sense and referent. As a very rough and ready rule, the *referent* is the extra-linguistic entity about which something is asserted, while the *sense* is the linguistic meaning of the assertion itself."[29] The Ogden and Richards triangle, which distinguishes between symbol (the term), sense (the mental response) and referent, represents the basic distinctions that need to be kept in mind when defining words.[30]

At the same time, there are those theories that posit a denotation (or reference) view of meaning. For instance, Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard advocate an approach that takes into account the referential, denotative, connotative and contextual meanings of words.[31] This means that words may convey significance in addition to their specific denotative reference. It is an accurate observation that words, whether spoken or written, bring up associations in one's mind. However, the denotation or reference view of meaning, rather than clarify our understanding of 'meaning,' introduces problems instead. First, equating meaning and denotatum often leads to the unwarranted idea that words inherently possess a certain basic meaning, a stable semantic core.[32] As Silva argues,

this view of meaning is fundamentally unsatisfactory because of the danger of positing a direct relationship between symbol and referent. While this link might be true of technical and semi-technical terms (particularly in the sciences) and terms with fixed theological significance, it is generally not the case with words in ordinary language usage.[33] A second reason why this view is unsatisfactory relates to accuracy of meaning. To state that something is denoted is inaccurate because it cannot have universal applicability.

Consequently, this work disagrees with the denotation or reference view of meaning. However, due to the frequency of usage of words in certain contexts and/or linguistic combinations, one may, while not assuming a basic or universal meaning, speak of an 'unmarked meaning.' This is the most common meaning assigned to a particular word by a particular group of speakers.[34] Note the following observation by Lyons:

> If a lexeme is frequently used in collocation with a restricted set of syntagmatically modifying lexemes or phrases, it may come to encapsulate their sense. This has happened, for example, in the case of 'drive.' Its frequent collocation with 'car' has resulted in the encapsulation of "a/the" car (in sentences like 'Will you drive or shall I?') or "by car" (in 'He's driving up to London'). The verb 'drive' is still used, of course in a variety of other collocations where it has a more general meaning; and it also has a number of other specialized meanings, which encapsulate the sense of other lexemes (e.g., *He drove off* might be said of a golfer striking the ball) and can be explained as having arisen as a result of its frequent collocation with these lexemes.[35]

This statement on syntagmatic lexical relations and their bearing on understanding unmarked meaning, clarifies the position of this work.

Of particular relevance is the use of words in biblical languages as articulated by James Barr. His contributions are represented in his thought-provoking work, *The Semantics of Biblical Languages.* His major argument revolved around two issues. The first was the sharp contrast drawn between Greek and Hebrew mentalities, a contrast that was then used to substantiate linguistic arguments. The second was the notion that certain etymological findings proved the notion of a theological substructure underlying the Bible as a whole.[36] Indeed, his major criticism against writers such as Pederson and Boman was their proposal that the Hebrew mentality was unique, and that this uniqueness encompassed not only linguistic usage, but the theological understanding of Scripture as well. He argued that this understanding led to an illegitimate confusion of theological and linguistic methods, as evidenced particularly in the work of scholars such as Torrance, Herbert, Knight, Rowley, Snaith, and numerous other contributors to Kittel's *Theologisches Worterbuch zum Neuen Testament.*[37] It is generally acknowledged that Barr played a special role in the early development of semantic thought, and that as a result of his work a foundation was laid for a "linguistically oriented approach to biblical lexicography."[38]

Unfortunately, as Silva points out, while some scholars have taken Barr's work into consideration, some have ignored it completely and still others, while

paying lip-service to the principle, have failed to incorporate linguistics in their exegetical work.[39] From the conclusions on truth terminology in the Gospel of John, this is clearly the case. The section following will therefore identify a few semantic principles that should guide one toward a linguistically informed exegetical process.[40]

Linguistic Contextual Priority

The first principle that suggests itself is that context, both linguistic and extra linguistic, must be given priority in the interpretive process.[41] It is clear from the conclusions arrived at in the history of interpretation of the Fourth Gospel that an overemphasis on conceptual background, to the exclusion of context, plays a major role in the determination of the use of ἀλήθεια. In his critique, Barr cogently argued against the possibility of reading the mentality of a people from the structure of language. In refuting the claims of Herbert and Torrance, he stated, "[i]t should be noticed that I am not trying to argue that the Greeks and the Hebrews did not differ in their conceptions of truth, but only (for the present) that neither Greek metaphysics nor Hebrew conceptions of the reality of God are built into the intrinsic semantic function of the word ἀλήθεια."[42] An understanding of his position leads to the conclusion that while the assumed conceptual background is important, it is not the determinant of the meaning of the word ἀλήθεια.

Given how ἀλήθεια has been understood, it can be concluded that one of the problematic issues surrounding the determination of its meaning is precisely what Barr addressed so effectively in his work. The failure to allow linguistic semantics a place in the interpretive process means that an interpreter may feel justified in suggesting that the word reflects either a Greek or a Hebrew usage. This comes from a failure to acknowledge the linguistic context in which the word is found. This misconception undergirded the work of Hoskyns and Davey, hence their proposal that since the Hebrew mind fixed upon God as the standard of truth, the semantic value of the word necessarily reflected this divine aspect. Arguing that theological usage should not be allowed to overshadow the usual meaning, Barr pointed out that, "[i]t is not true that a change of emphasis of this kind between the usual Greek use of ἀλήθεια and its use in the Greek of the Bible is to be traced to the influence of Hebrew *'-m-n.* It would have been different if Hoskyns and Davey had been speaking about certain particular linguistic combinations."[43] However, not only did the linguistic context fail to support their conclusions, they went even further and wrongly concluded that the contrast between the Greek and the Hebrew mind was supported by linguistic phenomena.

In the same vein Thiselton notes that the conclusions arrived at on the one hand by Bultmann, Dodd and others (reality as opposed to falsehood or

appearance), and on the other hand by Kuyper, Barrett, Morris and Brown, which seem to prove either a Hellenistic view of truth, or a connection to the Old Testament and Judaism, appear to suggest "an unduly clear-cut contrast between Heb. and Gk. views of truth" and wrongly assume that these exegetical conclusions must necessarily prove a theory about Johannine affinities of thought.[44] While neither Barr nor Thiselton deny the contrast between the two mindsets, both are of the consensus that this difference should not be used to support one's linguistic arguments.

An important hermeneutical point that arises from the above discussion is that words must be understood in light of the contexts that influenced the author at the time of writing. As has been determined by Saussure, Searle, Austin and others, it is only through sentences and speech-acts, namely as part of a general context, that meaning is conveyed. This general context includes both linguistic as well as extra-linguistic factors.[45] In dealing with the linguistic context, two important factors relate to the choice of words.

Every writer has his own unique style and each language has stylistic preferences that determine word selection, such that "individual style produces variety of expression, cultural norms produce conformity of expression."[46] Thus those involved in the interpretive task must work from the position that context and meaning are intricately bound up in each other. This naturally leads to the understanding that meaning is more than just words.[47]

Louw, noting that semantics crosses word boundaries, rightly argues that in determining meaning, a word cannot be isolated from other words with which it is connected.[48] Consequently, the relationships between words, both at the sentence and at the paragraph level, must be taken into account. Semanticists generally acknowledge that the paragraph, not the word, is the basic unit of semantic analysis. This is because the paragraph is the largest unit of language possessing a single semantic message. The participation of words and sentences is therefore understood within the framework of the larger discourse. Hence, in order to understand the meaning of particular words and sentences, the context of the entire text under study must be determined. It is this larger context that gives guidelines to the specific use of a word.

In terms of systematic analysis, however, the paragraph is too large to handle adequately. Hence, one starts with the colon, which Louw identifies as the basic syntactical unit.[49] Consequently, structural linguistics is built on the understanding of the importance of the function of a word within the larger linguistic unit, the sentence. The linear relationship of a word with surrounding terms in the speech-act is referred to as the syntagmatic relation. The vertical or associative relationship of a word with other words that could replace it, such as synonyms, is referred to as the paradigmatic relation.[50] Paradigmatic relations are useful in helping one determine the parameters for the use of a word.[51] This is particularly significant for technical and semi-technical terms. These linear and

vertical interrelationships, which form aspects of the linguistic context, must be taken into account in determining how any word is used.

Synchronic Priority

In coming to a conclusion about the meaning of ἀλήθεια, the methodology employed by numerous scholars failed to recognize the priority of a synchronic/descriptive approach, as opposed to a diachronic/historical one.[52] Many interpreters emphasized the importance of etymology, while failing to acknowledge current usage of the time. The second principle therefore highlights the priority of synchronic analysis in determining how a word is used.

Based on the assumption that the etymology of a word was the determinant of meaning, diachronic studies that examined the history of a word within the language with the aim of finding the oldest usage, were frequently employed in the past to determine the 'real' or 'true' meaning.[53] It is this practice that led to the rise of the etymological method. Eventually, this assumption that one needed to work from word to meaning gave rise to the fallacy that meaning is found within a word, and that consequently, the only way to derive its meaning was to find its origin, its *Grundbedeutung* or assumed basic meaning.

Today, there are three major approaches to the study of language. The synchronic/descriptive approach focuses on the study of language within particular time frames, not on the developmental changes that take place over time. The diachronic/historical approach studies language with reference to its historical development. The comparative approach studies the interrelationships between languages as well as the variations within the same language.[54] It is Saussure who made the distinction between synchronic and diachronic linguistics, emphasizing that the former should have precedence. Silva documents the statement which captures the distinction between the two: Synchronic linguistics is "the logical and psychological relations that bind together coexisting terms and form a system in the collective mind of speakers; diachronic linguistics, on the other hand, studies those relations, unperceived by the collective mind, that 'bind together successive terms.'"[55] Black notes,

> The ancient Greeks debated whether the meaning of a word is to be found in its nature (φύσις) or whether meaning is a matter of convention and usage (νόμος). The Stoics opted for the former position and through their influence the idea of ἔτυμον ("real meaning") became firmly implanted in linguistic investigation. Like the Stoics, New Testament commentators are often guilty of finding the "real meaning" of a word merely by looking up its etymology, without paying attention to the context in which that word occurs.[56]

Many conclusions regarding the use of ἀλήθεια in the Gospel of John reflect this practice. Rather than use etymology for comparison and background,

many scholars have used it to prove the 'real' meaning of ἀλήθεια. Note the following comment by Jepsen, which demonstrates the view that some scholars have that the fundamental meaning is to be found in all instances of the derivatives of אמן (*aman*). He argues that even though derivatives may have special meanings in any given context, "[w]hen a Hebrew heard the various words derived from the root *'mn*, the basic idea that came to his mind was apparently 'constancy' … Thus in spite of the different ways in which the words derived from *'mn* developed, generally speaking the meaning of the root was retained throughout."[57] Hence, אֱמֶת (truth) has often been understood as reflecting the divine standard, strictly in the sense of faithfulness, thereby emphasizing a relational aspect.

However, to insist that the basic meaning is to be found in every occurrence is to neglect the basic principle that etymology simply provides information about the history of a word. It is not a statement about its meaning. Those who see the fundamental meaning of "firmness" or "constancy" in all the derivatives of אמן, would be wise to heed Barr's warning:

> We must repeat that to be guided by the 'fundamental meaning' of a 'root' in discussing the various extant forms is to neglect the force of word-formation, which creates or may create separate fields of significance for what are independent forms. Even supposing there to be a 'fundamental meaning' throughout the forms from the consonant sequence *'-m-n*, it must be clear that the way in which the 'fundamental meaning' becomes integrated into the actual semantic function of any form of the sequence depends separately on the function of the different forms.[58]

As Barr rightly notes, etymology is not a definitive guide to the semantic value of words in their current usage. Barr is not alone in his conclusion. Silva also notes that the methodology that overemphasizes a word and its derivatives frequently results in an overestimation of the value of etymological studies, the danger of "totality transfer," ignoring differences in the way a word is used, as well as a lack of recognition of its semantically related terms.[59]

At the same time, while a synchronic approach should be given priority, a diachronic approach is crucial in some circumstances. This is particularly so in the translation of ancient documents written in poorly attested languages, as well as in the study of the Old Testament which has such an abundance of *hapax legomena*. Since the Greek of the New Testament is richly attested, etymological methods are not as necessary.[60] However, there are instances where the background of a word may prove useful, particularly in cases where the New Testament writers use the Old Testament or other extra-biblical literature, either through direct quotation or deliberate allusion.[61] Thiselton also points out that another field where etymological considerations are valuable is in lexicography. This is particularly so in cases of homonymy, where two distinct words have the same lexical form.[62]

Understanding the Polysemic Nature of Words

A third principle that arises from the above conclusions is that words are polysemic in nature and this should be taken into consideration in determining specific word usage. In addition to the overemphasis on etymology was the assumption that while a word may be used in a number of ways, it only has one meaning and must be consistently translated by one particular gloss. This is reflected in Swain's criticism of the conclusions arrived at by various scholars.[63] Swain himself concludes that 'reality' constitutes the major use of the term and even where a different sense is meant, 'reality' is still to be regarded as having a secondary meaning.[64] In most cases, one passage (generally John 1:14–18) is used to determine what ἀλήθεια means throughout the Gospel. This not only neglects the understanding that words change meaning over time, but that they also have a range of meaning. The technical term for the multiple senses an individual word can have is polysemy, literally 'multiple meaning.'

The failure to take the polysemic nature of words into consideration results in illegitimate totality transfer. For instance, note the following conclusion by Dodd: "[s]uch then is the characteristic sense of ἀλήθεια in the Fourth Gospel. It means eternal reality as revealed to men—either the reality itself or the revelation of it. It is probable that this pregnant meaning is to be read into the term even in expressions where we might seem to have only the current workaday sense of ἀλήθεια."[65] In his analysis, he suggests that the theological meaning be read into every occurrence of ἀλήθεια. Another aspect of this kind of thinking is represented by Torrance discussed above, who read every translation of the Hebrew אֱמֶת into the Greek ἀλήθεια. This equating of Hebrew and Greek words is probably motivated by the fact that because the Old and the New Testament form one Bible, the two languages can therefore be joined together.[66]

What complicates this discussion is that even with a range of possible meanings, there is generally a meaning that is used most often, as noted previously. This has led linguists to propose that there are at least three levels of word meaning. A word not only has a general, unmarked or central meaning, but a number of secondary or transferred meanings as well, a problem that Hirsch tries to avoid with his term 'implication.'[67] The primary meaning is believed to relate to the thread of meaning that ties together the semantic field of a word.[68] However, even this is debated, since many linguists are in agreement that there is only a peripheral agreement between many associated meanings.[69] The third level of polysemy relates to figurative meanings that derive from metaphorical language.[70] The perspective of this work is that the only way to determine how a word is used is to identify, within its semantic range, which meaning fits best in the context, and which level it relates to—unmarked, less commonly used, figurative or referential use. As Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard observe, the failure to distinguish the particular range of meanings that were in common use at the time a book was written is what leads interpreters astray.[71]

Summary

The general lack of consensus on what 'meaning' is has had an impact on our understanding of biblical languages, and in this particular context, biblical words and their meanings. One aspect of this problem is reflected in the history of interpretation of the Gospel of John, in which one observes a notable failure to arrive at a consensus of how truth terminology is used. As noted above, the major factors contributing to this lack of consensus include an overemphasis on a particular conceptual background, a misuse of etymology, a failure to recognize that words have a range of meaning and a general lack of integration of semantic principles in the exegetical process. Consequently, three principles, based on semantic theory and arising specifically from the particular problems noted in the history of interpretation of this word, were proposed in an effort to offer a more consistent approach. These include 1) Allowing context to have priority. 2) Emphasizing synchronic study, while recognizing that a diachronic study may be valid in some instances and therefore parallels should be used where appropriate. 3) Recognizing the polysemic nature of words. These are to be viewed as complementary to existing methodology. The following section will provide a basic overview of Qumran and New Testament studies which will provide a rationale for the comparative method adopted in this work.

Survey of Qumran and New Testament Research

From numerous studies carried out on the Qumran literature in the last sixty years or so, a number of scholars have concluded that John borrowed ideas, motifs and terminology from the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls.[72] Almost from the very beginning of Scrolls research, there has been an acknowledgement that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was in some way indebted to the sectarian writings from Qumran, however this might be conceived i.e. direct dependence or indirect dependence through a shared milieu. These theories have stemmed from studies that reveal numerous parallels between these two corpora, ranging from parallels in theology to those in symbolism and language.

Various hypotheses of some kind of direct influence from Qumran on John have been proposed by scholars such as K. G. Kuhn, J. H. Charlesworth and J. Ashton.[73] Others such as R. E. Brown and R. Schnackenburg, acknowledge some kind of influence, but propose that it is indirect.[74] On the other side of this debate are scholars such as G. Baumbach and R. Bauckham who see no influence whatsoever from the scrolls.[75]

According to Frey, scholarly discussion on the relationship between the Qumran texts and the New Testament can be divided into four quite different periods.[76] In the first phase, "First Discoveries and Premature Assumptions (1947–ca. 1955)," only the scrolls from cave 1 were available in their edited and

translated form.[77] These were read as the heritage of a Jewish sect and served as a point of comparison with the Hebrew Bible and later rabbinic sources. In this early phase, scholars such as A. Dupont-Sommer and K. G. Kuhn came to the forefront. Dupont-Sommer was the first to see parallels between Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness, and even suggested that Jesus' fate was prefigured in the Teacher's fate.[78] Kuhn suggested that the scrolls directly linked a sectarian type of Gnostic Judaism to Johannine Christianity.[79] However, as Frey notes, while many analogies exist between the Qumran community and Christianity in terms of practice and doctrine, this view of Qumran as the prototype of Christianity cannot be maintained from a study of the Qumran texts.[80]

Some extreme statements were made during this early time. Osborne notes that

> the Church was said to be the Christian equivalent of the Qumran community, the Gospel of John and the Epistle to the Hebrews were declared to be Essenic documents, and many practices (such as baptism) and beliefs (such as pneumatology and eschatology) were thought to be dependent on Qumran.[81]

Other claims include the contention that John the Baptist was an Essene. This was based on, amongst other factors, the geographical context in which he preached, namely the banks of the Jordan in close proximity to where the Essenes lived, as well as his practice of baptizing converts. Barrera notes that in the previous century, H. Graetz had already suggested that John the Baptist was an Essene and that his baptism was only a rite of entry into the Essene movement.[82]

The second phase, "The 'Qumran Fever' and the Discussion of the Material (ca. 1955–ca. 1970)," was one in which all the scrolls from this first cave had been edited and made accessible to numerous scholars, and ten more caves had been discovered. What characterized this phase was that it tended toward sensationalism, with individuals such as John Allegro, the journalist Edmund Wilson, P. Powell Davies and Charles Francis Potter contributing to the fervor of the time. An over identification between Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness led scholars to claim that the Teacher of Righteousness was "a Christ before Christ."[83] However, not all scholars in this era came to such extravagant conclusions. As Carmignac notes, it would be "a distortion of historical reality … to make of him an '*Essene Messiah,*' a '*Christ ante litteram,*' the *model copied by Jesus of Nazareth.* He was a spiritual director; but he was in no way—and he never represented himself as being—'*the Savior of the World.*'"[84] Note also Jeremias' observation that nothing in the text speaks of the Teacher's resurrection or even identifies him with the messiah. His role was to point the community in the right ways and to teach them the laws. His identity as the historical teacher was therefore distinct from that of the eschatological figure expected in the final days.[85] Brown also notes that the Teacher made no claims of divinity, and there is no evidence pointing either to his crucifixion or resurrection.[86] Frey notes that capable scholars in this era included William F. Albright, Millar Burrows, Francois-Marie Braun and Jean Danielou, Oscar Cullman as well as Otto

Betz, Matthew Black, Raymond E. Brown, James H. Charlesworth, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, David Flusser and Heinz Wolfgang Kuhn.[87] Another significant topic that occupied scholars during this time was the dualism in both the sectarian Qumran scrolls as well as the Gospel of John. This was important for Johannine studies because it offered better parallels to John than the Mandaean documents emphasized by Bultmann or the examples in Philo and the *Hermetica* offered by Dodd.[88] Frey observes of this period, "[i]n retrospect, we can see that many of the crucial issues concerning the relations between the Qumran texts and the New Testament could not have been answered sufficiently in that period. The discussion was still limited to the texts from cave 1 and included only a small portion of other Qumran documents."[89]

The next period was one of stagnation (*ca.* 1970–1991), in which publication was slow and no new discoveries surfaced.[90] However, from 1991, things changed dramatically. Frey calls this "A New 'Qumran Springtime.'" Computer-generated reproductions from Ben Zion Wacholder and Martin G. Abegg, the facsimile and microfiche edition of the photographs of the scrolls by Robert H. Eisenman and James M. Robinson, and Emmanuel Tov, as well as the accelerated publication of the series, "Discoveries in the Judean Desert" (DJD), made the scrolls largely accessible not only to the scrolls experts, but to the general public as well. At present, all Qumran texts are available in one form or the other and the DJD series is complete.

Although the fervor that first attended this field has since subsided, and time and further research have clearly shown that many of the initial claims were unduly over-optimistic, there is still much in this area that is being uncovered today that shows how important the findings of Qumran are to understanding the world and language of the New Testament. With the completed publication of the scrolls from Cave 4, many of the conclusions arrived at in previous studies have been challenged. New data from the scrolls is proving to be of invaluable help in shedding new light on various issues. The findings from cave 4 in particular have prompted further research and reevaluation of conclusions arrived at in the earlier phases.[91] Previously unknown pseudepigraphic, calendric and halakhic documents, as well as sapiential and liturgical texts, have forced scholars to rethink previous statements on Qumran and its library, the classification of the texts and their relations with the different traditions of early Judaism and early Christianity, and to begin to study the scrolls from a fresh perspective.[92] While Qumran research was involved with questions related to the relationship of the scrolls with Christianity, and in particular Jesus and messianism in its initial stages, in these later stages, largely due to the higher proportion of Jewish scholars, purity and other legal issues have gained prominence.[93]

Consequently, while the more exaggerated claims are not useful to scholarly New Testament study, it is nevertheless clear that the scrolls allow us access to valuable information that may help us understand the origins of early Christianity and its literature, particularly as it pertains to its relationship to

the Jewish people, religion and literature of the Second Temple Period. The recognition that the library at Qumran represents a vast array of diverse literary genres, traditions and groups within contemporary Judaism, has opened up this field of study to new possibilities. Indeed, an area that is proving extremely fruitful is that of terminological connections that can help to clarify New Testament usage of certain technical terminology.[94] Other texts that are proving useful for shedding light on Jesus and his ministry include 4Q521 (*Messianic Apocalypse*), a text that helps to clarify Jewish messianism of the time by identifying several characteristics expected of the coming messiah. Another is 4Q246 (*Apocryphon of Daniel*), which has interesting parallels with Luke 1:30–35, in particular the titles 'Son of the Most High' and 'Son of God.' 4Q525 (*Beatitudes*) has beatitudes similar to those of Matt 5:1–12 and Luke 6:20–23, showing the common roots in Jewish wisdom tradition.[95] Other areas for further research include the format of Jesus' words and deeds, in particular the recent insights from the legal document 4QMMT in its presentation of *halakhic* argument and Jesus' phraseology in the Sermon on the Mount, as well as discipline procedures in Matthew 18, which can be compared with those of the *Rule* and the *Damascus Document*.[96] In terms of more technical study, striking similarities between the text form of the New Testament quotations and those of Qumran have opened up new areas of research. Some of the issues arising from these discoveries relate to whether the New Testament writers had access to Hebrew texts similar to those known at Qumran, or if the Qumran text form or something similar underlies the Greek translations employed by the New Testament writers.[97]

In light of the above, it is likely that the discussion of the use of truth terminology in the Gospel of John would benefit from a comparative analysis of its various uses in the Qumran literature, in particular the *Rule*.[98] The *Rule,* a document that was extensively used by a Jewish community based in the wilderness at the same time that the Palestinian Jesus movement was on the rise, resembles in many ways the motifs, imagery and language of the Gospel of John. It is therefore best suited for this comparative task. Following is a discussion of the methodological considerations guiding this work. These are to be implemented in conjunction with the semantic principles identified above.

Methodological Considerations

The methodology consists primarily of an inductive study of truth terminology (ἀλήθεια/אֱמֶת/אֲמָנָה) in the different linguistic combinations and contexts in which it occurs within the literary flow of the Gospel of John and the *Rule* respectively. Given its multidimensional nature, it is understood that the text is grounded in a specific historical context, uses diverse literary genres and approaches and in some instances communicates a theological message. Consequently, the genre,

literary, historical, theological and grammatical-syntactical contexts will provide the hermeneutical constraints within which the meaning of the relevant words will be sought.

Genre

Various genre theorists have provided us with a number of metaphors or models with which to describe genre. Longman explains that these metaphors illuminate genre in three ways: "genre explains the possibility of communication in a literary transaction; genres rest upon expectations that arise in readers when they confront a text; and authors can be coerced in composition to conform to genre expectations."[99] The first metaphor, coined by Welleck and Warren, describes genre as an institution similar to the church, university or state.[100] A second metaphor is the legal contract offered up by T. Todorov. An author sets up an agreement with the readers concerning how the text should be read.[101] E. D. Hirsch, who enters genre theory via philosophy, specifically language philosophy, applies Wittgenstein's analogy of the sentence as a game to genre. Just as a sentence is a game, so too is genre, and therefore there are rules by which the author abides and which are based on the reader's expectations.[102] Hence these metaphors prove useful in enabling us to understand not only what genre is, but also how it facilitates interaction between the text, the author and the reader. Texts of the same genre have certain characteristics in common.[103] The implication is that it is therefore possible to speak of a broad genre of many texts with few traits in common, or of a narrow genre of as few as two texts that are identical in many ways.[104]

Authorial intention is conveyed within a specific genre; in order to communicate his message, the author selects the genre that will best do so. As Keener accurately observes, "[t]he kind of 'meaning' one pursues will depend to a great extent on one's goal in interpretation, but the historical goal of recovering how the implied readers of a document in its earliest historical context would have approached the document is inseparable from attempts to reconstruct the work's genre and the strategies of the implied author in that historical context."[105] Hence, literary genre functions as a vital interpretive device in the hermeneutical process. Longman writes,

> … something that is totally unprecedented is incommunicable. In literary terms, a text that bears no similarities of structure, content, or the like with anything previously written cannot be understood by a reader. Not only is genre recognizable in the expectations of the reader, but it also directs authors as they compose the text. It shapes or coerces writers so that their compositions can be grasped and communicated to the reader.[106]

Clearly, it is important to identify genre, because this is what defines how one reads the text, the 'rules of the language game' or the hermeneutical principles

by which one understands it. Hence, genre is a crucial component of the communicative process.[107]

An important point to note about literary genres is that they not only change over time, developing into different forms, but specific characteristics of the same genre often vary significantly in different settings. They are therefore not static or even universal categories.[108] In addition, motifs and vocabulary may be borrowed from one genre and incorporated into another to make a new genre.[109] This yields an important principle. One must focus on the genres and literary conventions of the period relevant to the era of writing.

Literature

With regard to literature, Porter notes that "[a]ny text no matter how artistic or literarily shaped has an inherent historicity in terms of at least the fact that an author wrote it in a particular place or time, using a variety of language of some linguistic community and it was read at least initially by readers in a given historical context who knew or understood the language or at least sufficient to think that they were making sense of it."[110] An analysis of the history of interpretation that focuses on the emphasis on author, text or reader, reveals that an emphasis on the form and features of a literary work was lacking in the past in the area of biblical studies. Until recently, historical criticism had a monopoly on the field of interpretation. The rise of literary criticism led to new insights in hermeneutics. Two major subdisciplines associated with literary criticism are narrative criticism and structuralism.[111]

Narrative criticism constitutes an important tool in analyzing the literary structure of texts, particularly given its emphasis on the whole, as opposed to just the parts of a text.[112] Together with Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard, this author affirms that "[t]o the extent that narrative criticism engages a close reading of the texts with a view to understanding their plots, themes, characterizations, and other features of the 'surface structure' of biblical books as literature, we may enthusiastically welcome the discipline." [113] However, one should guard against an ahistorical perspective, which tends to overshadow the historicity of events and people referred to in the text.[114] Critical for the analysis of texts is an understanding of the interaction of author, reader and text, as well as factors related to the setting, plot, characterization, style and narrative time.

History

It is crucial to remember that the historical elements of a text must be given their proper place in the interpretive task. This extra linguistic context is a crucial factor in determining how a word has been used. Turner points out the following:

> It is engagement between the writer's utterance and the implied presupposition pool that establishes the (determinate, even if sometimes ambiguous) authorial discourse meaning. It is important, then, fully to recognize that—insofar as it seeks to elucidate the elements of the first-century presupposition pool directly evoked by a piece of NT discourse—study of so-called 'behind the text issues' establishes a substantial part of the discourse meaning itself.[115]

This is a significant observation largely because communication is based on certain shared linguistic rules within communities which the interpreter must take into consideration in the hermeneutical process. This perspective emphasizes the socially conditioned nature of language. It mirrors sociolinguistics, a branch of linguistics that concerns itself with the sociological influence on language usage pioneered by Gadamer and Wittgenstein.[116]

The historical-cultural background provides important information that gives the interpreter valuable insight into the world of the author and his original audience.[117] These insights are related to factors such as the perspective of the original communicator which is rarely made explicit in the writing since both the author and his audience lived at the same time and in the same cultural context. In terms of locutions, a failure to take the perspective of the original communicators into account means that while the contemporary interpreter may understand the content, he or she may miss the energy and intended effects.[118] A second factor has to do with mindset. In reading a text, one seeks to understand not just the content but the purpose behind the communication as well as the intended emotional impact.[119] Since language is culturally conditioned, studying the historical-cultural background is the main way of uncovering the original intended impact of a statement.

Related to both perspective and mindset is the worldview of a particular people.[120] Sire defines worldview as

> … a commitment, a fundamental orientation of the heart, that can be expressed as a story or in a set of presuppositions (assumptions which may be true, partially true, or entirely false) which we hold (consciously or subconsciously, consistently or inconstantly) about the basic constitution of reality, and that provides the foundation on which we live and move and have our being.[121]

Worldview has both an individual and a corporate character. Its individual aspect is a reflection of the fact that individuals have beliefs and values that are uniquely theirs, and the corporate reflects the fact that communities hold things in common.[122] Worldview is influenced by, and develops within, a cultural context. One can obtain glimpses of the worldview of a literate people not only through their literature, but also through a study of the historical-cultural context within which this literature arose. Since every individual is situated within a certain cultural context and lives in general conformity to that context, an analysis of the historical-cultural background is a useful tool in uncovering the worldview implicit in any given writing.

A final factor underlying the significance of historical-cultural analysis has less to do with the original audience, and more to do with how the message can be accurately expressed for an audience today. Contextualization recognizes that there are two horizons that constitute the "alternating foci of the perceptive interpreter."[123] In order to bridge the gap between these two horizons, that of the biblical and the modern world, the interpreter must have a grasp of both.

Theology

A third important key to the interpretive process is a correct understanding of the theological emphases of a writing, and how these are expressed within the structural framework of the parts as well as the whole. Osborne comments, "while biblical theology provides a bridge to systematic theology and the contextualization of Scripture, it remains primarily within the sphere of exegetical research because its major goal is to discover the views of the biblical period."[124] Moreover, even as it technically builds upon the results of exegesis, this is in fact a mutually informing task, with each process informing the other until greater precision in meaning and understanding is achieved. Caution must be exercised in this area. One must not allow premature theological conclusions regarding the text to influence how one understands the words used. In other words, meaning must be consistent with the theology expressed through the words of the text but the assumed theology of the specific text, or even entire writing, must not be allowed to dictate the meaning of the words. A holistic approach is advisable. Hence one must consider the theology expressed in a particular section, then the theology of the particular book, followed by the corpus of writings of a particular author, and finally the combined collection of which the book is a part.

Parallels

Finally, in order to avoid 'verbal parallelomania,' there are a number of methodological considerations that need to be kept in mind when dealing with parallels.[125] This is a major fallacy which tends toward the excessive use of questionable verbal parallels in a bid to demonstrate literary dependence and conceptual links.[126] As the brief review of the history of New Testament and Scrolls research shows, this has been a major problem in this field. Pointing out that one must first identify a high degree of semantic overlap, Osborne cautions that "the immediate context is the final arbiter in deciding the proper parallel."[127]

Consequently, whereas parallels at the phenomenological level are easily determined, actual borrowing is not, even given the temporal priority of the scrolls. Hence, similarities at the terminological level will be noted, but not treated as the final determinant of influence. It may be that one corpus has been

influenced indirectly by the other, or that these are merely the expressions that occur when dealing with a common subject matter. Second, it is understood that points of comparison with other Jewish and early Christian literature are likely to be present as well, given their common Jewish background. Hence, admitting similarities with the Qumran literature need not necessarily negate similarities with, or even borrowing from these other sources. Note here the importance of the Old Testament as a source for the thought, theology and terminology of both corpora. One must be cautious not to read a parallel into a situation that clearly reflects a shared tradition. Therefore, one must show: 1) That the term that is paralleled is either not found elsewhere in Jewish writings of the same period, the Hebrew Old Testament, or the early Christian literature, or 2) That it reflects some kind of development from these, either in terms of increased usage, different usage or new combinations. Hence, both synchronic and diachronic analysis of the terms is necessary. Frye suggests that sources of possible influence should be categorized into three levels: 1) General beliefs; 2) Motif similarity (not only are general beliefs similar, but the details of those beliefs are similar); 3) Similarity of specific terminology. For his scheme, actual borrowing can only be considered if influences are established at this last level.[128] Finally, one should not assume the linguistic and theological homogeneity of the scrolls, since not all the literature found at Qumran was originally composed by the Qumran community members themselves and much of the literature shows evidence of redaction.[129]

Content Outline

The following is a summary of the outline followed in this work. Chapter two will be an exegetical survey of all the instances of ἀλήθεια in its various contexts and combinations. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the Fourth Gospel's use of truth terminology as it relates to authorial intent. In dealing with the historical context of the Gospel of John, the two-tiered nature of this document with regard to the original context of Jesus and that of the evangelist will be taken into consideration. In addition, even as debate continues as to whether the Gospel and the Johannine epistles can be viewed as deriving from one author, the epistles are to be considered an invaluable resource for the interpretation of the Gospel. As Bauckham notes, "[i]t is in any case generally recognized that these Johannine writings share characteristic linguistic usages, whether these belong to the 'idiolect' of one author or to the 'sociolect' of a school of Johannine writers. Parallels in the Johannine letters are therefore relevant to establishing the meaning of related passages in the Gospel of John."[130]

In chapter three, an exegetical survey of all the instances of אמת in the *Rule* in its various contexts and combinations will be conducted. The purpose of this chapter is to determine how truth terminology is used in this particular document. It should be noted that while the title *The Rule of the Community*

is generally used to refer to the group of manuscripts designated with the letter "S," the collection itself is varied and represents several literary genres and variants that originated at different times and derived from different sources. Therefore, the manuscript 1QS will be used as a point of reference in this work with the understanding that a standardized text did not exist at Qumran. Cross-references to other literature represented in the Qumran library (both sectarian and non-sectarian) that clarify usage in the *Rule* will be included.

The first part of chapter four will consist of a study of the background behind the Gospel of John. This will determine the parameters within which possible linguistic influences on the Gospel should be sought. The second part of this chapter will be a study of the use of truth terminology in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint via a selective survey of passages. The aim of this section is to investigate the common Old Testament tradition and its possible impact on the use of truth terminology in both corpora.[131] The final section of this chapter will be an investigation of the current usage of the term and its various combinations by way of a selective study of Jewish and early Christian writings between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100. This delimited period, which both predates and includes the time that the Fourth Gospel was written, is short enough to provide the most valid information regarding the use of truth terminology and extensive enough to reveal any major changes in linguistic usage. Due to the difficulty involved in establishing accurate dating of early Christian writings, only the New Testament writings will be surveyed. The aim of this section is to investigate whether the general Jewish and early Christian milieu spanning this period reveals a similar use of this terminology, or whether there is evidence of some kind of development reflected in John's Gospel and the *Rule*, either in terms of increased usage, new combinations or different usage.

Chapter five will organize the findings from the previous chapters into specific categories of usage arising from the study in the earlier chapters. Through a comparative analysis, specific areas of overlap between John's Gospel and the *Rule* that cannot be accounted for by influence from the Old Testament or current usage will be determined and assessed. The aim of this chapter is to attempt to establish the impact of the *Rule* on the use of truth terminology in the Gospel of John, taking into consideration other possible influences.

The concluding chapter will begin with a summary of the findings of the above research. This will provide an entry into a discussion of the implications of the conclusions drawn in the previous chapter for the study of the Gospel of John with regard to its interpretation.

Notes

1. For instance, see J. P. Louw, *Semantics of New Testament Greek* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 1.
2. Indeed, E. A. Nida and J. P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New*

Testament: A Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains (SBL 25; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 3, note that, "[o]ne of the principal reasons for the inadequacy of most dictionaries is the failure to distinguish between the meaning of a word and the various specific contexts in which a word may be used."

3. Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and A. S. Van Der Woude; STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997)*,* 1, points out that the *Rule* is "the foundational document expressing the main characteristics of the teachings and practices of the Qumran Community."

4. For instance, Geerhardus Vos, "'True' and 'Truth' in the Johannine Writings," *BR* 12 (1927):507–20; Caldwell Clifford Douglass, "The Meaning of Truth in the Fourth Gospel" (Th.M. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, 1961); S. Aalen, "'Truth,' A Key Word in St. John's Gospel" (ed. F. L. Cross; *SE* 2; Berlin: Akademie, 1964), 2–24; Prentice Lloyd Elder, "John's Concept of Truth in the Fourth Gospel and Epistles" (Th.D. thesis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966); John R. Barlan, "'Truth' in John's Gospel" (Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1971); Charles Sidney Davis, "The Hebrew root [omen] as background for [alethia] in the Fourth Gospel" (Th.D. thesis, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1971); M. N. Taffesse, "'What is Truth?': Thesis on St. John's Gospel" (MA thesis, Catholic Theological Union, 1980); Daniel P. Kucenski, "The Saving Truth in Saint John's Gospel" (MDiv thesis, Concordia Theological Seminary, 1984); Ignace De La Potterie, "The Truth in Saint John," in *The Interpretation of John* (ed. and trans. John Ashton; Issues in Religion and Theology 9; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 53–66; Dennis R. Lindsay, "'What is Truth?' Ἀλήθεια in the Gospel of John," *RQ* 35 (1993):129–145; David J. Hawkins, "The Johannine Concept of Truth and its Implications," *EQ* 59 (Jan 1987):3–13; Scott R. Swain, "Truth in the Gospel of John" (Th.M. thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1998); Michael David Roberts, "The Idea of Truth as the Revelation of Covenant Faithfulness in the Gospel of John" (Th.D. thesis, University of South Africa, 2003); Andreas J. Köstenberger, "'What is Truth?'" Pilate's Question in its Johannine and Larger Biblical Context," *JETS* 48 (2005):33–62.

5. For a more extensive discussion of this issue, see Elizabeth W. Mburu, The *Rule of the Community* as a Valid Linguistic Resource for Understanding Truth Terminology in the *Gospel of John*: A Semantic Analysis (Ph.D. dissertation, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008), 3–7.

6. Peter Cotterell & Max Turner, *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1989), 39.

7. Utterances can therefore only be rightly interpreted within the framework of the context in which they are given. See Max Turner, "Historical Criticism and Theological Hermeneutics for the New Testament," in *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies & Systematic Theology* (ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 46; Kevin J. Vanhoozer, *Is There a Meaning in this Text?: The Bible, the Reader and the Morality of Literary Knowledge* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998)*,* 210.

8. E. D. Hirsch, *The Aims of Interpretation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 49 (emphasis original).

9. This is what Hirsch refers to as 'verbal meaning.' E. D. Hirsch, *Validity in Interpretation* (London: Yale University Press, 1967), 31, 46.

10. A cautionary note is necessary. One cannot recreate the mental and/or emotional state of the author, or even attempt to relive his experience (the intentional fallacy). However, one can, to a degree, uncover his probable intended message.

11. Watson notes that indeterminacy construes the text "no longer as a communicative action but as an inert object, subject to interpretive criteria imposed on it from without." Criticisms against the determinacy of texts include arguments such as the following: 1) This view derives from ideas of 'objectivity' or 'value-free neutrality' that must now be recognized as untenable, and indeed as ideologically conditioned. 2) Interpretation is necessarily pluralistic and any "claim to present a normative, definitive interpretation would simply express the will-to-power of one interpretive community over all others." 3) This view hinders comprehensiveness or inclusiveness. See Francis Watson, *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 11, 95–96.

12. For an able defense of the position that defends the determinacy of textual meaning, see Vanhoozer, *Meaning,* 234. Other proponents of this view include Steven Knapp and Walter Ben Michaels.

13. Watson, *Text and Truth,* 12.

14. Stephen E. Fowl, "Authorial Intention in the Interpretation of Scripture," in *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies and Systematic Theology* (ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 76–82.

15. Ibid., 86.

16. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (trans. and ed. Garrett Barden and John Cumming; New York: Seabury Press, 1975), 357.

17. Hirsch, *Aims*, 79–80. For an indepth discussion of the distinction between meaning and significance see Hirsch, *Validity,* esp. 209–35, *Aims,* esp. 79–81. Using Edmund Husserl and Emilio Betti as the source of his hermeneutics, he proposes a hermeneutical response to what he calls the 'dogmatic relativism' of theorists such as Fish (reader response theory/experiential meaning of the text). Other proponents of this 'meaning/significance' distinction include A. C. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer and Wittgenstein* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1980), 3–23 and Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics,* 51–52.

18. Watson, *Text and Truth,* 124.

19. Linguistics is itself the science that investigates the internal structure of language, and includes not only speech sounds and meanings, but also the complex grammatical system that relates those sounds and meanings. It employs the empirical methods of the sciences in order to "bring the precision and control of scientific investigation to the study of language" and also interacts with other fields of science such as physiology, psychology, anthropology, and

sociology. Its focal point is, however, the study of language as an end in itself. David Alan Black, *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 5.

20. Other criticisms include the following: 1) Noam Chomsky's transformational grammar which analyses the meaning of sentences based on the sum of the meanings of the kernel sentences from which it is derived, as well as the semantic relations between kernels also tends to reductionism since this approach cannot give a total account of meaning; 2) Nida's work in translation theory, which is based on Chomsky's transformational grammar, also falls under the same criticism. Vern Poythress, "Truth and Fullness of Meaning: Fullness Versus Reductionist Semantics in Biblical Interpretation," *WTJ* 67 (2005): 216–17.

21. Vanhoozer, *Meaning,* 270.

22. Poythress, "Truth and Fullness of Meaning," 211–227.

23. For Saussure*,* according to Reidlinger's notebook, *la langue* (language) is "a set of necessary conventions adopted by the social body so as to permit the usage of the faculty of language among individuals. The faculty of language is a fact distinct from the language but which cannot be exercised without it." On the other hand *la parole* (speech) designates "the act of the individual putting his faculty into practice by means of the social convention which is the language. In speech there is an idea <of> the realization of what is permitted by the social convention." Ferdinand de Saussure, *Deuxième Cours de Linguistique General (1908 –1909) : d'après les Cahiers d' Albert Riedlinger et Charles Patois* (ed. and trans. Eisuke Komatsu and George Wolf; Oxford: Pergamon, 1997), 4, 4a.

24. Ibid.*,* 2–4 (2a–4a). See also Max Turner, "Modern Linguistics and the New Testament," in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation* (ed. Joel B. Green; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 148–53, for a summary of Saussure's principles of linguistics.

25. Nida and Louw, *Lexical Semantics*, 13–16, identify several functions that language performs.

26. Eugene A. Nida, *Exploring Semantic Structures* (Munich: Fink, 1975), 14.

27. Grant R. Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (2d ed.; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006), 94, illustrates this with James 1:2, 12–13 and the definite shift of meaning from trial to temptation evident in the use of *peirasmos.* He concludes, "[m]eaning was not inherent in *peirasmos* but was given to it by its context; without a context the term has only potential meaning."

28. Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics*, 175. Again, Hirsch, *Validity,* 23, cautions, "all meaning communicated by texts is to some extent language-bound, that no textual meaning can transcend the meaning possibilities and the control of the language in which it is expressed."

29. Cotterell and Turner, *Linguistics,* 89.

30. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 95–96; cf. Silva, *Biblical Words* (1983), 103.

31. In this scheme, referential meaning identifies what a word or term refers to, denotative and connotative meanings reflect complementary aspects where the

former represents a specific meaning and the latter conveys the word's emotional overtones, whether negative or positive, and contextual meaning refers to what one understands a word to mean in a specific situation. William W. Klein, Craig L. Blomberg and Robert L. Hubbard Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (rev. ed.; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005)*,* 9, 246.

32. Moises Silva, *Biblical Words and their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 100, points out that complications arise in any discussion of meaning because some items are best understood as denoting extralinguistic entities.

33. Ibid. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 95, agrees with Silva but rightly argues that even as we attempt to distinguish between technical/semi-technical and non-technical terms, there is no absolute or clear-cut distinction. He cites the example of *nomos,* which in some instances may be used in a non-referential or non-technical way, not to refer to law but to legal principles in general. In all cases, therefore, context should have priority.

34. According to Louw, *Semantics,* 34, this is the meaning "which would be readily applied in a minimum context where there is little or nothing to help the receptor in determining the meaning."

35. John Lyons, *Semantics* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 1:266.

36. Contrasts between Greek and Hebrew thought include the contrasts between static and dynamic, abstract and concrete, the contrast in the conception of man, and finally, the contrast between the divisive, distinction-forming, analytic type of Greek thought and the totality type of Hebrew thought. This thought contrast affected the examination of linguistic evidence, and this linguistic evidence was in turn used to support or illustrate the thought contrast. James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Languages* (Glasgow: Oxford, 1961), 10–13.

37. Barr, *Semantics,* 10–13, especially focused on the methodology behind Kittel's *TWNT*, which he evaluated negatively. Criticisms against Barr's findings include a questioning of his philosophical stand, his use of a particular school of semantics, as well as some of his statements regarding biblical interpretation. Documented by Silva, *Biblical Words,* 20.

38. Black, *Linguistics,* 120.

39. Silva, *Biblical Words,* 21.

40. Silva has developed a methodology for lexical study that is thorough in detail. The principles suggested in this section are merely meant to complement such methodology, not replace it. Ibid., 176–177.

41. This section will focus on linguistic context. The extra linguistic context will be handled in a different section.

42. Barr, *Semantics,* 190.

43. Ibid.*,* 125–26, 195–97.

44. In his article, Thiselton, "Truth," 3:882–89, concludes that John uses ἀλήθεια regularly in the sense of reality in contrast to falsehood or mere appearance, but

that this in no way provides evidence of Greek affinities of ideas, or of disregard for the Old Testament tradition.

45. This means that grammatical, literary and historical contexts, and not words in isolation, must be allowed to govern the interpretive process. Anthony C. Thiselton, "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation," in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (ed. I. Howard Marshall; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 78–79.

46. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 97.

47. J. L. Austin pioneered the move away from a focus on words toward sentences, comparing language to a toolbox. He defined three kinds of linguistic acts: locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary. Locution is to be associated with *langue,* whereas illocution and perlocution are to be associated with *parole.* John Searle, like Austin, also proposed that the basic unit of meaning be regarded as the sentence, or the speech-act. However, he went further and argued, much like Wittgenstein before him, that certain socially agreed upon rules must be in effect for communication to take place. Unlike Wittgenstein, however, who proposed that there are numerous ways in which language can be used, he argued that there are only five basic things one does with language: telling people how things are, trying to get them to do things, committing ourselves to doing things, expressing feelings and attitudes, and bringing about changes through our utterances. These may happen concurrently. Vanhoozer, *Meaning,* 209–210 citing J. L. Austin, *How to do Things with Words* (2d ed.; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1975), esp. lectures 8, 9, 10 and John Searle, *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979)*,* 29.

48. Louw, *Semantics,* 67, follows J. C. Nyiri in this assertion.

49. A colon consists of a *nominal element* (or subject) and a *verbal element* (or predicate). In addition, for Louw, meaning begins at the sentence level. At the word level one can only speak of different usages. Ibid.*,* 138.

50. Stephen Ullmann, *The Principles of Semantics* (2d ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957)*,* 108–109, points out that synonymy is of two kinds. There are pure synonyms which he refers to as "coextensive and interchangeable in intellectual and affective value," and pseudo-synonyms or homoionyms which are "coextensive and interchangeable *in some contexts* but not in others," and "coextensive and interchangeable from the cognitive but *not from the emotive and evocatory angle.*" See his discussion on multiple meaning (also known in linguistic circles as polysemy) and semantic pathology from pg. 107–137. Noting that the functional analysis of meaning has frequently been on a binary relation basis (one name and one sense), he argues that language does not work as simply as that. Semantic patterns are usually complicated, reflecting not just one meaning, but multiple meanings. He includes two categories in his discussion: synonymy, which is one sense with several names, and plurivalence, which is one name with several senses. Under this last category he includes shifts in application, polysemy (which he views as the pivot of semantic analysis) and homonymy.

51. Particularly in cases where not just a word, but the concept it represents, is being determined, it is generally accepted that isolation of a word from its synonyms, antonyms and even figurative language connected with it leads to inadequate findings. It is understood that the concept itself may be present even in instances where the word itself is absent. Caird notes that words and concepts only rarely coincide. Most words cover a variety of concepts, and all concepts are expressed by a complex assortment of synonyms and antonyms. G. B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 42.

52. For more on fundamental principles of the scientific study of language as well as its historical dimensions see Moises Silva, *God, Language and Scripture: Reading the Bible in Light of General Linguistics* (Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 4; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990), 41–75.

53. Louw, *Semantics,* 1.

54. Black, *Linguistics*, 5–11.

55. Synchronic linguistics is also referred to as static and diachronic as evolutionary. Silva, *Biblical Words,* 3, citing Ferdinand de Saussure, *Course in General Linguistics* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966), 79–81.

56. Black, *Linguistics*, 122.

57. Jepsen, "*'aman,*" TDOT 1:322.

58. Barr, *Semantics,* 115.

59. Silva, *Biblical Words,* 25–6.

60. There are several approaches in this study of word origins: identifying the component parts of a word, the earliest attested meanings, the pre-historical forms and meanings, or the forms and meanings in the parent language. Ibid*.,* 34.

61. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 167–73, points out that one of the most difficult things to determine in the interpretive task is whether or not a particular text is paralleled in another portion of scripture. Where identical wording or imagery is used, this may not be as difficult, but where allusions are concerned, the task becomes more difficult. However, where it is possible to adduce a clear parallel, a background study should be done as it aids tremendously in the determination of the use of a word.

62. Thiselton, "Semantics," 81.

63. Swain, "Truth," 14, writes, "[f]urthermore it must be noted that these interpreters are not always rigid in their interpretation of 'truth' and may sometimes drift between categories."

64. A minor use of the term is fact as opposed to falsehood. Ibid, 78.

65. C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958), 177.

66. Louw, *Semantics,* 41.

67. Hirsch, *Validity*, 61–62, explains, "[t]o say that a particular meaning is implied by an utterance is not to insist that it is always 'unsaid' or 'secondary,' but only that it is a component within a larger whole. The distinction is between the submeaning of an utterance and the whole array of submeanings that it carries."

68. See John Beekman and John Callow, *Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 94–103.

69. Note Silva's caution: "[t]o speak of the 'basic' or 'proper' meaning of a word invites confusion. We should specify whether we are referring to the word's etymology (in one of its several senses), its most frequent meaning, or that meaning that seems to account (historically or "logically") for the other meanings of the word." Silva, *Biblical Words,* 105.

70. See Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 121–30.

71. An important implication of polysemy is that a particular form of a word can belong to different fields of meaning. Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard, *Biblical Interpretation,* 246.

72. In the Gospels in general, these include the practice of the community of goods, teachings about messiah(s), dualism in the Gospel of John, as well as the career of John the Baptist. For an indepth discussion of some of these parallels, see Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebelle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 205; Raymond Brown, "The Scrolls and the New Testament," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroads, 1991), 3–7; James C. VanderKam*, The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*, 58 min., Biblical Archeological Society, 1999, videocassette; Michael O. Wise, "Dead Sea Scrolls," *DJG*, 145; Joseph A. Fitzmeyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000); James Charlesworth, "A Study in Shared Symbolism and Language" in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 3 vols.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 3:97–152.

73. Karl Georg Kuhn, "Zur Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriftenfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft," *TLZ* 75 (1950):81–86. "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament," *ZTK* 47 (1950):192–211; Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language," 3:132–151, proposes a direct literary dependence and concludes a recent study by enumerating five hypotheses for how this direct influence could have come about; Ashton previously held that the evangelist was an Essene (see John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991, 1993), 205–237), but he has since withdrawn this hypothesis. See the statement in John Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel* (2d. ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 393.

74. Raymond Brown, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroads, 1991), 2, suggests that this influence should be attributed to a type of Judaism of which Qumran is exemplary; Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:131–32. However, as Aune notes, "[t]he notion of 'indirect' dependence, however is a foggy conception which implies only that a diversity of experiences, beliefs, and communities in similar historical and cultural circumstances exhibit similarities of language and thought. The viability of explaining such similarities in genetic terms continues

to prove elusive.**"** David E. Aune, "Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem," in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen* (ed. David E. Aune et. al.; NovTSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 303.

75. Gunther Baumbach, *Qumran und das Johannes-Evangelium*: *eine vergleichende Untersuchung der dualistischen Aussagen der Ordensregel von Qumran und des Johannes-Evangeliums mit Berücksichtigung der spätjüdischen Apokalypsen* (Aufsatze und Vortrage zur Theologie und Religionswissenschaft 6; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958), 51–54, argues that while there are certain contacts in the structure of the dualisms represented in both corpora, these do not constitute direct influence. Richard Bauckham, "The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after their Discovery* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et. al.; Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 105–106, finds no influence or particular historical connection between John and the Qumran literature.

76. For convenience, the terminology and the general flow of thought employed by Frey will be retained in this section. Jorg Frey, "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on New Testament Interpretation: Proposals, Problems, and Further Perspectives," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 3:409–19.

77. The scrolls included the *Great Isaiah Scroll* or *Isaiah Scroll A* (1QI[saa]), the *Rule of the Community* or *Manual of Discipline* (1QS), the *Habakkuk Pesher* (1QPHab), the *Thanksgiving Hymns* or *Hodayot* (1QH[a]), and the *War Scroll* (1QM). Frey, "Impact," 409–10.

78. Andre Dupont-Sommer, *Apercus Preliminaires sur les Manuscripts de la Mer Morte* (L'Orient Ancient Illustre 4; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950), 119–22, based his arguments on the hypothesis by Renan that Christianity was a kind of Essenism that had become successful.

79. Kuhn, "Zur Bedeutung," 81–86; "Die in Palästina,"192–211.

80. Frey, "Impact,"419–24.

81. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 169.

82. Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebelle Barrera, "The Qumran Texts and the New Testament," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 205, astutely notes that the Baptist is not mentioned in the scrolls and his baptism, being a baptism of repentance from sin, is also significantly different from that of the community. See also the discussion in J. Ian H. McDonald, "What Did You Go Out to See? John the Baptist, the Scrolls, and Late Second Temple Judaism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), 55–64.

83. Allegro made connections between the crucifixion of the Teacher of Righteousness and the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. Perhaps his most notorious claim

was the contention that early Christianity was a drug using orgiastic fertility cult under which influence Christians invented Jesus (see *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity Within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East,* 1970. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth*, 1979). Wilson claimed that Jesus had spent his childhood years with the Essenes (see *The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1947–1969*). Potter claimed that not only was Jesus a mere human being, but his ideology was shaped by the Essenes. Davies hypothesized that Essenism and Palestinian Christianity had a common root, and that Jesus' education and subsequent ideology, was Essene. For these examples, see James VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2002), 322; J. Carmignac, *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness* (trans. Katharine Greeleaf Pedley; Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1962), 12–15.

84. Carmignac, *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness,* 131 (emphasis original).

85. Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 285.

86. Brown, "The Scrolls and the New Testament," 2.

87. For an extensive bibliography see Frey, "Impact," 411–16.

88. Brown, "The Scrolls and the New Testament," 3–7.

89. The four general patterns of relating the Qumran library and/or community and the New Testament include: 1) Those that viewed the Qumran community as a "protoptype of early Christianity" (Dupont-Sommer, Wilson). 2) Those that viewed the Qumran texts as reflections of early Christian history (Eisenman, Thiering). 3) Those that find Christian documents within the Qumran library (O'Callaghan, Thiede). 4) Those that find personal links between Essenism and the primitive church (Pixner, Riesner). Frey, "Impact," 415–35.

90. Ibid., 416.

91. Note, however, that some scholars still continued to hold extreme views. For instance, Barbara Thiering, in *Jesus and the Riddle of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1992), proposed that the *pesher* method be employed in order to 'decode' the real meaning and events of the Gospels. According to her, the real meaning of the Gospels is to be found below the surface level. So, for instance, John the Baptist was the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus was the Wicked Priest (also referred to as the 'Man of the Lie'). For this example, see VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 326.

92. For this fresh analysis, Frey notes the theme of messianism by Johannes Zimmerman which is an analysis of the whole material. Frey, "Impact," 416–17.

93. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), xxiii–xxiv.

94. In a recent study, Charlesworth**,** "Shared Symbolism and Language," 132–143, argues that the following thirteen areas in Essene thought and symbolism have clearly influenced the shape of the Fourth Gospel: Cosmic dualism and its *termini technici*; Dualism of flesh and spirit; Predestination; Pneumatology;

Realizing eschatology; Esoteric knowledge; Salvific and eschatological 'living water'; United community; Purity; Messianology and Christology; A Barrier for love; Anonymity; Symbolic language.

95. VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 332–338.

96. Michael O. Wise, "Dead Sea Scrolls: General Introduction," *DNTB* 264," notes, "[r]epeatedly its authors precede their legal positions with the phrases … 'we believe, we say.' The formal identity with Matthew's depiction of Jesus' legal arguments in the Sermon on the Mount ('You have heard … but I say') is patent. Presumably, therefore, Matthew has preserved a common first-century rhetorical structure heretofore unparalleled in early Jewish materials." See also VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 338–40.

97. Early in scrolls research, D. Moody Smith, Jr., "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays* (ed. James M. Efird; Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972), 19–20, noted especially J. de Waard's work in the speeches of Acts.

98. The term 'comparative' is used in the sense of identifying similarities and differences.

99. Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation* (Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 3; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987), 78.

100. Welleck and Warren, *Theory of Literature,* 226.

101. See Longman, *Literary Approaches*, 76.

102. Hirsch, *Validity*, 72, rightly argues that this understanding leads to the conclusion that verbal meaning is genre-bound. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons,* 373–79, uses Wittgenstein's concept of the language game to express this. Each word used in an utterance is not an entity in itself but is part of a larger activity grounded in everyday life. Thus speech-acts have no uniform pattern; hermeneutical rules above all must be flexible enough to allow the syntax to speak for itself, to allow the language to play its own game.

103. These characteristics and factors have been identified by Hurtado as the formal features (e.g. structure, style, motifs, and devices), author's intention, compositional process, setting of author, setting of intended use, and contents. Larry Hurtado, "Genre," *DJD* 277. Welleck and Warren identify external and internal features with the external aspects relating to the overall structural pattern, the form (meter, rhythm, and narration), style, interrelationships, and content, as well as internal factors including the cohesive plot, action, narrative voice, setting and language. Rene Welleck and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature* (3d ed.; New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc., 1956), 219. Obviously there is a lack of consensus on what characteristics constitute genre and this has led to disagreement amongst those in the field in the method of genre identification. Nevertheless, if one seeks to be consistent in identifying the traits that one identifies as necessary, the results yielded ought to be reliable.

104. Within the field of genre criticism, the definition of the term 'genre' is not a settled issue as evidenced by the multiplicity of names given to it, for instance, kind, species, type, mode, form. In addition, discussion continues on other

questions the nature (descriptive or prescriptive, static or dynamic), number, and origin of genre. Frans de Bruyn, "Genre Criticism," *ECLT* 79–84.

105. Keener, *John,* 1:3–4.

106. Longman, *Literary Approaches*, 77.

107. Since the Bible is an anthology of separate works, it contains a mixture of genres, some of them literary and some nonliterary. At the same time, these genres are not mutually exclusive and most texts will include more than one genre–the phenomenon of embedded genre. There are at least four significant uses of an embedded genre: 1) It articulates the material, contains a lesson, or offers a point. 2) It intensifies the meanings already hovering in the air or implicitly present in the surrounding prose and hence is used for emphasis, as a means of focusing the reader on the message of the text. 3) It formulates a conclusion in order to add a point of its own to the prose, in which case it may be for a theological purpose, to convey certain significant truths. 4) Or it may serve a stylistic purpose, as a literary device to create variety and resonance in the material, or even structure and define the surrounding prose. See J. P. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide* (Louisville, KN: Westminster/John Knox, 1999), 178–79. While Fokkelman's analysis of the use of embedded poetry provides a convenient starting point, the uses may be effectively developed to incorporate any type of embedded genre.

108. Hurtado, "Genre," 277. With regard to the dynamic nature of genre, coming up with a scheme that shows the continuity of genres (i.e. generic succession and unity), is a difficult task since it is not always clear if a strict formal continuity exists between given genres. Welleck and Warren, *Theory of Literature,* 236–7.

109. Margaret Davies, *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel* (JSNTSup 63; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), 69.

110. S. E. Porter, "Literary Approaches to the New Testament: From Formalism to Deconstruction and Back," in *Approaches to New Testament Study* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 116.

111. While the latter is no longer popular today, the former continues to be employed to varying degrees. See D. Marguerat and Y. Bourquin, *How to Read Bible Stories: An Introduction to Narrative Criticism* (London: SCM, 1999); *The Literary Guide to the Bible* (ed. Robert Alter and Frank Kermode; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), for an introduction to the discipline of narrative criticism. For an evangelical perspective see Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III, eds., *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993); Leland Ryken, *Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987). Note that much literary criticism today focuses on post-structuralism and deconstruction which tend to relativism.

112. The disjunction between text and history that characterizes most narrative approaches is most clearly exemplified in the significant work by Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974). He proposed that

meaning was a function of the narrative itself. While his caution to return to the world of the text should be taken seriously, his proposed solution introduces new problems given that he ignores the world 'behind the text' in his interpretive approach.

113. Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard, *Biblical Interpretation,* 70.

114. Note Watson's complaints with regard to the eclipse of history by some narrative approaches whose ahistorical approaches tend to abstract narrativity from historiographic intention. Watson, *Text and Truth,* 33–69.

115. Turner, "Historical Criticism," 49–50, also notes that failure to recognize the implied but unarticulated presuppositions that are part of the presupposition pool, as well as bringing in one's own presuppositions is what leads to misunderstanding. While he focuses on the interpretation of letters, his observations apply to all kinds of texts albeit with varying levels of relevance.

116. Gadamer argued that because of specific rules established by each linguistic community, language can only operate effectively within a particular sociological horizon. On his part, Wittgenstein, author of the now famous term 'language game' (*Sprachspiel*) argued that communication was only possible if one understood the 'rules' of the language game, the agreed upon set of linguistic conventions within a particular society. Gadamer, *Truth and Method*; *Philosophical Hermeneutics* (trans. and ed. David E. Linge; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976). Also the later works of Ludwig Wittgenstein, *On Certainty* (ed. G. E. M. Anscombe and G. H. von Wright; trans. Denis Paul and G. E. M. Anscombe; New York: Harper & Row, 1972). A detailed discussion of their theories lies outside the scope of this work but for an overview see Robert Mulholland, "Sociological Criticism," in *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation* (ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 302.

117. While the aim is to uncover the original, intended meaning, one must be careful to avoid placing more emphasis on the background above the message communicated by the text itself.

118. Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard, *Biblical Interpretation,* 229–30.

119. Ibid., 230–31.

120. While an extended discussion of this concept is outside the scope of the current study, it should be noted that a number of definitions have been suggested by various people as to what worldview really is. Most of these tend to explain worldview as something that is outside of an individual. James W. Sire, *Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept* (Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity, 2004), 108.

121. Ibid., 122.

122. Sire refers to this as the private and public dimensions of worldview. "[t]hey are both specific commitments held by individuals and sets of assumptions that characterize a specific community, historical era or entire culture." Ibid., 107.

123. Klein, Blomberg, and Hubbard, *Biblical Interpretation,* 231, 232.

124. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 350.

125. These guidelines are adapted from Aune, "Dualism," 282–84.

126. D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 43–44.

127. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 92.

128. Richard Frye, "Qumran and Iran: The State of Studies," in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (ed. Jacob Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 167–73.

129. Aune, "Dualism," 282–84.

130. Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 371.

131. The Septuagint provides a crucial linguistic link between the two languages—Hebrew and Greek.

2

Truth Terminology in The Gospel of John

Introduction

This chapter provides an exegetical survey of all the instances of ἀλήθεια in its various contexts and combinations. It will begin with a brief discussion of the genre, history and literature of this Gospel. The purpose of this chapter is to explore the Fourth Gospel's use of truth terminology as it relates to authorial intent. Other words in the ἀληθ-word group, as well as the double ἀμήν sayings of Jesus, are beyond the scope of this work and will therefore not be investigated. However, a brief lexical summary with representative examples will be provided. With regard to the flow of thought, the generally linear chronological sequence of this Gospel displays a repetitive pattern that makes it difficult to postulate a structure. John's characteristic repetition, introduction of multiple themes and their development as the book progresses, as well as the use of chiasms and parallel constructions are all features that have been noted by various scholars. Even while numerous theories have been proposed, the structure that seems to best allow the text to speak for itself includes a four-part outline beginning with the Prologue (1:1–18), followed by the Book of Signs (1:19–12:50), then the Book of Glory (13:1–20:31), and ending with the Epilogue (21:1–25).[1] The literary flow of the Gospel will be followed as closely as possible, except in cases where a chiasm exists or a particular understanding crosses over to other sections of the text. A summary organizing the findings into various categories will complete the chapter.

The Fourth Gospel has many facets that contribute toward the difficulty in isolating its overall genre.[2] While it has numerous similarities with Greco-Roman 'lives' or *Bioi,* the 'life' of Jesus has a salvation-historical dimension, set as it is in the broader context of Israel's history. Hence, due to this wider scale, as well as its undisputed theological character, the genre of this Gospel may be understood as a theological biography communicated in the historical narrative style characteristic of the Old Testament, or perhaps even historical narrative with a theological-biographical character.[3] Within this larger genre, one finds embedded genres of various kinds, all playing differing roles within the larger setting of the Gospel.

John uses a number of literary and structural devices to weave his story.[4] However, there are a few that are significant by virtue of the fact that they contribute a great deal to the understanding of this Gospel. Of particular note are his use of editorial comments, misunderstandings, double entendre, irony, symbols, inclusios and chiasms. For John, plot development is structured around both the recognition, and the lack thereof, of Jesus' identity.[5] Hence, as in the other Gospels, the Gospel of John reflects 'conscious plotting,' that is, the deliberate arrangement of material by the author that reflects his understanding and interpretation of the life and ministry of Jesus. It revolves around Jewish feasts, festivals and religious symbols, and their fulfillment in Jesus Christ.[6]

There are a number of contentious issues regarding the background of this Gospel. Due to its limited scope, this work assumes certain conclusions regarding the historical background and composition of the Fourth Gospel, while at the same time conceding that there is by no means a consensus on most of these issues.[7] Following the classic approach initially proposed by Westcott, it is likely that the author was a Jew, of Palestinian origin, an eyewitness, an apostle, St. John, the son of Zebedee.[8] It is also likely that he was known to his readers, and therefore the more common understanding that this Gospel is formally anonymous may not be appropriate.[9] Tradition suggests that he wrote from Ephesus, probably around A.D. 85–95. As Köstenberger cogently argues, it is likely, without downplaying other factors, that the destruction of the temple in A.D. 70 constitutes at least one significant event prompting the writing of this Gospel.[10] The clearly articulated purpose statement indicates that the author has carefully selected certain material pertaining to Jesus, in particular certain signs, and organized them into a cohesive whole in order to convince his readers that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (John 20:30–31).[11] Hence, it seems that his intention is not only to engender faith in Jesus, but also to encourage those already in the faith.

Lexical Survey of Ἀληθ- Word Group

The word ἀλήθεια is relatively rare in the Synoptics but appears 25 times in the Gospel of John, concentrated mainly in chapters 1 to 8, and 14 to 18. It is the Greek rendering of the Hebrew אֱמֶת whose root is אמן.[12] אֱמֶת has been understood to signify: stability, reliability, durability, permanence, faithfulness, or truth.[13] Louw and Nida list ἀλήθεια under the domain 'True, False.' The sub-domains in which these words are classified are as follows: 1) True, False (which not only involves consistency with external facts but also implies positive and negative moral values). 2) Accurate, Inaccurate.[14] With the prepositions ἐν, ἐπί and κατά, it is classified under the domain 'Real, Unreal.'[15]

Whereas the adjectives and the adverb appear to be agreed upon, one of the issues that plagues commentators is the lack of a basic consensus amongst

Johannine scholars regarding the interpretation of ἀλήθεια.[16] The general trend, observed in the previous chapter, is to suggest either a Hebrew meaning, hence focusing on the moral and relational aspect, or a Greek meaning, hence focusing on the intellectual category of reality.

Prologue: 1:1–19

The Word Became Flesh (1:14, 17)

The first two references to ἀλήθεια are found in the prologue (vv. 14, 17; cf. 1 John 1:1–2; 4:2). In order to understand how ἀλήθεια is used in these two occurrences, it is necessary to situate it within its genre, literary structure and the overall purpose of the prologue. While the prologue actually begins John's narrative, it should nevertheless be regarded as an embedded genre since it differs from the narrative style employed in the rest of the Gospel.

Many opinions have been given concerning the genre of the prologue of John. One suggestion has been that the prologue is Hebrew poetry, interspersed with prose comments at various points.[17] Others have suggested that the prologue is poetry that has a Gnostic root.[18] While some promote the idea of poetry, whether Semitic or Greek, others are adamant that the form of these verses cannot be classified in such a manner. Barrett says of these verses, "Greek poetry they certainly are not; and it is doubtful whether they can legitimately be described as a rendering into Greek of Semitic verse."[19] Many scholars have instead proposed that the prologue be regarded as rhythmical or elevated prose, a genre that fits better particularly in light of scholarly disagreements surrounding the arrangement of the material with regard to the couplets, quatrains, strophes, stanzas, as well as the identification of 'interpolations.'

The purpose of the prologue is itself best understood within the framework of its structure. As rhythmical prose, the structure that commends itself and that has received much support in recent scholarly study is the chiastic structure.[20] Admittedly, some of the connections proposed do seem a little strained, added to which this view has to contend with the issue of an agreed upon pivot, a situation that has not been resolved as yet.[21] Nevertheless, this does not disqualify this structure altogether; moreover, recent studies have revealed that the use of chiasms is not uncommon in John.[22] Given that the nature of chiastic structures is that they reveal the focus of the defined text at a glance, the question that needs to be resolved is which verse (or verses) best communicates the purpose of the Gospel. This is a crucial question, particularly in light of the fact that the prologue summarizes many of the themes expounded on in the body of the Gospel itself.

In this regard, the statement in 1:12, ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι ("but as many as received Him, to them He gave

the right to become children of God"), is of crucial importance. This is because it emphasizes the result of belief in Christ.[23] Those who believe in Christ are given the right to become children of God. Ridderbos points out, "[t]he privilege of being children of God is special and exclusive. It is not a natural quality that every human being has as a creature of God; nor is it the inalienable right of Israel as 'his own' (cf. 8:42). It is, rather, the gift that is given only to those who believe in the Word."[24] In this context therefore, ἐξουσίαν does not have a judicial sense but should rather be understood as 'privilege,' 'right' or 'freedom of choice,' or even 'empowerment.'[25] This is contrasted against the previous verse εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθεν, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον ("he came to his own, and those who were his own did not receive him"), which is, according to Duke, "[p]erhaps the most obvious of John's ironic incongruities."[26] This verse therefore points to Jesus as the unique revelation of the Father, the only path to salvation and to abundant life for believers. Given the emphasis on Christology and Soteriology in this Gospel, it is likely that 1:12–13 constitutes the climax of the prologue and therefore best reflects the purpose of the Gospel (cf. 20:30–31).[27]

Consequently, the nature of the contents of the prologue, including its central message, theological import and introduction of themes that receive further elucidation in the main narrative, indicates that this piece of embedded genre has three purposes. 1) It has an emphatic function of focusing the reader on the message of the text that follows in the main body of the narrative. 2) It formulates a conclusion for theological purposes. In this case, even before he steps into the narrative, the reader is made aware of the eternal pre-existent Word made flesh in Jesus, who is the only one who possesses the authority to impart eternal life.[28] 3) It serves as a temporal marker, broadening the perspective of the reader to eternity past. It is therefore within this three-fold purpose, which itself further underscores the larger purpose of the Gospel, that one must understand how truth terminology is used in the prologue.

As noted above, the first occurrence of ἀλήθεια is found in verse 14, in connection with ὁ λόγος, "the word," who appears here for the second time as the defined subject and is later identified with Jesus Christ (v. 18). John begins his Gospel with ἐν ἀρχῇ ("in the beginning"), [29] words that echo the beginning of Genesis, introducing the λόγος in the first verse of his first chapter and immediately alerting his readers to the eternality of his subject.[30]His introduction at this specific juncture is significant: it establishes that the λόγος ushers in a new creation, a new beginning.[31] With the unfolding of the prologue, the narrator allows the readers to share in his omniscience regarding the identity and the mission of the λόγος—the λόγος is God and his mission is to reveal the Father to mankind.

The statement that follows in verse 4, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ("in him was life and the life was the light of men"), clarifies that the λόγος is also referred to in terms of life and light. The coming of the λόγος

into the world is equated with the coming of the light, a fact that is clarified further on in the narrative when Jesus refers to himself as the light of the world (cf. 8:12). This light is further defined in verse 9 as ὁ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, the "true light." Calvin points out that "[t]he Evangelist did not intend to contrast *the true light* with *the false*, but to distinguish Christ from all others, that none might imagine that what is called *light* belongs to him in common with angels or men ... Christ is *the light,* shining from itself and by itself, and enlightening the whole world by its radiance."[32] In addition to this, the affirmation that the λόγος is the true light is an indication that he is the fulfillment of Old Testament hopes and expectations. As the 'true' light, he is the real, genuine or authentic light, but there is also a sense in which the ultimate nature of the light may also be in view.[33] With the following statement, καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν ("and the light shines in the darkness and the darkness did not overcome /comprehend it"), John expresses the superiority of the light over the darkness.[34] It can neither be overcome nor understood by the realm of darkness.[35] As Ashton points out, the dualism expressed in this contrast is a modified dualism because while both light and darkness coexist in the world, the light must at the very least partially dispel the darkness.[36] This imagery of light contrasted with darkness further emphasizes the theme of new creation.[37]

This very same λόγος now becomes the subject of the verse in question, verse 14, Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν ("And the word became flesh and dwelt amongst us"). An analysis of the main verbs used here, namely ἐγένετο, ἐσκήνωσεν and ἐθεασάμεθα, reveals that they progress with increasing emphasis. That is, they record a sequence in which the λόγος first became flesh, then he made his dwelling amongst men, some of whom subsequently witnessed his glory.[38] In this context, the Greek word σκηνόω, commonly translated "to dwell" or "to live," alludes to Israel's wilderness wanderings, where God is seen as dwelling in the Tabernacle. Hence, this verse announces God's dwelling amongst his people once again, but in a more intimate way than before (cf. Exod. 40:34–35).[39] Ridderbos points out, "[t]he newness of this indwelling consists, of course, in the incarnation of the Word. It distinguishes itself from the divine indwelling operative up to that point by its totally different form of proximity—as that of one who permits himself to be seen and to be a member of society (cf. vss. 38, 39), to live among people as one of them."[40] Consequently, this allusive reference to the Tabernacle moves beyond the idea of a temporary residence to a more permanent one.[41] Completing this thought with καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ ("and we beheld his glory"), John alludes to the element of faith that is required in order for one to see the glory of the λόγος.[42]

In the phrase that follows, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, it is likely that πλήρης agrees syntactically with ὁ λόγος.[43] The genitives χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας, "grace and truth," are linked in a coordinate or paratactic relationship by the conjunction καί.[44] Since the head noun πλήρης indicates content, these are genitives of

content. Hence, in terms of syntagmatic relationships, the entire phrase πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας plays a descriptive role in relation to the subject, ὁ λόγος. This syntagmatic relationship is what gives it theological significance. This enfleshed Word, who now takes his place in human society, is therefore understood as being full of grace and truth. Citing examples in which this word pair occurs in the Old Testament, Brueggemann points out that this stylized creedlike formulation forms the basis of much of Israel's reflection upon the character of God.[45]

It is significant that ὁ λόγος, who has previously been identified as eternal and pre-existent, God, life and true light, is now referred to in terms that are reminiscent of Old Testament terminology used to describe God. While Bultmann sees these two terms as forming a hendiadys, such that ἀλήθεια becomes the 'content of the gift,'[46] it is more likely that given the allusion to the Old Testament formula, they should be viewed as separate and referring to different aspects of the λόγος. Hence, ἀλήθεια is a characteristic possessed by ὁ λόγος. Schlatter also points out that this word pair is to be associated with God's act of initiating (expressed in the first term) and sustaining fellowship (expressed in the second term) with Israel.[47] The semantic relationship between the two parts of the colon is therefore qualificational character-characterization.[48]

This same combination is repeated in verse 17 and no other place in the Gospel. Moving on from a description of John the Baptist's testimony, John picks up on the terminology of completeness, stating in verse 16 that it is from this fullness that we have received χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος ("grace instead of grace").[49] Beginning with an explanatory or epexegetical ὅτι, he goes on to clarify what this means in 1:17, ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο ("for the law came through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ").[50] Here ὁ νόμος is contrasted with ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια and the agency through which these come are respectively identified as Moses and Jesus Christ.[51] Köstenberger rightly suggests that the use of ἀλήθεια in verse 17 has an eschatological dimension, namely, "truth in its finality as compared to previous preliminary expressions."[52] He also understands this expression as a hendiadys and his interpretation therefore reads true grace, i.e. final eschatological grace.[53] However, given that this is the same combination as in verse 14, and that the word pair is syntagmatically related to Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (which combination is also related to ὁ λόγος above), it is likely that the two terms are better understood as separate but coordinate.

Betz suggests that ἡ ἀλήθεια and ὁ νόμος (Torah) in this verse should be viewed in contrast to one another, on the basis that ἀλήθεια in John is not bound to the Torah (as it was in certain Jewish groups such as the Qumran community), but to the person of Jesus Christ.[54] While this is accurate, the nature of this contrast needs to be more explicitly defined, particularly given the recurring motif of the presentation of Jesus as a second Moses that has been duly pointed out by commentators. For instance, note the following comment by Davies:

Again as the Law, God's λόγοι, expresses God's will, so Jesus, the λόγος become man, makes God's purpose known (Exod. 20.1; John 17.8). The Prologue describes the λόγος 'tabernacling' among people (1.14 ἐσκήνωσεν) as the Tabernacle of witness (ἡ σκηνὴ του μαρτυρίου) was the place where God met with Moses and made known his honour (Exod. 33.7).[55]

Clearly, the Gospel reflects an undeniable similarity between Moses and Jesus—indeed the text demonstrates that they are both agents of God's revelation. However, even while the biblical record reveals that Moses was a mediator of God's Law, there is an obvious contrast between his mediation and Christ's. One aspect of this contrast therefore lies in the fact that Moses could never be considered equal to Christ because of his inability to dispense God's glory in its 'fullness.'[56] A second aspect of this contrast relates to the inability of the system itself to reveal God fully (cf. v. 18).[57]

At the same time, as Casselli accurately points out, the contrast is not itself antithetical in nature. Following Schnackenburg and Godet, he suggests that the contrast is to be found in the subtle verbal alteration from ἐδόθη to ἐγένετο, which illustrates "the epochal shift taking place in the person of Jesus Christ. The old order, including the centrality of the Torah, is giving way to the new order with a new center who is the incarnation of all Torah promised and expected."[58] In addition, as Carson argues, the contrast is not between Law and grace, which are both regarded as gifts from God. Rather, the contrast is between the two agencies through which these gifts come, and the permanence of one over against the other in light of the fact that the Law itself pointed to Jesus.[59] Keeping the nuances of the contrasts in mind, the semantic relationship between these two cola may be identified as dyadic contrastive. At the same time, there is a sense in which this relationship may be described as concession-contraexpectation.[60] Given the pairing of the two words, it is likely that a reader, and in particular a Jewish reader, would expect to see God as the agent, coming after the expression ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια. However, John chooses to complete his sentence with Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

There are linguistic clues that suggest that the source of this word pair, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια, is the Old Testament. The Hebrew Scriptures and Septuagint are replete with instances in which אֱמֶת/ἀληθινός/ἀλήθεια are found. אֱמֶת ("truth") or some form of the root אמן is joined with חֶסֶד ("grace") twenty-two times in the expression 'grace and truth.' Jepsen raises the issue of whether אֱמֶת in these situations is only a characteristic of חֶסֶד, or whether it stands independent of it. It is likely, as he suggests, that in light of the parallelism of these two words in adjoining half-verses, as well as the plural form of verbs used with these two words in some contexts, they should be understood as two separate attributes of God.[61] אֱמֶת is therefore not subordinated to חֶסֶד in any way, but is a distinct aspect of God's character. Exodus 34:5–7, which is the most extensive statement about the name, i.e. character, of God in the whole Bible, includes in the qualities of God וְרַב־חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת (LXX μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός), which is best

translated as "filled with unfailing love and faithfulness" (NLT).[62] The context is the second giving of the Law to Moses after the first disastrous failure by the people to obey.[63]

While the Gospel does not use this precise terminology, there are a number of indicators that suggest that John is alluding to Exodus 34,[64] particularly given the numerous similarities and clear parallels between Exodus 33–34 and John 1:14–18 as noted by Köstenberger and Lindsay.[65] However, the verse that establishes the linguistic connection is Exodus 34:5–7, which gives a somewhat comprehensive overview of the character of God. Although, the phrase in question, וְרַב־חֶסֶד וֶאֱמֶת, occurs in verse 6, it is not this single phrase itself which gives the passage such importance. It is the context in which it is found. According to Brueggemann, chapter 34 is not only found in a triadic relationship with chapters 32 and 33, but also forms the conclusion of this triad. He states, "[t]ogether they express a great dramatic moment in Israel's life with Yahweh: 32, broken covenant; 33, intercession and the crisis of presence; 34, renewed, restored covenant."[66] This personal encounter of Moses with God is a significant one. Having broken the covenant with the calf incident (ch. 32), the Israelites are sorely in need of God's forgiveness and assurance that his promises to them will still be fulfilled. This reassurance comes in a declaration of God's character—a declaration that is comprised of seven elements, which provide the core vocabulary of the Old Testament for the affirmation of God's awesome graciousness: merciful, gracious, slow to anger, abounding in steadfast love and faithfulness, keeping steadfast love, and forgiving. These have a cumulative impact and hence the whole expression conveys God's commitment to his covenant with Israel. The fact that this declaration is made precisely at the point when Israel is at her worst is significant. As Brueggemann explains, "[i]t is crucial and precisely characteristic of this God that the statement of self-disclosure is given in the moment when God is most deeply offended and Israel is most profoundly in jeopardy."[67] Within this context, it is God's character as faithful that best describes the use of אֱמֶת. It is precisely because he is faithful that he responds to Moses' pleas.

Ἀλήθεια in both occurrences in the prologue has not just one, but a twofold meaning. It should be understood as it is understood in the Old Testament in its traditional connection with grace. Considering the clear allusion to Exodus 34, and not allowing Hebrew theological conceptions to determine its meaning, there is no reason to doubt that in this context it has the sense of 'faithfulness' and 'reliability.' Seeing ἀλήθεια here as an ontological concept as in Greek philosophy, i.e. a life lived genuinely under God versus the pseudo-life in sin as Bultmann suggests, fails to deal with this obvious connection.[68] It is also evident that, considering the context of the prologue within which it is set, it also bears the connotation of ultimate revelation. The prologue, and the Gospel as a whole, point to Jesus as the fulfillment of Old Testament expectations. Consequently,

God's faithfulness is seen in his ultimate revelation of himself through the sending of his son. Hence, ἀλήθεια takes on a deeper significance here. As Vos points out,

> The [fullness] of "truth," which, side by side with "grace," resides in the Only Begotten, must mean far more than the reliability pertaining to his words; similarly the "grace and truth" which, in contrast to the law of Moses, "came (or became) through Jesus Christ," must have a wider and deeper reference, if justice is to be done to the context.[69]

Ladd further notes that it reflects the fact that all of the previous manifestations of God's love and faithfulness were pointing toward God's deed in Christ.[70] This emphasizes the salvation-historical thrust of the prologue and the Gospel as a whole.[71]

Following Schnackenburg, Thiselton acknowledges this sense, but points out that this should be seen in the background, with 'divine reality' being more prominent.[72] Given that the prologue as a whole speaks of the λόγος coming to dwell amongst men, this nuance of 'divine reality' is not unwarranted. Thus John adds a new twist to this very familiar pair of words. It is not surprising that he does so, given that the circumstances themselves are unparalleled anywhere else in history. The incarnation necessarily means that familiar forms must be adapted to reflect the new situation, but adapted in such a manner that the vital connection with the old meaning is not lost.

The Book of Signs: 1:19–12:50

The second section of the Gospel is dominated by Jesus' signs. As the story unfolds, John includes not only Jesus' own affirmation of his messiahship, but also witnesses that support Jesus' claim that include Moses and the Scriptures, the Baptist, the Father, Jesus' works, the Spirit, the disciples, and the evangelist himself. All of this takes place in an environment of growing hostility. As the plot develops, John continually displays the conflict between belief and unbelief in the face of Jesus' signs. The signs that he performs become the evidence that prove his messiahship, authenticating his claims that he is indeed God's true representative, just as is portrayed in the Old Testament in Moses and later prophets.[73] Rising opposition to, and rejection of, Jesus is seen particularly in 5:1–7:52, with a radical confrontation between Jesus and the Jewish authorities occurring in 8:12–10:42. The confrontations are set in the form of interrogations or mini-trial scenes (cf. 5:19–47; 7:14–36; 8:12–58; 10:22–39).[74] In addition to opposition to Jesus, the section from chapters 5 to 10 also reveals that the Jews (the multitude) are in conflict amongst themselves. In the end, not only is the eventual rejection by the Jews portrayed as final, it is clear that they have not understood the Old Testament prophecies concerning the messiah—they continue to hope for a political messiah to deliver them.

Jesus and Nicodemus (3:21)

The first occurrence of ἀλήθεια in this second part of the Gospel is found in 3:21, concluding the section 3:16–21. In this section, which is characterized by its use of contrasts, John offers a commentary on the eschatological significance of the Son's coming.[75] In order to understand what this commentary is about, one must go back to the encounter between Jesus and Nicodemus (2:23–3:15).

Nicodemus is presented in an environment in which many have put their faith in Jesus, largely because of his miraculous signs. Numerous commentators have noted the connection between 2:23–25 and 3:1, some suggesting that the conjunction δέ, which begins 3:1, be understood as indicating that Nicodemus was like those mentioned in 2:23–25, an example of spurious faith ignited by Jesus' signs. Others suggest that the conjunction is adversative and the reader should therefore understand that Nicodemus was different, an example of a true believer.[76] A more likely option is that proposed by Carson. The conversation that is related does not indicate that the signs performed by Jesus had caused Nicodemus to come to faith. As Carson proposes, they were merely a "conversation starter."[77] Indeed, although verse 2 seems to reflect Nicodemus' belief that Jesus is a teacher from God, this confession is inadequate in light of the fact that he does not move beyond this to the proclamation of Jesus as the Son of God, the Promised One.[78] He therefore serves as a foil for the positive responses reflected in the accounts of Jesus' mother and the woman of Samaria, which frame Nicodemus' own encounter with Jesus.[79]

As the conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus progresses, Nicodemus poses three questions, the first implicit and the other two explicit (vv. 2, 4 and 9), which provide a basis for the direction the conversation takes. In light of the picture painted of Nicodemus, his questions and counter-questions are not surprising. It is significant that Nicodemus, although a teacher and obviously an authority on the Law judging from his position as a member of the ruling council (3:1, 10), did not comprehend the nature of the events unfolding during this time. The irony of the situation is captured in Jesus' question in 3:10, σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις; ("are you the teacher of Israel and do not understand these things?").[80] His understanding is that the signs are the key to unlocking the 'heavenly things' and that by comprehending these, he would consequently be able to unveil Jesus' identity, as well as discover the relationship between the revelation Jesus had brought and the kingdom of God (cf. 3:3; 3:5). Jesus, however, wants him to rise to a higher plane of understanding. Beginning all his answers with 'ἀμὴν, ἀμήν,' an utterance that is characteristic of Jesus and that demonstrates his authority, and consequently the authority and reliability of his responses,[81] he introduces a new dynamic—the new birth. This is the recurring theme in verses 1–8; the verses that follow emphasize eternal life.

The conversation begins with the kingdom of God. Jesus tells Nicodemus that one must be γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, "born again," in order to gain entrance into

the kingdom of God. [82] He clarifies this as being born ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος ("of water and the S/spirit").[83] This is a perplexing notion for Nicodemus whose entrance into the kingdom is assured according to Judaism.[84] His bewilderment is obvious as he tries to understand how it is possible for one to be physically reborn. While Nicodemus probably understood Jesus as meaning 'again,' in writing this for later audiences in the Greek language, the ambiguous nature of the word would have been evident.[85] Consequently, ἄνωθεν may be viewed as an adverb of time, in which case it points to recreation of the new life as opposed to a mere repetition of the first birth. Or, it may be understood spatially, as referring to the supernatural aspect of the birth. [86] John's literary style often employs double meanings and misunderstandings that serve to catalyze and move the dialogue forward. [87] In this case, ἄνωθεν carries a double meaning and should therefore be understood both in its temporal and spatial sense. It therefore stresses the spiritual rebirth and assurance of eternal life that take effect when one places their faith in Christ (3:16, 17, 36), as well as the source of this regeneration, namely God.[88] For this rebirth to be effected, the text clarifies that Jesus must first go through crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension (vv. 13–15). Hence, as Carson aptly summarizes, "[t]he Kingdom of God is seen or entered, new birth is experienced, and eternal life begins, through the saving cross-work of Christ, received by faith."[89]

The editorial section (3:16–21), therefore brings together these ideas of the kingdom of God, spiritual rebirth, eternal life, and Jesus as the sole means by which these are made available. The second word in this section is an explanatory, coordinating conjunction γάρ, "for," which signals to the reader that the author's aim is to expound on why God makes this eternal life (as explained to Nicodemus) available, the thought from verse 14. It is because of his love for all mankind. The ἵνα clause that follows therefore indicates the purpose for which the Son came: in order that through belief in him, all might be saved and have access to eternal life. The purpose for the coming of God's Son, the light, into the world is therefore not condemnation, but salvation (vv. 16–17). However, in order to have a share in this salvation, one must believe in God's sent Son. Those who believe are assured of eternal life. However, those who do not believe, who reject the revelation of God, remain in the realm of darkness, and the result is judgment (vv. 19–21).[90] The conflict between belief and unbelief in these verses is captured in a metaphor that pits light against darkness, with light being referred to five times and darkness once. As in 1:15, τὸ σκότος, "darkness," is used metaphorically and indicates not merely the absence of light, but an active presence of malevolence, evil and wickedness that is totally estranged from God.

In spite of the coming of the Light into the world (cf. 1:1–18), people preferred the realm of darkness. The explanation given for this preference, signaled by the explanatory conjunction γάρ, is that their deeds are evil (ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν πονηρὰ τὰ ἔργα). These individuals, described as ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων ("those who practice evil"), hate the light. τὸ φῶς, "the light," used here in direct contrast

to τὸ σκότος, is a metaphor that refers in the first occurrence to Jesus Christ and in the following occurrences to that arena in which God reigns and one's deeds are seen for what they are (v. 19). The ἵνα purpose clause that follows shows that those who hate the light avoid coming into it so that their deeds might not be exposed (ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, v. 20).[91] Ridderbos points out that "[t]hat fact that in the conflict between truth and error, uprightness and deception, reality and illusion one person shuns the light and another is attracted to the light is not just a matter of psychology or of a good or a bad conscience. At its root it is a matter of 'being' of God or not of God, that is, of the devil (8:44; 1 John 2:21)."[92]

Beginning with the conjunction δέ (v. 20), used in this instance in an adversative sense, John contrasts ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων (cf. 1 John 1:6, ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατῶμεν) with the parallel phrase ὁ ποιῶν ἀλήθειαν, "those who practice truth" (cf. 2 John 1:4, περιπατοῦντας ἐν ἀληθείᾳ; 3 John 1:3, σὺ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ περιπατεῖς).[93] The use of these verbs of doing with the substantives is a Semitism that is peculiar to John in the New Testament (cf. Rev 22:15, ποιῶν ψεῦδος). The participle linked with the substantive indicates that ἀλήθεια is something that is done, with the clause signifying not merely an occasional act, but constant practice or manner of life. Hence one's deeds reveal one's spiritual affiliations. The one who lives by ἀλήθεια is not afraid of exposure and identifies himself with the light (cf. 12:36, υἱοι φωτός) and consequently with God. The ἵνα purpose clause that follows reflects that God's role is plainly seen, and that the point of coming to the light is not to brag about one's achievements, but rather to show that these acts have been done in communion with God and in conformity to his will.[94]

There are at least two explicit paradigmatic relationships in this section. The first is expressed with the antonym φαῦλος, which shows that ἀλήθεια in this context is to be understood in its sense as opposed to everything that is worthless, bad, evil and base. The expressed contrast with ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων indicates that ἀλήθεια has a moral aspect to it—it reveals that one is of God through saving faith in his Son, as appropriated through the spiritual rebirth and eternal life that he offers. However, it goes beyond the mere practice of fidelity or even morality (as in Old Testament and Jewish usage) and alludes to the way of Christian revelation.[95] Lindsay observes that "John goes beyond the Old Testament and beyond the pietistic Judaism of his day … Faithful action which endures is necessarily bound to the historical person of Jesus Christ and is especially to be understood in terms of faith in him."[96] It entails living a life of integrity that is opposed to all that is evil and hence consistent with the nature and character of God as revealed in his Son.

The second paradigmatic relationship is expressed metaphorically through the imagery of light and darkness. There is a positive relationship between ὁ ποιῶν ἀλήθειαν and τὸ φῶς. Those who practice truth are not afraid of exposure and consequently come into the light. The semantic relationship between the two parts of the cola, ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν and ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, is logical

reason-result. On the other hand, ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων hate the light (i.e. Christ and the realm in which God reigns) and consequently shy away from it and the exposure it brings, preferring instead the realm of darkness.

Noting that "[t]he repeated and emphatic mention of 'deeds' is due not to the idea that in the end it is works and not faith that is decisive for entry into the kingdom of God; it is based rather on the idea (deeply rooted in the Old Testament and the religion based on it) that the truth is practical, that something must be done, and that what most deeply motivates a person becomes cognizable in his or her deeds," Ridderbos concludes that the phrase, ὁ ποιῶν ἀλήθειαν, refers to "that which is trustworthy, genuine, and nondeceptive."[97] Swain, emphasizing a Christological focus, suggests that this phrase means 'reality' or 'the reality about Jesus as the Sent Son.' He argues, "[i]n light of the previous discussion (cf. especially 6:29) it may be that to 'do the truth' simply means to believe that Jesus is the sent Son. This not only concurs with the themes in the immediate context concerning light coming into the world and the Son being sent, but it is supported by the major purpose of the Gospel to inspire belief."[98] However, in light of the context, it seems unnecessary to divorce the phrase from its usual sense which specifically relates to right action. The Christological emphasis that he rightly sees in this verse should rather be understood as the source from which one's actions flow. Therefore, in this instance, this typically Semitic expression means 'to act faithfully' or 'to act honorably,'[99] with the understanding that this is only possible through belief in Christ. In this context it is not in the abstract but the practical realm, as it is actualized in the daily lives of believers.

From 3:22–36, John proceeds to include John the Baptist's testimony about Jesus, which concludes with a reiteration of the theme of eternal life for those who accept Christ, but judgment in the form of God's wrath on all those who reject him. This leads into the narrative of the woman from Samaria.

Jesus and the Woman of Samaria (4:23, 24)

The story of the woman from Samaria that follows serves to reveal yet another aspect of the author's portrayal of Christ.[100] She serves both as a foil, and like a number of other individuals, as a mirror, reflecting Christ's image in different ways.[101] The setting itself is not uncommon as far as biblical settings go. It is a conventional biblical-type well scene, familiar from stories about Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses. The major characteristics of this scene are the encounter in a foreign land, the expected words or actions of the protagonist and the return of the maiden home to prepare for the man's visit to her home. This concludes with a wedding. All these elements appear in this encounter. However, as Culpepper points out, John treats these conventional elements in a radically unconventional manner.[102]

Jesus initiates the discussion by asking for water. Her response and the explanatory comment that follows in verse 9, οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις ("for Jews have no dealings with Samaritans"), reveals the unexpected nature of the encounter and highlights the significance of the exchange that follows. Intense hostility existed historically between Jews and Samaritans, a hostility that was based on their respective ethnic as well as salvation historical distinctions.[103] For a Jew to ask a Samaritan for a drink was therefore unheard of. For him to ask a Samaritan woman for a drink was just as shocking, for Jewish men did not interact publicly with women.[104]

Ignoring her question, Jesus rather points out that if she knew τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ ("the gift of God") and the identity of the one with whom she spoke, she would have been the one asking for ὕδωρ ζῶν ("living water"; v. 10; cf. 7:38–39).[105] The fact that Jesus qualifies what kind of water he is offering is a signal to the woman that he is no longer talking about the water found at the bottom of the well.[106] There is a direct relationship between τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ and ὕδωρ ζῶν. A number of proposals regarding this relationship have been forwarded. However, if one takes into account the salvation-historical emphasis of this Gospel, it is evident that John is developing his fulfillment theme.[107] Schnackenburg astutely points out the chiastic structure (gift-speaker-living water) that leads to the conclusion that τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ, and ὕδωρ ζῶν point to the same thing, namely the revelation that Jesus brings.[108] Even more importantly, it identifies Jesus Christ as the giver of eternal life. In addition, if this encounter takes place during the feast of Tabernacles, its significance is heightened. Jesus' words symbolize that he is the fulfillment of the water pouring ceremony which constituted part of this feast.[109]

However, this is a signal that she ignores, and as in the case of Nicodemus, this dialogue is impelled forward by misunderstandings coupled with irony, which allows Jesus to expound on the supernatural nature of the water that he provides.[110] As the conversation develops, it is evident that Jesus' purpose is not to bring her to a deeper understanding of her sinfulness, but rather to bring her to a deeper awareness of his identity.[111] Indeed, part of Jesus' response earlier in verse 10 reads Εἰ ᾔδεις … τίς ἐστιν ὁ λέγων σοι ("If you knew … who it is who says to you"). However, even when the climax of this story is reached through the unveiling of Jesus' identity as messiah with the statement ἐγώ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι ("I who speak to you am He"),[112] it becomes clear that she still has not made the connection since she does not recognize that he is, in fact, the one who is the fulfillment of her expectations.[113]

It is therefore not surprising when Jesus moves the conversation to the topic of true worship, and even more specifically, to the locus of worship. Speaking of a time when worship would no longer be centered on Mt. Gerizim or the Temple in Jerusalem,[114] Jesus tells her that the Samaritans worship what they do not know (ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε), implicitly contrasting this with Jewish worship which is based on knowledge regarding their object of worship (ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν

ὃ οἴδαμεν). This does not, however, imply that he believes that God is utterly unknowable in their perspective or that they worship what they do not believe, hence displaying an insincerity in worship. He is rather saying that God, the object of their worship, is unknown to them since they stand outside the stream of God's revelation. Consequently, what they worship cannot be characterized by truth and knowledge. The causal clause that follows in verse 22, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν ("for salvation is from the Jews"), establishes that this distinction exists because of the crucial role of the Jewish race in God's plan of redemption, a fact of which the Samaritans seemed ignorant.

Jesus' next statement in verse 21, ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ("but a time is coming and now is"), is representative of the already-not yet eschatology prominent in Johannine theology.[115] With this contrastive statement, Jesus begins to reveal that true worship would no longer be confined only to the Jewish race. He completes his thought with ὅτε οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταὶ προσκυνήσουσιν τῷ πατρὶ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ ("when the true worshippers shall worship the father in spirit and truth"; v. 23). In this particular context, ὥρα constitutes an eschatological marker that pertains to the end times inaugurated or realized by Jesus' coming.[116] This statement is therefore an indication that this period of worship is now present in him, the true temple, and that ethnic barriers are no longer valid.[117] Even more significantly, this new form of worship is based on "a relationship with a person rather than worship based on a relationship with a place."[118] Clarifying that God seeks such people to worship him, he continues with the words πνεῦμα ὁ θεός (God is spirit; v. 24), which establish God's nature, and a repetition of the main idea found in verse 23, τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν ("those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth").[119]

In both instances, ἀλήθεια is found in close relationship with the substantive πνεῦμα and is also the object of the preposition ἐν. The phrase ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ ("in spirit and truth") presents us with at least two syntactical difficulties that relate to the functions of ἐν and καί. The former is complicated by the fact that the one preposition governs the two nouns. Ridderbos suggests that these two words form a hendiadys; they therefore refer to the new mode of fellowship mediated by the Spirit of God himself.[120] Contra Ridderbos, Carson rightly suggests that even though the one preposition governs the two nouns, which on the surface seems to suggest that they should not be viewed as separable, they nonetheless constitute two separate aspects of worship.[121] A likely explanation (albeit with some nuancing) that explains the use of both is related to the use of καί. Rather than having a coordinating function, καί may be epexegetical with the translation being "in spirit, that is, in truth."[122] This understanding of the dative prepositional phrase avoids collapsing the two categories into one, and also reflects the close syntactical relationship between the two nouns.

However, this conclusion is affected by a corollary issue. What is the referent of πνεῦμα? The context indicates that the conversation has been pointing to the

'how' of worship. In this case, the human spirit is more in view.[123] Together with the understanding above that καί reflects an epexegetical use, the phrase reflects worship that engages one's spirit as opposed to merely being in the right place, going through the right motions and displaying the right attitude. The semantic relationship in this case is qualificational character-manner. Whitacre points out that on one level, worshipping in truth may point to genuineness in worship, without hypocrisy and with integrity.[124] While this may be true, given the nature of the conversation thus far, a deeper meaning is probably intended, one that incorporates the new reality Jesus offers, founded on the character of God and the identity of Christ.[125]

However, the 'where' of worship also appears to be an issue. The ambiguity in the use of πνεῦμα, which makes it difficult to determine whether 'Spirit' or 'spirit' is in mind as both may appropriately fit the context, makes it almost certain that John intends to address both the manner as well as the locus or sphere of worship. In this case, 'Spirit' is more in view, and therefore the dative prepositional phrase functions adverbially in relation to the verb προσκυνέω to define the sphere of worship. Hence, the prepositional phrase is understood not merely in terms of manner but also sphere. Proposing that πνεῦμα in this context refers to the Holy Spirit, Ridderbos, concludes that, "[t]he combination … suggests that worship is no longer mediated by all sorts of provisional and symbolic forms, but by the Spirit of God himself. True worship is not limited to a certain locale and is not to be associated with the supersensuous and elevated above the visible temporal world or any cultic form."[126] This statement is therefore an indication that the locus of worship has changed in light of the fact that Christ points to himself as the source of eternal life. Köstenberger properly views ἀλήθεια in this phrase as pointing to that sphere or realm in which God is rightly worshipped.[127]Moreover, since God is spirit, he cannot be confined to any one particular place—neither the Temple in Jerusalem, nor Mt. Gerizim. Therefore, in addition to being qualificational character-manner, another semantic relationship is evident. It also conveys a qualificational setting-place relationship.

This phrase therefore emphatically affirms that temple worship, both in Jerusalem and Samaria, is to be displaced by worship inspired by the Spirit. Additional evidence toward this conclusion lies in the structure of this verse. Lee points out that a chiastic relationship exists between πνεῦμα ὁ θεός and ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ which seems to indicate that John is pointing to both the Holy Spirit as well as an interior attitude in the worshipper. She rightly suggests that "John's primary meaning is that true worship has at its centre the divine Spirit, the one who is the Spirit of Truth—although unquestionably this has implications for the spirit in which the worshipper approaches the Father."[128] True worshippers are therefore not those who worship on Mt. Gerizim, or in Jerusalem, or even those of a particular ethnicity, but those who worship God out of the fullness of the supernatural life they now experience, whose basis is God's revelation to man, Jesus Christ himself. However, taking into consideration the two-tiered nature of

the Gospel, it is evident that this understanding of worship being mediated by the Holy Spirit would only be apparent in the context of the readers, and not the original context of the conversation as it unfolded.

Ἀλήθεια in this case therefore refers to both the attitudes that characterize one's approach to the worship of God and the sphere within which this worship occurs, both of which are grounded in one's knowledge of the ultimate revelation that has come in Jesus Christ, who now replaces the temple as the new locus of worship. This new worship is therefore not related to ethnicity or even geographical boundaries. Indeed, it is no accident that John deliberately places the cleansing of the temple at the very beginning of the Gospel (2:12–22). Both the time of the cleansing (Passover) and the event itself are significant. John interprets this as representing the Messiah's lordship over the temple, which will be destroyed and replaced by all that is represented in Jesus' resurrection (2:19–20).[129] Given Jesus' probable intention to point out to the Samaritan woman both the 'how' and the 'where' of worship, this category should be viewed as complementary to Collins' analysis of ἀλήθεια as 'reality' or 'genuineness.'

Witnesses to Jesus (5:33)

After these early episodes, John continues to develop his plot through the repetition of the conflict between belief and unbelief, the choice to respond in faith or to reject the offer of salvation. In the midst of all this, Jesus continues to perform his miraculous signs, but despite this demonstration, there is a growing hostility from the Jewish authorities, and this becomes more explicit with each successive chapter. Numerous commentators have noted that in John's Gospel the term οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι carries negative overtones. While this is generally true, it is not always the case, as seen in 2:6 and 5:1 where it is neutral and in 4:22 where it is positive (salvation is from the Jews). However, in the section that follows, the negative element is obvious. And, while John generally uses this term not as an ethnic designation, but to characterize those hostile to Jesus, it also serves to characterize the response of unbelief toward, and rejection of, Jesus' revelation.[130]

The setting of Jesus' speech recorded in 5:31–47, in which the word ἀλήθεια occurs (v. 33), is 'a feast of the Jews' in Jerusalem.[131] While Morris proposes that the description of this feast as being 'of the Jews,' is for the benefit of Gentile readers, it is more probable, as Ridderbos suggests, that the author makes this clarification as a way of bridging the temporal and material gap between the situation described here and the church of John's time.[132] Looking back to 5:1–14, the reader notes that John records the catalyst that prompted this speech from Jesus. The incident is the healing of an invalid at the pool of Bethesda. What provokes the hostile Jewish response to this incident is the fact that Jesus heals this man on the Sabbath. John writes in verse 16, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ... ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ ("and for this reason ... because he was

doing these things on the Sabbath"), with both διά and ὅτι being understood in a causal sense. The Sabbath was an extremely important day in Judaism and was to be observed as a holy day (Exod 20:8–10; cf. 31:12–18; 35:1–3; Deut 5:12–15). There were many rules and regulations governing what one could or could not do on this special day and anyone who desecrated this day would be cut off (cf. Exod 31:15).[133]

Jesus' justification for breaking the Sabbath (which is based on the fact that his Father is still at work; cf. 5:17) merely serves to aggravate the Jews even more. Even worse than working on the Sabbath, they felt that Jesus sought to make himself equal to God by claiming a Father-son relationship.[134] The verses that follow are Jesus' testimony regarding himself, justifying that whatever authority he has to do the things he does is based on his relationship with his father, his sender (vv. 19–30). In actual fact, since he accurately represents the Father and does all he does in obedience to his Father's wishes, his witness should be understood as the witness of the Father.[135]

The notion of testimony was very crucial in Jewish society and the section that follows Jesus' own testimony of himself, the larger section of 5:31–47, is replete with a cataloguing of witnesses.[136] Jewish law preferred external testimony, recognizing it as more valid than personal testimony (cf. v. 31). In actual fact, self-witness was regarded as invalid in both Jewish and Hellenistic legal proceedings. However, the invalidity of personal testimony was more significant in Jewish law, where legal procedure was based on an examination of the witnesses rather than the accused.[137] Therefore, to validate his testimony, Jesus calls up several witnesses, in language that reflects that of the courtroom, to testify in his favor. This makes it clear that in this context at least, John is using the term μαρτυρέω ("to bear witness," "to testify") in a judicial sense.[138] In his list he includes John the Baptist, his own works, the Father, the scriptures, and Moses. The testimony that comes from these witnesses is not only an affirmation of the messiahship of Jesus, but serves also to present a contrast to the Baptist's witness, being of a weightier, more authoritative nature.[139]

When Jesus says in verse 33, ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ("You have sent to John and he has borne witness to the truth"), in connection to the Baptist's testimony concerning ἡ ἀλήθεια, he is referring to an incident where Jews of Jerusalem had sent priests and Levites to question the Baptist (cf. 1:19). In spite of the fact that the Baptist's witness regarding Jesus had already been rejected, Jesus still points to him as a key witness, perhaps with the intention of giving them another chance.[140] Hence, Jesus mentions the Baptist's witness, not for his own benefit, but for that of his hearers.[141]

Ἀλήθεια in this context is linked to the verb μαρτυρέω in the clause καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. The dative substantive, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, functions as a dative of reference or respect in relation to the verb μαρτυρέω. The semantic relationship is qualificational substance-content. Hence ἀλήθεια is something that is verbalized with reference to the legitimacy or validity of a statement or

an action. In this context, it points to claims concerning Jesus. Given the legal context in which this monologue occurs, in saying that John verifies that Jesus is who he claims to be, the word ἀλήθεια refers to that which is in accordance with the facts as they stand. His claims are valid. Crump also points out that this is an example of metonymy, whereby ἀλήθεια is not merely understood as conforming to fact but reflects a deeper significance.[142] Hence, ἀλήθεια as used here also refers to the ultimate nature of that which is mediated through Christ.

The role of John the Baptist, established from the start, is crucial in this context for revealing Jesus' identity. He was introduced at the beginning of this Gospel in the prologue (1:6–9, 15; note esp. v. 7), and in 1:19–28 in his own speech regarding his understanding of his role as the one sent to testify concerning Jesus (note especially verse 23 where he quotes Isa 40:3). That was the purpose of his witness (1:7), and hence, as Ridderbos notes, Jesus' appeal to such witness is justified.[143] Trites points out that "the Baptist's whole function, in the eyes of the Fourth Evangelist, is simply that of witness ... The central purpose of his testimony is to point men to Christ."[144] Since people are saved by believing in Jesus, John the Baptist's witness may help them believe, if they would only come to the realization that he was pointing to Jesus. The fact that they were not willing indicates a deliberate refusal to accept Christ (cf. v. 40).[145]

As John progresses in his narrative, the conflict continues to escalate until it finally explodes in the larger section of 8:12–10:42. Seven of the twenty-five occurrences of ἀλήθεια are found in this section. By 7:45–52, coming to the close of the feast of Tabernacles, it is evident that not only are the people divided with regard to their reception of Jesus (cf. 7:43), but the chief priests and Pharisees are in active opposition to Jesus and consider him a fraud. Not all the leaders are against him, however, and Nicodemus appears again, this time in active defense of Jesus' right to be heard before being condemned, in accordance with Jewish law (7:50).

The Truth Will Make You Free (8:32)

This section, 8:12–10:42, displays characteristics common to a trial or lawsuit as is evidenced by the repeated motif of testimony. Jesus' identity is once again in question, and it is therefore crucial that the veracity and character of the witnesses on either side be established.[146] Jesus' own testimony of himself, ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου ("I am the light of the world"; 8:12), expressed metaphorically in the familiar contrasting terms of light and darkness, is declared by the Pharisees to be invalid.[147] This time, Jesus points them to the authority of his Father, his sender, thus validating his testimony in accordance with their own law, which states that the testimony of two men is valid (v. 17). Ironically, these experts of the Jewish law are not only ignorant of Jesus, but of the Father as well (v. 19). Their failure to accept Jesus' claims about himself, including his appeal to

the Father's testimony about him, would lead to their eventual downfall (v. 24). Only Jesus' coming death and resurrection, alluded to in verse 28, would convince them. In spite of the active opposition of these leaders, many people continue to put their faith in him (cf. v. 30, although the next few verses reveal that they are not yet true believers; cf. vv. 33, 37).[148] And while it may appear that in this context John's use of the term οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι is neutral, referring to the people of Jerusalem or Judea in general as Brown suggests, the conversation that follows reveals that this is not the case.[149] These Jews are hostile to Jesus.

The section under investigation, 8:31–41, beginning with the logical conjunction οὖν ("then," "therefore") consists of Jesus expounding on the true impact of his presence.[150] It is likely, as Morris suggests that the aim of this section is to "address the needs of those who recognize the truth of Jesus' words, yet fail to commit themselves to him."[151] Jesus begins by stating that true discipleship is measured by whether or not one remains in his word. As Bultmann notes, "[i]t is not immediate assent but steadfastness of faith that gives character to genuine discipleship."[152] If one satisfied this condition, then as a true disciple he would be in a position to benefit from this relationship. He concludes with the explanatory statement in 8:32 (καὶ is used in an explanatory or epexegetical sense here), καὶ γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς ("and you shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"; cf. 1 John 2:21). This explanatory statement (cf. 1 John 2:21), clarifies that knowledge of the truth is liberating. In the first clause, ἀλήθεια is the direct object of the future form of the verb γινώσκω. The verb γινώσκω has both an abstract and an experiential sense in this context (cf. 1:14, 17; 8:36).[153] Hence, truth is an object to be known. The semantic relationship is qualificational substance-content. It points back to the phrase τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, Jesus' word or his message and hence knowing the truth is therefore accepting the truth brought by Jesus. It is also the subject of the future form of the verb ἐλευθερόω, to set free or release, and consequently ἀλήθεια is what effects liberation. While the semantic relationship between these two cola may be described as either additive different or logical cause-effect, the latter is to be preferred because liberation only occurs as a direct consequence of knowing the truth. In this context, ἀλήθεια is personified as a liberator.

Ἀλήθεια is therefore both an object to be known and also that which effects liberation. Thus, freedom is not effected from within an individual, but is something external to him/her. The implication is that the listeners are in bondage, and their indignation at this thought is expressed in the verse that follows. They declare that they, being Abraham's descendants, have never been in bondage. Given their obvious history of bondage under various masters, including their present situation under Roman rule, this statement obviously refers to spiritual bondage.[154] Or, as Brown suggests, it may indicate that although they have briefly experienced subjection to foreign masters, they have never actually been enslaved.[155] Jesus clarifies that he is not talking about physical or political liberation, but rather release from bondage to sin.

With his characteristic double ἀμήν, Jesus points out that πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δοῦλός ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας ("everyone who commits sin is a slave of sin"). It is likely that the relative clause refers to a general attitude of opposition to God as Schnackenburg suggests, rather than actual acts of sin as proposed by Barrett, in which case their rejection of Jesus is included here.[156] He rearticulates this same liberation motif, this time with reference to the exclusive authority given to the Son to effect it in verse 36 with the words ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε ("if therefore the son shall make you free, you shall be free indeed").[157] Barrett explains that being made free is nothing other than a synonym for salvation; hence Jesus is the only one with the authority to give true freedom.[158] Indeed, while Judaism taught that study of the Law makes a man free, John goes further to show that the law points to Jesus (5:39; 46), who, as revealed later, is himself the truth (14:6).[159] It is only in him that true freedom is to be enjoyed. Lindsay also rightly points out that "'[k]nowing the truth' and being 'set free by the truth' are conditional upon 'remaining in the word of Christ.'"[160]

Ἀλήθεια therefore refers to the redemptive content of that which has been revealed in and through Jesus, and hence Carson may have a point in seeing this close to the meaning of gospel.[161] In this regard, ἀλήθεια should not be understood as general or philosophical truth, but the divine liberating message revealed both in and through Jesus. In this context, John's usage reflects the understanding that ἀλήθεια points to "the divine truth, revealed by God, about the salvation of man (cf. 17:17), more specifically, the eschatological revelation of salvation which Jesus, as God's messenger, has brought (18:37)."[162] There may be in this context an implicit contrast between the power of Jesus' revelation and the Law. This salvific function of truth as used by John demonstrates his authorial intent in pointing to Jesus as the Messiah who brings God's salvation.

Your Father the Devil (8:39–47)

In this section (8:39–47), although the Jews continue to protest that Abraham is their father, Jesus points out that by their rejection of him and the truth he conveys from God (v. 37), they show no relationship to Abraham. In fact, their intention to kill him reveals this clearly. This is what prompts their protest about their legitimate status. Both Carson and Ridderbos note that the issue of fatherhood is prominent in this discussion, ultimately separating Jesus from those who would kill him. Jesus is pointing beyond physical descent, which is ultimately irrelevant, to the manifestation of spiritual characteristics that accurately reflect one's lineage.[163] In this legal context, ἀλήθεια in the phrase ἄνθρωπον ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα ("a man who has told you the truth"; v. 40), is the direct object of the verb with Jesus as the implied subject. It is that which is expressed verbally and signifies the content of the message Jesus heard from God. It is also

the ultimate truth that Jesus mediates. The semantic relationship is qualifica-
tional substance-content.

As this conflict between belief and unbelief continues to build, Jesus denies
them any right to claim God as their father. Their inability to understand not
only that he has come from God but that what he conveys is from God is evidence
that they do not belong to God (cf. v. 47).[164] As a result, Jesus explicitly places
them in the lineage of the devil with the statement ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ
διαβόλου ἐστὲ ("you are of your father the devil"; v. 44; cf. 1 John 3:8).[165] Jesus
adds that their intention is to carry out their father's desire (with ἐπιθυμίας in this
context indicating strong desires directed to the wrong things),[166] whose character
as a murderer is ingrained in him and who is incapable of standing in the truth.
The reason (causal use of ὅτι) is that there is none in him.[167] In this context,
ἀλήθεια is the object of the preposition ἐν in the clause καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ
ἔστηκεν (v. 44a; and he does not stand in the truth).[168] It is possible that the verb
ἔστηκεν should be understood in a spatial sense. Schnackenburg, in suggesting
this, notes that it is not uncommon for John to use such spatial expressions to
describe one's sphere of existence (cf. 5:24) or influence of evil (cf. 8:31, 37). He
writes, "[c]orrespondingly 'truth' means the 'space' belonging to God, who by
nature is truth and purest light (cf. 1 John 1:5), and banishes all 'lying' from his
presence."[169] The prepositional phrase is therefore a dative of sphere signifying
the sphere or realm in which truth operates, one in which the devil is incapable
of operating. Within this colon the semantic relationship is qualificational
substance-content. The NLT eloquently translates the statement that follows
ὅταν λαλῇ τὸ ψεῦδος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ, ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ
(v. 44d) thus: "When he lies, it is consistent with his character; for he is a liar and
the father of lies."[170]

In line with the modified dualism represented in this Gospel, Brown suggests
that the personification of truth and lying are found in Jesus and Satan respec-
tively and a radical opposition exists between their followers.[171] Because they
are children of the devil, the Jews are unable to recognize the truth before them
(vv. 45–47). Their unwillingness to hear has as its basis the fact that they do
not belong to God. Ridderbos further notes that the lies referred to here and
attributed to the devil are not acts of commission that can be rectified. Rather,

> … one must not just think of dishonesty or mendacity in a moral sense, for the lie
> here is the antithesis of what in vs. 32 is called the truth. It is the contradiction of
> the word of God and therefore by implication enslaving and deadly (cf. Gn. 3:3, 4).
> Therefore "lie" does not refer here to a distinct act that can be immediately rectified
> but to a transindividual power of deception with paternity of its own, not from God
> the Father but from the father, the devil.[172]

Hence, God and the devil, truth and falsehood/deception are antithetical in every
way. One cannot hold the two together—to reject the truth is to embrace the
devil. Jesus finishes in verse 45 with the reason why his hearers do not listen to

him (causal and not temporal use of ὅτι as the NLT suggests)—it is because he speaks the truth (ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω). As in verse 40, ἀλήθεια functions as the direct object of the verb λέγω and hence suggests that truth is something that is expressed verbally. The semantic relationship is qualificational substance-content.

The expressed antonym of ἀλήθεια in this section is τὸ ψεῦδος. Hence with regard to paradigmatic relationships, just as God is set in uncompromising contrast to the devil, so ἀλήθεια is set in contrast to its antonym τὸ ψεῦδος. The phrase "to speak the truth" therefore has as its antithesis "to speak falsehood/lies" (cf. 1 John 2:21, 27). Although Schnackenburg argues that in these contexts (as well as in 16:17) the correctness of what is said is not in view, only Jesus' preaching, the paradigmatic context indicates otherwise.[173] At the same time, ἀλήθεια is interwoven with ὁ λόγος in such a way that their reciprocity suggests, as many scholars have proposed, that the Fourth Gospel's theology is that of revelation.[174] It therefore also signifies the content of the message which Jesus heard and brought from God, his ultimate revelation to humankind. At the same time ἀλήθεια is a quality that is found within those that belong to God, that constitutes a core characteristic of their nature (cf. 1 John 1:8; 2:4) and that is absent in the devil.

The Book of Glory (13:1–20:31)

The third major section of the Gospel, the Book of Glory (13:1–20:31), is so named because of the events of the cross that dominate this section. It follows Jesus' rejection by the Jews and is focused on Jesus' private ministry. It therefore moves from the general Jewish public addressed in the previous section, to the narrower circle of Jesus' disciples. After the footwashing, Jesus gives his final instructions and the promise of the Holy Spirit (13–16). John then records Jesus' final prayer which provides an appropriate entrance to the passion narrative. This is followed by the official commissioning of the disciples as the newly constituted community. They, like Jesus, are to testify to the truth, just as Jesus himself was sent into the world to do the same. As Carson points out, the focus of these chapters is not so much to expound on "the nature of discipleship, but the nature of Jesus' mission and what takes place after his impending departure," and therefore is pre-eminently salvation-historical.[175]

The structure of the Farewell Discourse is difficult to determine.[176] Consequently, many different proposals have been put forward with the three main categories today being chiastic, rhetorical and text-linguistic.[177] The following analysis works on the basis of a structure for the Farewell Discourse proper that is loosely chiastic in nature, with 15:1–11 as the pivot, and framed by 13:31–38 (which constitutes the introduction to the discourse),[178] and 16:4b–33. The genre of 13:31–16:33 is farewell discourse or speech, built on the precedent of patriarchal deathbed blessings and Moses' final words in Deuteronomy. It

therefore includes instruction in virtue, talk of Jesus' impending death, words of comfort and the provision of proper succession (the Holy Spirit) to ensure continuity.[179] Brown also points out similarities with postbiblical farewell speeches, pointing out some common themes such as reassurance, commands to love, unity, succession, final prayer and so forth.[180] The significant difference with these farewell discourses is that Jesus will return.

In his last discourse, Jesus prepares his disciples for his leaving, encouraging them with the fact that it would be brief, and that they would soon enter into a new relationship with him and with God the Father, through the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. The main emphasis of this section is reflective of the events of Jesus' death, resurrection and glorification and it is here that the new community begins to take on a more defined shape. Köstenberger comments that Jesus is no longer concerned to show the Jewish nation that he is the God-sent messiah. "[r]ather, the focus is on preparing his new messianic community for their Spirit-guided mission to the unbelieving world."[181] Having turned his attention from the larger crowds to his closest circle, Jesus begins to prepare them for the task of carrying on his mission.

Jesus the Way to the Father (14:6)

As noted above, some sections of the Farewell Discourse are very similar. This is the case with chapters 14 and 16. In both, Jesus addresses the issue of his imminent departure, comforting his disciples with the hope that he is going ahead to prepare a place for them, that they would see him again, and he would send the Holy Spirit to be with them. The first occurrence of ἀλήθεια in this section occurs in 14:6, one of the seven ἐγώ εἰμι ("I Am") statements. Prior to this, Jesus speaks of his imminent departure, referring to it as his glorification by God, and indicating that his disciples would not be able to follow him.[182] Talbert notes that "[t]he point here is that Jesus is going to the Father; he is going before the disciples do; and until he goes they are unable to follow. Christ and Christians are not on the same footing in salvation history. Jesus possesses a soteriological priority that is expressed here in terms of the chronological priority of Jesus' going."[183]

Knowing that his death would bring grief to his followers, he gives them a new command (13:34–35; cf. 15:12, 17), a command that is better understood in the context of his humble example of foot-washing. This event has a cleansing significance both in light of what his death was soon to accomplish, as well as with regards to the new community.[184] This selfless act sets a precedent for his followers (13:14–16), and when Jesus commands his disciples to love one another, this act of foot-washing is uppermost in their minds. Commands to love one another were not new (Lev 19:18) and parallels in other Jewish literature (Josephus, Hillel, the community at Qumran) testify to the fact that this was not

a new concept.[185] Consequently, lest one question the validity of labeling this command 'new', it is important to note that the newness is based on the fact that Jesus establishes himself as the model that all believers are to emulate with regard to love for one another. The ultimate demonstration of this love would be through his death. This genuine self-sacrificing love would henceforth be the parameter by which they would be identified with Christ as his followers. This theme of mutual love is reiterated in the pivot, 15:9–16.[186]

Going back to his imminent departure, Jesus urges the disciples not to be troubled (14:1). He commands them to trust in him as they do in God, reassures them of a place in his Father's house, of his task of preparation for them, and of his sure return to take them with him (vv. 1–3).[187] He ends with the statement καὶ ὅπου [ἐγὼ] ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν ("and you know the way where I am going").[188] It is this pronouncement that prompts Thomas' question, a question that anticipates a literal answer: κύριε, οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις· πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι; ("Lord, we do not know where you are going; how do we know the way?"). In answer to Thomas' question, Jesus makes the following statement (beginning with ἐγώ εἰμι which in this context identifies it as a divine formula), ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή ("I am the way, and the truth and the life"; v. 6a).[189] The impact of this statement in shaping Johannine theology has been noted by numerous commentators. A crucial point to note here is that it is "the juxtaposition of the words 'I' and 'the truth' in this context, along with the knowledge that the 'I' is Jesus and not a personified abstraction,"[190] that gives this statement its theological emphasis. The substantive ἡ ἀλήθεια is linked to the pronoun subject ἐγώ, referring to Jesus, by the equative verb εἰμί. The syntagmatic relations within this sentence are what give ἀλήθεια its significance; it is therefore not understood as an abstract concept, but a tangible one embodied in Christ himself. The semantic relationship is qualificational substance-content.

While the three substantives ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή share a paratactic relationship, Jesus clearly means to place slightly more emphasis on ἡ ὁδός since this is an answer to Thomas' question. Schnackenburg also notes that the emphasis in the statement made by Jesus prior to Thomas' question is on ἡ ὁδός, coming as it does at the end of the sentence. Moreover, this key word is repeated, and the phrase δι᾽ ἐμοῦ (v. 6b) also confirms it as the focal point.[191] Therefore, as Carson contends, 14:6a should not be interpreted as a Semitism, with the first noun governing the other two ("I am the way of truth and life" and hence "I am the true and living way"). He proposes that the three terms are syntactically coordinate, but with "truth" and "life" playing a supporting role. By mediating God's truth and God's life, he is indeed the way to God.[192]

While this is largely accurate, in terms of syntactical relations the first καί should be regarded as explanatory or epexegetical, while the second is a simple coordinating conjunction.[193] This declaration therefore goes beyond self-revelation, not only identifying who Jesus is, but what he does.[194] These three elements are also associated with the Torah in Judaism. In first-century Jewish

understanding, the Law provided the way; indeed, the Qumran community referred to itself as 'the Way,' by virtue of its strict adherence to the Law. However, Jesus, as the ultimate revelation of the Father, is the only one who can truly claim to be "the way."[195] Clearly, the fulfillment theme is evident here, with Jesus representing himself as the fulfillment of the Law.[196]

Truth is therefore not an abstract concept in this context, but a tangible one embodied in Christ himself. For Jesus to say that he is the truth is to reflect his awareness that he is the full revelation and embodiment of the redemptive purpose of God.[197] As the truth, therefore, he is in perfect accord with that which is veracious and veritable, both of which point to that which is genuine, authentic, actual, or real. This sense of the word ἀλήθεια is identical to the one that it holds in 1:17, and hence reflects that of the ultimate, true revelation of God in Christ, who is not only a purveyor of truth, but the manifestation of truth itself.

In all three cases, the linguistic context supplied by the *par excellence* uses of the article ἡ, together with the statement immediately following, οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ ("no one comes to the father except through me"), further support Christ's exclusivity in his role as intermediary between God and man. Hence ἀλήθεια in this context is exclusively mediated through Christ and is used to refer to the ultimate revelation that he brings. This exclusivity has to do with Christ's unique position as the one sent by the Father, a theme reiterated at various points in the Gospel. Schlatter notes of the crucial role of the motif of the 'sent son' in Johannine thought:

> The concept of the Son is his major expression, and his theological achievement, as far as one can speak of such, consists in the development of this concept. For the Son concept provided him with both conditions of faith: Jesus' dependence on God by which he speaks the divine word and performs the divine work, and his independent authority by which he provides humanity with the divine gift.... John uses the Son concept to delineate the basis, manner, and extent of Jesus' rule.[198]

Indeed, Jesus goes on to explain that he is the only way to the Father and that from that point on, because he has been with them, they both know and have seen the Father (v. 7). This exclusivity is also based on the intimate relationship of mutual indwelling that they share, such that whatever Jesus says and does is an accurate representation of his Father (vv. 10–11). Thompson further notes that this theme of 'sent son' has a legal flavor. As the 'sent son' Jesus is able to function as a unique delegate on his Father's behalf.[199]

The Promise of the Spirit (14:17)

Having revealed to the disciples that he is ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή, Jesus explains that all who wish to have a relationship with the Father can only do so

through him because they are a unity and moreover, he is the only one capable of revealing the Father. He continues to explain to them that although they had been accorded the privilege of direct access to Jesus, this was about to change with his departure. He would no longer continue to be with them in the same way.

The theme of love pervades the section spanning 14:15–31. Jesus begins with a conditional statement in verse 15, Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε ("If you love me, you will keep my commandments").[200] Contrary to this, those who do not love Christ will not obey his teachings (and by implication God's, cf. v. 24), because obedience to Christ's commands is motivated by love for him.[201] The fact that they do not obey is a clear indication of their opposition to Christ—those who reject Christ reject the Father. Speaking in this context of obedience to his commands, he promises ἄλλον παράκλητον ("another paraclete") in his place from the Father. He links this phrase appositionally with τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (the Spirit of Truth; cf. 1 John 4:6, where he is mentioned together with τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης meaning error, delusion, deception), who lives with them and would be in them (vv. 16–17).[202] The phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ("the Holy Spirit"), also found in apposition to ἄλλον παράκλητον a few verses later, identifies him with the Holy Spirit (14:26). In terms of paradigmatic relations, John uses the two terms, ὁ παράκλητος and τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, to refer to the same thing, namely τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

This terminology is significant, coming as it does on the heels of Jesus' declaration that he is himself ἡ ἀλήθεια. Note that in 1 John 5:6, ἡ ἀλήθεια is found in connection with τὸ πνεῦμα in the context of bearing witness in the statement τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ἀλήθεια (the Spirit is the truth).[203] Together with the phrase ἄλλον παράκλητον, which suggests that Jesus is the first Paraclete (cf. 1 John 2:1),[204] there is at least a preliminary indication of "a continuity between Jesus' pre- and postglorification ministry."[205] This continuation is successive rather than parallel.[206] Indeed, the giving of the Paraclete is intimately tied to Christ's own death and exaltation (7:39; 14:15, 26; 15:26; 16:12). He is sent by both the Father and the Son (14:17, 26; 16:7) and comes to indwell believers uniting them to both the Father and the Son (14:15–20; 23) in a manner never experienced before. However, while the reference in the epistle has a legal nuance, in this context where Jesus is in the midst of encouraging his disciples in view of his imminent departure, his role is clearly that of encourager or comforter. The purpose clause of verse 16, ἵνα μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ᾖ ("that he may be with you forever"), gives at least one reason behind the sending of the Paraclete—the permanent presence of the Spirit.

Jesus clarifies that although the disciples know the Spirit of Truth and can therefore accept or receive him, the world (ὁ κόσμος) cannot, because it neither sees him nor knows him (14:17). In this context, κόσμος refers to individuals in this world system who are opposed to God (cf. 1:10; 3:16). The Gospel repeatedly shows the failure of the world, generally represented by the 'Jews,' to recognize the truth that Jesus brings and is. The disciples, however, recognize him because

(causal ὅτι) παρ' ὑμῖν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ("he remains with you and will be in you"). This signifies that his residing would no longer be temporary, but the permanent indwelling of believers as anticipated in Old Testament prophets (Joel 2:28; cf. Acts 2:17–21).[207]

This abiding presence is identified as having yet another purpose (cf. 14:26).[208] Putting τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον in apposition to ὁ παράκλητος, Jesus states that ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ]. The Paraclete has the task of teaching the disciples all things, reminding them of everything that Jesus has taught them. At this present time, the disciple's understanding is incomplete and what Jesus teaches them is limited by their ability to understand.[209] This therefore necessitates that one come after him to provide a disclosure of his teaching.[210] In this context, the role of the Spirit of Truth most closely resembles that of the Spirit of prophecy in the Old Testament.[211]

The genitive τῆς ἀληθείας may be understood as modifying its head noun τὸ πνεῦμα in a number of ways. These are illuminated by the roles that he plays. It may be descriptive, in which case one would understand it as "the spirit who is characterized by truth" or "whose nature is truth." It could be attributive, in which case he is the "truthful spirit." While both are applicable, the context suggests that the latter option should be given more prominence. It is not just his nature as truth that is expressed in this relationship; it is the fact that he conveys only that which conforms to truth. Therefore, he discloses prior teaching given by Jesus, illumining it and making it understandable to the disciples. From prior contexts it is clear that Jesus' teaching must be understood as the ultimate revelation from God.

Jesus the True Vine (15:26)

Another reference to ἀλήθεια in the Farewell Discourse is found in the section following the extended metaphor of the vine (15:1–11). This metaphor is the core of the Farewell Discourse. The imagery of the vine is reflective of Old Testament references to Jews in which Israel is shown as failing to live up to God's ideal. It begins with the seventh ἐγώ εἰμι saying: ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινὴ καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ γεωργός ἐστιν ("I am the true vine and my father is the vinedresser"). In this metaphor, Jesus is identified as the true and genuine vine as opposed to Israel, the unfaithful vine.[212] Only he completely measures up to God's ideal. The emphasis of this metaphor is therefore not on the branches, but on the vine. Jesus is the center of this entity, just as he is the center in the metaphor of the flock in chapter 10. As Whitacre points out, "[t]he identification of the people of God with a particular nation is now replaced with a particular man who incorporates in himself the new people of God composed of Jews and non-Jews."[213]

Talbert points out that this metaphor primarily communicates the soteriological priority of Jesus and the fact that the disciples derive their existence from

him.[214] Hence, in order to be considered part of this corporate unity, the disciples must remain in Christ. Μένω, used eleven times in this section, is indicative not simply of that moment in which one enters into a relationship with Christ, but of continued dependence on him,[215] modeled after the example of the union that exists between Jesus and his Father.[216] Whitacre defines it thus:

> Remaining is not simply believing in him, though that is crucial, but includes being in union with him, sharing his thoughts, emotions, intentions and power. In a relationship both parties must be engaged. The divine must take the initiative and provide the means and the ability for the union to take place, but it cannot happen without the response of the disciple.[217]

The very structure of the Farewell Discourse leads to the understanding that Jesus is the locus of the newly constituted people of God. The exhortations to love, obey and be united are only possible if one remains in him. Those who fail to remain, and are cut off, may initially seem to be a part of this corporate entity, but are soon proved to be outside of it. The disciples, however, have been cleansed by Jesus' word and are therefore considered καθαροί.[218] The outward expression of this new community of faith is the bearing of fruit, which is in itself based on a relationship of dependence on Jesus. The context suggests that the bearing of fruit refers to a life of consistent Christian discipleship. It is the faithful continuation of Jesus' mission.[219]

In the midst of this, Jesus once again emphasizes the theme of mutual love for one another, a love that is grounded in his own example of love for them (vv. 12–13). Given that love for him is a necessary condition for obedience (cf. 14:1) and consequently fruit bearing, this is an appropriate reminder. Coming on the heels of this injunction to remain in him and to love one another, Jesus then turns to the relationship of the world to believers, a relationship that is characterized by hatred (15:18–16:4a). Because believers do not belong to the world, the world hates them—just as it hated both Jesus and the Father. And although the world witnessed his teachings and his works (vv. 22, 24), yet they rejected Jesus and are therefore guilty of sin.

It is in this context that Jesus refers yet again to the Spirit of Truth, this time in connection with the verb μαρτυρέω: Ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος ... τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ... ἐκεῖνος μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ ("When the paraclete comes ... the Spirit of Truth ... he will bear witness of me"; cf. 15:26). Once again the phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας is found in apposition to ὁ παράκλητος. It is the subject of the verb μαρτυρέω in its future form. The genitive relationship, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, may be understood as an attributive genitive, and hence "the truthful spirit." However, τῆς ἀληθείας in this context is more than that. It is possible that John means, as Barrett suggests, "the Spirit who communicates truth."[220] Carson, in turn, following Johnson, proposes that this description defines the Paraclete as the Spirit who bears witness to the truth, namely the truth which Jesus is.[221] While both are accurate, the context of 15:26 suggests that Carson may be closer to

the mark than Barrett. Indeed, noting that Christianity is itself 'the Truth' with the role of the Spirit being to interpret and enforce it, Westcott suggests that the genitive is descriptive of "the substance of that with which the Spirit dealt, and not a mere characteristic of the Spirit, that His witness is true."[222]

The preposition περὶ combined with the genitive ἐμοῦ may be understood as indicating reference, hence 'concerning' or advantage/representation hence 'on behalf of.' In this context, the sense is that the Spirit of Truth testifies on behalf of Jesus, concerning the claims that he has made of himself. The legal context of testimony and the role that is identified here suggests how ἀλήθεια is to be understood. It is used to signify the claims that Jesus has made of himself and hence should be understood as truth in its ultimate sense. Indeed, Lincoln suggests that the role of advocate is the primary role of the Paraclete/Spirit of Truth, as he witnesses to the truth that Jesus both embodies and reveals.[223]

The judicial language of testimony pervades this section, as Jesus points to the Spirit of Truth as one who testifies or bears witness to him (cf. 1 John 5:6). He thus becomes an additional witness for Jesus, adding to the list that has already been enumerated earlier in the Gospel.[224] This he does through the disciples, who are also required to witness in his favor since they have been eyewitnesses from the beginning (cf. 15:27).[225] Lindars proposes that this means that the Spirit will provide assistance to the disciples to defend their faith in times of persecution.[226] While this is true, it is too narrow a focus and hence unlikely in this particular context (although this is the sense in Matt 10:20; Mark 13:11; Luke 12:12). It is most likely a reference to the work of the Spirit of Truth as he aids the witnessing ministry of the disciples in their words and deeds. Because these disciples were eyewitnesses of Jesus from the beginning, they were regarded as guarantors of the Jesus tradition and hence could be relied upon.[227] Jesus now clarifies that the Holy Spirit himself would guide their work, thus further reinforcing their authority to testify in a legal sense in Jesus' behalf.

The Work of the Spirit (16:7, 13)

The final references to ἀλήθεια in the Farewell Discourse are found in 16:7, 13, although it is understood that the reference to ὁ παράκλητος in verse 7 is also a reference to τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας. In the larger context of this reference, 16:4b–15, further details of the work of the Paraclete/Spirit of Truth are provided. In 16:7 Jesus begins with the statement ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ("but I tell you the truth"). In this verse, ἀλήθεια functions as the direct object of the verb λέγω in 16:7 with Jesus as the subject. In this case, it is understood as it is in the references in 8:40, 45. Consequently, what Jesus is about to say is opposed to falsehood.

Reassuring them that his departure is to their benefit, Jesus tells the disciples that upon his departure he would send the Paraclete. Given all that he has said

thus far, it is clear that Jesus' exaltation must come before his presence through the Spirit can become a reality—what Köstenberger refers to as an "eschatological necessity."[228] He then states: καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖνος ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως, ("and when he comes, he will convict the world concerning sin, and righteousness and judgment") clarifying the work of the Spirit in relation to the world (16:8). These terms reflect the fact that John presents the Spirit's activity with respect to the world as a legal battle or cosmic trial.

Much of the understanding of this section is dependent on one's under-standing of ἐλέγχω and how John uses it here. The only other instances of the use of this verb in the Gospel include: 3:20, where it is used with reference to the exposure of evil deeds by the light, i.e. Jesus, who has come into the world; and 8:46, where it is used in a context where Jesus is asking which of those Jews opposed to him can prove him guilty of sin.[229] The use in this verse reflects that of 8:46 (in the sense of bringing a person to the point of recognizing their wrong-doing—in this case showing Jesus to be a sinner) and hence may be rendered convict or convince as reflected by the various translations (ESV, NIV, NKJ, NLT).[230] Buchsel further points out that although this word carries the sense of education and discipline in the LXX (conviction, chastisement, punishment, instruction by testing, teaching, admonition), in the New Testament it has a narrower sense and is always used with regard to showing someone their sin and bringing them to repentance.[231] It therefore has a forensic tone, with the role of the Paraclete being to prove the world guilty of its wrongdoing.

The object of conviction is τὸν κόσμον (the world), used in the very same sense that Jesus has just spoken of in 15:18–25. The role of the Paraclete is therefore to convict those who are opposed to the revelation of God. The list of things of which he convicts them includes three things, namely, sin, righteousness and judgment, which he expounds on in the verses that follow (16:9–11). There are at least three possibilities for understanding the use of περί and ὅτι in these verses: 1) To convict the world in regard to its wrong notion of sin, showing it that sin is the failure to believe in Jesus. 2) To convict the world of its sin because it has failed to believe in Jesus. 3) To convict the world of its sin, namely its failure to believe in Jesus.[232] Since the understanding of the construction ἐλέγξει περί in this present context is the same as that of 8:46, the proposal that the world has a wrong notion of sin, righteousness and judgment may not fit. In addition, it seems that John is giving the grounds rather than the content of the Spirit's conviction such that the third option, while possible is not as viable as the second in this context.[233] The second option appears to be the most probable with most translations viewing the ὅτι clauses in this and the following verses as causal. This option may also be better supported in light of the context of the Paraclete's judicial role.

What are the grounds of conviction in these verses? The first area of conviction, found in verse 9, is περὶ ἁμαρτίας μέν, ὅτι οὐ πιστεύουσιν εἰς ἐμέ ("concerning sin, because they do not believe in me"). In 15:21–24, the sin of

the world was identified as lack of belief in Jesus, and their rejection of him, and looking back to 8:21–24, unbelief was identified as sin. The conviction of the world is therefore on the grounds of their unbelief in Jesus. The second area of conviction in verse 10 is περὶ δικαιοσύνης δέ, ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ μὲ ("concerning righteousness, because I go to the Father and you no longer see me"). Δικαιοσύνη may be understood as a reference to people's lack of righteousness, [234] or to Jesus' righteousness as the basis of the Spirit's judgment.[235] In light of the context, it is likely that the righteousness in view here is that of Jesus himself and not the world's perception of its own righteousness, which is a false righteousness. Together with the phrase πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω, which is significant because it is a reference to Jesus' death and glorification, it is more likely that Jesus' righteousness is in view. Hence, the Spirit convicts the unbelieving world (which has misunderstood the plan of salvation) on the basis of Jesus' righteousness, which is itself affirmed by the fact of his resurrection. The third area that the Spirit brings conviction, listed in verse 11, is περὶ δὲ κρίσεως, ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κέκριται ("concerning judgment, because the ruler of this world has been judged"). While the term ἄρχων reflects a prominent position of authority used for both Roman and Jewish officials,[236] the genitive modifier τοῦ κόσμου suggests that it has a supernatural reference in this context and therefore refers to Satan.[237] John's portrayal of Jesus reflects the fact that he is opposed to the ruler of this world and indeed is the one that finally overcomes him. In this verse, the judgment of Satan and the unbelieving world he rules over is seen as an accomplished fact because of the certainty of Jesus' glorification in his death and resurrection. As Barrett notes, "It is on the basis of this historical event that men may be convinced by the Spirit of the fact of judgment, and thus of their own judgment by God."[238] The Spirit therefore convicts those who refuse to believe in Jesus of the judgment that they themselves are certain to face on account of their unbelief. With respect to the world, he (and hence also τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας) is now its accuser or prosecuting counsel, with the task of bringing it to a recognition of its guilt and ultimately to repentance.[239] Ἀλήθεια is understood in this section in light of the role of τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας with respect to the unbelieving world. This is clarified by the verb with which it is connected. It is found as the subject of the future form of the verb ἐλέγχω (16:8) which reveals that he has the legal role of convicting the unbelieving world on the grounds of its unbelief in Jesus, of Jesus' righteousness and of its own certain judgment incurred due to its failure to believe in Jesus.

With regard to the disciples, however, the task of τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας is positive: ὁδηγήσει [εἰς/ἐν] ὑμᾶς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ("he will lead you in all truth"; cf. 16:13).[240] In this instance the Spirit of Truth is used as the subject of the future form of the verb ὁδηγέω. While one ought not to overstate the differences, ἐν is the best reading, not εἰς, because the latter suggests new revelation, unlike the former which points to revelation already disclosed by Christ.[241] Therefore, the Spirit of Truth passes on only what he hears from Jesus and not new revelation,

contra Burge who proposes that "not only does the Spirit recall, authenticate, and enliven the teaching of Jesus for each generation, but *also* the Spirit works creatively in the church, bringing a new prophetic word."[242] In addition, rather than predictive prophecy, the emphasis is "on helping the believing community understand their present situation in light of Jesus' by-then-past revelation of God."[243] As in 14:26, this role most closely resembles that of the Spirit of prophecy in the Old Testament.

Since ἀλήθεια also occurs in combination with the adjective πᾶσαν in the second part of this verse, this is an indication that ἀλήθεια in this context also refers to the ultimate truth that Jesus brings. Given the content of what he is about to say, it may also be understood as 'true revelation' or 'eschatological reality.'[244] The semantic relationship is qualificational substance-content. Αλήθεια is therefore used in two ways: 1) As a genitive modifier to communicate that the Spirit of Truth leads disciples. 2) To signify the content of his leading, namely the ultimate truth concerning Jesus, thus aiding them in the work of testifying in Jesus' behalf.

The next reference to ἀλήθεια, encompassing not just the disciples but all believers, is found in the final prayer of Jesus (17:1–26).[245] Structurally, the final prayer is not part of the Farewell Discourse. However, in terms of its contents, it mirrors 13:1–35 with its central theme of oneness of Father, Son and believers.[246] This relationship can therefore be regarded as an inclusio.

The Prayer of Jesus (17:17)

While the more common designation for the prayer in this section is 'The High Priestly Prayer', it is perhaps more appropriate to refer to it as 'The Farewell Prayer' (so Ridderbos) or even 'The Prayer of Jesus' (so Carson).[247] Although Ridderbos identifies the genre of this prayer as a farewell prayer similar to other such prayers, given that it emanates from the farewell situation, it is not quite as straightforward as it appears.[248] It resembles the farewell words and farewell blessings of the patriarchs, employs the idea of intercession found in other texts of the same tradition (for instance apocalyptic literature), has some linguistic points of contact with Gnostic texts, and bears close affinities with the special type of prayer of the Son found in the Synoptics (the 'cry of rejoicing'). It is likely, as Schnackenburg points out, that this is a distinctive and unique form of prayer (note also the prayers in John 11:41–42 and 12:27–28).[249] It is divided into three general sections: a prayer for himself (vv. 1–5), a prayer for his disciples (vv. 6–19), and lastly, a prayer for all believers (vv. 20–26).[250] Although there is a wide range of material covered, at least three main themes stand out: 1) The glorification of the Father through Jesus' death/exaltation.[251] 2) The theme of unity, primarily "the eternal unity of Father and the Son in its relation to the incarnation and the temporary (and apparent) separation which the incarnation

involved,"²⁵² but also a unity amongst believers, and between believers, Jesus and the Father. 3) The theme of sending—Jesus is both the sent son and the sender.²⁵³

Jesus begins with a prayer for himself (vv. 1–5), requesting that his Father glorify him, in order that he himself might glorify his Father. Indeed, he states that he has already brought the Father glory by completing the work given to him, the purpose of which was to provide eternal life through making God known (vv. 3–4).²⁵⁴ In this case, just as in 8:32, knowing is both objective as well as relational hence there is a correlation between 'knowing' and 'believing.' As Barrett points out, "[s]aving knowledge is rooted in knowledge of a historical person; it is therefore objective and at the same time a personal relation."²⁵⁵The ultimate means by which Jesus would bring glory to God would be through his impending death on the cross. Δόξα is a prominent term in this prayer, being referred to eight times in various forms, and attached to the Father, Jesus and believers as a whole (vv. 1, 4, 5, 10, 22, 24). As in the prologue, it alludes to the Old Testament 'glory.'²⁵⁶

After praying for himself, Jesus then prays for his disciples (vv. 6–19), who in actuality belong to God. Having successfully completed his task (vv. 4, 8), he prays for their protection in the world. Knowing that they would have much opposition to face in the form of hatred from the world (v. 14; cf. 15:19), he prays for their unity (v. 11) and their sanctification. It is in the context of sanctification that the word ἀλήθεια is used. Beginning with the acknowledgement that they do not belong to the world, even as he does not, he asks the Father ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν ("sanctify them in the truth; your word is truth"; v. 17). The verb ἁγιάζω is used with reference to both things and people and means to make holy, sanctify, consecrate, dedicate, purify, or 'set apart for God's use,' (cf. Matt 23:17, 19; John 10:36; 1 Cor 7:14; Heb 9:13). For John, however, sanctification is always for the purpose of mission.²⁵⁷ Indeed, it is important not to lose sight of the centrality of missions in this prayer. Borchert points out that "throughout this prayer the overarching concern is not status but mission and that much of the discussion that has taken place in the last century on oneness or unity is truncated because it neglects to emphasize mission."²⁵⁸ The object of sanctification in this case is αὐτούς, which refers to the disciples. Looking back to the phrasing of verse 11b (πάτερ ἅγιε), it is apparent, as Barrett points out, that the sanctification of Jesus and his followers is only made possible on the basis of the Father's holiness.²⁵⁹ At the same time Jesus' self-sacrifice is what enables the disciples' sanctification,²⁶⁰ with the Paraclete participating in this sanctification by guiding the disciples in all truth (cf. 15:13).²⁶¹

Ἀλήθεια in this context is the object of the preposition ἐν, with the prepositional phrase ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ functioning in an adverbial relationship to the verb ἁγιάζω. One option is to take the prepositional phrase as an instrumental dative, and hence "by means of/through the truth."²⁶² However, it is far more likely that as in the case of 4:23–24, it reflects a sphere or realm of operation, hence 'in the sphere of truth.' ²⁶³ Consequently, as Ridderbos suggests, the phrase "refers to

the realm in which that consecration is realized, that of the truth of God's word and of his name (cf. vs. 11). Within that realm the disciples are not only safe in the world but also capable of continuing the work for which Jesus has destined them, their mission in the world."[264] The semantic relationship within this cola is qualificational character-setting-place.

Given the emphasis on words, ἀλήθεια should also be understood as 'words of reality' or 'true revelation' such that the prepositional phrase may mean 'in eschatological reality.' The paradigmatic relationships in this section indicate that truth is juxtaposed to the world hence, the sphere in which ἀλήθεια operates is to be regarded as contrary to the sphere of the world.[265] Αλήθεια therefore reflects a sphere or realm of operation that is juxtaposed to the world and that conforms to the ultimate truth revealed by and in Jesus.

The second clause can almost be regarded as an explanatory clause, albeit implicit. Using the equative verb εἰμί, John clarifies that ἀλήθεια is to be equated with God's word (ὁ λόγος ὁ σός). This word is itself "valid, effective, in no way false, indeed in accord with reality."[266] Within this colon the semantic relationship is qualificational substance-content and with the previous one it is qualificational substance-generic-specific. Brown points out that "in Johannine theology Jesus is both the Word and the truth (xiv 6), so that consecration in a truth that is the word of God is simply an aspect of belonging to Jesus."[267] In this context ἀλήθεια is God's Word in the sense of the ultimate revelation that Jesus brings and is.

Jesus concludes his prayer with a prayer for all believers (vv. 20–26), including the disciples. The unity that he emphasizes in this section has two aspects: as a contemporary unity, it brings together believers of any one age or time; as a historical unity, it binds present and future generations of believers to their predecessors in the past (cf. vv. 20–21).[268] Both the model and the basis are to be found in the unity existing between Jesus and the Father.[269] The unity of believers is a double testimony to the world: It demonstrates, first, that the sending of Jesus came from God himself, and second, that just as God loved the Son, he displays the same kind of love to believers everywhere.

The final prayer of Jesus provides an appropriate entrance to the Johannine passion narrative in which the last three references to ἀλήθεια are found—the first two by Jesus and the last by Pilate (specifically 18:28–19:16a).

Jesus before Pilate (18:37–38)

In terms of structure, a number of commentators have proposed seven scenes or episodes for this section: 18:28–32; 33–38a; 38b–40; 19:1–3; 4–8; 9–11; 12–16a.[270] Of theological relevance is the fact that Jesus' death during Passover week firmly establishes him as "the prototype of the Jewish Passover."[271] As Ridderbos points out, the significance of the redemptive-historical character of Jesus' suffering and

death is evident, particularly on this day of the great feast of Israel's liberation when the decision for or against Jesus hangs in the balance.[272]

Having been arrested (18:1–11) and questioned by both Annas and the high priest Caiaphus (18:12–27), Jesus is taken before the Roman governor, Pilate, for questioning. There is double irony in this situation: The first is pointed out by Carson: "[t]he Jews take elaborate precautions to avoid ritual contamination in order to eat the Passover, at the very time they are busy manipulating the judicial system to secure the death of him who alone is the true Passover."[273] Brown also notes of this situation: "[t]hey do not hesitate to make use of the Gentile to destroy their adversary, but they will not enter the Gentile's house."[274] The intention of the Jews is clear—they desire a death sentence by crucifixion for Jesus, even though the kinds of charges they raise against him have no weight in a Roman court. However, because Jesus had not been formally convicted of a crime, if they themselves executed him, they would be guilty of murder under the Law of Moses.[275] The author cleverly brings out the second irony involved in having this death sentence passed against Jesus. The intention of the Jews was to get rid of what they perceived as a threat against them. They also desired to discredit Jesus' claims about himself by having him die under the curse of God (cf. Deut 21:23).[276] However, death by crucifixion is exactly the kind of death Jesus predicted for himself and the only means of ensuring the fulfillment of God's plan of salvation for mankind.

In the dialogue between Pilate and Jesus, Pilate's character emerges in an interesting fashion. Commenting that Pilate is to be viewed neither as a representative of Rome nor of the state, Culpepper observes,

> Like other characters caught between Jews and Jesus (principally Nicodemus, the lame man, and the blind man), Pilate is a study in the impossibility of compromise, the inevitability of decision, and the consequences of each alternative. In the end, although he seems to glimpse the truth, a decision in Jesus' favor proves too costly for him.[277]

Even though he believes in Jesus' innocence, saying three times that he finds no basis for a charge against him (18:38b; 19:4, 6b), he nevertheless passes the death sentence.[278] He chooses his own self-preservation over the release of an innocent man (cf. 19:2). Ironically, while Pilate thinks that Jesus is the one on trial, it is Pilate himself who is on trial and who must decide whether or not he will accept the truth.[279] Even further, while seeking to protect Rome from political insurrectionists, in the end he ironically chooses to release Barabbas, who is, as Burge aptly points out "a man who *is* a genuine threat to Rome, a man with proven capability to challenge the military occupation of Israel."[280] The Jews' vehement outcry for Barabbas' release is also an indication that they are not really concerned for the maintenance of the socio-political order.[281]

Prompted by Pilate's question recorded in verse 37, οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ; ("so you are a king?"), asked initially in verse 33,[282] Jesus declares, somewhat

surprisingly in light of the weight of the question, Ἐγὼ εἰς τοῦτο γεγέννημαι, καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ("For this I have been born, and for this I have come into the world, to bear witness to the truth"; 18:37; cf. 3:32; 8:47; 1 John 4:6). Ἵνα introduces a purpose clause—hence his reason for coming into the world was to testify concerning the truth (dative of reference/respect). Given the legal nature of the proceedings thus far, it is likely that μαρτυρέω is used here in a judicial sense, as an affirmation of the revelation that has come through Christ himself. Ridderbos points out that Jesus' testimony for the truth is not on his own behalf, but against the world in the lawsuit that God brings against it.[283] As in 5:33, where a similar phrase is used of John the Baptist (καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ), ἀλήθεια is something that is verbalized with regard to the veracity of a statement or an action. It also points to the validity of the claims concerning Jesus, namely that which is in accordance with the facts as he himself has represented them. Consequently, as in 5:33, it is an instance of metonymy. The ἀλήθεια that Jesus testifies to in this context is that of the ultimate revelation that has come through him, who is himself the truth, and is not simply that which is opposed to falsehood. The semantic relationship within this colon is qualificational substance-content and with the previous one, it is means-purpose.

Whereas this question has political implications, Jesus shifts the focus away from a physical dimension and associates his kingship with ἀλήθεια, thus indicating that it is of a different order than that of which Pilate speaks. According to Barrett, the kingship of Jesus is the core of the section encompassing 18:28–19:16.[284] This kingship, as Ridderbos points out,

> … consists in the utterly unique authority with which he represents the truth in the world. His birth and coming had no other purpose than to 'bear witness to the truth,' in the absolute sense in which the Fourth Gospel continually speaks of the truth: Jesus testifies to what 'he has seen and heard of the Father' (cf. 3:31–36), indeed to the truth that he himself is (14:6) and for which he answers with his life, person, and work.[285]

He completes his statement by declaring that πᾶς ὁ ων ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ἀκούει μου τῆς φωνῆς (everyone who is of the truth hears my voice; v. 37b, cf. 1 John 3:19; 2:21).

The prepositional phrase functions in a genitival relationship to the participial phrase ὁ ων indicating a sphere of belonging. Paradigmatically, ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας in verse 36 points back to, and therefore contrasts, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. While Whitacre may be right in pointing out that the entire phrase signifies an inner disposition, one that is tuned to the truth,[286] it is more accurate to understand it as "everyone who belongs to the sphere of truth," that sphere in which God reigns.[287]

While Jesus' response is an indication to Pilate that he poses no danger to Rome's political interests, it nonetheless creates a certain measure of discomfort

for Pilate. It is an implicit challenge to Pilate to recognize the truth.[288] Coming on the heels of this declaration, Pilate's question in verse 38, τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια; ("what is truth?"), may seem to convey a philosophical skepticism, and, indeed, some have even suggested this. However, in light of the unfolding drama, this view is not viable. Schnackenburg comments that Pilate's question "is meant to express ... neither philosophical skepticism nor cold irony, and certainly not a serious search for truth; for the evangelist it is an avoidance and so a rejection of Jesus' witness."[289] Whether or not an avoidance of a confrontation with the Roman state is in his mind here or that his intention is to cut off Jesus' testimony as Kostenberger suggests,[290] it is clear that Pilate failed to see what was so clearly before him. Unlike the Jewish leaders, however, Pilate's rejection of the truth is different in that he "lacks spiritual insight to comprehend the true nature of the Jewish case against Jesus and the spiritual dimension of his kingdom."[291] As Duke perceptively points out, there is dramatic irony in this question because the readers are aware that Pilate asks this question of the one who is himself the Truth (14:6).[292] Even more ironically, he ultimately not only rejects the truth, but despite his declaration of innocence, is responsible for colluding with the Jewish authorities to silence the Truth. Clearly, he did not understand Jesus' association of his kingship with its nature as truth. With regard to Pilate's question, τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια; (18:38), ἀλήθεια in this context reflects a representation of the facts as they stand, without distortion or manipulation. The semantic relationship in this instance is qualificational substance-content.

Conclusion

In the past, the study of truth terminology in the Gospel of John has been approached in a number of ways. One of the problematic issues that continues to surround the understanding of the meaning of the word ἀλήθεια is the insistence by the majority of scholars that the word necessarily reflects either a Greek or a Hebrew usage. As pointed out in chapter one, this is a misconception that was effectively demolished by Barr, who argued that one should not see the intrinsic semantic function of the word as being tied to Greek metaphysics, or even Hebrew conceptions of the reality of God. Even more recently, Thiselton concluded that it was misleading to tie exegetical conclusions about the meaning of ἀλήθεια to a theory about Johannine affinities of thought. In many instances, the understood meaning is seen to underlie every occurrence. This chapter has shown that it was not John's intention to force one meaning on all the contexts. Rather than propose that ἀλήθεια for John means one thing and one thing alone, it is perhaps better to allow the various contexts to speak for themselves rather than have one passage (generally 1:14–18) determine what it means throughout the Gospel. The conclusions arrived at on the use of truth terminology in the

Gospel of John are therefore based on the priority of contextual interpretation as opposed to etymological or metaphysical theories of language.

This survey of the different contexts within which ἀλήθεια in its various combinations and linguistic relationships appears has shown that John's use was varied. John uses ἀλήθεια in a number of ways: to signify the full and final/ultimate revelation of the redemptive purpose of God; to refer to God's faithfulness and reliability; to indicate that which is both tangible and personal, embodied in Christ himself; to refer to the redemptive content of that which has been revealed in and through Jesus; propositionally, to reflect that which is conformed to fact, and hence opposed to falsehood; to specify the sphere of operation in which believers are to function for worship and sanctification, a sphere that is opposed to the world; to refer to a sphere of belonging that is also opposed to the world; and lastly, to refer to qualities inherent in the Holy Spirit. Ἀλήθεια is also linked metaphorically with light and that which is opposed to it with darkness. There may occasionally be an overlap of these categories.

The findings of this chapter show that 'truth' for John is not a rigid concept. It is clear from the prologue onward that although he uses a term that is familiar to his readers, in certain contexts he adapts this term to suit the new circumstances brought about by the revelatory act of God breaking into human history. Thus, in his hands, ἀλήθεια is given a redefined shape and form that takes on different hues in different contexts.

Notes

1. This is the structure proposed by Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel According to John* (2 vols.; AB 29–29A; NY: Doubleday, 1966–1970), 1:cxxxix, and adopted by numerous scholars today.

2. Within the broader framework of 'Gospel,' the Gospel of John has been characterized as a biography (*bios*) (included in this category are theological biography, historical biography, biography using different modes such as tragedy, and so forth), an aretalogy, history, a novel, Greek drama (whether tragedy or comedy), a new literary form, narrative, narrative Christology, Jewish Trial, and even a Jewish theodicy. For a discussion of these various options, note especially the discussions by Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 1:4–11; Robert Guelich, "The Gospel Genre," in *The Gospel and the Gospels* (ed. P. Stuhlmacher; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 173–208; Hurtado, "Genre," 1:276–82.

3. For theological biography, see the discussion in I. Howard Marshall, "Luke and His 'Gospel,'" in *The Gospel and the Gospels* (ed. Stuhlmacher; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 273–82. The connections with Old Testament historical

narrative and the salvation-historical aspect were clarified in discussions with Dr. Andreas Köstenberger.

4. See R. Alan Culpepper, *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 151–82; Paul D. Duke, *Irony in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1985); Mark W. G. Stibbe, *John As Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel* (SNTSMS 73; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Wayne Brouwer, *The Literary Development of John 13–17: A Chiastic Reading* (SBLDS 182; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000):117–18. George Mlakuzhyil, *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel* (Rome: Pontificio Ist Biblico, 1987); Peter Ellis, "Understanding the Concentric Structure of the Fourth Gospel," *SVTQ* 47 (2003):131–154; Brown, *John,* 2:cxxxv–cxxxvi.

5. Culpepper, *Anatomy*, 85–88.

6. While a detailed analysis of the role of feasts in the Gospel of John lies outside the immediate scope of this work, a comprehensive overview of hypotheses that includes: those who assume that they are literary devices, structuring or informing the narrative (Boismard and Lamouille, Mollat, Williford, Yee); those that argue that they are cues to Johannine liturgical practice (Guilding, Goulder); and finally those that propose that they are emblems and facilitators of institutional Judaism (Destro and Pesce), may be found in Michael A. Daise, *Feasts in John: Jewish Festivals and Jesus' 'Hour' in the Fourth Gospel* (WUNT 2/229; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 31–103. He himself suggests that they serve to mark the imminent coming of Jesus' "hour." This study does not discount some of the insights arrived at in previous hypotheses, but nevertheless assumes that the purpose of the feasts and festivals is primarily to demonstrate that they are fulfilled in Jesus in various ways.

7. For an overview, see the discussion in D. A. Carson and Douglas J. Moo, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005), 225–84.

8. See B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975 [1881]), v–xxviii, for the development of this idea. See also Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001), 27–30; Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to John* (rev. ed.; NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 218–92.

9. For this discussion, see Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 300–302.

10. This argument is a development of one of the historical datum initially proposed by Westcott, the other two being the Gentile mission and the inevitable rise of false teaching, particularly Gnosticism. Andreas. J. Köstenberger, "The Destruction of the Second Temple and the Composition of the Fourth Gospel," *TrinJ* 26 NS (2005):205–42.

11. D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (PiNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 90, 662, argues that this should be understood not as "Jesus is the Christ," but as "the Christ is Jesus," which has the effect of emphasizing kind

rather than identity. This makes better sense of the data presented throughout the Gospel.

12. Of the nominal derivatives of this root אֱמֶת occurs the most frequently. R.W. L. Moberly, "אמן," *NIDOTTE* 1:428.

13. אֱמֶת is found 126 times in the OT, or 121 if the doublets are taken into consideration. In the Septuagint it is translated as ἀλήθεια or ἀλήθινος most of the time, and the Aramaic *qushta'*. In some cases, it is translated with πίστις or δικαιοσύνη. Jepsen, "*'aman,*" *TDOT* 1:309–10.

14. Johannes P. Louw and Eugene Nida, "True, False," *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 673–75.

15. Louw and Nida, "Real, Unreal," 667–68. These idioms are classified as having the literal meanings "in truth," "upon truth," and "according to truth," and pertain to being a real or actual event or state i.e. "actually," "really." This study will demonstrate that ἀλήθεια on its own as well as in these prepositional phrases has a wider use.

16. For a more complete discussion of words related to ἀλήθεια, see Mburu, *Rule of the Community,* 56–57.

17. For instance, Lightfoot suggests that the rhythm and style of Hebrew poetry characterizes most of the prologue. R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 78.

18. Rudolph Bultmann, *The Gospel of John* (trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 23, suggests that the prologue can only be regarded as cultic liturgical poetry that originated in the Baptist community. He sees within it evidence of the language of revelation as well as confession, and consequently suggests that it is constructed in a manner similar to that of the Odes of Solomon. For him, both the Prologue and Wisdom literature are similar because both come from "the same tradition for their source."

19. C. K. Barrett, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 150.

20. One of the reasons why a chiastic structure appears to work best is that the 'interpolations' do not present a problem. While these seem to interrupt the flow of the text and are omitted by some authors, these verses are accounted for in the proposals that incorporate a chiastic structure. They are actually considered to add to the message of the prologue, rather than interrupt it. The verses that some regard as interpolations by later editors (generally 1:6–8, 15), are key to the purpose of the gospel in light of the fact that they introduce key figures (John the Baptist) and themes (witness motif), and consequently in no way do they pose a problem to the unity of this section.

21. For instance, George R. Beasley-Murray, *John* (2d ed.; WBC 36; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1999)*,* 4, objects to a pivot that is focused on 1:12b, arguing that 1:14 is of greater theological importance and should therefore be seen as the pivot. However, this appears to be a subjective judgment.

22. For an overview, see R. Alan Culpepper, *The Gospel and Letters of John* (IBT;

Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 113–15; Jeff Staley, "The Structure of John's Prologue: It's Implications for the Gospel's Narrative Structure," *CBQ* 48 (1986):245; Andreas J. Köstenberger, *John* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 21.

23. Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 382, argues that ἔλαβον in 1:12a, ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, should be understood as a historical, not a soteriological, statement (Jews in Palestine received Jesus into their houses as a prophet). While the physical act of welcoming Jesus should not be discounted, nevertheless, the context suggests that the statement following (τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ), is better understood as parallel to the first clause, providing an expansion of thought—to receive him is to believe in him. See also Rudolf Schnackenburg, *The Gospel According to St. John* (2 vols.; New York: Seabury Press, 1980), 1:261, Bultmann, *John*, 56, and Francis J. Moloney, *The Gospel of John* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 38, who argue that 'received' here is parallel to 'believe' (cf. 5:43–44). This understanding further clarifies the centrality of verse 12.

24. Herman Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary* (trans. John Vriend; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 46.

25. For these options see Ridderbos, *John*, 46; Morris, *John*, 87; Bultmann, *John*, 57, Carson, *John,* 126.

26. Duke, *Irony,* 111.

27. So also Ben Witherington, *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel* (Louisville, KN: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 56; Köstenberger, *John,* 23. Others that have come to a similar conclusion include Staley, "The Structure of John's Prologue," 245, and Culpepper, *Gospel and Letters,* 116, whose narrative approaches emphasize the final form of the text.

28. Categories developed from J. P. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide* (Louisville, KN: Westminster John Knox, 1999), 178–9.

29. Many commentators have noted that the words Ἐν ἀρχῇ are an allusion to Genesis 1:1. For instance, Ridderbos, *John*, 23, Brown, *John*, 1:4, Carson, *John*, 114, Morris, *John*, 64, Beasley-Murray, *John*, 10, Witherington, *Wisdom*, 52, Schnackenburg, *John*, 1: 232, Köstenberger, *John,* 9 and Gary Burge, *John* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000), 54. Ἀρχή can mean either 'beginning' or 'first cause'. Because John uses dual meanings often as part of his literary style, it is possible that he intends both meanings here.

30. Discussions of the background of λόγος are not directly relevant to this study and hence will not be pursued.

31. Morris, *John*, 64.

32. John Calvin, *Commentary on the Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ According to John* (trans. Rev. William Pringle; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1848, 1999), 1:37 (emphasis original).

33. Hence, "God has revealed himself in an escalated, eschatological sense." Köstenberger, *John,* 35; cf. Carson, *John,* 122.

34. Contra Beasley-Murray, *John*, 11 and Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel,*

389, the statement 'the light shines' is not a timeless statement. Rather, the context suggests that it refers to the unique historical event when Christ entered the world. So also Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:245.

35. While the only other use of this word is found in 7:35 with the meaning 'overcome', the present context suggests that John may be making a play on words—the world estranged from God can neither understand the light nor does it have the ability to overcome it. This dual meaning is understood by Barrett, *John,* 158; Carson, *John*, 138; Burge, *John*, 56; Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 387; Keener, *John,* 1:387. Other interpretations include: Understood: Ridderbos, *John*, 39–40, Bultmann, *John*, 48, Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:246–47, Beasley-Murray, *John*, 11. Overcome: Brown, *John*, 1:8, Morris, *John*, 76, Köstenberger, *John,* 31.

36. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel,* 390.

37. Right from the beginning of his narrative, John reflects a use of light/darkness imagery that harks back to the Old Testament (as well as other Jewish literature); cf. Isa 9:2; 50:10; Ps 107:10, 14, the Genesis creation account, the Qumran literature etc. darkness communicates the idea of ignorance and fallenness and not just the absence of light, but positive evil. Therefore, darkness in this case is understood in its spiritual sense as reflective of the blinded world of men ensnared by evil and related to the κόσμος of verse 10. See Witherington, *Wisdom*, 55; Carson, *John*, 119.

38. The fact that he became flesh should not be taken to mean that he was no longer the divine λόγος. Witherington, *Wisdom*, 55, following Barrett, *John,* 164–65, rightly suggests that the translation "took on flesh" better preserves his identity.

39. Köstenberger, *John*, 41. Note that others see here an allusion to Exodus 33, so Morris, *John*, 92, or the Exodus in general, so Beasley-Murray, *John*, 14.

40. Ridderbos, *John*, 51.

41. However, note that there are some objections to the identification of this verb with the divine tabernacle. For instance, U. Schnelle, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes* (2d ed.; Leipzig, 1999), 40–41 argues that the allusion is not so much to the dwelling of God, but as in the Wisdom literature, alludes to the physical nature of the incarnation. Note the following statement: Das Verb σκηνοῦν erinnert nicht so sehr an das Zelt als Wohnort Gottes (vgl. Ex. 33, 9-11), sondern hat im >Zelten< der Sophia seine nächsten Parallelen (vgl. Sir. 24,4.8; äth. Hen. 42,2; Ps. 19,4; Bar. 3,38; vgl. ferner Philo, Imm. 134; NHC XIII 47,14 f.). Hier steht σκηνοῦν für den vergänglichen Menschenleib (vgl. Weish. 9,15; 2 Kor. 5,1.4; 2 Petr. 1,13.14), so daß V. 14b eine Steigerung der Inkarnationsaussage in V. 14a darstellt. Der menschgewordene Offenbarer Jesus Christus verweilte tatsächlich unter den Menschen, lebte in Zeit und Geschichte, hatte seine Geschichte und entschied die Geschichte." Given the context, it is likely that both are in John's mind and hence he communicates in this one word the physical manifestation of the divine indwelling.

42. This glory is ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, which should most likely be understood as 'in the quality of,' and in the context of the Old Testament concept of

glory. So Brown, *John*, 1:13. Discussion of what μονογενής means is beyond the scope of this work. This study follows Brown in the view that it means 'unique' as against Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:270–71 and Ridderbos *John*, 53, who prefer 'only begotten.'

43. While Carson, *John,* 126, concedes that the words 'full of grace and truth' may be descriptive of the Word, especially if πλήρη is understood to be nominative, hence agreeing with ὁ λόγο, he argues that because πλήρη is regularly indeclinable it should be understood as a modifier of δόξαν. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel*, 90, suggests that this adjective may agree with either 'the Word' or 'his glory' in spite of the bracket in the RV. Ridderbos, *John*, 54, suggests that if it is indeclinable, it agrees with δόξαν or better still with αὐτοῦ (following BAGD). Brown, *John*, 1:14, proposes that it may agree either with ὁ λόγο or υἱος from the variant that has the combination μονογενὴς υἱος, with no significant difference in meaning.

44. Contra Bultmann, *John,* 73–74, Moloney, *John*, 39, who see this as epexegetical, hence "grace, namely in truth," and "the fullness of a gift that is truth" respectively. While an epexegetical use is grammatically possible, the allusive reference to Exodus makes it unlikely.

45. Walter Brueggemann, *Exodus* (*NIB* 1; Nashville: Abingdon, 1994), 946, lists Phyllis Trible, David Noel Freedman, and a host of other scholars (cf. Num 14:18–19; Ps 145:8–9; Jonah 4:2; Nah 1:2–3). So also John I. Durham, *Exodus* (WBC 3; Waco: Word, 1987), 453, who notes that the confession that follows the double calling of Yahweh's name is clearly reflected in eight OT passages, three of them in Psalms (86:15; 103:8; 145:8) and one each in Num 14:18; Joel 2:13; Nah 1:3; Neh 9:17; and Jonah 4:2. Possible allusions to it can be discovered at additional places in the Old Testament, for instance Exod 20:5.

46. Bultmann, *John,* 73–74, sees this as having the formal meaning of 'giving grace' and 'gracious gift,' with truth denoting the content of the gift, the divine reality revealing itself.

47. Adolf Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament* (6th ed.; Stuttgart: Calwar Verlag, 1927, 1982), 552, writes, "Daher wird sie mit grace zu einem festgefügten Wortpaar verbunden. Während grace die anhebende, mit eigenem Trieb gebende Güte vor truth voraus hat, fügt dieses zu grace die Beharrlichkeit, und erhebt die Güte über das augenblickliche Erbarmen und die einzelne Hilfeleistung zu einem bleibenden Verband."

48. The categories employed in this study to describe the semantic relationships are from Nida, *Exploring Semantic Structures,* 50–65; *Style and Discourse: With Special Reference to the Text of the Greek New Testament* (ed. E. A. Nida et. al.; Cape Town: Bible Society, 1983, 1991), 102–103. See the appendix for a full listing of categories. See D. F. Tolmie, "A Discourse Analysis of John 17:1–26," *Neot* 27 (1993):403–11, for a study that follows a somewhat similar approach to the analysis of the semantic content of language segments.

49. Various meanings have been suggested for ἀντί in 1:16: Corresponds to (Bernard); in return for (Augustine)—for these two options see Carson, *John,* 131–32; Upon or in addition to, which means that this grace is inexhaustible, so

Bultmann, *John*, 78, Beasley-Murray, *John*, 15, Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:275–6, Barrett, *John*, 168; instead of (the most convincing) so Brown, *John*, 1:16; Carson, *John,* 131–32, Köstenberger, *John,* 47.

50   Contra Wallace, *Grammar*, 461, who understands ὅτι causally.

51. Although these abstract nouns are articular in this case, there is no appreciable difference in sense with 1:14. They may have an anaphoric use, pointing to the grace and truth previously mentioned. In this particular context, διά with the genitive suggests that the preposition is used for agency.

52. Köstenberger, *John,* 438.

53. Ibid.*,* 47.

54. Otto Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960), 54, writes, "Johannes unterscheidet sich dadurch von der Sekte, daß bei ihm die Wahrheit nicht an die Tora gebunden ist, sondern mit der Person Christi in die Welt hereintritt."

55. Davies, *Rhetoric,* 73.

56. Ridderbos, *John*, 57–58.

57. Morris, *John*, 100.

58. Stephen J. Casselli, "Jesus as Eschatological Torah," *TrinJ* 18 NS (1997):37. He himself defines it as ambivalent, on the basis of the lack of evidence from the formal structure of this passage.

59. Carson, *John,* 132.

60. This category is not identified by Nida. However, Cotterell & Max, *Linguistics*, 212, describe a semantic relationship in which "the prominent kernel expresses an event or state of affairs that would be *unexpected* given the information offered in the other kernel."

61. For instance Gen 24:27, 49; Exod 34:6; Josh 2:14; 2 Sam 2:6; 15:20; Pss 25:10; 40:11; 57:3; 61:7; 85:10; 86:15; 89:14, 24; 98:3; 115:1; 138:2; Prov 3:3; 14:22; 16:6; 20:28. Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:314.

62. Note that in the LXX, πολυέλεος (very merciful) not χάρις is used to translate חֶסֶד, and the adjectival form ἀληθινός is used rather than the substantive. However, contra Bultmann, *John,* 74, this is not an obstacle to seeing Exodus 34 as the source. Thiselton, "Truth," 889, points out that John does not always follow the LXX accurately and moreover, χάρις replaced ἔλεος as the standard translation of חֶסֶד in later Greek. Representative translations that accurately capture the meaning include NIV, NIB (NIV UK) abounding in love and faithfulness.

63. Other instance where this formulaic proclamation attached to God occur in the same combination in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint include 2 Sam 2:6; Ps 25:10; 61:8; 86:15; 89:15. אֱמֶת is variously rendered in the versions as truth or faithfulness.

64. Morris, *John*, 95, suggests Exod 34:6, and Brown, *John*, 1:14, Exod 35:6.

65. Köstenberger, *Encountering John,* 52, points out that Israel finds grace in Yahweh's sight (33:14)/disciples receive "grace instead of grace"(1:16); No one can see Yahweh's face and live (33:20)/no one has seen God at any time (1:18); Yahweh's glory passes by Moses (33:23; 34:6-7)/the disciples beheld the

word's glory (1:14); Yahweh abounds in loving kindness and truth (34:6)/Jesus is full of grace and truth (1:14, 17); Yahweh dwelt in a tent (33:7)/the Word "tented" among the disciples (1:14); Moses was given the Law (34:27–28)/the Law was given through Moses (1:17); Moses, mediator between Yahweh, Israel (34:32–35)/Jesus, mediator between God and man (1:17–18). Lindsay, "'What is Truth?'129–145, notes the following: both dwell in a tent, the visible glory of God (Exod 33:9f., 18 ff.; 34:29ff./John 1:14), as well as the idea of seeing God (Exod 33:20–23/John 1:18) are prominent themes in both; finding or receiving the grace of God also features in both (Exod 33:12f. 16f.; 34:9/John 1:16), and the Law, also referred to here (1:17), is a dominant theme of Exodus 34.

66. Brueggemann, *Exodus*, 945.
67. Ibid.
68. See Bultmann, *John,* 321.
69. Vos, "'True' and 'Truth,'" 510.
70. George Eldon Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 302.
71. See Craig A. Evans, *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue,* JSNTSup 89 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).
72. Swain, "Truth," 33, in his discussion also concludes that in addition, 'reality,' not in the Platonic sense, but in the sense of the complete reality of the revelation of God's covenant faithfulness that Jesus has brought, be seen as a vital part of the meaning of this word here.
73. Köstenberger, "John," *DBT* 280–82.
74. Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel According to Saint John* (BNTC; New York: Hendrickson, 2005), 8.
75. Not all commentators are in agreement on this. Some suggest that Jesus' discourse continues to the end of verse 21, so Moloney, *John*, 90, Brown, *John,* 1:149. Those that view these comments as editorial and beginning in verse 16, the author's position, include Carson, *John,* 203, Burge, *John,* 113, 117–18, Köstenberger, *John,* 128, Morris, *John,* 202 (as evidence, Morris points out that the cross is spoken of in the past, μονογενῆ is used of Christ only by John, and the expression ποιέω τὴν ἀλήθειαν is characteristically Johannine, and never found on the lips of Jesus). Others suggest that verses 12–15 should at the very least be considered transitional; so Witherington, *Wisdom,* 99.
76. See Köstenberger, *John,* 118, for some of these views.
77. Carson, *John,* 186.
78. Barrett, *John,* 205.
79. Beck rightly observes that "Nicodemus' response to Jesus here is not merely inadequate, it is non-existent. He fails to indicate any acceptance, or even comprehension of Jesus' word. He never makes an active faith response to Jesus, or even verbal confession. He does not witness to anyone concerning what he has seen and heard from Jesus. His is not a wrong response, but a non-response." David Beck, *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel* (BibInt 27; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 67.

80. Duke, *Irony,* 45–46.

81. Ridderbos, *John,* 124, notes that as in 1:51, this utterance resembles "a revelational utterance that not only transcends human certainties ('we know') but also replaces them with something of another order and a higher priority."

82. While there is a controversy over the meaning/significance of γεννάω, whether it pertains to 'to be born' or 'to be begotten', the understanding is that "[e]ntry into the kingdom is not by way of human striving, … but by that rebirth which only God can effect." Morris, *John,* 189.

83. "Spirit" probably has a double meaning in this context. So Morris, *John,* 195, and contra Carson, *John,* 191–96, who identifies it as the human spirit. With regard to ἐξ ὕδατος, Carson, *John,* 191–96, rightly argues that this phrase must be understood in light of the Old Testament understanding, as Nicodemus would have. In this case, it refers to the eschatological cleansing and renewal promised by the Old Testament prophets, which is both corporate as well as individual. Any understanding of it by John's readers in terms of Christian baptism is therefore secondary. It is not the rite that is in view here, but the need for radical transformation.

84. For Nicodemus it meant a participation in the kingdom at the end of the age, the experience of eternal resurrection life. Only the wicked and the apostate would be exempt from this. John's stress, however, is on participation both now and in the future. Carson, *John,* 188–89.

85. Hence, Witherington, *Wisdom,* 95, argues against seeing this as an instance of double entendre and suggests instead that the problem lies in that Jesus and Nicodemus are operating on two levels of understanding. He writes, "Nicodemus assumes that Jesus is referring to another physical birth by the phrase 'born anew,' whereas in fact Jesus is referring to a birth of a different sort, caused by the work of the Holy Spirit in someone's life."

86. For the former see Bultmann, *John,* 135, Witherington, *Wisdom,* 95, and for the latter see Schnackenburg, *John,* 1:367–69, Burge, *John,* 114.

87. Barrett, *John,* 207, notes the following words with "double or doubtful meaning": ἄνθρωπος (19:5), ἄνωθεν (3:3,7), ἀποθνῄσκειν ὑπὲρ (11:50f.; cf. 18:14), βασιλεύς (19:14f., 19, 21), εὐχαριστεῖν (6:11, 23), καθίζειν (19:13), καταλαμβάνειν (1:5), ὕδωρ (4:10), ὑπάγειν (8:21; 13:33), ὕπνος (11:13), ὑψοῦν (3:14; 8:28; 12:32–34).

88. For instance Barrett, *John,* 205–6, Morris, *John,* 189, Moloney, *John,* 92, see this as part of John's literary technique of misunderstanding, which is only possible in the Greek. Brown, *John,* 1:130 and Beasley-Murray, *John,* 45, also hold this view but suggest that John is emphasizing 'from above' over 'again.'

89. Carson, *John*, 202.

90. Barrett, *John,* 216, points out that in 5:27 and 9:39, the meaning of κρίσιν is neutral, whereas in this context it means 'to condemn', the opposite of which is 'to save'. Lincoln, *Truth,* 70, however, sees this as a "rescue mission" (cf. v. 17b), and hence proposes the more neutral sense of "putting on trial." However,

his later statement, whereby he reiterates that a negative response to the Son produces a negative judgment, seems to imply otherwise.

91. Barrett, *John,* 217, notes that the same word, ἐλέγχω, is used in 16:8 of the Paraclete and in both places refers to convincing exposure. He therefore finds a parallel here between the work of Christ and the work of the Spirit. However, given the imagery of light which accompanies it, in this context it is the aspect of exposure rather than the judicial sense that comes to the fore (even as one cannot discount that conviction lies in the background). This is further strengthened by the fact that the positive counterpart of ἐλέγχω is φανερόω, used in the next verse (cf. Brown, *John,* 1:135). Hence, it has a different sense than in both 8:46 and 16:8. See also Lincoln, *Truth,* 71. This, however, in no way negates the parallels noted by Barrett.

92. Ridderbos, *John,* 142.

93. Although Morris, *John,* 208, argues that this phrase cannot be used to contrast verse 20 because the verbs used are different it is likely that John used ποιέω and πράσσω interchangeably, as he does with a number of other verbs such as ἀγαπάω and φιλέω.

94. Ridderbos, *John,* 142.

95. Thiselton, "Truth," 891.

96. Lindsay, "What is Truth?" 135.

97. Ridderbos, *John,* 142.

98. Swain, *Truth,* 37.

99. Carson, *John,* 207.

100. The identity of the woman is not important. Indeed, John presents her simply as γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας. Other references in which the article is affixed merely reflect an anaphoric use (cf. vv. 11, 15, 19, 25, 28, 39, 42). See the discussion in Wallace, *Grammar,* 218, 324.

101. See Brown, *John,* 1:176, Ridderbos, *John,* 152.

102. He notes that Jesus asks for water but apparently receives none. Dialogue rather than action carries the scene. Living water, of which Jesus is the source, rather than well water, to which the Samaritan woman has access, becomes the central concern. Additionally, the woman is not of marriageable status; she has had five husbands. Still, Jesus goes to her village, and she receives him as her Lord. Culpepper, *Anatomy,* 137; cf. Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 51–58.

103. While Samaritans recognized the five books of Moses, they were suspected of being an idolatrous cult because they venerated Mt. Gerizim as a holy mountain. Köstenberger, *John, Acts*, 45.

104. Gerald L. Borchert, *John 1–11* (2 vols.; Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1996, 2002), 1:202. Reading beyond this to verse 17b, the reader comes to the realization of just how unusual this situation is, when he is made aware of her immoral lifestyle.

105. This second class conditional statement is therefore understood thus: If you

knew the gift of God [but you do not] … you would have asked him and he would have given you living water.

106. Contra Brown, *John,* 1:179–80, this passage does not allude to baptism. He bases his argument on the similarities he sees between this story and that of Nicodemus and the assumption that 3:5 is a reference to baptism. Hence, although the issue in verses 1 and 2 had to do with baptism, there is nothing in this particular context to suggest that this is what Jesus is referring to. So also Morris, *John,* 225.

107. For a detailed discussion of the various viewpoints and arguments surrounding this issue, see Mburu, *Rule of the Community,* 82–84.

108. Schnackenburg, *John,* 1:426–31. Therefore while Burge, *John,* 144, correctly identifies this relationship of equivalence, his conclusion that they both refer to the Holy Spirit tends to underplay the Christological emphasis in this particular context. He points the reader to Acts 2:38; 8:20; 10:45; 11:17; Heb. 6:4.

109. Köstenberger, "John," 282.

110. Jesus is not speaking of physical water from a well and he is indeed greater than Jacob. Carson, *John,* 219.

111. See Morris, *John,* 236, Ridderbos, *John,* 158–60, Carson, *John,* 220–21.

112. Contra Beasley-Murray, John, 62, Brown, *John,* 1:172, Morris, *John,* 241, Moloney, *John*, 130, 134, Schnackenburg, *John*, 1:442 here ἐγώ εἰμι does not refer to Christ's divinity. So Carson, *John,* 227, Witherington, *Wisdom,* 121, Barrett, *John,* 239.

113. Although the statement οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός seems to indicate some awareness of the coming of the messiah, it may be that she is referring to the Samaritan messiah known as the Taheb, primarily a political figure but also expected to restore true worship since he was of the tribe of Levi. See Schnackenburg, *John,* 1:441. However, this is not certain as Moloney, *John,* 133–34, points out that the evidence for this individual is late.

114. The Temple played a significant role in the lives of the Israelites: it enabled them to fulfil their obligations e.g. offering first-fruits, tithes, wave offerings and obligatory sacrifices; it served as the place of worship and prayer and was the place in which study of the Torah was conducted and questions on legal tradition could be posed; it provided a place for Temple worship alongside the priests, as well as ritual cleansing with cleansing water. See S. Safrai, "The Temple," In *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (ed. S. Safrai et al; CRINT 2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 876–77. For Jesus to suggest that its centrality in worship would become obsolete is therefore shocking.

115. John's eschatology is a realized eschatology. As Beasley-Murray, *John,* lxxxvi notes, "[t]he Evangelist consistently represents the new existence in Christ by the Spirit to be a *present* reality. Life in the kingdom of God or new creation is *now,* not a hope reserved for the future" (cf. 5:21, 24; 12:31). At the same time, the tension between realized and futurist eschatology is evident, for this Gospel also anticipates the raising of the dead on the last day by the Son of God (5:21, 25,

28–29; 6:39, 40, 44, 54), future judgment (12:48), and what may be a reference to the Parousia (14:3). Barrett, *John,* 68, suggests that this paradox may be partially explained by the fact that John wrote from two standpoints—both before and after the resurrection.

116. Köstenberger, *John,* 155.

117. Schnackenburg, *John,* 1:435, points out that the shift in pronouns from verse 21 makes it clear that he is no longer addressing the woman as an individual, but as a representative of the Samaritan people (προσκυνήσετε, with the personal pronoun ὑμεῖς in verse 22).

118. Stibbe, *John as Storyteller,* 64.

119. This worship is based on the fact of the nature of God as spirit. So also Carson, *John,* 225–26, and contra Beasley-Murray, *John,* 62, who views the phrase as defining God in terms of his work in the world.

120. Ridderbos, *John,* 163–64. Other proponents of the hendiadys theory include Brown, *John,* 1:172, 180–81, Marianne Meye Thompson, *The God of the Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001)*,* 214–16.

121. Carson, *John,* 225.

122. C. John Collins, "John 4:23–24, 'In Spirit and Truth': An Idiomatic Proposal," *Presbyterion* 21/2 (1995): 118–21, esp. 120, points out that this ἐν … καὶ ἀληθεία combination only occurs one other time in the Johannine literature (cf. 1 John 3:18). There the context demands that καί be viewed as having an epexegetical or explicative use, hence the translation "in *deed*, that is, in *reality*," reflecting that genuine love is demonstrated in actions. He therefore argues for a similar use in this instance with ἀλήθεια having the sense of genuineness or reality, and πνεῦμα referring to the inner man. His translation therefore reads "in spirit, that is to say, in reality." He notes comparable instances of this structure in the New Testament, found only in Eph 5:9 and 1 Tim 2:7, with the latter being the only truly analogous instance (although even here it is not entirely clear whether an epexegetical use is in view). Looking outside the New Testament, and including at least one εἰς phrase, he suggests that it might "be possible to propose a wider definition, whereby ἐν A καὶ B could be interpreted as "in A, that is to say in B," when A and B are not synonymous and when the context favors seeing B as a comment on the activity done in manner A, rather than an additional item in a list. This seems to be the case in 2 Pet 3:7, and in Judith 7:25; and possibly 2 Pet 3:1; 1 Maccabees 3:51; Ben Sira 45:4." One criticism against these examples is that while most are valid, the first two use nouns that appear to be synonymous. However, this does not weaken the proposal as the other examples conform to the pattern.

123. See, for instance, Morris, *John,* 240; Collins, "John," 118–21.

124. Rodney A. Whitacre, *John* (IVP 4; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999), 106–107.

125. Contra Edwin D. Freed, "The Manner of Worship in John 4:23f.," in *Search the Scriptures: New Testament Studies in Honor of Raymond T. Stamm* (ed. J. M. Myers et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 46–47, the focus in this phrase is not merely ethical, relating merely to the right attitude and practice as in Qumran.

126. Ridderbos, *John,* 163–64.

127. Köstenberger, *John,* 438.

128. Dorothy Lee, "In the Spirit of Truth: Worship and Prayer in the Gospel of John and the Early Fathers," *VC* 58 (2004):280, 287, therefore proposes that Jesus acts as the locus, object, and means of worship (the first two overlap and the last signifies that he is the avenue through which true worship of the Father is made possible cf. 1:14; 2:13–22; 4:23, 24; 9:38b; 12:1–8; 20:4–29).

129. Ladd, *Theology,* 267.

130. Culpepper, *Anatomy,* 129, writes, "[t]he reasons for the Jews' response are explained not in terms of their 'Jewishness' but in universally applicable characteristics: they have never heard or seen the Father (5:37), they do not want to come to Jesus so that they might have life (5:40), they do not have the love of God in themselves (5:42), and they do not receive Jesus (5:43) or seek the glory of God (5:44). An even more basic reason emerges later: they are from a different world order (8:23). The pathos of their unbelief is that they are the religious people, some even the religious authorities, who have had all the advantages of the heritage of Israel. Through the Jews, John explores the heart and soul of unbelief."

131. It is not clear what this feast refers to, whether Passover, Pentecost or Tabernacles, and a search for its specific identity probably does not greatly affect one's understanding of this account; the information about it being 'a feast of the Jews' is sufficient. As Brown points out, this is a secondary interest. Brown, *John,* 1:206.

132. Morris, *John,* 265, Ridderbos, *John,* 184.

133. A. E. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1977)*,* 76, points out that in this instance, carrying a bed was explicitly forbidden in the Mishnah (*M. Shab.* 10.1–5) and had legal consequences.

134. Harvey argues that Jesus is not claiming honor or privilege, but is rather explaining that his actions are consistent with God's intentions. As God's accredited agent, he could not be charged. He writes, "it was an established rule that an agent, when acting on the authority of his principle, must be treated as his principal would be if he were present." Ibid.*,* 91.

135. Köstenberger, *John,* 188, explains that "Jesus' role as the sent son highlights both Jesus' equality with the Father in purpose (and even nature) and his subordination to the Father in carrying out his mission: 'it is a legal presumption that an agent will carry out his mission' (*b. `Erub.* 31b–32a; cf. *b. Ketub.* 99b)."

136. See the background to the legal principle of witness in Dt 19:15; 17:6; Num 35:30. Brown, *John,* 1:223. Aalen, "Truth," 7, also provides a discussion of Old Testament theological uses of 'testimony' and 'truth.'

137. Cf. Susanna, Daniel 13 and the trial of Jesus. Schnackenburg, *John,* 2:120.

138. Lincoln, *John,* 205.

139. Brown, *John,* 1:224.

140. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial,* 32, astutely points out, "[t]he whole question of Jesus' authority, in John's Gospel, is closely linked with that of his credentials, of the evidence he can produce."

141. While some suggest that the use of perfect tenses here indicate that his present testimony is as an established datum or it remains as evidence, is a continuing message or even that it still has value (cf. Barrett, *John,* 264, Carson, *John,* 260, Beasley-Murray, *John,* 78, Morris, *John,* 288, Brown, *John,* 1:224, Bultmann, *John,* 264–65), the perfect tenses are merely indicative of the front-grounding of this event. The author wishes to draw attention to it. For the significance of aspect, see Stanley Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament: With Respect to Tense and Mood* (New York: P. Lang, 1993).

142. Crump, "Truth," *DJG* 860.

143. Ridderbos, *John,* 260.

144. Allison A. Trites, *The New Testament Concept of Witness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 92.

145. Brown, *John,* 1:225.

146. Lincoln, *John,* 264, notes that as was the case in 5:17–49, "Jesus starts off as a witness in his own defense and then the roles become reversed, as he becomes prosecutor and judge of the opponents, leveling counter-accusations and charges against them." See also *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit motif in the Fourth Gospel* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000), 86. Trites, *Concept of Witness,* 84, points out that this switching of roles is not uncommon in the Fourth Gospel (John the Baptist is represented as both a witness to Christ and an advocate whose task is to convince unbelievers) and finds a precedent in the Old Testament lawsuit (cf. Isa 41:21–24, 26; 43:9).

147. Note that earlier, Jesus had himself stated that his own self-testimony was not valid, but had gone ahead to include ample testimony from others that proved that his testimony was acceptable (cf. 5:31–45). By stating that he is the light of the world, in the context of the Feast of Tabernacles, Jesus points to himself as the fulfilment of the torch-lighting ceremony that formed part of this feast (cf. 9:5) as well as all that the Torah signified with regard to light (cf. Ps 119:105; Wis 7:26) and life (cf. Deut 30:15–20; Sir 17:11; Prov 8:35). So Köstenberger, "John," 282; Lincoln, *John,* 265.

148. No semantic distinction should be made between πιστεύω plus the dative and πιστεύω plus εἰς. See Carson, *John,* 346–47, Beasley-Murray, *John,* 132, Morris, *John,* 404. Lincoln rightly refers to the response of the people as "pseudo-belief." Lincoln, *Truth,* 90.

149. Brown, *John,* 1:355.

150. It is possible that rather than have merely a transitional force (so Wallace, *Grammar,* 674), the conjunction οὖν should be interpreted logically. This suggests that Jesus saw the need to address the meager faith of those individuals. Morris, *John,* 404.

151. Ibid., 403.

152. Bultmann, *John,* 434.

153. Ridderbos, *John,* 308.

154. Borchert, *John,* 303, notes that an understanding of the Feast of the Tabernacles is important for understanding Jesus' words about liberation in this context.

He suggests that the feast commemorates the experience of the Israelites in the wilderness and therefore alludes to more than political freedom. The statement of the Jews therefore claims that because of their kinship with Abraham they have never been under the power of an external spiritual force. Schnackenburg, *John,* 2:206, also points out that in view of the Johannine concept of sin, more than 'moral freedom' is in view. Hence, it refers to "freedom existentially as liberation from the realm of sin and death, from the darkness of an existence remote from God (cf. 8:12), from the ordinary unsaved situation of man in 'this world' (see on 8:23)."

155. Brown, *John,* 1:355.

156. Schnackenburg, *John,* 2:208, Barrett, *John,* 345.

157. Morris, *John,* 407, notes that "Jews held themselves to be sons in God's household. They presumed accordingly on rights that, being really slaves, they did not possess." Jesus corrects this mistaken belief by pointing to himself as the liberator.

158. Barrett, *John,* 345.

159. Early rabbinic writing contains the idea that the study of the Law is a liberating factor, freeing one from worldly care (*Pirqe Aboth* iii 6). See Brown, *John,* 1:355.

160. Unfortunately, in arguing that remaining firm and knowing the truth are virtually the same, he commits the etymological fallacy. He argues that because they are represented by the same root in Hebrew (אמן), "the use of these various Greek terms in John 8:30–47 could reflect various aspects of the Hebrew *'mn.* The conditional, perhaps even reciprocal relationship between remaining in Christ's word and knowing the truth is not unlike the relationship between "believing" and 'being established," which is expressed in Isaiah 7:9 (cf. Chron. 20:20)." Lindsay, "What is Truth?" 139. Hence, while his conclusion is valid, the basis of his argument is not.

161. Carson, *John,* 348–49.

162. Schnackenburg, *John,* 2:205.

163. Carson, *John,* 351–52, Ridderbos, *John,* 311–12.

164. This is a second class contrary to fact conditional sentence: If God were your Father [but he is not], then you would love me.

165. Although this construction poses some difficulties in translation, it does not mean that the devil has a father. Rather, as has been pointed out by various scholars, Jesus is concluding his discussion of the Jews' paternity. See Barrett, *John,* 348–49 and contra Bultmann, *John,* 318–19.

166. Morris, *John,* 411.

167. Betz points out the analogous relationship between ἀλήθεια and τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας in this context. Both suffuse or fill the inner being of a believer (8:44, 14:17; cf. 1 John 1:8; 2:4). Betz, *Offenbarung,* 60.

168. This is a reference to his actions in the Garden of Eden. See Köstenberger, *John,* 266, who lists numerous commentators holding this view, as well as a secondary reference to Cain and Abel.

169. Schnackenburg, *John,* 2:214.

170. Note that unless one understands that the referent of αὐτοῦ is τὸ ψεῦδος, the construction ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ poses some difficulties in translation. Barrett, *John,* 349, suggests that this difficulty arises from the Evangelist's attempt to make a negative parallel between Jesus and the Father.

171. Brown, *John,* 1:365.

172. Ridderbos, *John,* 315.

173. Schnackenburg, *John,* 2:227, suggests that instead John uses καλῶς λέγειν/λαλεῖν (cf. 4:17; 18:23) and ἀληθές/ἀληθῆς λέγειν (cf. 4:18; 19:35c) to communicate this.

174. See Hawkins, "The Johannine Concept of Truth":3–13.

175. Carson, *John,* 481.

176. For a fuller discussion, see Mburu, The *Rule of the Community*, 104–105.

177. See the discussion in L. Scott Kellum, *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33* (JSNTSup 256; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004), 63–76.

178. See Barrett, *John,* 449; Morris, *John,* 558; Carson, *John,* 476; Kellum, *Unity*, 149–52.

179. Köstenberger, *John,* 396–98.

180. Brown, *John,* 2:597–601.

181. Köstenberger, *John*, 395.

182. Adolf Schlatter, *The Theology of the Apostles: The Development of New Testament Theology* (trans. Andreas J. Köstenberger; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998)*,* 178, rightly explains that for John, the cross is seen as the exaltation of Jesus. John focuses on Jesus' glory because this is his communion with the Father by which he accomplishes his mission of revealing God. Duke, *Irony,* 113–14 also points out that this death as exaltation is the dominant irony concerning Jesus' destiny.

183. Charles H. Talbert, *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles* (New York: Crossroad, 1994), 203.

184. This cleansing is both literal (the footwashing) and figurative (the exposure and departure of Judas). Köstenberger, *John,* 424–25.

185. Köstenberger, *John*, *Acts,* 136.

186. Some scholars suggest awkward redactional manipulation, but viewed in the framework of the loose chiastic structure adopted her, it fits in perfectly for it is only by abiding in Christ is a community of mutual love produced.

187. πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε. The context of distress and uncertainty suggests that the verbs in this clause are most likely imperative/imperative. As Carson briefly points out, the other options, namely indicative/indicative and indicative/imperative do not adequately reflect the context, and imperative/indicative, "though syntactically possible, is incoherent." See Carson, *John,* 487–88.

188. The nature of μοναί is not exactly clear. The only other occurrence is in 14:23 where it clearly has a spiritual sense. Whitacre, *John,* 348–49, in arguing against a materialistic view of heaven, explains, "[i]t is indeed an objective 'place' but not in the material sense many have in mind. Perhaps the most helpful language we

have at present to speak of such a reality is to refer to it as another 'dimension.' The exact relation between the present physical universe and the new heavens and new earth is unclear, but the idea that someone could reach heaven in a spaceship misunderstands the language of Scripture."

189. This identification of Jesus with ἡ ζωή is seen in numerous instances in the Gospel. Jesus is the one who possesses life and the only one with the authority to impart it (cf. 1:4; 3:15; 4:13; 6:54; 10:28 etc.). In this instance, he reveals that he is himself the life.

190. Barr, *Semantics*, 198, argues that those who see the Hebrew background as the key to the interpretation of ἀλήθεια in this context should realize that this is not a normal sentence even in normal Hebrew speech. He writes, "Even 'God is truth' is nowhere found in the Old Testament, although there are a good many references to 'thy truth' and the like."

191. Schnackenburg, *John,* 3:63–64, therefore interprets verse 6a as "I am the way, that is, the truth and the life," and notes that most exegetes today generally suggest this interpretation. See his discussion for a brief overview of other interpretations, with the Church fathers generally viewing the second and third predicates as having special value as goals to be achieved, and Bultmann, who gives it an existential, theological interpretation based on parallels in Mandaean literature.

192. Carson, *John,* 491.

193. See F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (ed. and trans. Robert W. Funk; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), no. 442. So also Potterie, "Truth," 72; David Mark Ball, *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications,* JSNTSup 124 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 120–21. While Swain, *Truth,* 53, argues against seeing this first καί as epexegetical, on the basis that John's typical grammatical construction of three elements connected by καί never has this use (cf. 2:14; 16:8), his argument is hardly convincing. In 2:14, the three elements (namely oxen, sheep and doves) are clearly to be regarded as coordinate given what they represent. In 16:8, sin can hardly be explicated with righteousness and judgment. In both cases, the context calls for a coordinating use for καί. As to his objection that καί never has this epexegetical use, this is overruled by the clear instance in 1:16 (ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος). While this does not prove its use here (the surrounding context does), it does show that this use was not foreign to John.

194. Moloney, *John,* 395.

195. So Lincoln, *John,* 438. Schnackenburg, *John,* 3:66, objects to the understanding that the Johannine idea of the way derives from Judaism. He states, "there is no conscious perspective directed towards the goal in the Jewish texts. This perspective is at the most in the background, providing motivation, either in the promises made to those who are walking on the right way or in their expectation of God's eschatological reward and new creation. In John, on the other

hand, the way and the goal form a single unity, the 'way' coming into view only through the 'goal.'" However, Brown, *John,* 2:628–30, points out convincing parallels from Jewish literature (e.g. Ps 119:30; Prov 15:24; Tob 1:3; Wis 5:6; 1QS 4.15–16) that come close to John's meaning. He rightly argues that even given the emphasis on the revelatory sense in this context, one ought not to posit a radical dichotomy between the revelatory and moral aspect of Jesus as the way. In addition, given John's Christology, there is no reason to assume that John's use is not a development of the Jewish terminology.

196. Stephen J. Casselli, "Jesus as Eschatological Torah," *TrinJ* 18 NS (1997):15–41, argues convincingly for the presentation of Jesus in this Gospel as the fulfillment of the Law, as eschatological Torah. This is based on John's use of the Exodus narrative, the connection of Jesus with Moses, and in particular the representation of both as the Word of God, wisdom, truth, as well as the familiar images of life and light, bread, water, and wine. See his article for this discussion.

197. Ladd, *Theology,* 303.

198. Schlatter, *Theology of the Apostles,* 129–30.

199. Thompson, "John," 378.

200. The future tense not the imperative is the correct reading, see Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament* (3d ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), 245.

201. Schnackenburg, *John,* 3:74, points out that τὰς ἐντολὰς does not refer to moral precepts or even the new command just given. It encompasses λόγος amd λόγοι mentioned in verses 23 and 24 and hence refers to "the whole of Jesus' activity in the sphere of revelation."

202. 14:16 is the first of five Paraclete sayings. Others are found at 14:26; 15:26; 16:7–11, 12–15.

203. This also shows the close relationship between Spirit and truth, a conclusion that leads Betz to rightly propose that ἀλήθεια is a mark of the divine being. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 60.

204. It could also be translated as "another who will be a Paraclete" but the option "another Paraclete" is preferred because of the textual evidence supplied by 1 John 2:1. This term is often used in a legal sense in secular Greek to refer to a legal assistant or advocate. Later Rabbinic writings associated the role of advocate with the Holy Spirit (*Lev. Rab.* 6.1 on Lev 5:1). See Johannes Behm, "Παράκλητος," *TDNT* 5. 803.

205. Köstenberger, *John,* 437.

206. Beasley-Murray, *John,* 256, refutes Blank's proposal that the two exercise parallel, not successive functions, since the Gospel is written in the post-Easter situation. He rightly points out that the Gospel makes a distinction between the past and present of Jesus.

207. D. Moody Smith, *John* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 274–75, points out that the pronouns used in this case are plural (ὑμᾶς, ὑμῖν) indicating that this

indwelling probably has the community of believers as a whole in focus, rather than individual believers, with ἐν having a range of meanings from 'within' to 'among' (the NRSV translation). While this is true, his inner presence in individuals is also necessary since it is only inwardly that believers are able to understand the Spirit and his activity. See the discussion in Schnackenburg, *John,* 3:76. Smith's conclusion is an unwarranted dichotomy that appears to lay excessive stress on grammar without recognizing the overall context. It should be understood as a both/and situation.

208. While the phrase τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας is not used in this context, it is understood from other contexts that τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας and ὁ παράκλητος refer to the same thing.

209. Schnackenburg, *John,* 3:82–83.

210. Carson, *John,* 505, further points out with regard to the original readers/hearers of this Gospel that John's purpose in including this theme was to explain how the first group of believers, the disciples attained "an accurate and full understanding of the truth of Jesus. The Spirit's ministry in this respect was not to bring qualitatively new revelation, but to complete, to fill out, the revelation brought by Jesus himself." So also Barrett, *John,* 467, who points out that this is not new teaching.

211. M. E. Boring, "The Influence of Christian Prophecy on the Johannine Portrayal of the Paraclete and Jesus," *NTS* 25 (1978):113–23, suggests that the role of the Paraclete accords best with that of the Spirit of prophecy in the Old Testament. Whitacre, *John*, 358–59, similarly notes, "[r]ather, the role of the Spirit as Paraclete is similar to that of the Spirit of prophecy in the Old Testament, that is, 'the Spirit acting as the organ of communication between God and a person . . . He bears witness to Jesus, thereby leading the disciples into all truth and convicting the world for their rejection of Jesus." However, this does not explain the judicial role or the personal character of the Paraclete. Similarities with regard to these aspects of the Paraclete are to be found in late Jewish literature (particularly the Qumran literature and *T. Jud.* 22.1–5). See Raymond Brown, "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel," *NTS* 13 (1967):121.

212. Cf. Jer 2:21; Ezek 15:1–8; 19:10–14; Ps 80:9–16. In this case, the true vine is not apostate Israel, but Jesus, and those incorporated in him as branches. Barrett, *John,* 472–73.

213. Whitacre, *John*, 372.

214. Talbert, *Reading John,* 214–15.

215. Keener, *John,* 2. 1000.

216. Barnabars Lindars, *John* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990)*,* 490.

217. Whitacre, *John*, 376.

218. While this adjective typically means pruned, in this context it has the sense of cleansed. There is an intentional play on the word stem. Hence, those branches that have been cleansed refer to true disciples—"they have heard, believed, and obeyed Jesus' word, although they may not even yet have comprehended it fully." See Moody Smith, *John,* 282–83. Furthermore, Carson, *John*, 515, points out

that rather than carry the metaphor too far, ἐν ἐμοί should rather be seen as describing the outward appearance of relationship as opposed to being viewed as a technical designation.

219. Lindars, *John,* 489.
220. Barrett, *John,* 463.
221. Carson, *John,* 500.
222. Westcott, *John,* 224.
223. Lincoln, *Truth on Trial*, 114, shows how this Gospel as a whole utilizes the metaphor of a cosmic trial of the truth (cf. Isa 40–55) and the corresponding terminology of testimony in a legal framework to develop the story of Jesus. The features of the trial/lawsuit motif are taken up in various parts of the Gospel. This motif is particularly significant in understanding the role of the Paraclete. Lincoln sets his notion of truth in the context of the trial/lawsuit motif, suggesting that "the Fourth Gospel has taken up a scriptural metaphor and interpreted it for its own setting."
224. As Brown, "The Paraclete," 116–17, argues, this forensic action is on behalf of Jesus, not the disciples. He notes, "the forensic function of the Paraclete is to show the disciples (and through them to show the world) by his witness that Jesus was victorious in the trial and that the Prince of the world was defeated."
225. This verse incorporates both legal testimony as well as eyewitness testimony.
226. Lindars, *John,* 496. Keener, *John,* 2:979, also suggests an analogy with Matt 28:19, concluding that "14:26 probably means that the Spirit will provide wisdom in the hour of testing before the court of 'the world,' bringing to remembrance the polemic of the Fourth Gospel for use in debates with hostile synagogue leaders and those influenced by them."
227. Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 93.
228. Köstenberger, *John,* 470.
229. The only other use in Johannine literature is in Rev. 3:19, where it has the sense of disciplining for wrongdoing with the purpose of restoration.
230. Harvey, *Jesus on Trial,* 113, argues that it should rather be translated 'accuse' since 'convict' implies judging. However, as Barrett, *John,* 90, points out, there is no reason why one should dismiss the dual roles of prosecutor and judge in this context.
231. Friedrich Büchsel, "ἐλέγχω," *TDNT* 2:473–74.
232. All three options are possible but if the first option is applied one would need to understand verses 9–11 in the context of the world having wrong notions of these three concepts. Barrett notes that if one does this, it would also require a different understanding of 8:46, hence rather than showing Jesus to be a sinner, he is accused of having a wrong view of sin. Barrett, *John,* 487–88.
233. The NLT conveys this third option (epexegetical use of the ὅτι clause) and reads: ¨The world's sin is unbelief in me."
234. E.g. Carson, *John,* 533; "The Function of the Paraclete in John16:7–11," *JBL* 98 (1979):547–67.
235. E.g. Burge, *John,* 438.

236. It also frequently refers to those who have supernatural and godly powers at their command. Gerhard Delling, "ἄρχων," *TDNT* 1:488–89.

237. Τοῦ κόσμου is a genitive of subordination, which in this contexts reflects the idea that the world, in this case those hostile to God, is under the authority or dominion of this ruler.

238. Barrett, *John,* 488.

239. Schnackenberg, *John,* 3:143.

240. The construction of εἰς plus the accusative was probably an introduction by copyists "who regarded it as more idiomatic after ὁδηγήσει than the construction of ἐν and the dative." Metzger, *Textual Commentary,* 247.

241. Carson, *John,* 539–40.

242. Burge, *John,* 452 (emphasis original).

243. Köstenberger, *John,* 474.

244. Swain, *Truth,* 62.

245. The authenticity of this prayer is not directly relevant to this study. For discussions of this issue, as well as its relationship to the prayer of Gethsemane, see Schnackenburg, *John,* 3:197–202.

246. Brown, *John*, 1:745, notes that Bultmann astutely points out the close relationship between these two sections, proposing that this be addressed by rearranging the sections, placing chapter 17 between 13:1 and 13:31. Brown rightly proposes that this be viewed as an inclusio rather than direct sequence.

247. Ridderbos, *John,* 546, Carson, *John,* 550–53, note that there is no textual warrant for the latter given that the prayer is made while Jesus is still with the disciples on earth and the Farewell Discourse itself envisions a future intercession from heaven (16:26). Consequently, the suggestion by Westcott and Hoskyns that it should be regarded as a "Prayer of Consecration," is also rejected because it is too narrow an interpretation.

248. Ridderbos, *John,* 546.

249. Schnackenburg, *John,* 3:199–200.

250. A number of specific structures have been proposed for this prayer, for instance Brown, *John,* 2:748–751, and more recently Borchert, *John,* 2:185–189. While a more general shape is evident, such as that proposed above, scholars differ over the specific structure. See Tolmie, "Discourse Analysis of John 17:1–26," 406–408, for an overview and brief critique of some proposals.

251. For this and other themes, see the discussion in Carson, *John,* 551.

252. Barrett, *John*, 500.

253. Ridderbos, *John*, 547.

254. Both Barrett, *John,* 503, and Schnackenburg, *John*, 3:172 view verse 3 as an editorial comment. Given the natural flow, it is probably part of Jesus' prayer. So also Carson, *John*, 556, Ridderbos, *John*, 549.

255. See the discussion in Barrett, *John,* 503–504, on the necessity of the knowledge of God for salvation in both Hebrew and Hellenistic thought. Barrett, *John*.

256. Ridderbos, *John,* 548–550, suggests that the glory of which Jesus speaks of in verse 5 is that which he already possessed as the incarnate Word, in which he also consistently glorified the Father during his life and ministry (citing 1:14; 2:11; 9:3; 11:4, 40; 12:28). He explains that this glory has two facets: an antecedent glory, which relates to his pre-existence, and a transcendent glory, as seen in his incarnation. He explains, "[t]herefore, if Jesus is here, on the boundary between two worlds, praying to be permitted to return to the glory he had with the Father, he is thinking not just of himself with a view to rediscovering himself and withdrawing to the 'eternal' glory due to himself alone, but rather of that glory in its ongoing relatedness to his work on earth." While Carson, *John,* 554, refers to this as a reversal of the self-emptying, this is not an idea that is explicitly addressed in the theology of this Gospel. He says, "[t]he petition asks the Father to reverse the self-emptying entailed in hs [*sic*] incarnation and to restore him to the splendor that he shared with the Father before the world began."

257. Carson, *John,* 566.

258. Borchert, *John,* 2:197.

259. Barrett, *John,* 507, adds that this is the Evangelist's equivalent to Lev 11:44.

260. Köstenberger, *John,* 497.

261. Given the lack of explicit reference to the Spirit in this context when it is expected, it may be that 'truth' should be identified not only with God's Word, but also with the Spirit of Truth. Brown, *John,* 2:766.

262. So Betz, *Offenbarung,* 61, who suggests that "die Präposition ἐν ein hebräisches bzw. aramäisches בְּ wiedergibt, das wie in 1 QS 4, 20 instrumental verstanden werden muß (so auch in V. 19)."

263. For the former see Carson, *John,* 566, and for the latter see Köstenberger. "'What is Truth?'" 33–62.

264. Ridderbos, *John,* 555.

265. Since some of the world is expected to be recruited for discipleship, the dualism here is not absolute. So Witherington, *Wisdom,* 270.

266. Thiselton, "Truth," 892.

267. Brown, *John,* 2:765.

268. Thompson, "John," 382.

269. Schnackenburg, *John,* 191.

270. This is the structure proposed by Brown, *John,* 2:859. Schnackenburg, *John,* 3:220, 242 and Moloney, *John,* 493, have a similar scheme but with slight differences.

271. Köstenberger, "John," 282. It is probable these events took place over the course of the Passover week including the Feast of Unleavened Bread. So Köstenberger, *John,* 537–38.

272. Ridderbos, *John,* 598.

273. Carson, *John,* 589.

274. Brown, *John,* 2:866.

275. J. Ramsey Michaels, *John* (NIBC; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989), 314.

276. Beasley-Murray, *John,* 328.

277. Culpepper, *Anatomy,* 143.

278. F. F. Bruce, "The Trial of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel," in *Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels* (ed. R. T. France and David Wenham; Gospel Perspectives 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 13, explains that in Roman law, "[t]he trial took the form of a *cognitio* or inquiry designed to elicit the facts of the case: the governor might enlist the aid of well-informed parties as his *consilium,* but the decision was his own responsibility. Unlike the judge in Rome, he did not have to instruct a jury." Hence, Pilate's decision was entirely his own.

279. Brown, *John,* 2:868. At the same time, in his declarations of Jesus' innocence and his desire to release him, Pilate "virtually assumes the role of a witness or advocate." Trites, *Witness in the Fourth Gospel,* 85.

280. Burge, *John,* 502 (emphasis original).

281. Ridderbos, *John,* 599.

282. In both instances, unlike the Synoptics, Jesus' answer is more extensive and is followed by a dialogue about Jesus' kingship.

283. Ridderbos, *John,* 596.

284. Barrett, *John,* 531.

285. Ridderbos, *John,* 596.

286. Whitacre, *John,* 443.

287. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 60, goes further to propose that ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας should be understood as "ein Kind der Wahrheit" (cf. 1 John 3:19), which communicates the supernatural origin of those that belong to God through belief in Christ. Hence, as one is born "from the spirit" (3:5 ff.), one can also be born "from the truth."

288. Brown, *John,* 2:869.

289. Schnackenburg, *John* 3:251. See also L. Russ Bush, "Knowing the Truth," *Faith and Mission* 11 (Spring, 1994):6, who suggests that Pilate "is simply unable to reason his way through this dilemma based on the information he has in hand."

290. Köstenberger, *John,* 529.

291. Köstenberger, "What is Truth?" 48.

292. Duke, *Irony,* 130.

3

TRUTH TERMINOLOGY IN THE *RULE*

Introduction

This chapter will conduct an exegetical survey of all the instances of אמת in the *Rule* in its various combinations. The purpose of this chapter is to determine how truth terminology is used in this document, particularly as it pertains to authorial intent. While other literature represented in the Qumran library (both sectarian and non-sectarian) will not be studied in depth, cross references that clarify the use in the *Rule* will be included.[1] The literary flow of the document will be followed except in cases where a particular understanding crosses over to other sections of the text.

The structure that will be followed is: General Introduction (1.1–15); Entry into the Community (1.16–3.12); Doctrine of the Community (3.13–4.26); Purpose and Way of Life of the Community (5.1–6.23); Penitential Code of the Community (6.24–7.25); Model of a Pioneer Community to Pave the Way for the Main Community (8.1–9.26); Closing Hymn (10.1–11.22).[2] A summary organizing the findings into various categories will complete the work.

A proper understanding of truth terminology in the *Rule* begins with an understanding of the general context of the documents of the community. There are various kinds and genres of writings that have been uncovered in the caves of Qumran, all of which are Jewish documents mainly in Hebrew or Aramaic, with a small Greek component.[3] Most of the manuscripts are non-biblical works that were either previously unknown to scholars or known only through secondary sources in ancient literature.[4] This diverse library also reflects the viewpoints of non-Essenes and Jews not living at Qumran; for instance, those in Aramaic probably originated in Jerusalem. It even represents ideas that diverge from those commonly held by the Qumran community, including some Sadducees and Pharisees (or their precursors), some traditions associated with the Samaritans, some books produced by the Enoch groups, and other types of Jews within early Judaism.[5]Although there is clearly no consensus regarding how this literature ought to be categorized, it is evident that some of it originated with the Qumran sect itself.[6] It is the sectarian literature that best reflects the linguistic matrix of the community and hence is most valuable for this work. Unfortunately, it is not an easy task to isolate this category. However, two

factors prove useful in this venture. The first is related to the twofold viewpoint of the literature that combines both *halakhic* interpretation and apocalyptic revelation.[7] The second relates to the presence of distinctly 'Qumranic' terminology and ideas.[8]

The *Rule* is found in the rule genre.[9] The rule documents, by virtue of their character and function, are generally the easiest to identify as originating with the community. The general aim of these documents was to teach the exclusive Qumran community how to apply the Torah to practical forms of communal life, so as to live blamelessly before God. Because the circumstances addressed in the rules were different, the particular perspectives represented in the rules also differed.[10] Internal evidence shows that the *Rule* was composed over time. Editorial activity is clear, and there is the presence of distinct literary units.[11] In addition to evidence gleaned from literary analysis, clear signs of the development of the *Rule* are seen in the character of the fragments from Cave 4.[12] Based on comparisons with similar documents in the contemporary Greco-Roman world, some conclude that the *Rule* is essentially a charter or constitution for the community, resembling more a philosophic academy than a club.[13] However, in terms of function, it also closely resembles early Christian church orders such as the *Didache,* the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, and the *Apostolic Constitutions.*[14]

The main purpose of the *Rule* was to instruct the community on the proper practice of the Torah in daily life prior to the end of the age. It consists of more than just instructions for daily life, however, for it also contains an important section detailing the community's beliefs (3.15–4.26) and also has hymnic material.[15] It shares many similarities in language and style with Wisdom literature such as Ecclesiasticus and Sirach, but, unlike them, includes eschatological and apocalyptic aspects.[16] Headings, marginal signs, blank lines and spaces indicate the different sections. Unfortunately, the paleography and the rough Hebrew syntax make it difficult to come up with a uniform translation. This is compounded by the fact that the historical and sociological contexts out of which the text arose are difficult to reconstruct.[17] Nevertheless, it is often viewed as the standard of identification for isolating other writings of Qumran origins. After the *Rule*, and appearing on the same scroll, are found the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSª=1QS28ª) and the *Rule of Blessings* (1QSᵇ=1Q28ᵇ).[18]

Lexical Survey

The word אמת in its various forms occurs most frequently in the sectarian documents, although it is also evident in the liturgical texts of the Hymns and Blessings. A few occurrences are also found in the parabiblical texts.[19] It occurs approximately 305 times in various linguistic combinations in the non-biblical texts from Qumran.[20] Betz notes that אמת is found in the *Rule* 41 times (+ 2 times in 1QSᵇ), and in the praise-songs approximately 50 times.[21] Elwolde, in noting the semantic developments that have taken place from the Hebrew Bible to the

Mishnah, argues that "[t]he extra use of אמת like that of אור 'light', probably reflects the emblematic status of 'truth' at Qumran."[22] This emphasis on truth is to be expected, given that the Qumraners were a sect that had broken away from the religious establishment and regarded themselves as a persecuted minority.[23]

General Introduction: 1.1–15

The *Rule* begins with what may possibly be a liturgy for an annual observance of covenant renewal, which is at the same time spoken of as the door of entry into the covenant community (1.1–3.12).[24] Although information regarding the historical context of the Qumran community is provided through archaeological evidence from the site as well as other ancient writings, it is difficult to identify the specific historical community and context that this document pertains to.[25] The most widely held view is that the Qumran community may have been the Essene community. This identification primarily relies on 1) External evidence provided by Philo (*Prob.* 12–12 and *Hypoth.* 11:1–18, both written prior to A.D. 40) and Pliny the Elder, who associated the Essenes with the site of Qumran (*Nat. Hist.* 5.15), and passages in Philo and Josephus (*J.W.* 2.8.2–13, written about A.D. 73, and in *Ant*. 18.1.2, 5, written about A.D. 94) that describe the Essenes. 2) Internal evidence that consists of a comparison between texts such as 1QS and CD. Similarities include admission and organization, novitiate periods, communal regulations, strict observance of the Sabbath vis-à-vis rabbinic law, and certain legal positions such as the transmission of ritual impurity by oil.[26]

While internal data concerning this community is scanty, their documents nonetheless reveal useful information about the community's self-identity and rationale for existence. For instance, the prolific use of Isaiah in their texts, and the approach of the *pesharim*, sheds light on their experience of reality and their self-identity.[27] The members of the Qumran community believed that they were the final remnant and the 'converts of Israel' (cf. CD 4.2). The *Commentary on Psalms*[a] 3.15–17 (Ps. 37:23–24) indicates that this community was founded by one referred to as מרה הסדק ("Teacher of Righteousness" or "Righteous Teacher"). [28] His title may be indicative of the content of his teaching or perhaps even point to his authenticity as a teacher.[29] His appearance, life, and death feature in the *Damascus Document* and portions of his life are also related in two *pesharim,* which indicates that the expositors of these prophetic texts believed that his appearance was predicted and that he held a priestly office.[30]

General Regulations for Person(s) in Authority (1.5)

The authors begin with a preamble (1.1–15), which essentially outlines the general aims and ideals of the community. Since this document was intended as

a constitution for the community, the opening verses, 1.1–11a, are characterized by a succession of infinitives that express purpose.[31] The first section begins with לן .. [שים לחיו. The gaps in the first line make it difficult to reconstruct the text with certainty. Martínez and Tigchelaar propose למשכיל [... which they translate "For [the Instructor ...] ... for his life," which suggests that the instructions that follow are for individuals in authority.[32] However, given the contents, it is likely that although the manual is addressed to the leader, the instructions themselves apply to the entire community.[33] This continues with [ספר סרך היחד, "book of the Rule of the Community."[34]The first occurrence of אמת is found in this context of instruction.[35] The phrase ולעשות אמת וצדקה ומשפט בארץ ("in order to do truth and justice and uprightness on earth") is used with reference to the conduct expected of a member of the covenant community (1.5b–6a).[36] In this context, אמת is found in a paratactic relationship with the moral qualities צדקה and משפט ("justice" and "uprightness") and is the object of the verb עשה, here translated "to do" or "to practice."[37] This suggests that it is something that manifests itself in outward, visible actions. The semantic relationship is qualificational substance-content. This statement is contrasted with the negation in 1.6b–7a, "and not to walk anymore in the stubbornness of a guilty heart and lecherous eyes performing every evil" (רע). The paradigmatic relations indicate that אמת in this context should be understood with reference to its expressed antonym, רע. Hence אמת, not as an abstract concept, but as a characteristic that demonstrated itself in outward, visible action, was required by God as the norm of behavior in the community.[38]

The opening purpose statement 1b–2a, לדרוש אל בכול לב] ו בנכול נפש] ("in order to seek God with all one's heart and with all one's soul"), which is reminiscent of the Old Testament, consequently reflects the high regard in which this community held diligent study of the Word of God.[39] It constituted one of the most important functions of the community.[40] Wernberg-Møller writes that "[t]he sole aim of the Torah study was the detection of the will of God, and the members set themselves the goal of living accordingly."[41] Prior to this, the author makes it clear that the standard upon which these instructions are based is that of God's Law given through Moses and the prophets.[42] However, it was not just obedience to the Law as commanded and taught by Moses and the prophets that was required of all community members. Since they believed that the prophets were not fully aware of what they wrote, an inspired interpreter was necessary to unveil the full import of the text. This reflects their perspective that there was a distinction between the revealed law and what they themselves had interpreted, and that it was only by a deeper study of the Torah that members of the community could unveil even deeper 'truth.'[43] The *Damascus Document* and the *Commentary on Habakkuk* (cf. 7.1–5) provide evidence of the God appointed nature of the Teacher's role as interpreter as well as the inspired nature of his exegesis.[44] Noting the recurrence of the expression פשרו אל, which may be

translated "the interpretation of this is," "this refers to" or "this means," Longenecker writes,

> Certain prophecies had been given in cryptic and enigmatic terms, and no one could understand their true meaning until the Teacher of Righteousness was given the interpretive key. In a real sense, they understood the passages in question as possessing a *sensus plenior*, which could be ascertained only from a revelational standpoint, and they believed that the true message of Scripture was heard only when prophecy and interpretation were brought together.[45]

Hence it was only this interpretation, propagated by his disciples, which offered true enlightenment and guidance.

Consequently, those that formed part of this community believed themselves "to be living in the true city of God, the city of the Covenant built on the Law and the Prophets (cf. CD 7.13–1 8)."[46] These members are identified in 1.9 as בני חושד ("sons of light"), the sect's self-designation and a term almost always unique to Qumran theology. Leaney comments with regard to this term and its connection to the creation doctrine, "[t]he sun was a light for the earth, Israel for mankind. It was therefore natural that those who believed themselves chosen to renew the Israel specially called by God should regard entrance upon membership of their sect as entrance into the covenant, should venerate the 'greater light' and should designate themselves 'sons of light.'"[47] In addition, it is because they were "doers of the Torah" that they could apply this name to themselves.[48] This term is contrasted with בני חושך ("sons of darkness"; cf. 1.10). This symbolism of light and darkness, used frequently in Second Temple Literature, was used as a designation that separated the good from the wicked. Hence, this metaphorical identification of the members of this community as בני אור contrasted with בני אור (1.9, 10) further clarifies how אמת is to be understood.

אמת in this context has a moral aspect. Leaney points out that it may be understood as "practicing the true law" but also "carries with it the further meanings of dealing sincerely with one's neighbor and of acting rightly according to one's own real feelings, and not by mere outward show."[49] Similarly, Knibb notes that it has the "underlying sense of faithfulness to God's law and sincerity in one's actions," a usage that is frequently found in the scrolls.[50] Taking into consideration the related symbolism of light and darkness, אמת is therefore understood as a sphere of operation that defines a way of life that is opposed to evil, and that is conformed to God's revelation and the Teacher's interpretation of the Law (cf. 8.14–16). It pertains to upright action.

General Regulations for Candidates (1.11, 12, 15)

Even a cursory reading of the *Rule* reveals that the covenant ideology was foundational to the community's basic beliefs. The covenantal terminology that

pervades the entire rule is more prominent in this section, and is significant for enabling us to understand not only the mechanics of community membership, but even more importantly, the nature of the community. Like many other areas, the concept of the covenant appropriated by the Qumran community was not original or unique to the community but a basic Old Testament idea.[51] Hence it was not a 'new covenant' *per se*, but a renewed covenant (cf. CD 1.4; 8.17–18; 19.30–31; 1QM 13.7; 14.8; 18.7), which had been established by the 'Teacher of Righteousness' as a reward for their conversion. It was regarded as the only legitimate form of the eternal alliance between God and Israel.[52] However, unlike the original covenant, the covenantal community that participated in this renewed covenant differed in that it consisted only of the 'sons of light,' and was therefore not attained by heredity.[53] Because of this, the community believed itself to be in a special relationship with God. This idea of covenant therefore undergirds all the rules and regulations of the community.[54]

Intimately tied to covenant, is the concept of community. יהד, the word frequently translated 'community' in the *Rule,* occurs numerous times in the Qumran literature. This term is unique to the community and Brownlee observes that its meaning embraces the ideas of unity, community and communion,[55] with context determining which is most appropriate. Entry into the community was presented as entry into a covenant with God, and was synonymous with entry בעצת אל (1.8). There is a constant ambiguity in the word עצה in the scrolls and depending on the context, may mean 'council' or 'counsel.'[56] Knibb rightly suggests that in this case the two senses overlap such that entry into the covenant is seen as part of God's counsel or purpose, while simultaneously bringing the new member into the council or community of God.[57]

It is in this context that the next two occurrences of אמת are found (cf. 1.11–12): וכול הנדבים לאמתו ... לברר דעתם באמת חוקי אל ("All those who submit freely to his truth ... in order to refine their knowledge in the truth of God's decrees ...").[58] In the first occurrence, אמת is found as the object of the participle (הנדבים), which in this case functions as a substantive (subject) that designates a particular class of people, namely, all who submit themselves freely לאמתו.[59] אמת is also found as the object of the preposition ל, which is understood as pointing to specification, expressing that in respect to which something is affirmed, hence 'with regard to' or 'concerning.' This clarifies that the submission that is in view is that which is with regard to אמתו ("his truth"). The context suggests that the pronominal suffix points to God. The semantic relationship within this colon is qualificational substance-generic specific.

The second occurrence of אמת in this verse is an expansion of the thought found in the phrase that begins with the purpose infinitive לברר ("in order to refine"), whose stated object is דעתם ("their knowledge"). Within the prepositional phrase, באמת חוקי אל, the relationship may be either genitival (lengthened series, i.e. "in the truth of the decrees of God") or appositional ("in the truth, namely the decrees of God").[60] In the first instance, the verity of God's decrees is

in view.[61] In the second instance, חוקי אל is used to clarify what the authors mean by אמת. Both are possible. In any case, it is understood that אמתו and חוקי אל refer to the same thing and the prepositional phrase (spatial use of ב) clarifies that the knowledge that the members are expected to acquire pertains to both 'his truth' and the 'decrees of God'. In addition, the phrase in 1.15, מחוקי אמתו is a parallelism that should be understood as emphasizing the previous באמת חוקי אל. In this case, the genitive is attributive emphasizing the nature of חק as reliable. The relationship with the previous colon is logical means-purpose.

As noted previously, there was great emphasis placed on study of the Law, an emphasis that arose from the perceived exalted status of the community. Hence it was expected that a member of the community would spend his time searching the Scriptures, including the interpretations available to him, in order to attain a greater understanding of their contents and purpose in specific aspects of community life. Indeed, 1.15 emphasizes that the members of the community ולוא לסור מחוקי אמתו ("shall not veer from his decrees of truth"). In this instance, אמת is to be understood as divine truth. It therefore has a revelatory sense and indicates a body of knowledge that constitutes the content of faith for the community. Hence, אמתו, חוקי אל and חוקי אמתו are merely different ways of referring to the Law, which has already been alluded to in 1.3 (cf. 5.8).[62]

אמת also includes the interpretation provided by the Teacher of Righteousness and the sages. Hence, in this context, "[t]ruth as seen from the point of view of revelation in the Qumran texts is 'the revealed Torah, the synthesis of everything revealed by Torah.'"[63] Betz points out that the interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness and the sages was regarded as God's truth, hence propagating their claim that it too was revelation. Moreover, in that it is given to him expressly by God, this truth is God's truth (cf. 1QH 5.9; 11.4, 9, 16).[64]

Entry into the Community: 1.16–3.12

The larger section of 1.16–3.12 continues the theme of membership into the community. From 1.16–2.18, the authors expound on the ritual that accompanies entrance into the community. 2.19–25a addresses issues related not just to the new members, but to a gathering of all the members, who met together yearly at the covenant renewal ceremony. Then, from 2.25b–3.12, the authors elaborate on a certain group, namely, those who refused to enter into the covenant after a probationary period.

Rite for Entry into the Covenant (1.19, 25b–26a)

The first occurrence of אמת in this section is found in 1.19, והלויים מברכים את אל ישועות ואת כול מעשי אמתו ("and the Levites shall bless the God of victories

and all the works of his faithfulness …").[65] One significant indicator of the community's self-understanding is seen in the social and religious structure that the community chose to adopt. The reference to priests and Levites, and the special role that they played in acting as intermediaries between God and the community (1.21–23), is an indication that its structure was intended to reflect that of Israel itself.[66] Consequently, the entrance ritual described here is very similar to the covenant ceremony described in Deut (27; 28–30).[67] As is evident from the preceding verses, this entry into the covenant had serious implications for one's life. It was essentially entrance into a covenant to serve God faithfully. In this context, the author notes that the priests and Levites are expected to praise God and his works at the entrance of new members into the covenant. The construction preceding this, ובעוברם בברית ("when they enter the covenant"), is a temporal adverbial clause that identifies the timing and order of events that is to be followed in this ceremony.[68]

אמת in this reference must be understood within the context of the works of God (cf. 10.17).[69] In the Old Testament, the word אמת is sometimes associated with the works of God. For instance, the Psalmist declares: "The works of his hands are אמת and just; all his precepts are trustworthy" (Ps 111:8[7]). In such contexts, אמת usually signifies God's faithfulness and reliability.[70] Given the context of covenant that pervades this section, it is likely that this is the same sense intended here, as reflected in various translations.[71] This interpretation is bolstered by the following section, which reveals in more specific detail what this praise entailed. It was a recitation of the just deeds of God in his mighty works and a proclamation of all his merciful favors toward Israel (cf. 1.21). Consequently, the genitive relationship (מעשי אמת) is understood as an attributive genitive which further defines the works that have been done by God. This is found in a coordinate relationship with אל ישועות, both of which function as the direct objects of the participle (מברכים), here functioning as the main verb. Hence, אמת, namely the faithfulness and reliability of God that is inherent in his character, shows itself outwardly in the works that he performs, particularly toward the nation of Israel. In this context it is the object of praise of the priests and Levites. The relationship between this colon and the previous one is qualificational character setting-time.

After this reference, אמת is found in 1.25b–26a. The context is the confession of the new covenant members, a confession that comes after the recitation by the Levites of the iniquities, the blameworthy offences and the sins of the children of Israel.[72] This is, in essence, an affirmation of their recognition of their sinful condition under the dominion of Belial. This dominion is to be understood as the period prior to their entry into the covenant. The authors use a number of synonyms to express this confession (for instance, "acted sinfully," "transgressed," "sinned," "committed evil"), which is made also on behalf of their fathers before them. The verbs reveal that not only the inner

attitudes, but the outward actions are in view as well. These are equated with a failure to walk in conformity to אמת and צדיק ("truth" and "righteousness"), here represented in a coordinate relationship.[73] אמת is therefore used to indicate a standard of conduct required of those in covenant relationship with God. The paradigmatic relationships revealed in the expressed antonyms indicate that the authors expect אמת and צדיק to be understood as antithetical to these negative characteristics. The semantic relationship within this colon is qualificational substance generic-specific.

Ceremony for Assembly of Members (2.24)

The section spanning 2.19–25a is best understood as a continuation of the instructions that cover the ceremony of entry into the community, and not as a separate ceremony as some scholars have suggested.[74] The instructions reflect the hierarchical order prescribed during the yearly admission of new members. In addition to the priests and Levites mentioned in various parts of the scroll, the *Rule* clearly shows an emphasis on communal organization.[75]

In this section, אמת occurs in 2.24 in the construct relationship ביחד אמת ("in a community of truth"). Following a statement that prescribes the proper order to be followed during the ceremony, and the admonition to stay in one's allotted place, the authors write כיא הכול יהיו ביחד אמת ("for all shall be in a community of truth"). In this section, אמת is used in a possessive genitive relationship to further describe the community that belongs to God's heavenly council.[76] The semantic relationship is qualificational substance-content. In this instance, אמת signifies a sphere of belonging that is characterized by 'truth.' As in the other references in which אמת and יחד occur together, the sense intended is that of the holy and upright sphere of operation that characterizes its members and that is reflective of the inner submission to the Law of God, and the covenant relationship with God that is enjoyed by its members. It is thus used as an identifying marker for the community, whose conduct is expected to be characterized by uprightness in every aspect and integrity in interpersonal relationships.

This community is further described in this section as a community "of proper meekness, of compassionate love and upright purpose, towards each other, in a holy council, associates of an everlasting society" (2.24). Titles such as these, as well as the idea that angels were present in the community are evident in other sections of the scrolls (cf. 1QS[a] 2.8b–9a), and indicate that "the members believed that their life already formed a part of the life of God's heavenly council (cf. Jer 23:18, 22)."[77] Indeed, they held that as "[t]he priestly courses were in harmony with the circuits of the celestial luminaries, so the covenanters perceived themselves to be unified with the angels."[78] This is further reflected in their reference to themselves as יחד אל ("a community of God").

Denunciation of Those Who Refuse to Enter the Covenant (2.26; 3.6, 7)

In the final portion of this section, 2.25b–3.12, the author addresses those who refuse to enter into the covenant after their probationary period, hence indicating their refusal to become a part of the community. This section, particularly the rules for purity and atonement, demonstrates the exclusivity of the community. This entire section must be understood in light of the sect's ideas of defilement and purification, and the stages necessary to complete the process of purification. Dimant explains:

> The successive stages of admission are marked off by the purity rules of the sect. The degree of purity of the candidates is raised after each examination. In the first year he is not allowed to touch the 'Purities of the Many' (6:16); in the second year the prohibition is restricted to the 'Drink of the Many' (6:20), and finally he is allowed to participate fully in the communal meals. … True purity of the body became effective only when repentance takes place, i.e. by accepting the sectarian way of life. In this context, ritual purity is seen as only one facet of a more comprehensive idea of purity: purity from sin.[79]

In order to be cleansed from sin, there was need for both genuine repentance and ritual purification. Those who refuse to enter into the covenant indicate by their refusal that they prefer to walk in the stubbornness of their hearts (2.26). This refusal to participate in the covenant ceremony and to enter into the covenant therefore goes beyond outward actions. It is reflective of an inner attitude of insincerity (cf. 2.11–18), in the face of which the purification rites are useless (cf. 3.4b–5).

   Consequently, those who refused to enter into the covenant, who showed by their outward acts their lack of repentance and their affiliation with that which is contrary to the decrees of God (cf. 3.2b–3), would not receive atonement for their sins. Their preference for רשע ("wickedness") and חשך ("darkness") over the paths of אור ("light") condemn them.[80] To choose one is to reject the other and hence they would not be reckoned as Israelites in the final judgment of God since they cannot enter [… ביחד אמתו] ("into the community of his truth"; cf. 2.26).[81] A similar expression is found in 2.24 with one slight difference—there אמת in the construct relationship does not carry a pronominal suffix. In this case, the pronominal suffix points to God and it is therefore understood as the community of God's אמת. אמת in this construct relationship functions in a possessive genitive relationship and signifies, as in 2.24, a sphere of belonging that is characterized by truth. In this case it is clear that אמת refers to divine truth. It therefore clarifies what was only implicit in 2.24—it emphasizes the community's sense of "belonging" to God, whose character is truth. Walck notes that since אמת is viewed as an important quality of God's character and of his dealings with mankind in the sectarian documents, it follows that it is therefore also seen as an important characteristic of the identity and behavior of the community, both toward God

and toward fellow members.[82] Here it is used to describe the character of the community, related to both an inner attitude as well as an outward manifestation. This is conformed to the character of God and opposed to all wickedness. In terms of paradigmatic relationships, אמת is explicitly juxtaposed with רשע which further clarifies how the authors expected it to be understood in this context (cf. 3.2b–3). It is that which is opposed to wickedness.

On the other hand, both purification of sins and entrance into the covenant and therefore God's eternal community, were guaranteed for those with sincere hearts.[83] The emphasis on a right inner attitude forms an important part of the community's orientation toward God and his Law. Indeed, this section emphasizes the necessity of an inner purification. Without it ritual uncleanness still persisted in spite of participation in outward purification rituals with the cleansing waters (3.4b–5).[84] The authors clarify that it is God alone who is able to effect this purification and they explain how the iniquities of man are atoned for: כיא ברוח עצת אמת אל (cf. 3.6, "for it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God"; note the ambiguity discussed above). Hence God's activity, the individual's inner disposition of uprightness, as well as holiness and compliance to all God's laws, are all necessary components for an individual's atonement by God. In this phrase, which clarifies God's role in the purification process, the genitive relationship עצת אמת is attributive, signifying the reliability of God's council/counsel.

The authors further emphasize in 3.7–8a that the spirit of holiness also plays a vital role in the purification of hopeful members: וברוח קדושה ליחד באמתו יטהר מכול עוונותו ("And it is by the holy spirit of the community, in his truth, that he is cleansed of all his iniquities").[85] In this prepositional phrase, אמת refers to divine truth. The semantic relationship within this colon is logical means-result. Leaney, warning against seeing this as a reference to the Holy Spirit, writes,

> But it is vital to true understanding of the Qumran way to remember that what its members desire, and so often make the subject of their writing, is not the Holy Spirit, but a spirit of holiness; and this must be interpreted in the contexts in which it occurs.... The subject is purification from moral and ceremonial defilement ... It is the spirit of holiness in this combined moral and levitical sense that is the acme of a sectarian's desire.[86]

This atonement therefore has a positive benefit. It is what enables the cleansed person to look at the אור החיים ("light of life"), which is in this case used with reference to the Law and the wisdom derived from it, in the sense of life-giving enlightenment.[87] In metaphorical terms, אור is used in this section to indicate that which conforms to אמת and is descriptive of the holy and pure sphere of operation that characterizes its members and that is reflective of the inner submission to the Law of God, and the covenant relationship with God that is enjoyed by its members. It is opposed to darkness.

Doctrine of the Community: 3.13–4.26

As many have emphasized, albeit in varying degrees, this portion contains an important theological teaching that underlies many of the regulations given in the *Rule*.[88] 3.13 makes clear that the instructions that follow are addressed to the משכיל ("instructor").[89] It was his official role to teach the members of the covenant community about the nature of mankind.[90] At the same time, it is likely that study of this section was compulsory for all members since this doctrine underlies the community's understanding of God's role in mankind's nature and history and supplies an explanation for the existence of evil and God's eventual triumph.[91]

Charlesworth identifies seven key features of the dualism expressed here: it is a modified dualism, because both spirits are subjugated to one God, and the existence of the spirit of perversity is limited; it is primarily explained in terms of the light vs. darkness paradigm; it is an ethical dualism; it is combined with an absolute determinism; it is a dualism that attributes responsibility for evil to God; it is an eschatological dualism with present and future rewards and punishments; and it is ultimately a cosmic dualism, although the struggle is centered in man.[92] In a later study, he isolated what he termed the *termini technici* associated with this dualism, that then form an identifiable paradigm.[93] This paradigm is based on the fact that the dualism is defined and its technical terms concentrated only in 1 QS 3 and 4, on the probability that this section was to be memorized by the candidates and, finally, on the fact that these terms reflect the mind-set of the community and overflow into other Qumran compositions.[94] What this paradigm does is explain the human condition and the fact that all people do evil because of the angel of darkness (3.22).

The Two Spirits (3.19, 24)

The first passage in which אמת occurs is found in this dualistic context. Like all Jewish groups, God, the creator of all, was the starting point of the belief system of this sect (3.15b; cf. 1QHa 18.8–11; 9.7–20).[95] The authors write: "He created man to rule the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk with them until the moment of his visitation: they are the spirits of truth and of deceit" (3.18b–19). This doctrine of two ways is not unique to the sect. It is also found in pseudepigraphical and early Christian literature.[96] The surrounding context indicates that the relationship between the two spirits, רוחות האמת והעול, is one of opposition (cf. 4.23).[97] They are further described in the metaphorical language of light and darkness as רוחות אור וחושך (3.25), thus equating 'truth' with 'light' and 'deceit' with 'darkness.'[98] The substantive אמת modifies רוח in a number of ways (3.18b–19). These are illuminated by the roles the spirit plays. While this is an attributive genitive, in this context it is the role of the רוח האמת that is

emphasized. This role is to be understood in terms of instruction and guidance, which itself entails a gradual unveiling.[99]

Moreover, these spirits derive from the במעין אור ("spring/fountain/source of light") and וממקור חושך ("spring/ fountain/source of darkness") respectively (3.20–21).[100] The text clarifies that all those under the dominion of the שר אורים ("prince/leader/chief of lights") live lives that are characterized by uprightness and integrity.[101] This is only possible because God and the מלאך אמתו ("angel of his truth") assist the members of the community in order that they might have victory over the רוח העול ("spirit of deceit"; cf. 3.24–25). The context makes it clear that רוח האמת and מלאך אמתו refer to the same thing. On the other hand corruption, sins, iniquities, guilt and offensive deeds are under the dominion of the מלאך חושך ("angel of darkness"), which is an alternate term for רוח העול (3.19b–20).[102]

Aune notes that these two opposing figures, the spirits of truth and deceit, can be interpreted both macrocosmically, as angelic beings, as well as microcosmically (i.e. psychologically), constituting spiritual dispositions in each person. This tension has been explained thus: Some scholars see the two angels as personifications of the two spirits, hence they have only anthropological significance; others see the two spirits as people in microcosmic manifestations of a supernatural macrocosmic conflict.[103] The first view therefore emphasizes the conflict within mankind such that the two spirits represent opposing forces that struggle to find dominant expression in every human being.[104] The second view emphasizes the conflict in the cosmos. [105] The textual support points to both a macrocosmic as well as a microcosmic dualism (where the spiritual forces within each person correspond to the spirit of truth and the spirit of deceit).[106] The pertinent point is that a struggle between light and darkness is experienced at every level. In the situation of the Qumran community, where the members devoted themselves in strict obedience to the Teacher's interpretation of the Law, the spirit of truth was seen as dominant.[107]

In terms of paradigmatic relations, the explicit use of עול in this context indicates that the authors intend אמת to be understood in its relationship as juxtaposed to עול. Hence, anything that is opposed to the spirit of truth is under the influence of the spirit of deceit. Consequently, אמת in this context is descriptive of the spirit who guides the members of the community in a proper understanding and application of the Law. It therefore refers to divine revelation. It is opposed to עול and the two spirits struggle for dominion over the inhabitants of the world, influencing mankind either in the direction of truth or in the direction of deceit.

The Work of the Spirits in the Lives of Men (4.2, 5, 6)

In the section spanning 4.2–11, the work of these two spirits in the lives of men receives further elucidation. 4.2–6 focuses on the role of the spirit of truth and

this is contrasted with the role of the spirit of deceit from 4.9–11.[108] Brownlee notes that these are presented in ascending order, reflecting developing religious experience whereas the vices attributed to the spirit of deceit/injustice are presented in descending order, reflecting increasing wickedness.[109] This list, which is reminiscent of Old Testament ideals, enumerates positive defining character-istics that result from the direct influence of the spirit of truth, and includes amongst other things character traits such as meekness, patience, generous compassion, eternal goodness, trust in God and dependence on his mercy, love for members of the community, a concealment of the truths revealed to the community, and so forth.[110] The spirit of truth has the positive task of enlight-ening man, straightening out in front of him the דרכי צדק אמת and establishing respect for God's Law in his heart (4.2–3a).[111] This phrase may be translated in a number of ways. Martínez and Tigchelaar translate the phrase as "true justice." Brownlee suggests "true righteousness," a somewhat similar understanding.[112] Leaney, on the other hand, views אמת appositionally and accordingly trans-lates this phrase as "ways of righteousness, of truth." All three translations are possible. However, given that אמת in the sect frequently refers to upright conduct, it is more likely that the use of אמת here is not merely attributive as in the first two examples, thus reflecting justice that is genuine and sincere. This phrase should be understood appositionally, emphasizing that the 'paths of righteousness' are in essence the 'paths of truth' and that these accord with the standards of uprightness and integrity demanded by the Law.

A third reference to אמת in this section concerns the רזי דעת ("mysteries of knowledge"). The members of the community are to have ורוח ... בערמת כול וחבא לאמת רזי דעת (4.4, 6). The preposition ל affixed to אמת is understood in the sense of "concerning." The phrase is therefore translated "a spirit ... of concealment concerning the truth of the mysteries of knowledge."[113] Complete disclosure to fellow members was expected but absolute secrecy to outsiders, even under the pain of death, was required.[114] Leaney suggests that the reason for this secrecy was

> ... probably to be found in the sentiment that the practice of a regulation by those who did not belong to 'the truth' (that is, those who practice the truth or Law of God in their everyday lives perfectly, in other words, the sect) would be a defilement of that regulation.[115]

The term רזי דעת is an all embracing term for the secrets of the Law that can only be unveiled through daily study (cf. 5.6) and only by people specially gifted to do so. For the community, this knowledge was a privileged possession bestowed on them by God, hence the need to guard it jealously (cf. 1QM 13.12).[116] With regard to the phrase לאמת רזי דעת (4.4, 6), Wernberg-Møller argues for the use of לאמת in the sense of 'faithfully,' based on his conclusion that it is dependent on Isa 42:3.[117] However, if as pointed out above, the preposition is used in the sense of 'concerning,' אמת in this context should be understood as signifying the

veracity of the mysteries of knowledge, namely that which is uncovered in the Law through study.

The authors end by cataloguing the present and eschatological rewards for all those who walk according to the spirit of truth, for whom a crown of glory awaits (4.6b–8). This group has previously been identified as בני אמת (4.5).[118] This expression communicates their belief that they, and not the apostate Jews in Jerusalem, are the true Israel. This view is in keeping with their perception of themselves as the only faithful adherents to God's truth.[119] Other related terms that are used to refer to the members of the covenant community help to clarify how בני אמת should be understood. The first is בני צדק ("sons of righteousness"; cf. 3:20, 22).[120] In this case, it is understood that this phrase refers to upright conduct. Another related expression is בני אור ("sons of light"). This is the sect's self-designation and a term almost always unique to Qumran theology.[121] The metaphorical use of light for truth has been previously noted. בני אור is contrasted with בני חושך ("sons of darkness").[122] Another contrasting expression is אנשי העול ("men of injustice/perversity/deceit"; cf. 5.3).[123] The context therefore indicates that the genitive relationship בני אמת is simply another way of referring to the members of the covenant community (יהד), in whom the spirit of truth reigns and the spirit of deceit been overcome. This genitive relationship is therefore a possessive relationship that is not only translated 'sons characterized by truth' (particularly given the characteristics listed above), but even more so, 'sons that belong to the sphere of divine truth.'

In direct contrast to the traits of the spirit of truth, the author lists the characteristics that result from the work of the spirit of deceit (4.9–11). In his list he includes character traits such as greed, slowness in implementing justice, wickedness, falsehood, pride, insincerity, impurity, blasphemy and other negative character traits. This section, like the preceding one, also ends with a cataloguing of the present and eschatological punishment that befalls all those who walk according to the spirit of deceit. Those in this category find that their eventual end, after the abyss of darkness, is total annihilation (4.11b–14a; cf. 3.14).[124] Interestingly, in this context, שקר ("falsehood") is not seen as directly juxtaposed to אמת, but is one of the character traits of עול (perversity/wickedness/deceit).

God's Final Plan for the Two Spirits (4.17, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25)

The section ends with God's future plans for these two spirits. The deeds that arise from one are abhorrent to the other and vice versa such that תועבת אמת עלילות עולה ("deeds of injustice are abhorrent to truth"; cf. 4.17). The animosity that exists between these two spirits is identified as originating with God himself. Although this relationship is one of violent conflict, these two spirits are nevertheless found

together in human beings, albeit in different proportions.[125] In this context, אמת in the phrase ותועבת עולה כול דרכי אמת ("all the paths of truth are an abhorrence to injustice"; cf. 4.17) is understood in terms of its relationship of direct juxta-position to עול. It functions as an attributive genitive that describes a way of life that is conformed to the truth that is uncovered in the Law.

This hostile relationship that exists between the spirits of truth and injustice/perversity/deceit is further clarified in 4.23. These genitives are attributive in nature. Paradigmatically, אמת and its antonym עול are juxtaposed to one another and indicate how the authors expected אמת to be understood. The authors declare that they feud in the heart of man, causing him to walk either in wisdom or in folly. Hence, the righteous, namely those that walk in wisdom, are viewed as acting in agreement with נחלת איש באמת ("man's inher-itance in the truth"; cf. 4.24), while the wicked, namely those that walk in folly, are viewed as those that יתעב אמת ("will despise truth"). אמת in this case refers to divine truth, and perhaps more specifically to the Law and that which is revealed in it.

However, even while the two coexist at the present time, the authors make it clear that God has determined to put an end to perversity and wickedness. Just as was true of those under the influence of the spirit of deceit, a total annihi-lation of the very existence of perversity and wickedness is to be expected in the future (cf. 4.18). Using the metaphorical language of personification, the authors describe the rising up of אמת and an end to its defilement forever, which reflects that it too has been under the influence of עול (4.19).[126] In this context, אמת is juxtaposed to the ממשלת עולה ("dominion of injustice/perversity/ deceit"). In this case, the previous phrase דרכי אמת, is understood in juxtaposition to the constructs עלילות עולה and ממשלת עולה ("deeds" and "dominion of injustice/perversity/deceit" respectively). It functions as an attributive genitive that describes a way of life that is conformed to the truth that is uncovered in the Law.

Furthermore, God will refine and purify man באמתו ("by his truth"; cf. 4.20).[127] He will accomplish this by completely stripping him of any remnants of deceit and cleansing him with the רוח קודש ("spirit of holiness") and the רוח אמת ("spirit of truth") like lustral water (4.21). In this case, the images of water (cf. 3.4–5) and spirit are combined, as is the cleansing role performed by רוח קודש and רוח אמת. These are the cleansing agents at God's final judgment when God finally brings an end to the conflict between the spirit of truth and the spirit of injustice/perversity/deceit. The deeds from which the defiled are cleansed include violations against ethical and ceremonial rules (cf. CD 6.15ff; 12:1–8; cf. Lev. 11:43).[128] This purification is, in essence, an "eschatological baptism of the spirit."[129] The context makes it clear that רוח קודש and רוח אמת are not two different spirits but are terms that are used interchangeably.[130] In this context, they are contrasted with the רוח נדה ("unclean spirit" or "spirit of impurity"). The righteous will be able to live righteous lives because the רוח אמת will instruct them in the knowledge and wisdom that is to be found in the Law and the secrets

revealed to the initiated (4.22).[131] אמת in this genitive relationship is therefore understood as a defining term, hence an attributive genitive, for the spirit whose role is in this case, both one of cleansing and of instruction. The paradigmatic relationships indicate that in this context, אמת is understood in light of its antithesis to נדה ("impurity").

Purpose and Way of Life of the Community: 5.1–6.23

The *Rule* includes a section that articulates the code of conduct that is expected of every member of the community (5.1–7.27). Beginning with an introductory passage (5.1–7a), members are warned against associating with men of injustice, and are encouraged to test one another's spirits and deeds for purposes of either promotion or demotion, depending on the results.[132] In addition, regulations for communal life and the religious observances of the community, direction for conduct during official meetings, direction in the manner in which trials were to be conducted, and the determination of penalties imposed during these trials are included.

General Statement of Purpose and Way (5.3, 5, 6)

Elledge observes that the dualistic doctrine had serious implications for the daily life of the community: "[s]ince the cosmos had been structured according to a conflict between Darkness and Light, strict separation from Darkness was necessary to practice the Torah in purity."[133] Because the community understood life in terms of this dualism, its members were obligated to separate themselves totally from all 'darkness' in order to avoid corruption. Hence the emphasis on keeping apart from the congregation of אנשי העול ("men of injustice"; cf. 5.1b–2a, 10b).[134] This phrase refers to non-members of the community, who by virtue of being out of the covenant, are under the influence of the spirit of deceit.[135]

However, not only were members of the community to separate themselves from אנשי העול, they were also expected לעשות אמת יחד ("to achieve truth together," 5.3; cf. 1.5; 8.2). Together with additional moral qualities, אמת functions as the object of the verb עשה, here translated 'to achieve' (cf. 1.5), and is used with reference to the conduct expected of every member of the covenant community. In this case, the community context is explicit and the term יהד is used in the sense of 'together' or 'in communion.' As Walck points out, "[t]ruth, based on the Torah, was to be the standard of judgement for internal community matters, as well as the standard of behavior by which the community council was to encourage truth, justice, judgement compassionate love, and unassuming behaviour, in order that the community might be a house of perfection and truth (cf. 8.1–9)."[136] Most importantly, where communal organization was concerned,

this אמת was a vital component of every aspect of community life. In terms of syntagmatic relations, אמת is found in a paratactic relationship with the moral qualities of ענוה ("humility"), משפט ("justice"), צדקה ("uprightness"), אהבת חסד ("compassionate love") and צנע ("seemly behavior") in all things (5.3). Given that it follows the denunciation of אנשי העול, אמת should be understood with reference to עול ("injustice"). Hence in terms of paradigmatic relations, the two are juxtaposed. Consequently, in this context it refers to a sphere of operation that defines a way of life that is opposed to injustice/perversity/deceit, and that is conformed to God's Law.

This pure way of life had the atoning purpose of laying a מוסד אמת ("foundation of truth") לבית האמת בישראל ("for the house of truth in Israel," 5.5, 6; cf. 8.5ff.). The genitive relationships may be understood as attributive. Given that this community believed that they were "recreating" Israel, these phrases identify this community as "a cleansing community which purifies those who join it by absorbing them into its life . . . in Qumran men are regarded as effecting atonement when they observe those conditions of repentance and purification which bring them within the atonement which God alone, properly speaking, provides."[137] אמת therefore refers to divine truth and further defines the community as belonging to that sphere or realm in which God reigns. Previous contexts in the *Rule* and the scrolls in general attest to the community's self understanding as the 'house of truth.'[138] However, by pointing out that the community is also a foundation of truth, the authors emphasize that it therefore constitutes the foundation from which the new Israel will arise.

Members not to Associate with Other Israelites (5.10)

One of the obligations to which a member bound himself in entering into the covenant included the oath to return to the Law of Moses (5.7b–10a). The significance of this lies in the fact that the covenant was understood as a continuation and renewal of the Mosaic covenant.[139] The men of the covenant are identified as those המתנדבים . . . לאמתו ("who freely volunteer together for this truth") and who also pledged to live in accordance with God's will (5.10a; cf. 9.16–18). In this case, the participle (המתנדבים) functions in apposition to the preceding phrase, אנשי בריתם ("men of the covenant"). Since אמת is found as the object of the preposition ל, this clarifies that the submission that is in view is that which is with regard to אמתו ("his truth"). The preposition is understood as pointing to specification, expressing that in respect to which something is affirmed, hence 'in regard to' or 'concerning.' The pronominal suffix points to God. The context suggests that dedication to the study of the Law is the issue here. Brownlee points out that as in 1.11, the reference to study of the Law is followed by a reference to the conduct required of the members of the community. This conduct is expected to conform to what is prescribed in the Law.[140] Hence, as in 1.11 where

a similar expression is found (וכול הנדבים לאמתו), אמת is used in a revelatory sense to refer to the Law of Moses, the content of faith. The other obligation, also noted in 5.1, was to keep oneself pure by avoiding men of injustice (5.10b–20a). This oath revealed the community's emphasis on the strict observance of the laws of ritual purity (like the Pharisee sect), and its perspective of itself as the true Israel, complete with the priestly and Levitical ideals of the Old Testament.[141]

Rules for Life in the Community (5.25)

The section encompassing 5.20b–26a continues with a cataloguing of the rules for life within the community. The contents reveal that a yearly examination of members was practiced.[142] The section that lays down principles for rebuking a fellow member begins in 5.25. The authors note that complainants were not to accuse in anger or with a spirit of wickedness, and neither were they to detest those who had wronged them, but they were to bring up the matter באמ[ת] וענוה ואהבת חסד ("in truth, meekness and compassionate love") and without delay. In this section, אמת is found in paratactic combination with other moral qualities, namely ענוה ("meekness") and אהבת חסד ("compassionate love"). These substantives are used with the verb יכח ("rebuke," "reprove") and as objects of the preposition ב (instrumental use) to describe the manner in which one ought to rebuke fellow members. The semantic relationship within this colon is therefore qualificational character-manner.

Pointing out that this is an interpretation from Lev 19:17 (and closely related to CD 9.2 ff.; cf. CD 7.2 ff), Wernberg-Møller notes that this practice of admonishing fellow members was not unique to the sect. It also featured prominently in Jewish and Christian circles (cf. Ecclus.19:13 ff; Sabbat 119b; *Test. Gad* 6.3, 6; Matt 18:15; Luke 17:3; Rom 15:14; Hebr 10:25).[143] The legal context suggests that אמת is used in the sense of 'sincerely,' and 'in accordance with the facts as they stand.' This implies that members were to have the right motivation in rebuking one another and were not to raise false accusations of misconduct. The requirement of witnesses ensured that proper procedures and standards were followed (cf. 6.1) and that the complaints were genuine, based on an objective observance rather than a grumbling disposition.[144]

Steps by Which a New Member Enters the Community (6.15)

The section encompassing 6.13b–23 continues with the entrance ceremony and outlines in greater detail the specific steps that an individual was expected to go through in order to be admitted into the community. First, there was an indefinite probation period, during which time the potential member was outside the

sect, then a year's probation after which admission into the purity of the Many took place, and finally another year before admission to full membership.[145] It is clear that one's entrance was voluntary, based on the individual's desire to become a part of this community. The entrance ceremony involved certain tests administered by the פקיד (the instructor and the head of the Many) and by the Many (the general community) that related to the insight and deeds of the prospective member. Depending on the outcome of the vote, he was either admitted into the community or excluded. This was in order that he might אמת. לשוב לאמת ולסור מכול עול is found as the object of the preposition ל and as the object of the infinitive with ל (לשוב), indicating purpose. Hence, as in other contexts, the phrase signifies "in order to revert to the truth"; cf. 6.15. As other contexts show, entry into the covenant or the community implied a promise to return to the Law of Moses (cf. 8.15; 22; CD 5.8, 21; 1QH 17.12).[146] אמת in this context is therefore used to refer to the Law.

Penitential Code of the Community: 6.24–7.25

Penitential Code (7.18)

Following the section on entrance into the community, the *Rule* continues with the 'Penitential Code of the Community,' which outlines rules for the punishment and/or rehabilitation of offenders. The literary form of the list of punishments follows that of casuistic law.[147] Offenses that incurred punishment included lying about property, discordant interpersonal relationships, blasphemy, angry speech against the priest, intentional lying, and so on. All these offenses, and the many others listed, violated the standard of uprightness that was expected of a member of the community and revealed that the individual was not living up to a life of purity. This failure incurred two types of punishment: either exclusion or total expulsion, depending on the nature (either intentional or unintentional) and the seriousness of the offence.[148] In this context, the authors warn that anyone who turns aside from the foundation of the community לבגוד באמתוללכת בשרירות לבו ("to betray the truth and walk in the stubbornness of his heart"; cf. 7.18b–19) would be excluded from the community for two years. This punishment applied only to those who had been in the community less than ten years (cf. 7.22).

In this verse, אמת is found as the direct object of the verb בגד ("betray"). In this case אמת is used to refer to the Law and its interpretation in the community. This section that outlines the code of conduct for the community therefore clarifies the nature of the sphere of operation that those who live in covenant community are to aspire to. Hence, while אמת is mentioned explicitly only once in this section, there is clearly a warning against the failure to live up to the standard of אמת as prescribed in the Law and as interpreted by the sages.

Model of a Pioneer Community to Pave the Way for the Main Community: 8.1–9.26

In the section spanning 8.1–9.26, the reader begins to gain an understanding of the reason for the community's existence (cf. 8.13–16; 9.19–20), and why its original members felt compelled to separate themselves from the rest of Israel and retire to the wilderness.[149] Barrera notes that the rejection of the temple at Jerusalem, as well as worship celebrated there, is one of the most distinctive characteristics of the Qumran community. However, lest the nature of this antagonism be misunderstood, it must be emphasized that the Qumranites were not opposed to sacrifices and the cult. Rather, considering themselves to be the legitimate successors of the priesthood, they disagreed with the priests of Jerusalem on the issue of the calendar of Feasts and accused them of betraying the laws of purity. This break with the priesthood was the main reason for their withdrawal into the desert.[150]

However, even though they had broken away from the establishment and had no means of offering sacrifices, they still regarded themselves as the 'temple of God.'[151] They therefore intended, "to start the history of Israel afresh, beginning with its roots in the desert and especially to prepare in the desert the path of the Lord by means of the study of the Law" (cf. 1QS 8.13–15).[152] They believed that only they had the solution. As further evidence of their perceived exalted status as the 'true Israel,' the authors emphasize the central role that the community played in atoning for the sins of the entire nation of Israel (8.3–10; 9.3–6; cf. 5.5–6). This atonement involved both living a righteous life as well as enduring suffering (8.3–4).[153] A look at the Old Testament prophets and Jewish literature (apocryphal and pseudepigrahical) of the Hasmonean and Herodian periods reveals that this general unrest regarding temple practices, as well as the expectation of the purging of the temple and establishment of a new, restored temple, was not unique to the community.[154]

Constitution of the Pioneer Community (8.2, 4, 5, 6, 9; 9.3)

Although this section addresses the responsibilities of a specific community council, consisting of twelve men and three priests, these instructions are also understood to apply to the larger body of the community in general.[155] These responsibilities include carrying out justice (צדקה), judgment (משפט), compassionate love (אהבת חסד), unassuming behavior (הצנע) of one to another, preserving faithfulness (אמונה) in the land with firm purpose, and to do truth (לעשות אמת; cf. 8.2).[156] The translation given by Martínez and Tigchelaar, "to implement truth," appears to imply that these instructions were given only to the leaders mentioned, in which case the sense would be that they were to help the community members implement the moral qualities listed.[157] However, as pointed out above, while

this may have been the case for a while, once the community was constituted, the instructions applied to everyone. As in 1.5–6a, אמת in this reference functions as the direct object of the verb עשה, which suggests that it is something that manifests itself in outward, visible actions. The relationships are the same in both contexts, and both references indicate that אמת has a moral aspect. Used in conjunction with the moral qualities listed above, it signifies a sphere of operation that defines a way of life that is conformed to God's revelation and the Teacher's interpretation in the Law (cf. 8.14–16).

They were also to walk with everyone במ{{ם}}מדת האמת ("in the measure of the truth," 8.4; cf. "measure according to truth," 4Q181 2.8; 4Q416 6.6). This construct relationship conveys that relationships with fellow members of the community were to adhere to the precepts laid down in the Law. It indicates that it was the responsibility of every individual to ensure that the community functioned as it should, by practicing, within the community context, the principles prescribed in the Torah. Walck points out that "truth is an important quality of God's character and of God's dealing with humanity. *Derivatively, truth is an important characteristic of the identity and behavior of the community, both in their adherence to God's truth and in their dealings with one another.*"[158]

The result of this is that {{ה}}עצת היחד באמת נכונה ("the community council would be founded/stand firm on truth"; cf. 8.5).[159] In this context, this is a clear reference to the community in general. In this phrase, אמת functions as the object of the participle נכונה, which functions as the main verb ("shall be founded/stand firm"). The preposition ב attached to אמת is used spatially. One of the aims of the community was to establish itself on the Law and this is how this reference should be understood in this context. Hence, the community would be founded in that realm in which divine truth reigns.

The hymn that follows, which is probably sectarian in origin,[160] clarifies that the community was to consider itself not only "an everlasting plantation, a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron," but also אמת עדי ("witnesses of truth") for the judgment (8.6; cf. Isa 43:10, 12.). This may be understood as a subjective or objective genitive. In the former case, the emphasis is on the character of the individuals and on the accuracy or veracity of their report, hence 'true witnesses.'[161] In the latter case, the emphasis would be on the content of their witnessing. The context suggests that while the former may also be true, the emphasis is on the content of witnessing, the divine truth upon which the community is founded, namely the Law. Hence, it was expected to be the standard of judgment for internal community matters.[162] This idea that God chooses the righteous to act as his witnesses at the judgment can also be found in a fragmentary Aramaic version of *1 En.* 93:10.[163]

In addition, the community was to function as בית תמים ואמת בישראל ("a house of perfection and truth in Israel") for the purpose of establishing the covenant (8.9–10). In this phrase, אמת is found in a paratactic relationship with תמים. The construct relationship, together with the emphasis suggested by this paratactic relationship, suggests that אמת is used as in previous contexts in an attributive genitive relationship

as a defining term for the community, whose lives must be characterized by deliberate effort toward ethical perfection in all things, as well as an inner submission to, and an outward manifestation of, the requirements of the Law. Ethical perfection (cf. CD 7.5; 10.6; used as the title of the sect in CD 20.2, 5, 7) is synonymous with keeping every aspect of the Law.[164] In this context, 'house' is used as a reference to the temple.[165]

The final reference to אמת in this section is found in 9.4–5, which is a reiteration of the theme found in 8.1–11. Here, the authors discuss the punishment for inadvertent transgressions and the culprit's restoration to the community. Shemesh suggests that the scrolls distinguish between two groups of offenders, only one of whom may rightly be called בני העבל. There are those who sin willfully and hence must be expelled permanently, and there are those who sin unintentionally, who are excluded from the community for a while but are restored after discipline has been administered (cf. 9.3–6).[166] However, Qimron provides us with a third option. Pointing out the failure of numerous studies in making a connection between the dualistic division of mankind into two categories, the covenant, and the practical aspect of the expulsion of an offender from the community, he suggests that in this context (9.5–11; cf. CD 20.20–25), these individuals belong to an ambiguous category, they are neither one nor the other. Although they are in the community, they still continue to maintain their perverse ways, making it difficult to judge whether or not they ought to be expelled from the community. He concludes that there are degrees of liability, ranging from intentional, to unintentional and finally to careless transgression.[167]

The phrase that speaks of the establishment of the רוח קודש לאמת עולם ("spirit of holiness in truth eternal"; cf. 9.3–4) points to at least one purpose behind the community's conformity to the Law that is prescribed throughout the *Rule.* In a previous context (4.20–22), the 'spirit of holiness' refers to the 'spirit of truth.' This is not the case here; rather the emphasis is not so much on the identity of the spirit, but on what he accomplishes. The substantive עולם clarifies the eternal aspect attached to truth and by implication its divine origins. The preposition ל is understood as pointing to specification, expressing that in respect to which something is affirmed, hence "in regard to" or "concerning." The combination of אמת and קודש are a linguistic clue that purification and cleansing go hand in hand with the truth of God—it is the truth revealed by God that exposes and sweeps away error and cleanses from all defilement. אמת is therefore used to refer to the sphere in which God reigns.

Guidance for the Instructor of the Pioneer Community (9.17, 18)

This section also relates to regulations for the משכיל ("instructor"). His task, in accordance with the revelation given in every period, is to carry out the will of God and to judge between the sons of Zadok (i.e. the whole community) in

accordance with their spirits (cf. the dualistic doctrine).[168] He is also to acquire wisdom that has been gained "according to the periods and the decree of the period." Leaney points out that while the phrase "decree of the period" pertains to the time present to the student, the phrase "according to the periods" relates to "what had to be learnt by members, the scriptural commentaries found at Qumran furnishing examples of the necessary textbooks."[169] One of his tasks, with respect to those who had chosen the way of the Lord, was ולהוכיח דעת אמת ("to reproach with truthful knowledge") and just judgment (9.17). The genitive relationship is attributive, clarifying that the knowledge referred to here must have the character of truth. The phrase ולהוכיח דעת אמת therefore specifies the manner in which the act of reproaching was to be conducted. It was through knowledge that is informed by the Law.

In addition to this as well as his other roles and responsibilities, he was to lead the men of the community with knowledge and instruct them ברזי פלא ואמת ("in the secrets/mysteries of wonder and truth"; cf. 9.18). As noted previously, secrecy was crucial in the community. Indeed, in some instances (e.g. 4Q298), scribes sometimes wrote in code in order to hide secrets from the uninitiated.[170] This term, together with the related term רזי דעת ("secrets/ mysteries of knowledge"; cf. 4.6) emphasizes the shroud of secrecy that surrounded the community (cf. 10.24–25). Given the context of teaching in which this phrase occurs, as well as its linguistic combination with רז and פלא (9.18), אמת is used here to refer to that which is revealed to the community in the Law.

Closing Hymn: 10.1–11.22

Finally, in 10.1–11.22, the authors bring the *Rule* to an end, but not as one would expect. Rather than the casuistic style that has been the emphasis throughout the scroll (except for the doctrinal section), the author chooses to include a calendar of worship (10.1–8a), a hymn (10.9–11.15a) and a benediction (11.15b–22).

Hymn (10.17; 11.4, 14)

The last occurrences of אמת are found in the section incorporating the hymn. As one scholar points out, the hymn serves to reveal:

> … the Community's self-understanding as a dwelling place of the divine, which God has joined together with the heavenly world (11.7–9). In the pure worship of the Community, the boundaries between heaven and earth diminish, as human beings and angels assemble together to praise God.[171]

This piece of embedded genre, serves at least two functions. First, it emphasizes what is already present in the sections that have gone before it by focusing, not

surprisingly, on God's mercy toward humanity despite their depth of impurity before him. Second, it formulates a conclusion for a theological purpose, namely to convey the significant truth that the community is indeed the dwelling place of God.

The hymn states that an individual's steps do not waver, and beginning with the causal conjunction כיא, explains why this is so. In 11.4b–5a, one reads כיא אמת אל היאה סלע פעמי ("for the truth of God is the rock of my steps"). This possessive genitive relationship (אל אמת), identifies God himself as the author of אמת. It also functions in an equative relationship with סלע (rock) thus indicating that life itself is founded on divine אמת. The hymn therefore expresses the conviction that those who are of God are assured of righteous lives as long as they hold to the truth of God. Hence, אמת is not merely assumed, but praised as the foundation of life.[172] אמת therefore refers to divine truth.

Finally, as the hymn comes to a close, the theme of judgment reappears in the phrase בצדקת אמתו שפטני (11.14a) which may be translated "He will judge me in the justice of his truth," or even "By his righteous truth has he justified me."[173] This genitive relationship with the moral quality of צדקה ("justice") and the occurrence of the verb שפט ("judge") indicate the sphere in which judgment takes place (11.14a). While both translations noted above are possible, it is likely that the genitive relationship in this case is attributive and hence the latter translation ("righteous truth") is more accurate. The substantive צדקה is therefore used in this context to define אמת. The pronominal suffix makes it clear that divine truth is in view here.

Indeed, just prior to this, in the context of God's authority to impose judgment, the authors declare that the judgment of all living things lies in God's hands. Moreover, ואמת כול מעשיו ("all his [God's] deeds are truth," 10.17; cf. 1.19). In the declaration that all God's deeds are אמת, it is the character of the one who does them that is emphasized. In this case, אמת is used by the authors in the sense of the faithfulness, reliability and trustworthiness of the character of God. Hence, while 9.13 seemed to imply that the instructor is the judge (and indeed he is), this verse clarifies that it is God who is the ultimate judge and he bases his judgment on certain standards that pertain to his character.

Conclusion

The community that composed this document believed themselves to be the 'true Israel,' and hence 'truth' naturally occupied an emblematic status in their literature. The *Rule* is itself a document whose general aim was to teach the exclusive Qumran community how to apply the Torah to practical forms of communal life so as to live blamelessly before God. It was established that the word אמת in its various forms occurs most frequently in the sectarian documents, although it is also evident in the liturgical texts of the Hymns and Blessings. A few occurrences

are also found in the parabiblical texts. It was also noted that in addition to the paleography and the rough Hebrew syntax, which make it difficult to arrive at a uniform translation, the historical and sociological contexts out of which the text arose are also difficult to reconstruct. This was evident in the lack of consensus in translation for some of the texts studied.

This survey of all the instances of אמת in the *Rule* in its various combinations indicates that the authors used אמת in a number of different ways. When used with reference to God, it is descriptive of his character and his deeds. In these instances, it generally signifies faithfulness, reliability and trustworthiness. אמת is also used in a revelatory sense, in that it refers to the Law of God revealed through Moses and the prophets. In this case, it forms the content of faith for those in the community. That which has been revealed through the Teacher of Righteousness and the sages is also regarded as אמת in the sense of divine revelation. אמת is also used to signify the sphere of operation of those who are rightly related to God, by virtue of being in a special covenant relationship. In this case, it is conformity to the Law and its interpretation as evidenced in outward acts of uprightness and purity. This is vertical (towards God) and horizontal (toward fellow members). אמת is also used as a defining term to describe: 1) The spirit of truth, who instructs and cleanses the members of the community. 2) The sons of truth, who are the members of the community and consequently belong to the realm of divine truth. 3) The community itself. In most instances, the emphasis is on the character of the community. It is also used dualistically, in opposition to עול ("injustice/perversity/ deceit") as well as נדה ("impurity"). Rather than falsehood, injustice/perversity/deceit is the functional opposite of אמת in the *Rule.* Finally אמת is also linked metaphorically with light, while that which is opposed to it is linked with darkness.

Notes

1. Two works serve as core resources in this chapter. 1) *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (eds. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997). This is a two volume work that proves particularly useful for anyone not specializing in Dead Sea Scroll studies. While it is primarily based on the translation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated,* as well as prior work done on the scrolls, it is itself a fresh transcription and English translation of all the non-biblical scrolls found in caves one to eleven, as well as three cases of manuscripts not found at Qumran but related to this literature. 2) The electronic resource on the scrolls accessed through Bible Works 7, Martin G. Abegg, Jr., *The Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts* © 1999, 2000, 2001.
2. This is the structure proposed by A. R. C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 112–13.
3. The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls is very similar to late biblical Hebrew.

However, it also has features that reflect the transition from Biblical Hebrew to Rabbinic or Mishnaic Hebrew. On the basis of its unique features, Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 117–18, argues that it is probably a mixture not only of biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic, but "also draws on a distinct spoken dialect."

4. Wise, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 137–38. For a fuller discussion of these introductory issues see Mburu, The *Rule of the Community,* 145–49.

5. For instance, Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language," 3:97, notes that *The Prayer of Jonathan* honors a person who was hated by the Qumranites. This implies that conclusions regarding the marginal nature of the group are not as secure as was once assumed.

6. The following comment by Philip R. Davies, "Qumran and the Quest for the Historical Judaism," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures:Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield, England: Sheffield, 1997), 26, represents a growing consensus in Qumran studies: "[o]nce these manuscripts could easily be referred to as a sectarian library, in which everything that was not biblical (i.e. about 75% of the texts) could be taken to represent the views of the owners of the library. But the idea is long gone. We do not in any case know what 'biblical' means in the context of the Qumran texts, and, even allowing that the producers and owners of the texts had the notion of a category of Scripture, there remains the problem of distinguishing among remaining manuscripts so-called 'sectarian' from so-called 'non-sectarian' writings, which means, in effect, writings already known from outside this collection as against those only known within it. A further problem is that of the eight hundred or so distinct manuscripts that can be reconstructed, very few indeed can be positively identified as having been written by the same scribe. Furthermore, the Scrolls attest different kinds of Hebrew, different ways of writing it, and different conventions of preparing the manuscripts for writing. There are differing editions of 'scriptural' texts but even important variations in so-called 'sectarian' texts (such as between 1QS and 4QS, 1QM and 4QM). The idea that the Qumran archive was a collection of texts even largely written at Qumran has therefore been largely abandoned, and it now seems widely agreed that many or most were brought there from elsewhere."

7. The twofold eschatological and *halakhic* viewpoint is made clear by the issue of the calendar. The calendar is a legal presupposition of the ordering of the cult and has the added function of both dividing history into periods and allowing for the calculation of the end time, all significant aspects of the community. Julio Trebelle Barrera, "The Essenes of Qumran: Between Submission to the Law and Apocalyptic Flight," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Julio Trebelle Barrera; trans. Wilfred G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 67.

8. These ideas relate to the practices and organization of a distinct community, the history of the community and its contemporary circumstances, the theological and metaphysical outlook of the community, the community's typical biblical

exegesis with the most characteristic (though by no means the only) term, *pesher.* See Alex R. G. Deasley, *The Shape of Qumran Theology* (UK: Paternoster, 2000), 69.

9. The *Rule* is also formerly known as the *Manual of Discipline* or the *Discipline Scroll,* and is very similar to the *Damascus Covenant* with regard to *halakhah.*

10. Elledge, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 55.

11. There are at least eleven other copies of this document that have been discovered in addition to the main one from Cave 1, namely 4QS[a-j]=4Q255–264, 5QS=5Q11; cf. 11QS=11Q29. These are not identical to the main one from cave one, but contain some variants.

12. Deasley, *Qumran Theology,* 15, notes the following: One of the copies of the Rule from Cave 4 begins at the same point as 1QS 5. This may be indicative of the fact that for some purposes or at some stage in the history of the community, the *Rule* began here; the reference to the "Messiahs of Aaron and Israel" in 4QS[e] is missing; and while 1QS 8–9.25 appears to be designed to serve much the same purposes as columns 5–6, the latter is not as extensive and appears to be written more from the perspective of the aims and spirit of the Community, as well as from a more distinctly historical rather than a legislative view point. Because this study is concerned with the final form of the text of the *Rule,* issues related to redaction and textual criticism are not directly relevant. However, where necessary, issues in these areas that impact this study will be noted.

13. Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr. and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Fransisco: HarperSanFransisco, 1996), 113.

14. Philip S. Alexander, "Rules," *EDSS* 2:803.

15. Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: University Press, 1987), 77.

16. P. Wernberg- Møller, *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 1; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 16–1, points out that the best parallels to the eschatology of 1QS are found in the pseudepigraphical literature.

17. Wise, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 138.

18. The first, also known as the *Messianic rule* (1QS[a]), is two columns long and deals with the "last days." It apparently originally belonged to the same scroll from Cave 1, but the connection is not clear. It discusses the education of children raised in the community, the stages of progression within the community according to age and ability, and procedures for the communal meal presided over by priests and the "messiah of Israel." The second appendix, (1QS[b]), is very poorly preserved. It consists of several blessings pronounced by the *maskil* ("wise leader") over the community, the priests and the prince. Like the *Messianic Rule* it has a definite eschatological setting. Ibid.

19. Leslie W. Walck, "Truth," *EDSS* 2:950.

20. Martin G. Abegg Jr. et. al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* (vol. 1; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 72–75.

21. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 55.

22. John Elwolde, "From Bible to Mishnah," in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea*

Scrolls and Ben Sira, Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University 11–14 December 1995 (eds. T. Muraoka and J. F. Elwolde; STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 36, argues that in the Qumran literature there are instances of new collocations of אמת in the sense of 'truth' (i.e. conformity to fact), rather than 'reliability,' which, according to him, seems to be the more common meaning in the pre-mishnaic corpus as a whole. Both the quantity of usage and the use of אמת primarily as 'truth' rather than 'reliability' are admitted. However, these are not the only two categories as this study will demonstrate.

23. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 392–93.

24. Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 46, following Brownlee, points out that 2.19 suggests that all the members renewed the covenant each year and therefore contra Dupont-Sommer, this covenant renewal ceremony did not just apply to the newcomers. VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 263, suggest that *A Liturgy of Blessing and Cursing* (esp. 4Q286–90) may supply the words used in the annual covenant renewal ceremony.

25. While the following is by no means a consensus, one position holds that the *Rule* applied to more than just one particular community living at Qumran. Wise, Abegg and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 113, argue against the standard model that presupposes this. They explain, "[s]cholars commonly refer to this work as the 'Community Rule.' According to the Standard Model described in the Introduction, this work is supposed to have governed a community living at Qumran. But this idea is at least partly wrong; the work itself refers to various groups or chapters scattered throughout Palestine. Therefore it did not attach specifically to the site of Qumran (whatever the connection of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the site, and whatever the nature of that site). This text does not merely reflect a small community living there. Since 'community' usually implies a definite and restricted geographical location and thereby calls this mistaken notion to mind, it seems better to find a different word for the text's users. As we have explained in the Introduction, to avoid the misleading connotations of various possible English semiequivalents we have decided to use one of the association's most common self designations, *Yahad,* 'unity.'"

26. For a number of reasons, this "Qumran-Essene" hypothesis, first suggested by Eleazar Sukenik, has been refuted. One objection to this hypothesis is that the source upon which Pliny relies postdates the First Revolt, hence describing a community that lived on the shores of the Dead Sea after A.D. 70, after use of Qumran had ceased. Apart from the multiplicity of scribes involved in the composition and/or editing of the Scrolls (which probably indicates a source other than Qumran), there are also significant disagreements (and sometimes no point of contact at all), with regard to the descriptions of Essene life (for instance with regard to celibacy, involvement in war and slavery, lack of mention of the sect's solar calendar etc.). Others, recognizing that Essenism was a widespread movement whose members did not all isolate themselves from the rest of Judaism, propose that the "Groningen hypothesis" provides the best explanation for both the common elements and the differences. In this

hypothesis, the Palestinian Apocalyptic tradition provides the ideological roots of the Qumran community. Yet another competing hypothesis (although still a minority position) is Golb's Jerusalem hypothesis which postulates a Jerusalem provenance. On the basis of similarities between the way the law is interpreted in MMT (and other scrolls), Schiffman argues that the sect consists of Sadducees (compare with the Sadducee-Pharisee conflict). For these discussions, see Wise, "Dead Sea Scrolls,"144–45; Wise, Abegg and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 25–26; T. Beall, "Essenes,"*DNTB*, 343–46; Martínez, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 11. Clearly, these arguments are not conclusive either way and there is not enough evidence from any party to make a clear identification. It is probably best not be overly dogmatic on the identification of the Qumran sect with any particular community. At any rate, this study is not itself dependent on any particular identification, and the results are not likely to be dramatically affected by new information with regard to this debate.

27. See J. J. M. Roberts, "The Importance of Isaiah at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed. James H Charlesworth; 3 vols.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:273–286.

28. James Charlesworth, "Community Organization," *EDSS* 1:134, notes of this individual: "[h]e was the bearer of God's special revelation (1QpHab), he was like Moses 'the Lawgiver,' he was the author of some of the hymns chanted in the community, and he most likely composed many of the rules to be memorized by members of the community (most likely, but not certainly 1QS iii.13–4.16)."

29. This can be understood as both a subjective and an objective genitive. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 55.

30. VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 282–84; Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 12; Gert Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerchtigkeit* (SUNT; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 285.

31. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 43, suggests, following Burrows, that these infinitives "except in cases of clear subordination, are to be translated as finite forms: they are the promises, to which the members of the community pledged themselves on renewing the covenant." On the grounds that this is an introductory section in the *Rule* that enumerates general principles of community life, Metso, *Textual Development,* 120, argues that the series of infinitives with ל in this section (twenty occurrences), as well as in 5.1–7a (nine occurrences) and 8.1–13a, 15a (ten occurrences), are "to be understood in a predicative sense, denoting commands." However, the context suggests a third, more probable alternative. According to T. Leahy, "Studies in the Syntax of 1QS," *Bib* 41 (1960): 138–39, 143, in this instance the use may be categorized as having three uses—explicative, appositional and purpose. Given that the opening sentence identifies this document as belonging to the rule category, it is likely that the instructions contained in it are intended to serve specific purposes, the substance of which are identified in this, as well as the other two introductory sections (5.1–7a; 8.1–13a, 15a). The translations by Martínez

and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:71, and Elisha Qimron and James H. Charlesworth, "The Rule of the Community," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with Translations* (ed. James H. Charlesworth et. al.; The Princeton Theological Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1; Louisville: Westminster, 1994), 7, reflect this understanding.

32. Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:71. See also Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 79, who proposes "For [the wise leader …]" which has the same sense. For other reconstructions, see Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran*, 117–18, "For [the instructor and the me]n his brothers"; cf. J. Carmignac, "Conjecture sur la première ligne de la Règle de la Communauté," *RevQ2* (1959): 85–87, esp. 85), "De l'instructeur … aux hommes ses frères, le livre de la règle de la communauté." Carmignac argues that "להיו pourrait être une graphie qumrânienne pour לאהיו, et alors on devine immédiatement que le terme précédent serait ולאנשים"; and William Hugh Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline* (BASORSup 10–12 ; Connecticut: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951), 6, "[These are the ordinances] for [the whole assembly, including children and wo]men," which differs from Carmignac's reconstruction only in that it includes all ages and genders.

33. Note Metso, *Textual Development*, 111–112, who argues that the principles of community life enumerated here apply to all members of the community and therefore the division of the text into 1.1–11a (directed to the instructor) and 1.11b–15 (directed to the candidates) as has been argued by Knibb is not accurate. Her reconstruction reads "For the wise leader, to instruct the men for (during?) his life, the book of the order of the community." See her discussion for criticisms against reconstructions by Brownlee, Carmignac and Dupont-Sommer.

34. This heading, סרך היחד, has been preserved in two copies of the Community Rule (1QS and 4QS^a) and in the *verso* of the handle-sheet of the scroll containing 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSb. Ibid., 67. Apart from denoting a document that sets out rules, the semantic range of סרך extends to: practice, orderly procedure or ritual (cf. 5.1; 6.8); 'Order' (cf. 1.1, 16; 2.20, 21; 5.23; 6.22); position or rank (cf. 1Q28a 1.21); list or register (cf. 1QS 5.23; 6.22; 1Q28a 1.21; 1QM 4.6, 11); battle array (cf. 1QM 7.1; 3.3; 9.10–11, 14; 13.1, 5); a synonym for the community (cf. 1QS 1.16; 2.20); a specific ruling, statute or commandment of the Torah (CD 7.7). In the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, it is translated with the Greek word τάξις. See Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline*, 7, Philip S. Alexander, "Rules," *EDSS* 2:799.

35. Cf. 1.19; 5.3; 6.15; 8.2; 10.17; 1QM 13.1 f., 9; 14.12; 1QH 1.30; 6.9; 13.4; 1Q22 1.11.

36. Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 45 points out that no parallel can be found for 1.4b–5a in the Old Testament, but that this appears " to be an echo of a 'golden rule', used by both Jewish and Christian moral teachers, cf. e.g. Test. Asher iii 1 f (BROWNLEE); Test. Benj. viii 1; Rom. xii 9; 1 Thess. V 21 f."

37. Cf. 5.3f, 8.2, and the very close parallel in *Testament of Benjamin* 10.3 where 'truth', 'righteousness' and 'judgment' are objects of 'to do'; Jer 9:23 (with the

Lord as subject); 23:5 (with the Davidic messiah as subject). Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 45.

38. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 54, writes, "[d]ie Wahrheit wird nicht nur im Handeln Gottes in Erscheinung treten, sondern soll auch beim Menschen zur Tat werden. Das fordert vor allem der Sektenkanon. Dort bezeichnet der Begriff אמת den Dienst, den Gott vom Menschen erwartet und der,,wahr" ist, weil ihn Gott befohlen hat. Die,,Wahrheit" ist durchaus praktischer Art."

39. For this emphasis, albeit with different wording, see the other introductions (cf. 5.1; 8.1–2). Metso, *Textual Development,* 122.

40. Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 79.

41. Cf. 1.3; 8.15 ff. Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 13.

42. For Moses (cf. 5.8; 8.15, 22; CD 5.21; 1QM 10.6; 1QH 17.12), and his servants, the prophets (cf. 8.16; 4QpHab 2.9; 7.5; 4QpHos[b] 2.5). The reference to prophets is important and it may imply that as in the Mishnah, the Qumraners viewed the prophets as serving "an essential link in the transmission of the Law from Moses to the Rabbis," and also understood them to be "not only teachers of morality, but also guides in the domain of the final eschatological realities." Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 70. Note also that given that these two are never mentioned together in the Old Testament, this pairing is an indication of the value that this community placed on the Torah and the prophetic writings. Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 45.

43. 4QMMT provides clear guidance on what was considered valid interpretation. VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 263.

44. VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 284, point out that "[i]f the Teacher wrote a revealed law, then, according to the *pesharim*, his inspiration extended to both the law and the prophets."

45. Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 29. See also Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 118–19; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), 8ff., 67.

46. Vermes*, Dead Sea Scrolls*, 71.

47. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 80.

48. Cf. 1QpHab 7.10–12. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 54.

49. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 119.

50. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 80.

51. Ibid.*,* 84.

52. Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 69.

53. Its importance is seen in its repeated appearance in numerous documents found at Qumran including 1Q28a, 1Q28b, 1QM, 1Q34, 1QH[a], 4Q501, 4Q504, 11Q19 and especially in 1QS, 4Q255–264a, 5Q11, and CD, 4Q266–273, 5Q12, 6Q15. James C. VanderKam, "Covenant," *EDSS* 1:152–53.

54. Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 115, also point out that this new covenant is also referred to as the Covenant of Mercy, the Covenant of the eternal *Yahad,* the Eternal Covenant, and the Covenant of Justice.

55. Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 7.

56. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 120, explains that "[t]his council is believed to owe its existence to the counsel (or plan) of God and to make decisions which are according to his counsel; thus the council of the community, when it makes a pronouncement after deliberating according to what it holds to be the divinely ordered procedure, can almost identify itself with the counsel of God."

57. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 81.

58. The full reference reads: "All those who submit freely to his truth will convey all their knowledge, their energies, and their riches to the Community of God in order to refine their knowledge in the truth of God's decrees and marshal their energies in accordance with his perfect paths and all their riches in accordance with his just counsel." Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:71. This command overlaps the command in Deut 6:5 in which a wholehearted devotion to God is enjoined. See the discussion in Moshe Weinfeld, "The Covenant in Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 3 vols.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 59–69.

59. Leahy, "Syntax," 145 notes that "[t]he use of the masculine plural of the participle with the article, following *kwl,* is frequent in 1QS for designating the various classes of persons with whom the author is concerned."

60. For lengthened series, see *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (ed. E. Kautzsch; rev. A. E. Cowley; 2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), 414 § 128.

61. For instance, Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 117, translate 1.13 as follows: "in the verity of God's laws," which emphasizes the aspect of reality, authenticity and actuality of God's laws.

62. As Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 47, points out, it should be seen as a synonym for the Torah (cf. 1.7; Ps 119:142). Contra Yalon, in this context it does not refer to covenant.

63. Schnackenburg, *John* 2:233.

64. Indeed, the Teacher of Righteousness is the teacher of truth; as such, he is opposed to איש הכזב ("the man of the lie"); cf. 1QpHab. 2, 1 f; 5, 10 f; cf. CD20, 14 f. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 55–60. Timothy H. Lim, "Liar," *EDSS* 1:493–94, describes the man of the lie as depicted as being a rival of the Teacher of Righteousness on the matters of legal interpretation. He adds that his teachings are considered to have rejected the Torah and to be full of falsehood (1QpHab 5.11–12; 2.2–10) and in the Qumran literature he is described as a scoffer who preached lies to Israel and led many astray (CD 1.14–17; 10.9–13).

65. Note that Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 50, translates this "true works."

66. Cf. 1.18–19. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 85.

67. Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo* (ed. Michael Stone; CRINT 2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 483–550, esp. 500. Worth mentioning is the fact that the formula עבר בברית which occurs

in 1.16–18a; 1.18b–2.18 and 2.19–25 has its origins in Deut 29:11, and in that context "denotes the concrete act of the congregation submitting itself to the covenant with God." Metso, *Textual Development,* 141; cf. Manfred. Weise, *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der Ordensregel vom Toten Mer* (StPB 3; Leiden, Brill, 1961), 69–70.

68. The infinitive construct with the preposition ב plus the context is what suggests the temporal use of this clause. See also Leahy, "Studies in the Syntax of 1QS," 139, who identifies it more closely as temporal-circumstantial i.e. "upon the occasion thereof."

69. Cf. 1QM 13.1, 2, 9; 14:12; 11Q17 10.6.

70. See also Ps 111: 9[8]. This reliability and fidelity of God is reflected in the scrolls (e.g. 1QM 10, 11–16) where God's אמת is made evident in his acts in nature and history. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 53.

71. So Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:71, Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 99, and contra Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 117, who translate this as "veritable deeds," thereby placing more emphasis on the genuineness and authenticity of God's works.

72. This confession is also found in CD20.28–30, albeit in a slightly different form. Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 51.

73. The exact words are uncertain. Based on the reading of CD20.29, Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 85, suggests, "We have acted sinfully … in that we have walked [contrary to the covenant] of truth and righteous[ness];" Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 8, suggests a translation almost similar to this: "because we have walked [contrary to] true [ordinances]"; Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 51, translates this as "true and righteous is his punishment." He objects to the translation by Knibb on the grounds that this expression occurs nowhere else in the Scrolls and that just as the parallel text in CD indicates that אמת וצדיק belongs to what follows and should be taken as a predicate of משפטו, so should this text be taken. Following Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:71, this study leaves it uncertain.

74. So Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 88, Metso, *Textual Development,* 140, and contra Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 55.

75. The hierarchical structure of the community followed biblical tradition. The *Rule* describes categories that identify priests, Levites and the people (1.19–22). The latter are collectively referred to as the Many (cf. 6.8–9). The officials that had specific responsibilities include: the פקיד (the Instructor), who was the head of the Many and the one responsible for examining candidates during this period of membership (cf. 6.13c–15); the מבקר (the Examiner), who officiated at the council sessions (6.11–13); the משכיל ("the instructor"; cf. 3.13–15; 9.12–19, 21–26) who was involved mainly in the teaching of the doctrine and practice of the sect. These organizational terms mirror the self-understanding of the community at different times and stages of its history and hence one should not try to systematize them. For representative discussions on these and other organizational categories, see Deasley, *Qumran Theology*, 16–17, Leaney, *Rule*

of Qumran, 229f., Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 12–13, Charlesworth, "Community Organization," 1:134–35, Sarianna Metso, "Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed., Charlesworth, James H., 3 vols.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 2:283–300.

76. Contra Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 10–11, who sees the sense of יהד as 'unity,' and hence translates it "true unity." He also suggests, "[o]r in the 'true Community' as in line 26 but here the phrase seems to be coordinated with the following virtues by reason of which one does not aspire to a rank higher than that assigned him."

77. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 90. See also previous discussion on "council" and its ambiguity.

78. See also *Thanksgiving Psalms* 11.21–23; 14.12 –13; *War Rule* 7.5–6; 9.14–16; 12.1–9; *Priestly Blessings for the Last Days* 3.25–26; 4.23–26; *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice.* VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 263.

79. Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 499. See also Magen Broshi, "Qumran and the Essenes: Purity and Pollution, Six Categories," *RQ* 87 (2006):463–74, who lists at least six areas that the purity laws encompassed. These relate to table, bed, body, space (camps and Jerusalem), time (the calendar and the Sabbath) and means of purification (ritual bathing and spiritual repentance). Although he is dependent on a Qumran-Essene identification, his study is useful in that it isolates the main categories and relates these to specific Qumran texts.

80. This preference for the darkness is clarified in the dualistic doctrine (cf. 3.13–4.26). Light in the scrolls is frequently associated with wisdom and the Law. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 43–46.

81. Ibid., 138.

82. Walck, "Truth," 2:950.

83. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 90.

84. See also the Mishnah, *Yoma* 8.9, for this teaching, particularly with reference to the cleansing waters. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 139; It is not clear whether the context of this section is the Day of Atonement (so Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 60, and Lehman, "Yom Kippur in Qumran," *RQ* 3 (1961–62): 117 ff.) or the Feast of Weeks (so Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 104–107).

85. Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 13, suggests that it should be read "through a holy spirit disposed toward unity" cf. "heart (disposed) toward unity" (ליחד לבב) as in 1 Chronicles 12:18 (17). If the pronominal suffix in the prepositional phrase באמתו points back to יחד, this reveals that the community is the emphasis here. However, if it points back to רוח קדושה as is more likely, then it is the spirit of holiness that is in view. 3.6b provides a parallel expression which clarifies this understanding: כיא ברוח עצת אמת אל דרכי איש יכופרו כול (For it is by the spirit of the true counsel of God that are atoned the paths of man). It is the following verses that show that the character of the community members is also important for this cleansing.

86. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 35.

87. Ibid., 143.

88. Commenting on the theological exclusivity of this doctrine to the community, Charlotte Hempel, "Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield, England: Sheffield, 1997)*,* 51, points out that "[t]he famous teaching of the two spirits in 1QS 3.13–4.26, which is frequently described as 'Qumran theology' at its most developed and in its purest form, is missing from a number of Cave 4 manuscripts of the Community Rule … The teaching on the two spirits is thus not intrinsically linked to the communal legislation, and by implication the community legislated for, in1QS 5–9, and may well have originated independently of that material and/or outside of that community. It can, therefore, no longer be taken for granted that the two-spirits passage should be regarded as Qumran doctrine *par excellence*." In the same vein, Sarianna Metso, "Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History," *DSD* 11 no. 3 (2004), 325–28, points out that fragment 16 of 4Q502, which only has eight words, appears to overlap with 1QS 4.5–6 and consists of an enumeration of the virtues of the spirit of light. This raises the possibility that such a list of virtues did exist independently of the *Rule.* The implications are that it either used the *Rule* as a source, or both texts depended on a common source, oral or written, perhaps created outside the Essene circles with no knowledge of the *Rule* or the doctrine of the two spirits. In Metso, *Textual Development*, 67, she also notes that "[t] he manuscripts 4QS[a] and 4QS[h] include two fragments which have no direct parallel in 1QS. The vocabulary of the fragments indicates that at least the fragment of 4QS[a] belonged to the doctrine of the two spirits." While it is beyond the scope of this work to pursue this further, this data does bring up the possibility of an awareness of this doctrine beyond the narrow confines of the Qumran sect.

89. Cf. 9.12, 21; CD 12.21. While it may refer to a wise man in general (so Burrows), a particular teacher (so Dupont-Sommer), perhaps the *Mevaqqer* (so Van Der Ploeg), Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 66, points out on the basis of its use in Dan 11:33, 12:3, *En*. 100:6, 14:12, that "[b] oth in Daniel and in Pseudepigraphical literature the designation 'wise' is used in a general sense about a member of the pious community, and this is probably the meaning in which the word is used also in 1QS and CD; cf. especially 1QS ix 12 where the ensuing injunctions are most naturally taken as applying to the community as a whole, and not only to the teacher of the society."

90. Metso, *Textual Development,* 140, points out, on the basis of the notable change in style from legislative to doctrinal, that given that other sections addressed to the משכיל generally consisted of rules, this difference in style and theological reflection must point to the conclusion that this section was not originally addressed to him. However, because of the emphasis of his role as a teacher in

certain sayings in the *Rule* (for instance, in 9.13, 18–21), when this section was attached, it seemed only logical to address it to him.

91. As Metso, rightly argues, the rationale for including this doctrine "was probably to provide an explanation as to why in the community of the חמימ even lists of punishment were needed." Ibid.

92. He notes that while recognizing the cosmic dimension of this dualism, J. Jeremias isolates only three main characteristics: the dualism is monotheistic, ethical and eschatological. James H. Charlesworth, "A Critical Comparison of the Dualism in 1QS 3:13–4:26 and the 'Dualism' Contained in the Gospel of John," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Crossroads, 1991), 88–89.

93. The technical terminology within this paradigm in 1QS 3.13–4.26 includes: light/darkness; sons of light/sons of darkness; angel of light/angel of darkness; angel of truth/spirit of perversity; sons of truth/sons of perversity; sons of righteousness/sons of perversity; spring of light/well of darkness; walking in the ways of light/walking in the ways of darkness; truth/perversity; God loves/God hates; everlasting life/punishment, then extinction. Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language," 3:116.

94. Ibid., 133.

95. Cf. *1 Enoch*, *Jublilees*. VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 255–56.

96. The Two Ways tradition; cf. *Barn.* 18–20; *Did.* 1–6; *Herm.* 6; *Sir* 33; 42; *Jub.* 7–12; *1 En.* 2–5; 41–48; *T. 12 Patr.* (*T. Jud.* 20:1–4, *T. Ash.* 1:3 ff., 3–6; *T. Benj.* 4:1 ff.). Light and darkness representing powers or spheres to which men belong (*2 En.* 30.15; *T. Naph.* 2.10; *T. Levi* 19.1); being or causing ethical qualities (*T. Levi.* 17.6f.; *T. Benj.* 5.2; 6.4; *T. Gad* 5.7). The depiction of this struggle is also reflected in Rabbinic literature which taught that every person had two tendencies in him, the good and the evil tendency, that both struggled for dominion in the person. See Aune, "Dualism," 294; Ladd, *Theology*, 270; Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 96; Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 42, 149–50; Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 71; Metso, *Textual Development,* 137.

97. Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 14–15, points out that רוחות האמת והעול is "doubtless the Hebrew underlying the Greek of *T. Jud.* 20:1, which R. H. Charles translates 'the spirit of truth and the spirit of *deceit.*'" Cf. 'Prince of Deceit' (*T. Sim.* 2:7; *T. Jud.* 19:4); 'spirits of deceit' (*T. Iss.* 4:4; *T. Naph.* 3:3; *T. Ash.* 6:2; *T. Reu.* 2:1; *T. Sim.* 6:6; *T. Levi* 3:3); 'angel of peace' (*T. Benj.* 6:1).

98. Given the biblical phraseology evident in this passage, it is likely that it is based on Gen 1:1 ff. Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 67.

99. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 54.

100. Cf. "those who were born in darkness" (*1 En.* 108: 11, 15). Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 15. Cf. also *T. Ash.* 5:3 (πᾶσα ἀλήθεια ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός ἐστίν). Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 70.

101. This precise phrase is only found here and in CD 5.18 in extant Judeo-Christian writings. 'Prince' is equivalent to angel and is used in antithesis to Belial. Following Guilbert, Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 148, suggests that "the plural

lights may be due to the fact that this angel controlled the stars whose behaviour in the heavens determined the calendar by which the righteous ones in heaven and on earth regulated their life of worship" (emphasis original).

102. While there are some phrases that come close to it, this exact phrase, מלאך חושך, is not found in any extant Hebrew literature. He is probably to be identified with Beliar (*T. 12 Patr.; Jub.* 1.20; 15:33) or Belial (1QS 1.18, 24; 2.5, 19; CD4.13, 15; 5.18; 8.2; 12.2; 19.14; 1QM 1.1; 5, 13; 4.2; 11.8; 13.2), and is also known as Satan and Mastema (*Jub.* 10.8; 11.5, 11; 17.16; 18.9, 12; 19.28; 48.2, 9, 12, 15; 49.2; CD16.5). So Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 149.

103. For an overview of these discussions, see John R. Levison, "The Two Spirits in Qumran Theology," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 3 vols.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 2: 169–194. Levison points out the lack of scholarly consensus on the cosmic and psychological interpretations assigned to these two spirits. The issue centers on the nature of these two spirits (human dispositions, angels, something different?) and whether or not, given their long history, there existed a consistency in Qumran pneumatology. He examines several views, ranging from those given by K. G. Kuhn and A. Dupont-Sommer (the spirits as cosmic beings based on Zoroastrian influence), P. Wernberg-Møller (the spirits as two inclinations within human beings), and O. Seitz, who postulated a relationship between passages from the Shepherd of Hermas, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,* and the *Rule of the Community* (the spirits as the product of the *creative exegesis* of 1 Sam 16:14). Scholars with a both/and interpretation are also represented in his discussion and include Otzen, Schweizer, Leaney, Gammie, Lichtenberger, and Sekki. However, while he represents Wernberg- Møller as having only a psychological understanding, this is not accurate. Noting that the former is evident especially in 3.18 and the latter in 4.23, Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline,* 67, writes, "[t]here is no doubt that *rwḥ* in this essay is used in both a metaphysical and a psychological way, designating at the same time the governing principle of either good or evil *and* the individual spirit of every man" (emphasis original).

104. See also *1 En.* 41:8, which reads: "God made a separation between the light and the darkness, and divided the spirits of men." With reference to their works; cf. "works of light" (*T. Naph*. 2.10). Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 13.

105. This dualism is also represented in the *War Scroll,* but there, the representation of this dualism is not psychological or individual but points to the eschatological war between Michael and his angels (the sons of light) and Belial and his angels (the sons of darkness). And where they might share a cosmic dualism, different aspects are emphasized in the two works. See Richard Bauckham, "The Qumran Community," 108; Metso, *Textual Development,* 137.

106. While both the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule* have this macrocosmic dualism, only the dualism of the *Rule* involves good and evil. See Aune, "Dualism," 294.

107. Ladd, *Theology of the New Testament*, 270.

108. 4.2 reflects an appositional use of infinitive constructs that expounds on the paths of the spirits in the world (ואלה דרכיהן בתבל ...).

109. Note also that the heading to the first list has been lost through accidental scribal omission, or through oversight on the part of the author as some scholars suggests. Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline*, 15.

110. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 152, notes that even in the Old Testament, the idea that following a certain code yields earthly rewards is common (cf. Prov 3:1 ff; Exod 23:26; Job 5:26; Gen 49:25 etc.). There are also passages that point to the futurity of these rewards (cf. Isa 49:20; 53:10), particularly in the Pseudepigraphical literature (*1 En.* 5.7–9; 10.16 f.; 11; 25:6; 28:1; 55; 59; *Jub.* 1.29). He concludes, "[w]e can therefore understand **the visitation** as the reward which God will bestow at the end of this age to be enjoyed in the new order" (emphasis original).

111. Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 73, notes that although this exact expression (דרכי צדק אמת) does not occur in the Old Testament, it echoes Isa 40:3; 45:13; Ps 5:9; cf. *Pss. Sol.* 10:3 and is found in *Jub.* 1:20; *En.* 91:18, 19; 94:1; CD1.16. He also points out that אמת is a gloss that was probably originally written in the margin and later incorporated into the text. For this frequent combination, which he views as synonymous; cf. 1QS 1.24; 5.3f; 8.2; 11.14; CD 3.15; 20.29 f; cf. *En.* 39.6.

112. Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:77; Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 14.

113. So Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:77. Note Leaney's translation (following Habermann's pointing and punctuation): "concealing for the sake of truth the secrets of knowledge." Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 144.

114. Cf. *J.W.* 2.8.7 from Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 99–100.

115. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 152.

116. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel,* 506.

117. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 78–79.

118. Cf. 1QM 13:10; 4Q257 5:2; 4Q491 f11ii:15.

119. Walck, "Truth," 2:950.

120. Cf. 1QM 3:6; 13:10; 17:8; 4Q424 f3:10 ; 4Q468b f1:5 ; 4Q503 f48_50:8 ; 11Q13 2:8. Noting that this terminology 'sons of righteousness,' is common in Pseudepigraphical literature, Wernberg- Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 71, points out that, "this designation provides us with one of the most important links between 1QS and Pseudepigraphical literature: the pious circles behind Enoch called themselves by this name, as did the circles behind 1QS."

121. Cf. 1QS 1:9; 2:16; 1QM 1:1, 3, 9, 11, 13f; 13:16; 4Q177 4:12, 16; 4Q510 f1:7; 4Q511 f10:4; 11Q13 2:8. Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language," 3:116, following David Flusser, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), esp. 26, notes that בני אור occurs only in Qumran compositions and in documents influenced by Qumran theology (cf. 1QS 3.13–4.26 (3.13, 24, 25; cf. 1:9; 2:16; 3.3; 1QM 1.1, 3, 9, 11, 13; 4Q510 11.7; 4Q177 [=4QCatᵃ] frag. 12 1.7 and 1.11; 4Q174 [4QFlor] frag. 1 1.1–9). However, while one would expect to find it in the *Testaments of the Twelve Partriarchs*, a document that has a dualism similar to that of the Essene dualism, and probably influenced by it, this term is

surprisingly absent. It is also absent in both the Old Testament and in rabbinic literature.

122. Cf. 1QM 1:1, 7, 11, 16; 3:6, 9; 13:16; 14:17; 16:11; 4Q491 f8_10i:14; f11ii:9.

123. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel,* 211, points out that the separation of mankind into two categories, good and bad, is more noticeable and more extreme in Second Temple literature that originates from circles outside of the establishment.

124. Cf. CD2.6 f.; 1QM 1.6; cf. 4.2; 14.5; 1QH 6.32; Ezra 9.14. Cf. *Jub.* 24.30 and *1 En.* 52.7. Zeph 1:18 also expresses this idea of total annihilation. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 154.

125. Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language," 3:118, notes that the *Horoscopes* explain more clearly the constitution of each person–a mixture of darkness along with light (see esp. 4Q186). Each human has nine parts, some of light and others of darkness. Some humans are very evil, having eight parts of darkness and one of light. Other humans are nearly perfect, having eight parts of light and one part of darkness.

126. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 136.

127. The use of the preposition in this context is instrumental. So also Otto Betz, *Offenbarung,* 54. The translation 'refine' is used by Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:79, as well as Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 17, but Leaney, following Jastrow prefers 'make manifest' since he argues that it is man's deeds that are in view here. He sees a similar idea in 1Q27 1.6 f. which reflects the idea of a final *dénouement.* Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 156.

128. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 159.

129. Betz, *Offenbarung,* 131.

130. Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 17.

131. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 160.

132. As above, the series of infinitives with ל in this section (5.1–7a) are used to express purpose.

133. Elledge, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 57–58.

134. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 392, points out that this hatred is to be expected, given that this is a work that originated with a sect. He continues, "[t]hey are therefore what Peter Berger calls cognitive minorities: their discontent finds expression in the burning conviction that they and they alone possess the truth."

135. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 105, suggests that a particular group may be in mind, given that they are described as a 'congregation.'

136. Cf. 5.6, 9.16–18. Walck, "Truth," 2:951.

137. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 168. Cf. men effecting atonement 3.6; 8.6; God effecting atonement 2.8; 11.14; CD 2.4f.; 3.18; 4.6f.; 14.19; 20.34.

138. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 214, quoting Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism,* 32f., on 8.5ff., "[t]he Temple of Jerusalem, fallen into the hands of wicked priests, was to be considered defiled (CD6.11–20; 1QpHab 12.7–9) until its purification at the return of the sons of Zadok in the last days. The War

Scroll prophesies that this capital event will occur in the seventh year of the eschatological war against the sons of darkness (1QM 2.1–7). In the meanwhile, the council of the community is the one true sanctuary in which God is to be worshipped."

139. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 108.
140. Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 95.
141. Knibb, *The Qumran Community,* 109.
142. Given the use of the formula באים בברית (go in/enter into the covenant), found in 1.16, 5.20–24 may also contain, in addition to the yearly examination, rules for the examination of new members. See Metso, *Textual Development,* 130.
143. Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 100.
144. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 178.
145. Ibid.*,* 191.
146. Ibid., 171.
147. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 125.
148. For this discussion, see Aharon Shemesh, "Expulsion and Exclusion," *DSD* 9.1 (2002):44–74.
149. Whether or not 8.1–9.26 is an insertion lies outside the scope of this work. For a representative discussion see Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 229–30.
150. Barrera, "The Essenes of Qumran" 65. Martínez cites, in addition to the above, a particular way of understanding the prescriptions relating to the temple as well as the conviction of the imminence of the end of days. Martínez, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 11.
151. Cf. 4Q174 [4QFlor] and the *Temple Scroll.* Barrera, "The Essenes of Qumran," 66.
152. Cf. 1QS 8.13–15; *Temple Scroll* 12. Barrera, "The Essenes of Qumran," 66. Betz, *Offenbarung*, 155ff. explains that for the sect the way is *halakhah* and obedience to it (cf. 9.19) and this *halakhah* must be constructed by study of the Law.
153. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 213–14.
154. For this discussion see K. A. Mathews, "John, Jesus and the Essenes: Trouble at the Temple," *CTR* 3.1 (1988), 101–126.
155. Leaney cautions: "[a]t first sight it appears that the passage which now follows (8.1–9.11) regulates part of the constitution of the community at Qumran, stipulating the formation and maintenance of an inner council of twelve men and three priests (so Dupont-Sommer, Vermes, Brownlee); but 8.12–24 makes it clear that the Qumran community was to be formed after this inner *corps d'élite* had been established and tested for two years (10b–11). The community or movement therefore out of which it arose must have been represented by groups dispersed throughout the land, such as we know to have existed … Further, **the council of the community** does not necessarily mean a smaller body within the wider community, for it is one of the phrases which is used to mean simply the community (3.2; 5.7; 6.13f.; cf. 8.11; 1QHab 12.4). Wernberg-Møller is therefore right to say that all that follows 'applies to the community, and not to the twelve or fifteen men exclusively', although it applies to them alone at first, since they

for a time are identical with the community" (emphasis original). Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 210–11. So also Metso, *Textual Development,* 123.

156. As noted earlier, the series of infinitives with ל in the introductory section (8.1–13a, 15a) are used to express purpose.

157. Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:89.

158. Walck, "Truth," 2:950 (emphasis added).

159. Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 129, translate this as "truly be established" hence emphasizing an adverbial sense.

160. Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline,* 32–33.

161. Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:89, Wise, Abegg and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 129.

162. So also Walck, "Truth," 2:951.

163. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 131.

164. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 213.

165. Knibb, *Qumran Community,* 132.

166. See discussion in Shemesh, "Expulsion and Exclusion," 44–74.

167. Elisha Qimron, "Dualism in the Essene Communities," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins* (ed. James H. Charlesworth, 3 vols.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 2:195–202.

168. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran,* 231, notes that in Proverbs 16:2 this task is ascribed to the Lord.

169. Ibid.*,* 230.

170. James H. Charlesworth, "Secrecy," *EDSS* 2:852–53, also notes that there were seven categories of secrets. These include: 1) The secrets of the cosmos (Mysteries 1Q27 13). 2) The secret society of the eternal planting (1QH^a 16 [8]). 3) The secrets of music (1QH^a 9.28 [1.26]). 4) The secret of language (1QH^a 9.29 [1.27]). 5) The secrets of Scripture (1QpHab 7). 6) The secrets of the universe that helped establish the solar calendar (1QH^a 9.9–13 [1.7 –11]). 7) The secrets of recent and past salvific history and the future (1QS 11.3–4, 1QpHab).

171. See *Thanksgiving Hymns, Angelic Liturgy, Blessings*[a-e]. Elledge, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 59.

172. Walck, "Truth," 950.

173. Cf. 1QM 11.14. For the former see the translation by Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSE* 1:99, and for the latter see Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls,* 135.

4

BACKGROUND OF USAGE

Introduction

This chapter provides a survey of the background of truth terminology in Jewish and Christian literature. [1] The first part will consist of a summary of the background behind the Gospel of John.[2] This will lay out the parameters within which possible linguistic influences on the Gospel should be sought. The second part of this chapter will be a study of the use of truth terminology in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint by way of a selective survey of passages. The aim of this section is to investigate the common Old Testament tradition and its possible impact on the use of truth terminology in both the Gospel of John and the *Rule*. The final section of this chapter will be an investigation of the current usage of the term and its various combinations via a selective study of Jewish and early Christian writings between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100. This delimited period, which both predates and includes the time that the Fourth Gospel was written, is short enough to provide the most valid information regarding the use of truth terminology, and extensive enough to reveal any major changes in linguistic usage.[3] The aim of this chapter is to investigate whether the general Jewish and early Christian milieu of this period reveals a similar use of this terminology, or whether there is evidence of some kind of development reflected in John's Gospel and the *Rule*, either in terms of increased usage, new combinations or different usage.

Background of the Gospel of John

Early in the history of interpretation of this Gospel, it was noted that significant differences in style and theological emphases set it apart from the other three Gospels. The differences between this Gospel and the Synoptics in terms of its "unique content, distinctive presentation of Jesus, and the significant differences between it and the other three (Synoptic) Gospels" have often raised questions about its reliability.[4] F. C. Baur of the Tübingen school identified

an *Entwicklungsprozess* (developmental process), which ruled out an apostolic period for its composition, thus drastically reducing the possibility of a Jewish background.[5] Goodspeed claimed that the Gospel was thoroughly Greek.[6] Loisy also argued that Greek philosophy was behind this Gospel. For him John's portrayal of the *logos*-concept stemmed from pre-Socratics like Heraclitus, or with the Stoics.[7] Bultmann, with his Gnostic redeemer hypothesis, suggested that John's primary sources were Gnostic, particularly the *Offenbarungsreden,* the Revelation-Discourses of a Baptist Gnostic sect.[8] Kümmel likewise contended that the thought world of the Fourth Gospel cannot be explained by heterodox Judaism, apocalyptic Judaism, modes of thought in Palestine at the time, or even Samaritanism. The real religion behind John, the Hermetica, and Philo, is Gnosticism, with the Evangelist employing pre-Christian Gnostic language in an anti-gnostic sense.[9] Dodd suggested that Philo, Rabbinic Judaism and the *Hermetica* should be regarded as the most direct sources for John's background.[10] Another frequently suggested influence is that of the Hermetic literature or *Hermetica.*[11] Other suggested influences include: The *Paraphrase of Shem,* a Nag Hammadi tractate regarded as an example of pre-Christian Gnosticism (F. Wisse); the *Trimorphic Protennoia,* a Sethian Gnostic tract*,* and a type of wisdom monologue (G. Robinson);[12] a basic set of pre-Christian theological motifs visible in a preredactional reconstruction of the Prologue, christianized in John and Gnosticized in the Gnostic tract (Hofrichter); a pre-Gospel foundation document that had a Gnostic dualistic outlook similar to elements in the *Odes of Solomon* and some of the Nag Hammadi tractates (Langbrandtner); a general adoption of Gnostic concepts (Lieu); The poem in the Coptic *Apocryphon of John*.[13] Even more recently, Bruns pointed out with reference to the numerous parallels that have been drawn between John and Gnosticism, that these parallels are even stronger with Mahayan Buddhism.[14]

Today, the pendulum has swung in the opposite direction. A new understanding of Judaism in the Second Temple Period, illuminated especially by the fortuitous find of the Dead Sea Scrolls, clearly challenges prior conclusions. More recently, numerous scholars have highlighted the Jewish character of this Gospel. Indeed, the author shows a significant interest in, and knowledge of, other Jewish groups or sects on the fringes of Judaism.[15] The Semitic strain is so strong that some have even proposed an Aramaic original.[16] In addition, there is evidence of the knowledge of Palestinian geography, Jewish customs and beliefs, a strong reliance on the Old Testament, a Semitic style and ideas, as well as other indications that reflect a strong Jewish interest.[17] This Jewish perspective is further supported by studies such as that recently done by Bauckham that emphasize the eyewitness nature of the Fourth Gospel.[18] Internal evidence of the Gospel itself, the style, ideas, motifs, ideologies, language and symbolism employed by the author all indicate that the parameters within which possible influence should be sought therefore lie within the linguistic matrix of Jewish literature.

At the same time, no culture has ever succeeded in totally insulating itself against the beliefs and practices of surrounding cultures—not unless it is geographically so far removed from them that no contact is possible.[19] At the time that this Gospel was written, there was already a strong Hellenistic influence on Judaism in both Palestine and Alexandria.[20] Since Judaism was positioned within the midst of the Hellenistic culture and Greek language, traces of Hellenism would not have been uncommon in documents written during this time. Indeed, given that the society that the Gospel writers belonged to was part of the ancient world, it is to be expected that they had much in common with their contemporaries.[21] Hence, while core beliefs may have remained largely untouched, modes of expression did not. Brown cites various examples of this phenomenon and concludes that "Johannine thought would inevitably have reflected Hellenistic influence."[22] Barrett points out that "the gospel also has Hellenistic and Gnostic connections, and cannot therefore be satisfactorily understood or interpreted within a Jewish context alone, even within the context of Qumran."[23] In the same vein, Keener notes that Greek language and culture was often evident in rabbinic texts, Greek interpretive methods were often incorporated into Palestinian Jewish documents, and it was not unusual to find elements of Greek mythology in Jewish texts.[24] In addition, it is important to recognize that even as one speaks of the 'Jewishness' of the Gospel, there are numerous elements that indicate that the author was consciously standing outside Judaism. Examples include the often pejorative references to the Jews, who form a group antagonistic to Jesus (e.g. 5:16; 10:31; 18:36), as well as references to the Law as something from which both Jesus and the Evangelist dissociate themselves (e.g. 10:34; 15:25; 19:7).[25] Although some scholars have suggested an influence that goes beyond the natural absorption of characteristics from a host culture, most acknowledge that the influence that best accounts for the shape of the Fourth Gospel is a Jewish influence.[26]

Consequently, the governing linguistic influence can now be more than adequately accounted for by the Old Testament and a Palestinian Jewish milieu, together with the recognition that both the environment in which this Gospel was penned, as well as the author himself, were already influenced by Hellenistic ideas. Although Beasley-Murray suggests that "[t]he links traceable between the Gospel and diverse Hellenistic and Semitic traditions make it implausible to settle for any one of them to the exclusion of the rest," it is becoming increasingly evident that the Palestinian Jewish background and the Old Testament scriptures exerted the greatest influence on John.[27]

Common Tradition
אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια in the Hebrew Old Testament/Septuagint

Two major issues have often plagued the understanding of truth terminology in the Old Testament: an overemphasis on the contrast between Greek and Hebrew

thought that is then related directly to linguistic usage, and the insistence that the fundamental meaning of the root אמן ("to be firm") be carried over to all its derivatives. Hence, it has often been understood as reflecting the divine standard, strictly in the sense of faithfulness, and emphasizing a relational aspect. While this theological meaning is important, this section will show that it is not the only meaning that can be attached to this word. The aim of this section is to investigate the common Old Testament tradition and its possible impact on the use of truth terminology in both corpora in its various linguistic combinations. Only selective examples will be dealt with. It is hoped that this approach, while not exhaustive, will nevertheless provide an accurate understanding of the use of this word in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint.

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια in Combination with Other Substantives

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is frequently found in combination with other substantives. For instance, in addition to speaking truth from his heart, Ps 15:2 [LXX 14:2] combines תמים/ἄμωμος ("blameless") and צֶדֶק/δικαιοσύνην ("righteousness") with reference to the character of the person who may dwell in God's sanctuary or live on his holy hill. The writer of Proverbs (3:3) urges the reader to hold closely to חֶסֶד ("love") and אֱמֶת because these are the character qualities that will earn him favor and a good name in the sight of God and man. Truth with reference to the character of God is also used in paratactic combination with a number of moral terms. Some of the most significant ethical terms in the Old Testament include justice, righteousness, goodness, honor, and peace. In the context of God's unfailing favor and mercy toward his people, the psalmist (Ps 85:11[84:11]) states that חֶסֶד־וֶאֱמֶת/ἔλεος καὶ ἀλήθεια ("love and truth") meet together. This combination is also used in Gen 24:27, when Abraham's servant celebrates God's faithful loving-kindness in answering his prayer and leading him to Rebekah. A theologically significant reference in this regard is Exod 34:5–7, which gives a somewhat comprehensive overview of the character of God, and is a reassurance of God's forgiveness and assurance that his promises to Israel will still be fulfilled. Within this context, it is God's character as faithful that surfaces. It is precisely because he is faithful that he responds to Moses' pleas. In these and other contexts, this signifies that God is worthy of complete trust and can be relied upon to act in accordance with his character. In addition, as Thiselton suggests, "[e]ven here the context may suggest the idea of truth in the sense both of veracity and integrity, since the next verse sets side by side the promise of mercy for thousands and the warning of punishment for the guilty."[28]

Other instances in which אֱמֶת (or some form of the root אמן)/ἀλήθεια occur in combination with חֶסֶד/ἔλεος include Gen 24:27, 49 (LXX uses δικαιοσύνη in both these instances); Josh 2:14; 2 Sam 2:6; 15:20; Ps 25:10 [24:10]; 40:11 [39:11]; 61:8 [60:8]; 89:15 [88:15]; 117:2 [117:1]; and Prov 16:6; 20:28. These are understood

as two separate attributes of God, such that אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is not subordinated to חֶסֶד/ἔλεος in any way, but is a distinct aspect of God's character.[29] Perhaps the most frequent examples of the usage of אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια as God's faithfulness occur in the Psalms. For instance, Ps 146:6, which is an imperative call to praise, demonstrates the psalmist's confidence in God, and his reliability to provide help when help is needed. Psalm 40 also demonstrates a similar confidence (see also the beatitude in Ps 33:12). This emphasis is a reflection on the character of God as faithful, reliable and wholly trustworthy. The understanding of God as a God of faithfulness is naturally often celebrated in Israel's worship as this is represented within the Psalter (e.g. Ps 86:15 [85:15]; Ps 108:4 [107:5]; 117:2 [116:2]; 138:2 [137:2]).

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is also found in combination with other substantives. For instance, Isaiah (48:1) rebukes Israel for taking oaths or swearing in the name of the Lord and invoking the God of Israel in a manner that is לֹא בֶאֱמֶת וְלֹא בִצְדָקָה/μετὰ ἀληθείας οὐδὲ μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ("not in/with truth and righteousness"). This indicates that it lacks sincerity. The paratactic combination of ἀλήθεια and κρίσις in Tobit 3:2, as well as the combination in Dan 3:28, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ κρίσει, in the context of God's judgment, suggests that ἀλήθεια should be understood in the sense of judicial righteousness.[30]

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is used not only with respect to God's character, but also in connection with his activity. The Psalmist declares that God's works are אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια and מִשְׁפָּט/κρίσις ("faithful and just") and all his precepts are trustworthy (Ps 111:7 [110:7]). Both God's saving works and his word constitute God's activity, and consequently both are understood to reflect the character of faithfulness and reliability.

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια *in Combination With Verbal Forms*

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is also found in combination with certain verbs. For instance, it is the direct object of the verb 'to speak' in the following examples. In Ps 15:2 [14:2] וְדֹבֵר אֱמֶת בִּלְבָבוֹ/λαλῶν ἀλήθειαν ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτου ("speaks truth in his heart"), speaking truth is a characteristic of the one that God allows to dwell in his sanctuary and live on his holy hill. In this instance, it is found in juxtaposition to speaking slander (v. 3). This suggests that truth in this context is understood as that which corresponds to fact and is in contrast to falsehood or deception. The close relation between truth as consistent with the facts, and also as reliable, is seen in Zech 8:16. The author urges the people to דַּבְּרוּ אֱמֶת /λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν ("speak truth") each to the other and to administer justice that is true and satisfying. The writer of Proverbs (8:7) writes that his mouth speaks אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια ("truth") because his lips detest רֶשַׁע/ψευδής ("wickedness"), which the LXX renders with falsehood or lies. In this context, "[w]hen Wisdom says, 'My mouth will utter truth' [Prov 8:7], the point is that she will not deceive the one

who embraces her. Indeed, she will bring him the disclosure which comes through instruction and knowledge."[31] Other instances in which this sense of speaking the truth as conformity to fact and contrary to deceit or falsehood include Gen 42:16; 2 Chr 9:5; cf. 1 Kgs 17:24; 22:16; Prov 14:25; Dan 8:26; 10:1; 11:2. It is clear that many biblical texts include statements such as "speaking the truth" (Jer 9:5) or "giving a true message" (Dan 10:1) or a "true vision" (Dan 8:26). In contrast παροδεύσω τὴν ἀλήθειαν ("to go past the truth") in the context of Wisdom 6:22, is to misrepresent reality or the real state of affairs.[32]

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια in relation to speaking is also found in 2 Chr 18:15 (cf. 2 Kgs 22:22ff). In this context, the king asks Micaiah whether or not to go to Ramoth-Gilead to battle. Although he receives an affirmative answer, he is not satisfied and rebukes Micaiah, reminding him always to speak nothing but אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια in the name of the Lord. While this incorporates both senses of אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια as reliable and also as conformity to fact, in this case it is primarily related to imparting divine revelation.[33]

אקהלשאאֱמֶת is found as the direct object of the verb עָשָׂה/ποιέω with God as the subject (cf. Gen 24:49; 47:29; 2 Sam 2:6; 15:20; 111:8 [110:8], although in the LXX, the first reference is translated with δικαιοσύνη ("righteousness"). In these contexts, it is understood as the faithfulness of God that manifests itself toward his people.[34] In Tob 4.6 (cf. 13:6), where prosperity is the expected result for those that do truth, ἀλήθεια is found as the direct object of the participle form of the verb ποιέω. In this context, it is understood in the sense of people keeping the commandments and acting uprightly. Similar linguistic combinations include Sir 27:9, where ἀλήθεια functions as the object of the participial form of the verb ἐργάζομαι. Here, it is a reference to upright conduct (cf. Sir 7:20).

אֱמֶת is also found as the direct object of ידע (hiphil, "to make known") / ἀναγγέλλω. The writer declares that each generation יוֹדִיעַ אֶל־אֲמִתֶּךָ/ἀναγγελοῦ σιν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ("will make God's truth known") to the next (note the LXX rendering). It is therefore an object to be known (cf. Ps 103:7: God makes his ways known to Moses and his deeds to Israel). In this context, it is God's faithfulness that is in view. In Wis 3:9, the author writes that those who put their confidence in God συνήσουσιν ἀλήθειαν ("comprehend truth"). The use of ἀλήθεια in this context is as antithetical to falsehood, or perhaps even in the sense of divine truth.

In Ps 43:3 [42:3], אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is found as the direct object of שָׁלַח/ἐξαποστέλλω ("send"). The psalmist cries out to God to send out אוֹרְךָ וַאֲמִתְּךָ/τὸ φῶς σου καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειάν σου ("your [God's] light and truth"). This combination suggests that what the psalmist desires is not so much God's faithfulness, but rather that God would reveal to him the reality of the matter, so that he can avoid falling into deception (cf. v. 1).[35]

The acrostic Psalm 119 [118] offers a comprehensive understanding of what God's word is and how it was to be understood by the nation of Israel. It is the most developed instance in the Old Testament. The psalmist declares with

regard to God's Law, that וְתוֹרָתְךָ אֱמֶת/ὁ νόμος σου ἀλήθεια ("your law is truth"); cf. Ps 119:42 [118:42]). This equative relationship reflects that the Law is to be considered not only reliable and trustworthy, but is to be regarded as divine revelation. In particular, the lasting nature of the Torah is emphasized. It is its origin (from God himself) and its permanent nature which give it its reliability. Hence, in this and similar contexts, אֱמֶת is used to signify truth as the embodiment of God's wise and merciful pattern for human life, designated by the terms law, precepts, commandments, ordinances, judgment etc. (especially in the Psalms).[36] At the same time, it "has the existential ring of testimony on the part of one who delights in God's law … However, it is not *only* existential truth. For the same Psalmist sees the law of God as a lamp and a light (v. 105) which shows the believer the true state of affairs, although admittedly the true state of affairs as it relates in practice to him (my feet … my path)."[37]

In 1 Kgs 17:24, after Elijah had raised the widow Zarephath's son from the dead, she exclaims that דְבַר־יְהוָה בְּפִיךָ אֱמֶת/ῥῆμα κυρίου ἐν στόματί σου ἀληθινόν ("the word of the LORD from your mouth is the truth" [LXX uses the adjectival form]). This reflects that his words conform to fact. In 1 Kgs 10:6, the Queen of Sheba journeys to the kingdom of Solomon because reports of his unprecedented wisdom have reached her kingdom. Her intent is to verify if what she has heard of him is indeed the truth (cf. 2 Chr 9:1; 1 Kgs 4:29–34). Having heard and observed Solomon in person, the queen of Sheba declares אֱמֶת הָיָה הַדָּבָר/ἀληθινὸς ὁ λόγος ("It is true" [the LXX uses the adjectival form]), with regard to the words that she had heard about Solomon concerning his affairs and his wisdom. His words and actions conform to the reports previously received, and thus she is able to prove their veracity. אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is also used within an idiom in an equative relationship, with regard to the truth of a report in Deut 13:15 (cf. 17:4; 22:20): אֱמֶת … הַדָּבָר/ἀληθὴς … ὁ λόγος ("If the rumor/matter is true" [the LXX uses the adjectival form]). In these contexts, investigation of a report of questionable behavior verifies that the particular report is accurate. This reflects that which is conformed to fact in contrast to anything that would be erroneous or deceitful. Perhaps in this situation, the added use of reliability should not be ruled out. After all, by virtue of its being true, a statement or message is in fact, reliable.

In many legal contexts the statement "if it is true" refers to the question of whether a charge can be substantiated (cf. Isa 43:9; Deut 13:14; 17:4). The verification of a charge provides proof of its truth or conformity to certain facts. The legal context of Deut 22:20, carries the same sense. This sense of correspondence to fact is also used in references that use witness terminology (Prov 14:25; 29:14; 20:28; Isa 43:9; Jer 42:5). In a close connection to the judicial process of Israel, the ninth commandment specifically states, "You shall not give false testimony against your neighbor" (Exod 20:16). שֶׁקֶר/ψευδής means lying, deceiving, false, and fraudulent. It occurs in the Old Testament in reference to a lying testimony in a judicial context also in Deut 19:18; Ps 27:12; Prov 6:19 12:17; 14:5, 25;

19:5, 9; 25:18. Murphy comments with regard to Prov 14:25 (which has obvious allusions to Exod 20:16) "[t]he assurance of honest witnesses in judicial cases was an utter necessity, even to save lives; cf. the story of Naboth in 1 Kgs 25."[38] This virtue of honesty was of crucial importance in every judicial proceeding. Not surprisingly, in some of these legal contexts, אֱמֶת is found in combination with justice and righteousness (cf. Zech 7:9; 8:16; Ezek 18:8–9). In Ezek 18:8–9, executing מִשְׁפַּט אֱמֶת/κρίμα δίκαιον ("a judgment of truth" or "true justice") is seen as a characteristic of righteousness. In both references to Zechariah, there is an injunction to carry out justice in truth. In Zech 7:9, other moral terms such as justice, covenant love and compassion are linked with truth in the context of social justice. In these contexts, this refers to justice that is fair and that rightly assesses the facts.

In 1 Macc 7:18, the writer declares that there is no truth in the people. While it may appear that he is referring to their lack of faithfulness, the context suggests that truth, in contrast to falsehood and the deceitful use of words is what is in view. In Hos 4:1, the declaration by the prophet that there is no אֱמֶת in the land is linked to his complaint that there is no knowledge of God. Similarly, in the speech of truth in 1 Esd 4:37, the writer states that wine, the king and women are all unrighteous; there is no ἀλήθεια in them and as a result they will perish. Hence in these contexts it is clear that truth is a quality that stems from a knowledge of God's will and must be actualized in every sphere of life.[39]

In Ps 86:11 [85:11], the psalmist prays that God would teach him his ways, so that he might walk in God's truth. In this context, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is found together with the verb הָלַךְ/πορεύομαι ("walk," "conduct oneself"), indicating a sphere of operation in which man is to live. This sphere is conformed to God's Law. Both words and actions are included. In the exhortation in Prov 23:23 (cf. 3:3), אֱמֶת קְנֵה ("buy truth"), אֱמֶת is the direct object of the verb and is consequently understood in a general sense as something of the highest value, which man should seek. Here it is mentioned in parallelism with wisdom, instruction/discipline, and understanding/insight. Hence, truth as that which is acquired "is knowledge of the true facts of the matter, and an end to deception through false or partial information. The emphasis is on the value of good education."[40] Even more, this literally means to live in truth, a principle that derives from God's desire that his people imitate him in his faithfulness (Josh 24:14; 1 Sam 12:24; 1 Kgs 3:6; 2 Kgs 20:3; cf. 2 Chr 31:20; Is 38:3). Psa 51:8 [50:8], David's prayer of repentance, reveals that אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια (in the inner parts) is something that God desires his people to have. Contra Anderson, who suggests that it means "faithfulness," Thiselton rightly argues that what the psalmist is pleading for is liberation from self-deception.[41] While truth as a sphere of operation that those who fear God are to live in is required, it is often absent. The record of Israel's history, with their constant turning away from God to worship foreign gods, shows that this was a standard they failed to meet (note Zech 8:19; Hos 4:1 and the lament over the lack of אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια).

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια *in Combination with Prepositions*

In Ps 86:11 [85:11], the psalmist prays that God would teach him his ways, so that he might walk בַּאֲמִתֶּךְ/ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου ("in your [God's] truth"). This prepositional phrase is indicative of a manner of life that is consistent with God's Law. אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is also found in a worship context in connection with the verb עָבַד ("serve") in Josh 24:14. Having revealed himself to his people as helper and redeemer, God expects them to put away the gods they had worshipped in Egypt and to serve him בְּתָמִים בֶּאֱמֶת/ἐν εὐθύτητι καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ("in sincerity and truth"; note the LXX rendering). This is indicative of the manner of worship and reflects that which is whole hearted, genuine and without guile. Other similar instances include Ps 111:8 [110:8]; 146:18 [145:18]. In Tob 3:5, failure to walk ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ("in truth") before God is equated to a failure to do God's commandments. Conversely, therefore, walking in truth means living in a manner that is consistent with the will of God as expressed in his commands. In this context, ἀλήθεια refers to divine revelation as laid out in Scripture.

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια *in Genitive Relationships*

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is also found in genitive relationships, frequently with God as the head noun. For instance, the psalmist declares in what is commonly classified as an individual lament, "Into your hand I commit my spirit. Redeem me, אֵל אֱמֶת/ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας" ("God of faithfulness"; cf. Ps 31:6 [30:6]). This psalm reflects a confident expectation in God's ability to fulfil this request, an ability that has been ably demonstrated in the past, and hence it is the character of God as faithful that is communicated in this phrase.

The emphasis of Psalm 119 [118] is on God's Torah which is referred to in the genitive relationship as דְּבַר־אֱמֶת/λόγον ἀληθείας (v. 43; cf. Prov 22:21; Eccl 12:10). Similarly, the phrase בִּכְתָב אֱמֶת/ἀπογραφῇ ἀληθείας ("book/writing/record of truth") is a reference to Scripture and hence אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is understood as divine revelation (Dan 10:21). More specifically, as in the apocalyptic and wisdom tradition, it is used to refer to 'mystery' namely, "the divine plan for the times of salvation."[42] However, the phrase ῥήματα ἀληθείας ("words of truth") in Jdt 10:13 is used to indicate that which conforms to the facts.

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is also used to describe people. For instance, Prov 14:25 states that עֵד אֱמֶת ("a witness of truth") saves lives but a false witness is a liar. In this context, truth is directly juxtaposed to lies and hence is understood in its capacity as that which is conformed to fact, in contrast to anything that would be erroneous, false or deceitful (note LXX rendering: μάρτυς πιστός). In addition, the added use of reliability should not be ruled out. In Exod 18:21, Moses undertakes the project of selecting a group of men to whom he will delegate some of the tasks of administration. His primary criteria is that they be אַנְשֵׁי אֱמֶת/ἄνδρας δικαίους

("men of truth" [note the LXX rendering). This attributive genitive suggests that they are reliable and trustworthy men.

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is not only used of God, his word and deeds, or even people; it sometimes refers to inanimate objects or even abstract concepts. In Josh 2:12, Rahab asks the two spies that she is sheltering for a אוֹת אֱמֶת ("a sign of truth"), a pledge that they will spare the lives of the members of her family in the coming trouble.[43] In Jer 2:21, the prophet conveys God's disappointment in Israel. Those who had been planted as a choice vine, a זֶרַע אֱמֶת ("a faithful seed"), have turned into a corrupt vine. And in Prov 11:18, the reader is warned that the wicked man earns deceptive wages, but he who sows righteousness reaps שֶׂכֶר אֱמֶת/μισθὸς ἀληθείας ("a sure reward"). The attributive use of אֱמֶת in all these instances reveals that the point of reference is that on which someone can rely, which will also prove to be true in the future.

Summary

In this section, a number of uses of truth terminology have been identified. אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια reflecting the meaning 'faithfulness and reliability' is used often in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint. The Septuagint sometimes translates this with righteousness. When it is used with reference to God, it generally refers to an aspect of his character. However, it is also frequently used of the activity of God as well as his word. This quality of faithfulness is not confined to God alone. In some instances, it is used in reference to people, inanimate objects as well as abstract concepts. It is frequently found in combination with moral qualities such as justice, righteousness, judgment, and is also frequently combined with wisdom and understanding. It is also used in the sense of conformity to fact. As the above examples show, the understanding of faithfulness need not be applied to every occurrence of אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια. While there is some overlap in some contexts, conformity to fact is a perfectly valid understanding for many others. In these cases, while it is often used in contrast to falsehood or deception, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια also stands in contrast to a number of terms such as deceit, error, falsehood, guile, lie, vanity and their cognates. אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια also defines the sphere of operation to which those who fear God and live according to his Law are to adhere. This third category reflects the understanding that God's people are to live upright lives, characterized by honesty and integrity, reflecting the standards that he has set, and indeed to which he adheres in all his dealings with mankind. In this case, it is sometimes used in an attributive relationship to describe such individuals. In some cases considered above, this may simply be an adherence to ethical values. In others, it signifies sincerity. It is used in other instances to indicate a sphere of worship that is genuine, sincere, whole hearted and without guile. In other contexts, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια refers to divine revelation. This may either be a body of knowledge (namely Scripture), that leads one to a deeper understanding of God

and his law, precepts, commandments and ordinances, or it may refer to that which one utters. It is also used to refer to a sphere of belonging in which God reigns. In some instances אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια also signifies reality, what is really so. In this case, it is contrasted against that which is deceptive. Finally, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is also linked metaphorically with light.

Current usage

The section following will investigate the literature arising from the general Jewish and early Christian milieu spanning the period 200 B.C. to A.D. 100. The aim is to investigate whether this literature reveals a similar use of truth terminology as in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, or whether there is evidence of some kind of development, either in terms of increased usage, new combinations or different usage.

Jewish Literature from 200 B.C. to A.D. 100

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια *in Combination With Other Substantives*

Philo (*Sacr.* 1:27) combines ἀλήθεια with many desirable moral qualities or virtues such as piety, holiness, purity, an honest regard for an oath, justice, equality, an adherence to one's engagements and commitments and so forth. In these contexts, ἀλήθεια refers to a sphere of operation that is characterized by upright conduct and integrity in one's dealings. Indeed, in yet another context, it is regarded as the 'chief of all the holy virtues' (*Spec.* 2:259), and those who strive for it are referred to as 'those who practice virtue' (*Somn.* 2:133). Truth is found in a paratactic relationship with righteousness in *1 En.* 10:16. In this context, in which the destruction of the earth is a direct consequence of the union of heavenly beings with earthly women, the writer also contrasts it with injustice and iniquity/wickedness. Once these have been destroyed, then the plant of righteousness and truth will appear forever. In this context, it is used to refer to upright conduct that conforms to the ethical standards required by God.

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια *in Combination With Verbal Forms*

אמה is used as the subject of the verb עשה (hiphil, meaning "perform") which indicates that it is something that is carried out (1Q22 1.11). In this context, it is reflective of the judgment of God which will come upon the people in the form of curses. In other combinations with עשה (for instance, 1QpHab 7.10–12), it is used of the conduct expected of those that follow the Law. In similar uses (cf. *T.*

Ash. 3:1 f; *T. Benj.* 10.3), ἀλήθεια is used in the sense of conformity to the Law of the Lord and his commandments.[44] In *T. Benj.* 7:1, there is a specific warning to flee from the evil of Beliar; thus evil constitutes the main contrast to truth in this context.

Josephus writes that Abraham's servant, desired τὴν ἀλήθειαν μαθεῖν ("to learn the truth about Rebekah"; cf. *Ant.* 1.247). In this context, the servant's aim is to determine if her character is indeed as worthy as she has demonstrated by giving him water. In both this context and in the phrase γνῶναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν (*Ant.* 13:291), ἀλήθεια is a representation of the facts as they are (cf. *J.W.* 1.16, 17, 22; *Ag. Ap.* 1:68; *Life* 1:338, for other instances in Josephus' writings of knowing the truth in this sense). In 1QHᵃ 15.26, אמת is the direct object of the verb שכל ("gain insight into"), indicating that אמת in this context is to be understood as a body of knowledge that one is supposed to learn. In this case, God is the subject and hence the one who enables understanding.

In addition, ἀλήθεια is something to be pursued. In some contexts, it has the sense of conformity to the Law (*T. Ash.* 6:1). In other contexts it has a different sense. Philo writes of Moses that, rather than be influenced by what was likely and probable, he pursued τὴν δὲ ἀλήθειαν ἀκραιφνῆ ("the pure unadulterated truth"; cf. *Sacr.* 1:12). In this context, ἀλήθεια is a reference not to conformity to the Law or even that which conforms to the facts as they appear, but to what is really so, the reality of the matter. Hence, although Cain is obviously older, Moses represents him as though he were younger, because Abel has precedence in terms of devotion. Similarly, in describing what constitutes worship, Philo states that the only sacrifice that can be considered genuine worship is plain ἀλήθεια (*Det*. 1:21; cf. *Deus*. 1:102). In this context, this signifies a sphere of worship that rejects all spurious, inauthentic, false and fake forms, particularly those that involve an external show of extravagance and riches. Ἀλήθεια in this case therefore refers to that which is genuine and sincere.

In the introduction to his *Antiquities* (1.4), Josephus explains that one purpose behind his writing of the history of the Jews was to provide an accurate account, largely because others had perverted the truth. Ἀλήθεια is also found in the context of speaking (cf. τῆς ἀληθείας λέγομεν; *Ant.* 8:56). In these contexts, Josephus clearly uses ἀλήθεια in the sense of conformity to fact, an accurate representation of reality. In like fashion, Philo comments that Moses refrained from the methods of some lawgivers who present what they think is just and reasonable, and others, by τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπικρύψαντες ("concealing/disguising the truth") seek to bewilder the people (*Opif.* 1:1; cf. 1:170). While ἀλήθεια in this context also points to an accurate representation of the facts, what is more prominent is the contrast between concealment and non-concealment.

In one account, Josephus records Darius quizzing his great men, his princes, and toparchies of Persia and Median, on which of the four, namely wine, kings, women or truth, was to be considered the strongest. Zerubbabel's conclusion, that ἀλήθεια is to be esteemed above all these things, is based on the fact that

God is both true and righteous. Hence, ἀλήθεια is both eternal and immortal and provides mankind with righteous rules and laws (*Ant.* 11:55, 56). In this context, it is therefore to be understood as that which conforms to the divine will and is opposed to unrighteousness.

᾽Αλήθεια is also linked metaphorically with light (*T. Ash.* 5:3). In the two occurrences, the first is explicitly contrasted against lies or falsehood, and hence this is the sense in which it is to be understood. It is that which is conformed to fact and opposed to falsehood. In the second instance, the writer declares that all truth is subject ultimately to the light. Rather than single out specific acts of conformity to the Law, it has a more general sense.[45] In the same vein, Philo points out that ἀλήθεια exposes that which has been concealed, revealing either virtue or vice (*Ebr.* 1:6).

Josephus dedicates his book, *Against Apion*, to Ephaphroditus, whom he describes as τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀγαπῶντι ("one who loves the truth"; cf. *Ag. Ap.* 2:296). Truth in this context is that which conforms to the facts as they are and is opposed to lies and falsehood. He also writes of the Essene sect that they take oaths τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀγαπᾶν ("to love the truth"; cf. *J.W.* 2.141). While this may signify never speaking falsehood or deceit, the context suggests that ἀλήθεια in this context encompasses all aspects of life. It is therefore a vow to live a life of uprightness and integrity.

Philo comments that all the strivings of a foolish man are dreams that have no portion of ἀλήθεια in them (*Leg.* 3.229). Similarly, he declares that he has set forth the beauty of the first created man; however he points out that his accounting is far less than the ἀλήθεια (*Opif.* 1:145). In both contexts, ἀλήθεια is understood as reality.

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια in Combination with Prepositions

In the reference to the proselyte described as taking up his abode εἰς ἀλήθειαν ("in the truth"; cf. *Spec.* 4:178), ἀλήθεια refers to true teaching or faith.[46] In this specific context, it is descriptive of a sphere of belonging in which God reigns.

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια in Genitive Relationships

Pherora's wife, on being questioned about a deadly potion intended for Herod (*J.W.* 1:595) refers to both Herod and God as ὁ μάρτυς … τῆς ἀληθείας ("witness of the truth") of what she was about to reveal. In this context, the role of the witness is to attest to the veracity of the facts as they are, hence ἀλήθεια here is that which conforms to fact and is opposed to falsehood and deceit. אמת is found in a possessive genitive relationship to indicate that the author of truth is none other than God himself. For instance, in 1QM 4.6 the phrase אמת אל ("truth of

God") was to be written on the banners that the people carried as they went out to battle. Similarly, in 1QM 13.1 f., 2, 9 the brothers, priests, Levites and elders are to bless the God of Israel and the מעשי אמתו ("deeds of his [God's] truth"). This attributive relationship clarifies that in this instance אמת is to be understood as God's faithfulness or reliability (cf. 1Q28b 1.2; 1QHᵃ 13.11, 27; 1QM 14.12; 11Q17 10.6). Yet another text that speaks of the faithfulness of God's works is 1 *En.* 63.8.

אמת is also found in combination with substantives that refer to people. For instance members of the Qumran community were referred to as בני אמת ("sons of truth,"; cf. 1QM 13.10; 4Q257 5:2; 4Q491 f11ii:15; 1QHᵃ 15.29–30) or even אנשי אמת ("men of truth"; cf. 11QT 57.8). The parabiblical Qumran texts emphasize this righteous lifestyle (cf. 4Q213 1.1.12, 5.2.8; 4Q215 2.2.5; 4Q542 1.9; 2.1–2).[47] However, these designations signify not only that they were men of faithfulness or even integrity, but even more so that they belonged to the divine sphere in which God reigns.

Ἀλήθεια is also found in a genitive relationship with λόγος in the phrase ἀδεκάστῳ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας ("the incorruptible word of truth"; cf. *Her.* 1:143). In this context, Philo is using this phrase to refer to Scripture and hence ἀλήθεια is divine revelation (for a similar use cf. *1 En.* 104:9; *T. Gad* 3:1). Philo comments that the account given in Gen 6:4 about giants walking on the earth may be considered by some to be an allusion to fables handed down by the poets. However, he is emphatic in declaring that the lawgiver thinks fit only to walk in ἀληθείας ἴχνεσιν ("the paths of truth"; cf. *Gig.* 1:58). In this context, where ἀλήθεια is explicitly juxtaposed to that which is merely invented, the phrase 'paths of truth' does not refer to upright conduct, but to a conformity to the facts, to history as it really happened.

The linguistic combination 'spirit of truth' is found in *T. Jud.* 20:1–5, in direct juxtaposition to the 'spirit of deceit.' This is reminiscent of the Two Ways tradition (cf. *T. Ash.* 1:3 ff., 3–6; *T. Benj.* 4:1 ff.).[48] The role of the spirit therefore clarifies how 'truth' is to be understood in this context. Charles points out that "the spirit of goodness not only exhorts to righteousness but on the commission of evil appears as an accuser in the sinner's heart."[49] He therefore has the role of testifying (μαρτυρέω) as well as accusing individuals (κατηγορέω) so as to encourage good conduct.

Summary

A number of uses of truth terminology have been identified in this section. אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is sometimes used in the sense of faithfulness or reliability with regard to God, his works, and even people. When it is used with reference to God it generally refers to an aspect of his character. In a number of contexts, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is used to refer to a sphere of operation that is characterized by upright

conduct and integrity in one's dealings and that conforms to the Law and the ethical standards required by God. It is frequently combined with other desirable moral qualities or virtues such as righteousness, holiness, purity, honesty and so forth. In such contexts, it is understood as opposed to unrighteousness, injustice, wickedness, evil or deceit. It is also used to refer to a sphere of belonging in which God reigns. In some instances, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια refers to a sphere of worship that is genuine and sincere, and that is opposed to all spurious, inauthentic, false and fake forms. It is also used to signify that which is conformed to fact and opposed to falsehood. This usage is not confined to everyday contexts, but is found in legal contexts as well. In addition, some contexts have the added sense of the contrast between concealment and non-concealment. Hence, it sometimes means total disclosure. אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια sometimes refers to a body of knowledge that leads one to a deeper understanding of God and his will. It refers to divine revelation, namely Scripture. It also signifies reality and is sometimes contrasted against that which is merely illusion. Finally, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is also linked metaphorically with light.

Early Christian Writings of the First Century

Ἀλήθεια *in Combination With Other Substantives*

Ἀλήθεια is found in a paratactic relationship with εἰλικρίνεια ("sincerity"; cf. 1 Cor 5:8). In this context, it is indicative of the manner in which one ought to celebrate the festival, a manner that is conformed to the gospel and explicitly opposed to malice and wickedness. In another context, ἀλήθεια is related to φῶς ("light") in that it constitutes one of the products of light. Paul declares that the fruit of the light is ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ ("in every manner of goodness, righteousness and truth"; cf. Eph 5:9). These are the visible character qualities that are exhibited by the children of light. In these contexts, ἀλήθεια points to uprightness and integrity in every aspect. It is a sphere of operation of those whose lives have been transformed by Christ. In 1 Tim 2:7, Paul declares that he has been appointed as a teacher of the Gentiles ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ ("in faith and truth"). In this context, ἀλήθεια is used for the gospel, hence Paul is the teacher with reference to matters of faith and the message of the gospel.

Ἀλήθεια *in Combination With Verbal Forms*

Ἀλήθεια is found as the direct object of the verb λέγω ("say," "speak"; cf. Mark 5:33). In this context, a woman touches Jesus because she believes that by so doing, she will be healed. In response to Jesus' question, "Who touched me?" (v. 31), the woman comes forward and tells him the whole truth. Although

conformity to fact is a valid explanation for ἀλήθεια in this context, the sense goes beyond this. It is the contrast between concealment and non-concealment that is in view.[50] It therefore refers to full disclosure. 2 Cor 12:6 and 1 Tim 2:7 reflect instances in which conformity to fact is the intended sense. Similarly, in Acts 26:25, Paul says to Festus that he declares (from ἀποφθέγγομαι) the sober truth (literally "true and prudent words").[51] However, while conformity to fact as opposed to falsehood is in view, particularly in light of the legal context, ἀλήθεια also has the sense of divine revelation. Similarly, as the direct object of πείθω ("obey"), ἀλήθεια in Gal 5:7 has this same sense of divine revelation.

Ἀλήθεια is found as the direct object of the verb κατέχω ("suppress"; cf. Rom 1:18). Paul warns that God's wrath is against those who suppress the truth. In this context, in which it is explicitly juxtaposed to ἀδικία ("wickedness"), ἀλήθεια is used to indicate that which God has revealed of himself in the created order, hence divine revelation.[52] Clearly, Paul does not imply that natural revelation brings one to salvation. Rather, "[h]is purpose is to underscore that the knowledge of God obtained through creation was suppressed and therefore distorted."[53] Salvation, as he repeatedly points out in the epistle, is itself made possible only by an acceptance of the gospel. Paul declares that there is no salvation for those μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ("who do not believe the truth"), but rather have chosen to indulge in wickedness (2 Thess 2:12). Instead, these individuals will be condemned. This suggests that in this context, ἀλήθεια must be understood in light of the divine truth that comes from God, and specifically, the message of the gospel of Christ.

Ἀλήθεια is also found as the direct object of the verb ἐπιγινώσκω ("know"; cf. 1 Tim 4:3), indicating that it is an object to be known. In this context ἀλήθεια is a body of knowledge that refers to the content of Christian faith. Therefore, those who are faithful and know the truth are those who have believed the gospel. Paul, in rebuking the Jews, asks why they do not teach themselves, if they believe that the embodiment of knowledge and ἀλήθεια is found in the Law (Rom 2:20). In this context, ἀλήθεια refers to divine revelation.

Ἀλήθεια is also found in various combinations with the verbs λέγω ("say"; cf. Mark 12:14; Luke 4:25; 20:21; 22:59) διδάσκω ("teach"; cf. Mark 12:32; Luke 20:21), καταλαμβάνω ("grasp/comprehend"; cf. Acts 10:34) together with the prepositional phrase ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας. In these contexts, ἀλήθεια is used to signify the manner in which the action communicated by each of these verbs is performed, i.e. 'truthfully,' to affirm the veracity of the statement, or even to emphasize the action of the verb.

Ἀλήθεια *in Combination with Prepositions*

In the pronouncement made by Jesus, ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ("But I say to you in truth"; cf. Luke 4:25), ἀλήθεια is found as the object of the preposition

ἐπί and in combination with the verb λέγω ("say"). Jesus has just read from Isaiah and declared that he is the fulfillment of this passage. In response to the people's negative attitude toward this statement, he gives a speech that exposes their rejection of him. The statement goes beyond pointing to the truthfulness of his words, to the authority behind them. Similar examples have been noted above. Such prepositional phrases therefore serve to introduce a weighty, authoritative response made by Jesus. The prepositional phrase in Mark 12:14, ἀλλ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις ("but you teach the way of God in truth") is reflective of the manner in which Jesus is perceived as communicating divine revelation. Similarly, the phrase ἐν ἀληθείᾳ (Matt 22:16) has this same sense. Ἀλήθεια in the prepositional phrase found in the statement made by Paul, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐλαλήσαμεν ὑμῖν ("we spoke all things to you in truth"; cf. 2 Cor 7:14), points both to the manner as well as the veracity of the content of what Paul has previously communicated.

In Acts 4:27, as the believers are gathered together praying after the release of Peter and John, they declare that ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας ("in truth") Herod and Pontius Pilate conspired together against Jesus. In this context, this is an affirmation that what the people are saying really happened. Paul exhorts the Ephesian believers to stand by means of girding their waists ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ("with truth"; cf. Eph 6:14). In this context, ἀλήθεια may be understood in a number of ways: 1) The objective truth of Christianity or the gospel; 2) Subjective truth, i.e. the believer's integrity and faithfulness; 3) The messiah's righteousness and faithfulness, thus implying objective truth inherent in the messiah. Given the context, it is likely that while objective truth is in the background, the primary reference is to subjective truth.[54]

Ἀλήθεια *in Genitive Relationships*

In the context of prayer and worship, Paul declares in his letter to Timothy (1 Tim 2:4) that God desires all men to be saved and εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν ("to come to a knowledge of the truth"). The genitive relationship is an objective genitive relationship that emphasizes the object of knowing. In this case, ἀλήθεια points to divine revelation. Even more specifically, in this context where the theme of salvation is prominent, it points to the gospel and the person of Jesus Christ (cf. 2 Tim 2:25; 3:7; Tit 1:1). Ἀλήθεια is also found in the genitive relationship ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ("words of truth and reason"; cf. Acts 26:25). Here, the genitive relationship is attributive, emphasizing the character of the words as truthful, i.e. as conforming to fact and opposed to falsehood and deceit. At the same time, the context in which he speaks, namely the recollection of his call by God to preach to the Gentiles, reveals that it is indicative of divine revelation, specifically the gospel.

In the phrase τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom 1:25), the genitive relationship may be understood as an attributed genitive.[55] Hence, men exchanged the true God

for a lie. Ἀλήθεια is therefore used to signify reality, as opposed to that which only appears to be so but is really a delusion. On the other hand, ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ ("the truth of God"; cf. Rom 3:7) is an attributive genitive that emphasizes the truthfulness of God. In this context, explicitly juxtaposed as it is to ψεῦσμα ("lying," "untruthfulness"), ἀλήθεια is used to signify that which is opposed to falsehood and lies. It pertains to God's truthfulness in judging sin. The genitive phrase ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ (Rom 15:8) is an attributive genitive, which in this context, reflects the faithfulness and reliability of God. Paul also uses the expression ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ in declaring that the truth of Christ is in him (2 Cor 11:10). Given that the context is that of false apostles, ἀλήθεια is used to signify that which is opposed to falsehood and deception (cf. 2 Tim 3:8; 4:4). Here, as often in Paul, truth is a reflection of the correspondence between word and deed.[56] In 1 Cor 5:8 the readers are urged to celebrate the festival in a certain manner: ἐν ἀζύμοις εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας ("with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth"). In this context, ἀλήθεια is used to indicate an attitude of genuineness and purity that is explicitly opposed to malice and wickedness.

Ἀλήθεια is found in a genitive relationship with λόγος in the phrase ἐν λόγῳ ἀληθείας ("by a word of truth"; cf. 2 Cor 6:7). Paul is explaining how they, as workers of God, try to commend themselves before God (in contrast to the false apostles), so that their ministry might not be discredited. While it may appear that the genitive relationship in this context is attributive, emphasizing the character of their speech as conformed to fact and opposed to falsehood (cf. 2 Cor 4:2), it is far more likely that the evangelical and soteriological context (5:20; 6:2) point to the gospel message.[57] Similarly, in Eph 1:13, the phrase, τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας ("the word of truth"), is explicitly equated to τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ("the gospel of salvation"), hence showing that in this particular context ἀλήθεια refers to divine revelation, and even more specifically, to the gospel (cf. Col 1:5). The two are found in a more intimate relationship in the genitive phrase ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ("the truth of the gospel"; cf. Gal 2:5, 2:14). This may be a genitive of apposition, i.e. the truth, which is the gospel. In this context, therefore, ἀλήθεια is simply another way of referring to the gospel of Jesus Christ. In 2 Tim 2:15, the phrase τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας refers to the body of knowledge that constitutes the content of Christian faith. Hence, ἀλήθεια refers to divine revelation.[58] The writer of Jas 1:18, declares that God has chosen to give us birth λόγῳ ἀληθείας ("through/by the word of truth"). This can either be understood as a reference to God's reliability and consistency, or perhaps even a reference to his divine revelation communicated through the gospel message. Given the context of regeneration, the latter is to be preferred (cf. v. 21).[59]

In yet another context, the church is referred to as στῦλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας ("the pillar and foundation of the truth"; cf. 1 Tim 3:15). In this context, this metaphor has a twofold sense: The church is God's temple and it also houses God's family.[60] In this attributive genitive relationship, ἀλήθεια refers to divine truth and therefore further defines the church as belonging to that sphere or

realm in which God reigns. The genitive relationship ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ("the way of truth"; cf. 2 Pet 2:2) is a reference to the sphere of operation of those that have placed their faith in Christ. It is the Christian way, the way of the gospel. Peter warns that by following false teachers, the way of truth will be maligned.

Summary

Ἀλήθεια is used in a number of ways in early Christian literature. It is used to refer to a body of knowledge that refers to the content of Christian faith, namely the gospel message. It therefore frequently signifies divine revelation that has a salvific purpose, the redemptive content of that which has been revealed in and through Jesus. In relation to the words of Jesus, ἀλήθεια implies the authority of the speaker. It is also used to refer to uprightness and integrity in every aspect. It is a sphere of operation of those whose lives have been transformed by Christ. This is evidenced in an outward manifestation of positive character qualities. In this context, it is also used in the sense of faithfulness, particularly with regard to believers, as well as to indicate an attitude of genuineness and purity that is explicitly opposed to malice and wickedness. In both legal as well as non-legal contexts, ἀλήθεια is used to refer to that which conforms to fact and is opposed to falsehood and deceit. It refers to the veracity of a communication, both divine as well as human, and reflects the correspondence between word and deed. In some instances in which this use occurs, the sense goes beyond this. It is the contrast between concealment and non-concealment and hence ἀλήθεια sometimes refers to full disclosure. It is also used to refer to the church, thus defining it as belonging to that sphere or realm in which God reigns. Metaphorically, it is related positively to light.

Conclusion

In this chapter a survey of the background of truth terminology in Jewish and Christian literature was conducted. The aim of this section was to investigate whether the general Jewish and early Christian milieu spanning this period reveals a similar use of this terminology, or whether there is evidence of some kind of development reflected in John's Gospel and the *Rule*. In the first section, a summary of the background behind the Gospel of John was carried out. It was concluded that the Jewish environment out of which the Gospel arose did not exist in a vacuum. Hence, while the Palestinian background and Old Testament Scriptures provide the primary linguistic influence on the Gospel, a Hellenistic influence is also to be detected.

The study of the use of truth terminology in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint revealed that אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is used in a number of different ways in this

literature. It is used to refer to faithfulness and reliability, to conformity to fact (and opposed to falsehood), to a sphere of operation of those who fear God and live according to his Law, to a sphere of worship that is genuine and sincere, to divine revelation, to indicate a sphere of belonging in which God reigns, to signify reality, and finally it is also linked metaphorically with light.

The final section of this chapter investigated current usage of the term and its various combinations via a selective survey of Jewish and early Christian writings between 200 B.C. and A.D. 100. This revealed that אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια is used as follows: in the sense of faithfulness or reliability, to refer to a sphere of operation that is characterized by upright conduct and integrity in one's dealings and that conforms to the Law and the ethical standards required by God, to refer to a sphere of belonging in which God reigns, it is used for a sphere of worship that is genuine and sincere, to signify that which is conformed to fact and opposed to falsehood (it sometimes means total disclosure), to refer to divine revelation, to signify reality, and finally, it is also linked metaphorically with light.

The Christian literature also reflects a number of uses for ἀλήθεια. It is used to refer to the gospel message, to a sphere of operation of those whose lives have been transformed by Christ, to refer to that which conforms to fact and is opposed to falsehood and deceit in both legal and non-legal contexts, to refer to the veracity of a communication (sometimes referring to full disclosure), with respect to Jesus' words it implies the authority of the speaker, to refer to 'reality,' and to refer to the Church, thus defining it as belonging to that sphere or realm in which God reigns. Metaphorically, it is also related positively to light. This survey shows that although the current usage reflects overlap in many of the categories, there is also development in others and in some cases, new uses have been incorporated.

Notes

1 The Septuagint provides a crucial linguistic link between the two languages—Hebrew and Greek. The primary texts will be accessed through the following resources found in Bible Works 7: *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (ed. K. Elliger and W. Rudolph; 4th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (German Bible Society), 1990; *LXX Septuaginta* (ed. Alfred Rahlfs; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt/Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (German Bible Society), 1935; *The Works of Philo Judaeus, the Contemporary of Josephus* (trans. C. D. Yonge; 4 vols.; London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854–1855); *The Works of Flavius Josephus* (1828 Whiston English Translation, Greek text based on the 1890 Niese edition). Other resources include the following: *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (ed. R. Kittel; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bebelgesellschaft, 1997); *Septuaginta: Id Est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes* (ed. Alfred Rahlfs; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bebelstiftung, 2006); *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James

H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–1985); *The Greek New Testament* (ed. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland; 4th rev. ed.; United Bible Societies, 2001).

2. For an extensive discussion see Mburu, *Rule of the Community,* 214–43.

3. Due to the difficulty involved in establishing accurate dating of early Christian writings, only the New Testament writings will be surveyed.

4. Marianne Meye Thompson, "John, Gospel of," *DJG* 368.

5. Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language, 3:99; cf. F. C. Baur, *Kritische Untersuchungen uber die kanonischen Evangelien* (Tübingen: Fues, 1847), 328, 356, 378, 383; Martin Hengel, "Bishop Lightfoot and the Tübingen School on the Gospel of John and the Second Century," *Durham University Journal* 84 (January 1992):23–51, esp. p. 24.

6. Edgar J. Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937)*,* 314–15, concluded that the author was a Greek, not a Jew, based on what he perceived as the thoroughly Greek character of the thought, interest, literary cast, style, comparatively limited use of the Jewish scriptures, its definite purpose to strip Christianity of its Jewishness, intense anti-Jewish feeling, and great debt to the mystery religions.

7. Alred F. Loisy, *Le Quatrieme Evangile* (Paris: Picard, 1903), 123–29, argued that the author behind the composition of this Gospel was a theologian with no historical interest. Moreover, he could not have been an eyewitness, and therefore not even an apostle. The most likely candidate, according to him, was a convert from Diaspora Judaism who was influenced by Greek Philosophy.

8. With particular regard to dualism in John, Bultmann, *John*, 9, claims that the evangelist remodeled a Gnostic cosmological dualism into an anthropological dualism of decision. His major influence was H. Jonas, *The Gnostic Religion* (2d ed.; Boston: Beacon, 1963), who took a phenomenological approach to Gnosticism, seeing it as part of a syncretistic movement in antiquity drawing its imagery from various religious traditions. However, while both W. Bauer and R. Bultmann supported and further developed this theory, influencing German critical scholarship for much of the century, there were others, such as J. B. Lightfoot, B. F. Westcott and A. Schlatter who challenged it. See Burge, *Interpreting,* 17.

9. Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. Howard Clark Kee; rev. ed.; NY: Abingdon, 1975), 226–28.

10. Dodd, *Interpretation,* 133.

11. The *Hermetica* illustrate how Hellenized Egyptian cults sought to compete with Hellenism in general, just as Judaism and the others did.

12. On this, Yamauchi, "Gnosticism," 417, notes that others see it as being dependent on John's prologue and not vice versa.

13. Proposals documented by Keener, *John,* 1:162.

14. J. Edgar Bruns, *The Christian Buddhism of St. John: New Insights into the Fourth Gospel* (NY: Paulist Press, 1971), 14–15, cites at least two major ideas of Mahayanist literature that are also found in Gnostic literature: a carefully

entrusted higher teaching and the idea of a teacher who has transcended the physical world.

15. Moody Smith, *Theology of the Gospel of John*, 19, points out, for instance, John the Baptist and his disciples (1:35; 3:25; cf. Luke 7:18–30; 11:1; Matt 11:2–15; also Acts 18:25–19:4), Samaritans represented initially by the woman at the well (4:1–42), as well as his knowledge of the Jewish/Samaritan hostility.

16. For this claim, note C. F. Burney, *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1926) and C. C. Torrey, *The Four Gospels: A New Translation* (New York: Harper, 1933); *Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1936). Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel*, 47–48 points out that this has not found a large following.

17. This Gospel shares much in common with Jewish literature of the Second Temple Period. For instance, the Psalms of Solomon and the Prologue both emphasize the divine characteristics of the Messiah; Qumran and the Fourth Evangelist witness to the Semitic concept of talking about moral conduct as a way of walking (i.e. *halakhot);* the dualism in John and that of Qumran share similarities; the prominence of the 'light-darkness' imagery found in the *Fragment of the Book of Noah*, *Testament of Zebulun*, *Testament of Levi*, *1 Enoch*, etc.; the style of the prologue resembles the Jewish tradition of theological exegesis of the Genesis creation narrative e.g. Ezra 6:40; *2 En.* 24:4; 25; *Opif.* 29–35; the image of the Torah as a light e.g. L.A.B 11:1; 19:4; 33:3; *4 Ezra* 14:20–21; *2 Bar.* 17:4; 18:2; 59:2 and so forth. See *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period,* ed. Michael E. Stone (CRINT 2; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984); Helyer, *Exploring Jewish Literature.*

18. Drawing on internal literary evidence, Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 352, demonstrates how the author of the Fourth Gospel could only have been one of Jesus' disciples and more specifically the Beloved disciple. While not concurring with all his conclusions, his excellent study serves to make even firmer the Palestinian Jewish perspective of the author of the Fourth Gospel.

19. The Old Testament bears witness to this fact. Although the Jewish nation diligently attempted to keep itself from corruption from other nations, it was not often successful. With this in mind, it is important to recognize that John was himself influenced by Hellenism and targeted his Gospel to an audience within a Diaspora Jewish context.

20. Larry R. Helyer, *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002), 75–111, points out that this meshing of cultures shaped much of the literature of the Second Temple period. Note for instance *Enoch* (in the Pseudepigrapha) and *Ecclesiasticus* or the *Wisdom of Ben Sira* (in the Apocrypha), which aptly illustrate the way in which Hellenism shaped the Jews' view of the world. The Hellenistic age, ushered in by Alexander the Great, lasted from 323 B.C. to 31 B.C.

21. R. B. Edwards, "Hellenism," *DJG* 316–17, accurately points out that the Gospel writers held certain presuppositions in common with Greeks, Romans and other

peoples of the Hellenistic world, making it difficult to judge whether one is dealing with "direct Hellenistic influence or a parallel development of ideas."

22. Brown, *John,* 1:127, notes that Josephus draws an analogy between the thought of the Essenes (Brown identifies the Qumran group with the Essenes) and that of the neo-Pythagoreans, attributing to the Essenes an anthropology with clear Hellenistic features. He also points out that Braun identifies affinities between the *Hermetica* and Essene thought as it is found in Josephus and the Qumran scrolls, and Cullmann has attempted to draw together the Qumran Essenes, the Samaritans, and the Hellenists (Acts 6:1).

23. While Charles K. Barrett, *The Gospel of John and Judaism* (trans. D. M. Smith; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975)*,* 19, goes further than this study is prepared to in his conception of the extent of the influence of various backgrounds, his point is well taken. Emphasizing the Jewishness of the Fourth Gospel's background while ignoring the fact that the surrounding environment and intended audience were set in a Hellenistic environment is too simplistic.

24. Keener, *John*, 1:155–56 mentions the following examples: Jud 16:7; *J. W.* 1.353; 2.155–158; *Ag. Ap*. 1.255; 2.263; *Pesiq. Rab.* 20.4 (cf. Greek phlegethon; cf. the Elysian plain and Acherusian lake in *Sib. Or.* 2.337–338).

25. Barrett, *Gospel of John and Judaism*, 69–70.

26. Johannes Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917), 624, concluded early that the dualism so characteristic of this Gospel could only have been influenced by Hellenism; According to Goodspeed, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 308, John shifted from Jewish vocabulary to satisfy the demand that Christianity be transplanted to Greek soil and translated into universal terms. This ensured that it was intelligible to the Greek mind. Hence he writes that "the gospel may be said to be intensely Greek from Prologue to Epilogue in ever fiber of both thought and language."

27. Therefore the conclusion given by Robert, "Truth as Covenant Faithfulness," 26, while a step in the right direction (given that he acknowledges the general Jewish and Greek presence), is nevertheless unnecessarily narrow. He writes "[g]iven this importance of the Old Testament witness for proof of Jesus' testimony, it seems incorrect to attempt to link John's Gospel with the broader Jewish backgrounds as seen in the apocalyptic and sapiential writings, or in rabbinic Judaism. This is not to imply that no similarities exist, or that the Evangelist did not know about the movements and works produced, or even that John did not intentionally use phrases popular in these circles in order to speak to them. But considering John's view of the Old Testament, it is unlikely that anything else would have had the kind of influence so as to serve as the Gospel's background." He appears to make no mention of Qumran literature in his assessment.

28. Thiselton, "Truth," 3:879.

29. Jepsen, *TDOT* 1:314.

30. Rudolf Bultmann, "ἀλήθεια," *TDNT* 1:242; cf. Adolf Schlatter, *Die Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten*, 94.

31. Thiselton, "Truth," 3:880.

32. Bultmann, *TDNT* 1:243.

33. Lindsay, "What is Truth?" 138.

34. A related expression is עֹשֵׂי אֱמוּנָה/ποιῶν πίστεις (cf. Prov 12:22; Sir 15:15). In its context, the writer warns that lying lips are an abomination to the Lord but he delights in those who do the truth. Here, it is understood that truth is antithetical to lies or falsehood. Lindsay rightly points out that "[t]he Proverbs passage is primarily concerned with faithfulness to God. Faithfulness certainly presupposes keeping the commandments, but it also surpasses this form of external piety. The emphasis is upon an inner attitude of consequent abiding faithfulness whereby a person is found pleasing to God." Ibid., 133.

35. Thiselton, "Truth," 3:881.

36. Roger Nicole, "The Biblical Concept of Truth," *Scripture and Truth* (ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 290.

37. Thiselton, "Truth," 3:882.

38. Roland E. Murphy, *Proverbs* (WBC 22; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998), 103.

39. Gottfried Quell, "ἀλήθεια," *TDNT* 1:235.

40. R. B. Y. Scott, *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes* (AB 18; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965), 143.

41. A. C. Thiselton, "Truth," 3:880.

42. De la Potterie, "The Truth in Saint John," 68, also points out that a similar understanding of 'truth' as the divine plan revealed to men (i.e. 'mystery') is found in the Book of Wisdom (3:9; 6:22), in *1Enoch* (21:5) and the Qumran literature (cf. 1QH 7.2–27).

43. Adolf Schlatter, *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament* (6th ed.; Stuttgart: Calwar, 1927, 1982), 553, points out that this sign, given without guile, is heeded at the conquest of the city and therefore proves to be a "real sign," protecting effectively.

44. H. C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 1:779, points out that "[a]lthough there is throughout the Testaments a stress on obedience to the Law, the ethical appeal rarely refers to specific legal statutes of the Torah."

45. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," 818.

46. Cf. *Post.* 1:101 for that which is opposed to it. Bultmann, *TDNT* 1:244.

47. Walck, "Truth," 2:951.

48. For the Two Ways tradition cf. *Barn.* 18–20; *Did.* 1–6; *Herm.* 6. Cf. *Sir* 33; 42; *Jub.* 7–12; *1 En.* 2–5; 41–48; *T. 12 Patr.* (*T. Jud.* 20:1–4, *T. Ash.* 1:3 ff., 3–6; *T. Benj.* 4:1 ff.). See Aune, "Dualism," 294.

49. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (trans. and ed. R. H. Charles; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908), 89–90.

50. Thiselton, "Truth," 884.

51. Darrel Bock, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 722 notes that this combination is common in Greek. The sense is that "[i]n this context where Paul

has been accused of being crazy, his reply is that his words are truth. He has not lost control of his thoughts; they are quite sober and thought through."

52. James Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1988), 56, sees the possibility of a reference to "the real state of affairs" in the use of ἀλήθεια in this context.

53. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 86.

54. See Harold Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 839–40, contra Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* (ICC; New York: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 599, who suggests that it is God's truth which is in mind.

55. Wallace, *Grammar,* 89–90, suggests that this is an attributed genitive in which "truth of God"="true God."

56. Thiselton, "Truth," 3:886.

57. Contra NIV, RSV, NET. Paul Barnett, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 329; Ralph P. Martin, *2 Corinthians* (WBC 40; Waco, Texas: Word, 1986), 178.

58. William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000)*,* 524 points out that, "In contrast to the opponent's myths and misconduct, Timothy is to teach the true gospel and behave in accordance with its teachings, his teaching and conduct acting as a deterrent to the opponents."

59. This is further supported by the fact that "the word is the instrument through which God brings people to life." Note other references (cf. 2 Cor 6:7; Eph 1:13; Col 1:5; 2 Tim 2:15) that refer to the gospel as the agent of salvation. Douglas J. Moo, *The Letter of James* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 75–80.

60. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles,* 220.

5

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRUTH TERMINOLOGY IN THE TWO DOCUMENTS

Introduction

This chapter will organize the findings from chapters 2 and 3 into specific categories related to the linguistic combinations and use arising from the study in these chapters. Through a comparative analysis, specific areas of overlap between John's Gospel and the *Rule* that cannot be accounted for by influence from the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, or current use as found in the surveyed Jewish literature and the writings of the New Testament (the findings of chapter 4), will be determined and assessed. The aim of this chapter is to attempt to establish the impact of the *Rule* on the understanding of the use of truth terminology in the Gospel of John, taking into consideration all other possible influences.

In dealing with the task of tracing parallels between any two sources, one needs to keep in mind that any parallel involves some degree of contrast as well as overlap. The following analysis is therefore not expected to reveal completely identical uses of truth terminology. In addition, given the post-resurrection perspective of the author of the Fourth Gospel, it is expected that his use of truth terminology will reflect a certain development that is absent in the *Rule*. The following tables represent the linguistic combinations of ἀλήθεια in the Gospel of John and אמת in the *Rule*.

Syntagmatic relations			Reference	Paradigmatic relations	Translation
1. Substantives connected with conjunction					
a. Paratactic relationships	χάρις	πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια	1:14 1:17		Full of grace and truth Grace and truth
	ζωή	ἡ ἀλήθεια καὶ ἡ ζωή	14:6		The truth and the life
b. Epexegetical relationships	πνεῦμα	Ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ	4:23, 24		In Spirit, that is, in truth
	ὁδός	ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια	14:6		The way, namely the truth
2. Verb combinations	γίνομαι	ἡ ἀλήθεια … ἐγένετο	1 :17		Truth … came
	ποιέω	ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν	3:21	ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων (antonym: the one who practices wickedness) Metaphorical : φῶς (light) and σκότος (darkness)	But the one who practices truth
	μαρτυρέω	μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ	5 :33 18 :37		He has testified to the truth In order that I might testify to the truth
	γινώσκω	γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν	8:32	τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ (my word)	You will know the truth
	ἐλευθερόω	ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει	8:32	τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ (my word)	The truth will set you free

Table 1: Linguistic Combinations of ἀλήθεια in the Gospel of John

λαλέω / λέγω	τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελάληκα	8:40	τὸ ψεῦδος (antonym: lie, falsehood) ὁ λόγος (the word)	[a man] who has told you the truth
	ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω εἰ ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἀλλ' ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ὑμῖν	8:45 8:46 16:7		Because I tell the truth If I speak the truth But I tell you the truth
εἰμι	ἐγώ εἰμι … ἡ ἀλήθεια	14:6	ἡ ὁδός (the way)	I am … the truth
εἰμι	ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν	17:17	ὁ λόγος ὁ σός (your word)	Your word is truth
εἰμι	ὁ ων ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας	18:37	ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (antithetical : of this world)	[Everyone] who is of the truth
εἰμι	τί ἐστιν ἀλήθεια;	18:38		What is truth?
3. Prepositional phrases ἐν	ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ	4:23, 24		In spirit and truth
ἐν	ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ ἔστηκεν	8:44		He does not stand in the truth
[εἰς]/ἐν	[εἰς]/ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ	16:13		Into all truth
ἐν	ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ	17:17	ὁ κόσμος (antithetical: the world) ὁ λόγος ὁ σός (your word)	In the truth
ἐκ	ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας	18:37	ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (antithetical : of this world)	Of the truth
4. Genitive relationships	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας	14:17 15:26 16:13	ὁ παράκλητος (the paraclete)	The Spirit of truth

Table 1: Linguistic Combinations of ἀλήθεια *in the Gospel of John*

Syntagmatic relations			Reference	Paradigmatic relations	Translation
1. Paratactic relationships with other substantives	צדקה	ולעשות אמת וצדקה	1:5–6a	רע (antonym: evil) Metaphorical : אור (light), חושך (antithetical: darkness)	In order to do truth and justice
		בלכתנו [קרי בחוקי]אמת וצדיק	1.25b–26a	Antithetical: (acted sinfully, transgressed, sinned, committed evil)	Inasmuch as we walk […] truth and just […]
		לעשות אמת יחד ... צדקה	5.3–4		To achieve truth together … and justice
		לעשות אמת וצדקה	8.2		To do truth and justice
	משפט	ולעשות אמת ... ומשפט	1:5–6a	רע (antonym: evil) Metaphorical : אור (light), חושך (antithetical: darkness)	In order to do truth … and uprightness
		לעשות אמת יחד ... ומשפט	5.3–4		To achieve truth together … and uprightness
		לעשות אמת ... ומשפט	8.2	רע (antonym: evil)	To do truth … and uprightness
	עול	רוחות האמת והעול	3.18b–19	Metaphorical : אור (light), חושך (antithetical: darkness)	Spirits of truth and injustice/perversity/deceit
	ענוה	לעשות אמת יחד וענוה	5.3–4		To achieve truth together and humility
		באנ[ו]ת וענוה	5.25		In truth and in meekness

Table 2: Linguistic Combinations of אמת in the Rule

	חסד אהבת	לעשות אמת יחד ... ואהבת חסד	5.3–4		To achieve truth together and … compassionate love
		חסד	5.25		
		באמ{ת} ... ואהבת חסד	8.2		In truth … and in compassionate love
		לעשות אמת ... ואהבת חסד			To do truth … and compassionate love
	תמים	בית תמים ואמת בישראל	8.9 –10		A house of perfection and truth in Israel
	פלא	רזי פלא ואמת	9.18		Mysteries of wonder and of truth
2. Verb combinations	עשה	ולעשות אמת	1:5–6a	רע (antonym: evil) Metaphorical : אור (light), חושך (antithetical: darkness) עול (antonym: injustice/ perversity/ deceit)	In order to do truth
		לעשות אמת יחד	5.3		In order to achieve truth together
		לעשות אמת	8.2		To do truth
	ברך	והלויים מברכים ... ואת כול מעשי אמתו	1.19		And the Levites shall bless … and all the works of his faithfulness
	בגד	לבגוד באמת	7.18		To betray the truth
	הלך	ולהתהלך עם כול בנ{{□}}מדת האמת	8.4		To walk with everyone in the measure of the truth
	כון	נכונה {{ה}}עצת היחד באמת	8.5		The community council shall be founded on truth
	Understood היה	ואמת כול מעשיו	10.17		All his [God's] deeds or works are truth

	שפט	בצדקת אמתו שפטני	11.14a		He will judge me in the justice of his truth
	היה	כיא אמת אל היאה סלע פעמי	11.4b–5a		For the truth of God is the rock of my steps
3. Object of preposition	ל	וכול הנדבים לאמתו	1.11–12	חוקי אל (the decrees of God), חוקי אמתו (decrees of his truth)	All those who submit freely to his truth
		וחבא לאמת רזי דעת	4.6		(A spirit …) of concealment concerning the truth of the mysteries of knowledge.
		המתנדבים יחד לאמתו	5.10		… who freely volunteer together for this truth
		לשוב לאמת	6.15		In order to revert to the truth
		רוח קודש לאמת עולם	9.3–4		(In order to establish) a spirit of holiness in truth eternal
	ב	באמת חוקי אל	1.11–12	חוקי אל (the decrees of God), חוקי אמתו (decrees of his truth)	In the truth of the decrees of God
		באמתו	3.7–8a	רשע (antonym: wickedness)	In his [God's] truth
		נחלת איש באמת	4.24–26	Metaphorical: אור (light)	(In agreement with) man's inheritance in the truth
		באמֿת	5.25		(Reproach one another) in truth

Table 2: Linguistic Combinations of אמת in the Rule

		בן{{□}}מדת האמת	8.4		Measure of truth
4. Construct relationships	בן	בני אמת	4.6	Metaphorical: בני אור (sons of light)	Sons of truth
	חק	באמת חוקי אל	1.11–12	חוקי אמתו (decrees of his truth)	In the truth of the decrees of God
	מעשה	מעשי אמת	1.19		Works of his [God's] faithfulness
	יחד	ביחד אמת	2.24	יחד אל (community of God)	In a community of truth
		לוא יעבור ביחד אמתו	2.26	Antonym: רשע (wickedness) Metaphorical uses: אור (light) Antithetical: חשך (darkness)	Shall not enter the community of his truth
	רוח	רוח האמת	3.18b–19 4.20–22	מלאך אמתו (angel of his truth); רוח קודש (spirit of holiness) Antithetical: רוח העול (spirit of perversity) Metaphorical: (3.25) רוח אור (spirit of light) Antithetical: רוח חושך (spirit of darkness), מלאך חושך	Spirit of truth

			(angel of darkness), נדה (impurity)	
צדק	דרכי צדק אמת	4.2–3.a	Antithetical: עלילות עולה (deeds of perversity/ wickedness) ממשלת עולה (dominion of injustice/ perversity/wickedness)	Paths of righteousness, namely of truth
	דרכי אמת	4.17		Paths of truth
בֶן	בני אמת	4.5	Antithetical: עול (perversity/wickedness/ deceit)	Sons of truth
מוסד	מוסד אמת	5.5		Foundation of truth
בית	ולבית האמת בישראל	5.6		And for the house of truth in Israel
	בית תמים ואמת בישראל	8.9–10		House of perfection and truth in Israel
מדה	בן}}□{{מדת האמת	8.4		In the measure of truth
עד	עדי אמת	8.6		Witnesses of truth
דעת	דעת אמת	9.17		Truthful knowledge
רז	רזי פלא ואמת	9.18		Mysteries of wonder and truth
אל	אמת אל	11.4b–5a		Truth of God
צדקה	בצדקת אמתו	11.14		In the justice of his truth

Table 2: Linguistic Combinations of אמת *in the* Rule

The contents of the tables above reveal that in both the Gospel and the *Rule*, 'truth' is found in a number of linguistic combinations. The various paradigmatic relationships identified help to clarify how the author(s) intended 'truth' to be understood in its various contexts.

1) With other substantives: these are generally paratactic relationships, but in some cases epexegetical relationships are evident.

2) With verbs: in most cases, the substantive 'truth' functions as the direct object in relation to the verb or verbal form (in some instances participles function as verbs). The verb 'to do' appears in both documents, but, unlike the *Rule,* the Gospel also includes a number of verbs of saying.

3) With prepositions: 'truth' functions as the object of various prepositions in both documents. While both documents use the preposition 'in,' the Gospel also uses 'of' and the *Rule* uses 'to/for.'

4) In genitive relationships: the *Rule* displays a greater variety of these relationships. The expression 'spirit of truth' is common to both documents.

Within these linguistic relationships, truth terminology in both documents (albeit with some nuances) is used in a number of ways and at different levels.[1]

1) Keeping in mind the polysemic nature of words, the meaning of 'truth' that surfaces from the various contexts is 'reality,' faithfulness and reliability, and that which is conformed to fact and opposed to falsehood or deceit. The two levels of meaning, 'unmarked' and less frequently used, are naturally to be determined on the basis of frequency of use in the respective documents. In some contexts, more than one meaning is intended.

2) The figurative meanings in both documents fall under the following categories: comparison, contrast, personal figures and association and relation.[2]

3) The referents in different contexts include: divine revelation, a sphere of operation for sanctification, a sphere of operation for worship, a sphere of belonging, an aspect of pneumatology, and finally Jesus Christ. Understandably, this last applies only to the Gospel.

These categories will be analyzed more closely in the following section and the impact (if any) of the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, the literature of the Second Temple period, and the early Christian writings (the New Testament) assessed.

Meaning of 'Truth'

'Truth' as 'Reality'

'Truth' carries the sense of 'reality' in various instances in the Gospel. In some contexts, especially where verbs of speaking abound, it is understood as 'eschatological reality' (cf. 8:40, 45). Similarly, 'truth' as reality is sometimes

found in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint and in Jewish writings of the Second Temple period. In some cases, it is contrasted against that which is deceptive or merely illusory. This is particularly evident in Philo. With regard to the Christian literature, Paul's use of ἀλήθεια in Rom 1:25 may also reflect this use.

However, while in John the aspect of ultimate 'reality' is understood in terms of the coming of Jesus Christ and the salvation-historical significance of all he represents, in the *Rule* the sense of the completeness and 'reality' of this revelation is provided by the function of the Teacher of Righteousness, who is given the authority to interpret Scripture for the community.

'Truth' as Faithfulness and Reliability

Ἀλήθεια in John is also used in the sense of faithfulness and reliability. Particularly in the Prologue, this aspect of God's character is emphasized with regard to his full and final revelatory act of sending his son, Jesus Christ. The paratactic combination with χάρις ("grace") clarifies this understanding. Likewise, in the *Rule,* אמת is often used with reference to the faithfulness, reliability and trustworthiness of God, in which case it is generally descriptive of his character and deeds. In both sources, paratactic combination with other substantives that reflect moral qualities is not uncommon. In at least one context in the *Rule*, this use of 'truth' is found with a verb of speaking, ברך ("to bless"), where the Levites bless the works of God's faithfulness. Charlesworth suggests that the combination of 'truth' with 'grace' as opposed to the biblical correlative concept 'glory' (e.g. Ps 84:11; Eph 1:6) or 'favor' (e.g. Est 2:17; Gen 6:8ff; 19:19) raises the possibility that John was influenced by the pattern of thought in this Qumran text as opposed to the Old Testament.[3] However, as noted in the discussion of the Prologue of John, 'grace and truth' are frequently used together to describe the character of God in the Old Testament and hence it is unnecessary to postulate a Qumran source for this combination.[4]

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια, reflecting the meaning faithfulness and reliability, is used often in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, although the Septuagint sometimes translates this with "righteousness." When it is used with reference to God, it generally refers to an aspect of his character. It is also frequently used of the activity of God, as well as of his word. This quality of faithfulness is not confined to God alone. Sometimes, it is used with reference to people, inanimate objects as well as abstract concepts. In many instances, it is found in combination with moral qualities such as justice, righteousness, judgment, and is also frequently combined with wisdom and understanding. This is also reflected in Jewish writings of the Second Temple period. The use in the Gospel is most likely reminiscent of the Old Testament understanding of the character of God.

'Truth' as Conformity to Fact

Ἀλήθεια in John is sometimes used dualistically, in both legal and non-legal contexts, to reflect that which conforms to fact and is opposed to lies or falsehood. In these contexts, the term is frequently the object of verbs of speaking such as μαρτυρέω, λαλέω and λέγω. אמת in the *Rule* also functions similarly, but rather than falsehood, injustice, perversity, deceit, as well as impurity are its functional opposites.

This use of 'truth' as conformity to fact is also evident in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint and in Jewish writings of the Second Temple period, where 'truth' is often the object of a verb of speaking. In these cases, while it is often used in contrast to falsehood or deception, it also stands in contrast to a number of negative terms such as deceit, error, falsehood, guile, lie, vanity, wickedness and their cognates. This use is not confined to everyday contexts, but is found in legal contexts as well. What is usually at stake is the veracity of one's words or actions, or even whether or not a charge can be substantiated. Early Christian literature also reflects a similar use of ἀλήθεια, generally signifying an antithesis to falsehood and deceit. It frequently occurs with verbs such as λέγω ("say") διδάσκω ("teach"), καταλαμβάνω ("grasp/comprehend"). Like the tradition of which it is a part, it refers to the veracity of a communication, both divine as well as human, and reflects the correspondence between word and deed. It is likely that John developed his use from this common tradition as well.

In addition, some instances in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, and in Jewish writings of the Second Temple period have the added sense of the contrast between concealment and non-concealment. Early Christian literature also reflects this contrast such that ἀλήθεια sometimes refers to full disclosure. This use is not found in the *Rule*. 'Truth' used to signify total disclosure is particularly significant for John's understanding of Jesus (who is ἀλήθεια) in terms of the full revelation of the Father. Through Jesus, God has provided a full disclosure of himself.

Figurative Meaning

There are a number of figurative meanings attached to אמת/ἀλήθεια in both the Gospel and the *Rule*. In some contexts, particularly where verbs of speaking are employed (for instance μαρτυρέω, λαλέω, λέγω), ἀλήθεια exhibits a clear use of metonymy, because it also refers to the ultimate truth that is mediated through Christ. Hence, it is not merely understood as conforming to fact. In at least one instance, personification is used to represent ἀλήθεια as a liberator (John 8:32). Similarly, in the *Rule,* the authors use the figurative language of personification to describe the rising up of אמת and an end to its defilement forever (4.19). In the verse following, they state that God will refine and purify man באמתו ("by his

truth"; cf. 4.20). However, while in both cases 'truth' is personified, the *Rule* does not represent 'truth' as a liberator from sin.

In metaphorical terms, the use of truth terminology in the literature surveyed reveals that 'truth,' is often equated with light while which is opposed to it is equated with darkness. Charlesworth concedes that this light/darkness motif was common in John's day, often used to describe the contrast between good and evil in many writings (e.g. *Bk. Noah* 108:11–15; *T. Zeb.* 9:8; *T. Levi* 2:8–3:1; *1 En* 58:5f.; *2 Bar.* 17:4–18:2; 48:50; 59:2). Light and darkness is also used to represent powers or spheres to which people belong (*2 En.* 30.15; *T. Naph.* 2.10; *T. Levi* 19.1) and is also viewed as being or causing ethical qualities (*T. Levi.* 17.6–7; *T. Benj.* 5.2; 6.4; *T. Gad* 5.7). However, he argues that none of the authors of these texts emphasize this motif to the extent seen in the *Rule* and John.[5] For instance, the *Rule* applies this imagery to the community, identifying its members as בני אור ("sons of light") contrasted with בני חושך ("sons of darkness"). While John does not have the contrasting 'sons of darkness,' he does identify believers as υἱοὶ φωτός ("sons of light").[6] These are regarded in contrast to the rest who are ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ("of the world") and ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ("of the devil"). The Gospel also has the unique designation of Jesus as "the light" (Prologue; 8:12; 9:5).

Although the light/darkness motif appears to be strikingly similar in both the Gospel and the *Rule*, this may in itself prove nothing. Knibb accurately points out that, "[t]he symbolic use of the terms 'light' and 'darkness' is entirely natural in itself and finds many parallels of various kinds in biblical writings (e.g. Isa 9:2; Ps 107:10, 14; Jn 8:12; 9:5),"[7] and hence it need not be seen as confined only to the Qumran mode of thought. Light is frequently associated with wisdom and the Law. For instance, *Test. Naph.* 2.7 ff. uses the metaphor 'works of light' synonymously with right conduct (i.e. acting in accordance with the order God has ordained). In Ps 119:105, light is used for God's Word (the Law). Apocalyptic literature has a much clearer use of this metaphor (cf. *Bar*. 4.2; 4 *Ezra* 14.20–21, certain passages in *T. 12 Patr.* e.g. *T. Reub.* 3.8; *T. Levi* 14.3–4; 19.1; *T. Ash.* 5.1–6.3, others in *2 Bar.*).[8] Light and darkness are also used as metaphors for the realms of good and evil. Aune notes that, "[t]his ethical dualism of light and darkness finds a parallel in the dualistic language of conversion, found in both early Christian and early Jewish texts, language which explicitly or implicitly alludes to the cosmological language of Gen 1:2–5."[9] One cannot therefore discount a common dependence on the Hebrew Bible and general Jewish tradition.

As do Aune and Knibb above, Bauckham notes that this contrast of light and darkness is the most obvious of dualisms observable in the natural world. Noting that most, and perhaps even all, cultural traditions have used it metaphorically to signify knowledge and ignorance, truth and error, good and evil, life and death, he goes on to point out the usage of this very imagery in the Hebrew Bible and in Second Temple Jewish literature. In his view, arguing as Charlesworth and others do, that a connection must be present because both John and the Qumran texts place a greater emphasis on this imagery is insufficient. He identifies sources

in the Hebrew Bible and parallels in Second Temple Jewish literature, noting the significance of the light/darkness imagery in Genesis (1:3–5), the image of a light shining in the darkness to give light, as well as the Torah as a light for people, Christ as the light reflecting Isa 9:1[2], and the association of Jesus with the light symbolism of the Feast of Tabernacles (7:37–39). He concludes that "the dominant picture of light and darkness in the Fourth Gospel results from creative exegetical fusion about the Jewish primordial light of the first day of creation and messianic interpretation of the prophecies of eschatological light," and hence it is unnecessary to attribute it to any influence from Qumran.[10] In addition, given that the expression 'sons of light' is found in the New Testament (cf. Luke 16:8; 1 Thess 5:5; τέκνα φωτός in Eph 5:8 which is a somewhat similar expression), one cannot rule out a dependence on Christian tradition.[11]

While this is accurate, what is significant is that only in John and Qumran is this contrast between light and darkness presented within the context of a modified dualism with certain technical terms that appear to be shared by both documents.[12] Both the dualism and the terminology are shared by John and Qumran, and both these documents make use of the symbolism of light and darkness to communicate this dualistic relationship. Of additional significance is the absence of the expressions 'sons of light' and 'sons of darkness' in the Old Testament and in Rabbinic literature.[13] This at least raises the possibility that John may have acquired this terminology from the Qumran linguistic matrix.[14] Metso raises the question of whether the dualistic ideas can be explained through the affinities with the Old Testament (e.g. Gen 1–3; Num 27:16; 1 Sam 10:10; 16:14–16; 1 Kgs 22:21–23; 2 Kgs 19:7), with other Qumranic writings (e.g. 1QM, some psalms of 1QH), or even as a reflection of the beliefs of some Jewish and pre-Christian circles (e.g. *Jub.* 7–12; Sir 33; 42; *1 En.* 2–5; 41–48; *T. 12 Patr.*, e.g. *T. Jud.* 20:1–4, *T. Ash.* 1:3 ff., 3–6; *T. Benj.* 4:1 ff.); or even some early Christian writings, and concludes that these do not reflect as great a parallel as does 1QS.[15] Hence while those who affirm an influence from the Hebrew Bible and general Jewish tradition are largely accurate, this does not in itself rule out the conclusion that John used the Qumran model to conceptualize this dualistic relationship between light and darkness.

A significant difference, however, is that the Qumran community viewed darkness as disobedience to the Law, whereas John understood darkness in terms of the rejection of Jesus Christ, who is himself the light. Another important distinction is that whereas the Gospel calls people to believe in the light, the scrolls assume that the members of the community are already in the light.[16] In addition, it should be noted that whereas the *Rule* reflects a conflict between two spirits, John describes a conflict that is between the world and its ruler, children of light and children of darkness. These are not two spirits ruling over two distinct classes of people, but rather all are human beings in darkness, who are invited to come into the light, by the Light himself, Jesus Christ.[17] Moreover, the psycho-logical function of the two spirits warring in an individual is not represented

in John. This is unlike the Synoptic Gospels which frequently speak of demon possession and exorcisms.[18] The coming of the light also represents a realized eschatology that is not reflective of Qumran theology.[19] Nevertheless, even given these differences, the use of the light/darkness imagery and the expression 'sons of light' are illuminated by the *Rule's* use within a similar dualistic paradigm.

Referential Use

'Truth' as Divine Revelation

In the Gospel of John, ἀλήθεια is used to refer to the full and final/ultimate revelation of the redemptive purpose of God. This sense of completeness is further communicated by the expression πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας (1:14) which describes the *logos*. אמת in the *Rule* is also used in a revelatory sense. The view of 'truth' as eternal (9.4–5) and the understanding that God himself is the author of 'truth' that surfaces throughout the *Rule* clarifies its divine origins. Given that the Gospel and the *Rule* share a common Jewish heritage, it is understood that the revelation referred to in both documents is mediated by means of Scripture that is common to both. In the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, as well as the literature of the Second Temple period, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια also refers to divine revelation. This may either be a body of knowledge (namely Scripture), that leads one to a deeper understanding of God and his law, precepts, commandments and ordinances, or it may refer to that which one utters. God as the author of 'truth' is a perspective that is also represented in this literature.

᾽Αλήθεια as revelation is also used in the Gospel in relation to the content of faith of the newly constituted people of God. It is also referred to as Jesus' word or his message (ὁ λόγος ὁ σός; cf. 17:17). As the content of faith, the gospel message, it is both an object to be known as well as that which effects liberation (cf. 8:32 and the use of the verbs γινώσκω and ἐλευθερόω). אמת in the *Rule* is also used in a similar sense to refer to the content of faith for those in the community. חוקי אל ("decrees of God") and 'truth' are equated in the *Rule* (cf. 1QS 1.11–12), and the phrase רזי פלא ואמת ("mysteries of wonder and truth") is used to refer to that which is revealed to the community in the Law. Indeed, the purpose of the community was to be established on 'truth', that is, the Law, and members of the community were expected to submit to it. The *Rule* therefore emphasizes the Law of God revealed through Moses and the prophets, as well as that which has been revealed through the Teacher of righteousness and the sages. The Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, and the Jewish writings of the Second Temple period also refer to the content of faith in terms of a body of knowledge that is knowable and that leads one to a deeper understanding of God and his will. In a number of contexts, 'truth' is found in an equative relationship with the Law (or Torah), which reflects that the Law is to be considered not only reliable and

trustworthy, but is to be regarded as divine revelation.[20] Aspects that are emphasized include its origin from God as well as its eternal nature. It is considered the embodiment of God's wise and merciful pattern for human life.

All these ideas are present in John's conception. In the case of the Gospel, however, the referent is not generally the Law but the redemptive content of that which has been revealed in and through Jesus, the gospel message. This is reflected in 1:17 where the semantic relationship between ἀλήθεια and ὁ νόμος is understood as dyadic contrastive. John's more specialized use is found in early Christian literature where it is sometimes used to refer to the gospel message. In these contexts, it frequently signifies divine revelation that has a salvific purpose and is regarded as an object to be known (cf. 1 Tim 4:3). Where it is found in relation to the words of Jesus, ἀλήθεια implies the divine authority of the speaker.

With regard to embodied 'truth' as revelation, John regards Jesus Christ as the 'truth' that leads to the salvation of mankind. Schnackenburg points out that, "[f]or John, Jesus is not only an interpreter of the old revelation and a teacher of truth, but also becomes himself, through his all-embracing direct revelation of the Father, the way through which we reach the Father."[21] For the Qumran community, it is the sages and the teachers that unveil the 'truth' of the Torah and apply it to their contemporary situation. However, unlike the Gospel, this 'truth' is exclusive, to be kept from all outsiders. What is significant is that both the *Rule* and John's Gospel retained the idea of the historical revelation of the one true God. However, both understood it in different ways.

'Truth' as revelation is also featured in terms of wisdom and God's hidden plan or salvation in other writings of Qumran (cf. 1QH 1.26–27; 7.26–27; 10.4–5; 11.4; 1QHab 7.8).[22] In these occurrences, there is the understanding that God unveils his mysteries or plan, so that it is possible to come to a knowledge of his intent. However, the knowledge and wisdom to be found in the Law comprise secrets that are to be revealed only to the initiated, those who constitute the 'true Israel.' The Prologue also displays a prominent wisdom motif (cf. *logos* concept), and the Gospel as a whole presents Jesus as crucial to God's plan of salvation. However, this use is also evident in the sapiential and apocalyptic literature of the Old Testament (cf. Prov 23:23; Sir 4:28; Wis 6:22 Dan 10:21), and there is therefore no need to postulate a dependence on Qumran thought.

'Truth' as a Sphere of Operation for Sanctification

Ἀλήθεια in the Gospel also refers to the sphere of operation in which believers are to function for sanctification, a sphere that is opposed to the world. This is also a sphere or realm that stands in opposition to the devil and all he represents. In the *Rule,* אמת is also used to refer to the sphere of operation of those who are rightly related to God by virtue of being in a special covenant relationship with him. In

this case, it is conformity and submission to the Law and its interpretation that are in view, as this is evidenced in outward acts of uprightness and purity. This conformity is vertical (toward God) and horizontal (toward fellow members of the community).[23] In numerous instances where upright action is the focus, אמת is found in paratactic relationships with moral qualities such as justice, uprightness, humility, meekness, compassionate love and seemly behaviour.

In both contexts, the typically Semitic expression 'to do, practice or achieve the truth' (ὁ ποιῶν ἀλήθειαν, לעשות אמת) is expressed in a strikingly similar linguistic combination (John 3:21 cf. 1 John 1:6; 1QS 1.5–6a, 5.3; 8.2, 9 cf. 1QHab 7:11–12).[24] This expression has at least two explicit paradigmatic relationships in the Gospel—the antithetical ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων ("those who practice evil") and the metaphorical imagery of light and darkness. In the *Rule,* this linguistic combination, "to do the truth," is also found severally in the Qumran literature as an expression for faithful participation in the elect desert community.[25] The frequency of use in the Qumran literature is noteworthy and suggests that upright conduct in the community was highly valued. Hence, אמת is frequently understood as defining a way of life that is opposed to רע ("evil"), רשע ("wickedness") and עול ("injustice/perversity/deceit") and that is conformed to God's revelation and the Teacher's interpretation in the Law.[26] Indeed, 'paths of truth' are in essence 'paths of righteousness.' The community is also referred to as a house of perfection and truth in Israel (cf. 8.9–10), a label that captures the ethical standards of perfection required of its members.

As in the Gospel and the *Rule*, אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint also defines the sphere of operation for those who fear God and live according to his Law. This category reflects the understanding that God's people are to live upright lives, characterized by honesty and integrity, and reflecting the standards that he has set, indeed to which he adheres, in all his dealings with mankind. References to the 'way of truth' or even 'walking in God's truth' are common (for instance, Gen 24:48; Ps 25:4–5, 19; 119:30). In some instances, it is used in an attributive relationship to describe upright individuals. However, in some texts, 'truth' may simply be an adherence to ethical values, while in others it signifies sincerity. Sometimes the verbs ἐργάζομαι (to work; cf. Sir 7:20) or even הלך /πορεύομαι (to walk, conduct oneself; cf. Ps 86:11 [85:11]) are used with the same sense. The latter occurs frequently in 1 John.

Jewish literature of the Second Temple period also combines אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια with a number of moral qualities such as piety, holiness, purity, honesty and right-eousness, to define a sphere of operation that conforms to the ethical standards required by God. In some contexts, it is contrasted with injustice and iniquity/wickedness (cf. 1 *En.* 10:16). In some instances, it is used with the verb עשה (to do) to refer to the conduct expected of those that follow the Law (cf. *T. Ash.* 3:1 f; *T. Benj.* 10:3). While specific acts of conformity to the Law are generally the issue, a more general sense is sometimes intended.

In early Christian literature, ἀλήθεια is used to refer to a sphere of operation for those whose lives have been transformed by Christ. This is evidenced in an outward

manifestation of positive character qualities that include uprightness and integrity. In some contexts it is found in paratactic relationships with moral qualities such as goodness and righteousness (cf. Eph 5:9). It is also used in the sense of faithfulness, particularly with regard to believers, as well as to indicate an attitude of genuineness and purity that is opposed to malice and wickedness. The precise linguistic combination 'to do truth' is not found in the New Testament, although Gal 5:7, where ἀλήθεια is the direct object of the verb πείθω ("to obey"), may approximate John's use.

In that the phrase, 'to do the truth,' signifies commitment of life, its use in the *Rule* is very similar to the Johannine use. However, in the Gospel, the emphasis is not on conformity to an interpreted Law and the avoidance of those outside of the community, but rather on the outward expression of an inward conversion. And even while 'truth' functions as a medium of purification and sanctification in both documents (cf. John 17:17; 1QS 4.20–21),[27] thus empowering its members to live in accordance with the standards required by God, the concept of deliverance from sin by truth is absent in the Qumran community. Brown points out that "[i]t is not said that truth frees from sin but that it destroys sin."[28] This is in contrast to John 8:32, where ἀλήθεια clearly plays a liberating role with regard to spiritual deliverance from sin.

'Truth' as a Sphere of Operation for Worship

Ἀλήθεια in John also specifies the sphere of operation in which believers are to function for worship, which sphere is opposed to the world. Within this sphere, the attitudes that characterize one's approach to the worship of God are also included. These are grounded in one's knowledge of the ultimate revelation that has come in and through Jesus Christ, who is represented by John as the replacement of the temple and the new locus of worship. This is expressed in a qualificational-character-manner and setting-place semantic relationship (esp. 4:23–24). While the linguistic combination 'worship in spirit and truth' does not occur in the Qumran literature, there is nevertheless a close relationship between John and Qumran with regard to worship. Brown writes,

> Schnackenburg, "Anbetung," has shown how the close connection between spirit and truth in the Qumran writings offers some interesting parallels to John's thought. At Qumran in an eschatological context God pours forth His spirit on the sectarians and thus purifies them for His service. This spirit is the spirit of truth in the sense that it instructs the sectarians in divine knowledge, that is, the observance of the Law insisted on at Qumran (1 QS iv 19–22). The purity thus obtained turns the community into the temple of God, 'a house of holiness for Israel, and assembly of the Holy of Holies for Aaron' (viii 5–6, ix 3–5). We may well have here the background making intelligible Jesus' remarks about worship in Spirit and truth replacing worship at the Temple.[29]

The involvement of the Spirit in worship is clearly emphasized in both documents. A second similarity with regard to worship is found in the expectations

regarding the temple. Like the prophets before them, the Qumranites were dissatisfied with temple practices and looked forward to a replacement temple, an expected eschatological temple that would satisfy their standards of purity.[30] This expectation is also expressed in the Gospel. However, while the expectation in the *Rule* is of another physical temple, the Gospel points to Jesus himself as the spiritual replacement. Nevertheless, there is a sense in which the temple may have been regarded by the Qumranites as spiritual (present in the community itself) as well as physical (a future reality).[31] Both the Gospel and the *Rule* therefore recognize that the temple extends beyond physical realities. The crucial difference is that in the Gospel, this reality is found in the person of Christ and not the community of believers. In addition, while worship in the Qumran community involved ritual purity, this requirement is absent in John and so there are some obvious differences.[32]

The Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint also use אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια to define a sphere of operation with relation to worship. The Psalms frequently urge worship that is in sincerity and truth. This is indicative of the manner of worship and reflects that which is sincere, whole hearted, genuine and without guile. In a number of contexts, the Jewish writings of the Second Temple period use אֱמֶת/ ἀλήθεια to refer to a sphere of operation of worship that is genuine and sincere, and that is opposed to all spurious, inauthentic, false and fake forms. Similarly, in early Christian writings, believers are urged to celebrate the festival in 'sincerity and truth,' which refers to an attitude of genuineness and purity that is explicitly opposed to malice and wickedness. Thus, John appears to go beyond this under-standing of worship. Even given the obvious differences with Qumran noted above, his use of the phrase 'in spirit and truth' more closely approximates the Qumran understanding of the presence and function of the Spirit in worship.

'Truth' as a Sphere of Belonging

Ἀλήθεια in John also refers to a sphere of belonging that is opposed to the world, with the world being understood as that which is hostile to God. It is also a quality that is found within those that belong to God, a quality that constitutes a core characteristic of their nature (cf. 1 John 1:8; 2:4) and that is by definition absent in the devil. In the *Rule,* members of the Qumran community are referred to as 'sons of truth' and 'sons of righteousness' (in opposition to 'sons' or 'men of perversity'), signifying not only the character of the community, but more so that they belong to the realm of divine truth. The phrase 'witnesses of truth' identifies the members of the community as those who display a wholehearted devotion to the truth (cf. 1QS 8.6). The emphasis is on the content of witnessing, the divine truth upon which the community is founded, namely the Law.[33] אמת and יחד (community) also frequently occur together in a relationship that is indicative of the covenant relationship between the community and God.[34] The

linguistic combination (frequently a genitive relationship) points to a sphere of belonging that is characterized by divine truth. The phrases מוסד אמת ("foundation of truth") and בית האמת בישראל ("house of truth in Israel") further clarify this (cf. 5.5, 6). While these precise linguistic combinations are not found in the Gospel, the characteristically Semitic phrase used by John, ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, is particularly significant (cf. 1 John 1:6) and expresses the same idea of belonging. In Semitic thought, it conveys morally good action done according to God's will.[35]

אֱמֶת/ἀλήθεια in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint, as well as in Jewish writings of the Second Temple period, is also used to refer to a sphere of belonging in which God reigns. In early Christian literature, ἀλήθεια is used to refer to the church, thus defining the church as belonging to that sphere or realm in which God reigns. All the literature surveyed reveals that while the notion of a sphere of belonging is common, the construction ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας is itself characteristically Johannine.[36]

'Truth' as an Aspect of Pneumatology

Ἀλήθεια in John is used with reference to qualities inherent in the Holy Spirit (cf. 14:17; 15:26; 16:13).[37] In the Gospel, the Spirit of truth functions in a number of ways. He is the 'truthful spirit,' conveying only that which conforms to truth, thus disclosing prior teaching given by Jesus, illuminating it and making it understandable to the disciples (14:17). He also bears witness to the truth, namely the truth which Jesus is (15:26). The verbs ἐλέγχω (16:8) and ὁδηγέω (16:13) communicate his role with regard to the conviction of the world (with respect to sin, righteousness and judgment), and his role of leading the disciples (with regard to the ultimate truth concerning Jesus), thus aiding them in the work of testifying in Jesus' behalf. He therefore communicates ultimate revelation from God. The spirit of truth in the *Rule* appears to play somewhat similar roles. As a defining term, אמת in the *Rule* is used to describe רוח האמת (the "spirit of truth"), who instructs and cleanses the members of the community (cf. 1 QS 3.18–19; 4.21, 23). This instruction and guidance entails a gradual unveiling. This phrase is also found in one text of the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* (*T. Jud.* 20:1, 5) where it reflects the Two Ways Tradition. What is significant about this reference is that the role of the 'spirit of truth' is that of testifying as well as accusing individuals.

Davies points out that although the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint use the phrases 'God of truth' (cf. Ps 31:5 [LXX]; Est 4:40), 'λόγος of truth' (cf. Ps 119:43, 160 [LXX]), Spirit of God (cf. Gen 1:2; 8:1; 41:38; Num 23:6; 24:2; I Kgs 10:10), the Spirit of the Lord (cf. Judg 3:10; 6:34; 11:29; Wis 1:7; Mic 3:8), the divine Spirit of Wisdom (cf. Exod 31:3; 35:31; Wis 1:6; 7:7), the Spirit of life (cf. Gen 6:17; 7:15; Ezek 10:17) and even associates spirit and truth (Num 24:2–3 and Isa 42:1–3), the phrase 'spirit of truth' is itself absent.[38] The fact that this linguistic combination is not found in the Hebrew Old Testament and Septuagint

(and in other portions of the New Testament) is striking, particularly given John's rather developed use of this phrase.

In terms of the activity of the S/spirit of truth, both the *Rule* and John's Gospel show a clear parallel. In addition, the linguistic combination is strikingly similar. In both texts, the S/spirit of truth has the role of helping the members of the community and also plays a forensic role. Lincoln objects to a hypothesis that links the two on the basis that whereas the two spirits reflect the good and evil inclinations in human beings, the Spirit in this context is clearly the Spirit of God, who is not conceived of as already being within humans.[39] While he is largely accurate, his last point is diluted by the fact that John speaks of a future time when the Spirit would be found in believers (cf. 14:16–17). Moreover, as Price observes, "[t]he only certain, pre-Christian parallel to this assignment of forensic activity to 'the Spirit of Truth' is found in the Qumran documents," consequently "the Qumran complex of ideas which defines the Spirit both as a God-appointed, cosmic-defender and advocate, and as a witness within certain men to 'the truth' (a spirit which opposes the spirit of deceit in the sons of darkness) affords a particularly close analogy to the forensic activities of John's *parakletos.*"[40]

Charlesworth suggests that in the dualistic treaty of 1QS 3.13–4.26 the four shared linguistic formulae, two of which are particularly relevant for this work, suggest a strong correlation between John and the Qumran text: spirit of truth, Holy Spirit (or spirit of holiness in the *Rule*), sons of light, and eternal life.[41] These formulae are strikingly similar to the Qumran use. On the other hand, even given the similar linguistic combination, 'spirit of truth,' Davies argues that both the Qumran community and John independently developed the meaning for this phrase from Scripture. She suggests that for the Qumran community, the spirit of truth has the role of enabling members of the community to live upright and holy lives in accordance with the Law. In this context, אמת in this phrase therefore signifies fidelity, which she sees as the primary use in the Old Testament Scriptures. With regard to the Gospel, she argues that John envisioned Jesus as "the revealer of the true way for people to live" and for this reason identified him with Truth (cf. John 14:6), "so that his Spirit, another Paraclete, is described as the Spirit of Truth."[42] While this may be a plausible explanation, it is also possible that the source for this terminology is to be found in the religious milieu of the time. This is bolstered by the fact that while the expression 'spirit of truth' is absent in the Old Testament and Septuagint, it was not uncommon in the context of first-century Judaism, where it was frequently understood in its antithetical relationship to the 'spirit of perversity.' These two spirits were understood as two conflicting 'inclinations' in every human being. Interestingly, this dualistic force is absent in John.[43]

Therefore, with regard to the use of 'truth' as linked to the Holy Spirit in a totally new manner, the *Rule* proves useful. At the very least, this linguistic combination, and the similarities in the roles of the two S/spirits in both documents, shows that a particular way of understanding 'truth' was already present by the

time John wrote his Gospel. However, because of the revelatory Christ event, John expanded his use of 'truth' to reflect both Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit. Even given the similarities, one should not infer that John's understanding of the Spirit's work was directly influenced by the ideas expressed in the Qumran dualistic teaching. Rather, it may be that these ideas provided him with congenial modes of expression.[44] Indeed, a significant difference between the S/spirits in the Gospel and the *Rule* is that whereas the Qumranic terms 'angel,' 'Prince of lights' and 'spirit of truth' all point to one angelic being, John distinguishes between Jesus, who is the truth incarnate, and the Holy Spirit, who comes after him.[45] In addition, unlike the Gospel, the spirit of truth in the *Rule* is always understood in terms of his juxtaposition to רוח העול ("spirit of injustice/perversity /deceit"), who produces corruption, sins, iniquities, guilt and offensive deeds in mankind.[46] Moreover, one must keep in mind that John's portrayal of the Holy Spirit also has distinctive emphases. The most important of these is that the 'truth' in which the Spirit leads the disciples is not the interpreted Law as in Qumran, but Jesus Christ himself.

'Truth' as That Which is Embodied in Jesus Christ

Ἀλήθεια in John is also used to indicate that which is both tangible and personal, embodied in Christ himself. Particularly important for the discussion in this work is the representation of Jesus as the truth (14:6) and as characterized by truth (1:14), and the continuation of his work after his death being carried out by the Spirit of truth (14:17; 26). In these contexts, the sense of ἀλήθεια is identical to that of 1:17, namely that of the ultimate, true revelation of God in Christ, who is not only a purveyor of truth, but the manifestation of truth itself. Because of their awareness of their respective ideological positions, both corpora tended to emphasize truth terminology. However, the understanding of 'truth' as embodied in a person is not a use that is found in the *Rule*. The Fourth Evangelist clearly recognized a new dimension to truth with the notion that Christ is embodied truth (John 14:6).

Conclusion

In conclusion, both John's Gospel and the *Rule* use truth terminology in ways that reflect certain differences with regard to their respective theologies but also striking similarities with respect to linguistic combinations and certain uses. In both documents, 'truth' is used to mean 'reality.' However, in the Gospel it carries the additional nuance of ultimate reality, a nuance that is understandably absent in the *Rule*. 'Truth' is also used in the sense of faithfulness or reliability, particularly in relation to the character of God. This has a deeper meaning for

John, who understands God's faithfulness in terms of the sending of his son, Jesus Christ. The more ordinary use of conformity to fact is evident in both documents. In John it is opposed to falsehood, whereas in the *Rule* it is primarily opposed to injustice/perversity/ deceit.

The figurative meanings in both documents have several nuances as noted above. In some instances in the Gospel it is used as metonymy for the ultimate revelation that has come in Christ. Both documents employ the personification of 'truth' but the function performed by personified 'truth' in both instances is different. Both documents also use 'truth' dualistically, effectively incorporating the metaphorical use of light and darkness. Of significance is their appropriation of a similar dualistic paradigm.

With regard to the referents in different contexts, there is overlap but there are also significant differences. In both documents, 'truth' refers to divine revelation; however, in the *Rule* this is the Law and its interpretation, whereas in John it refers to Jesus Christ himself as well as the Gospel he brings. In addition, 'truth' also refers to a sphere of operation for sanctification. What is significant is that the rare linguistic combination 'to do the truth' is found in both documents. This phrase conveys a commitment of life that is evidenced in outward action. However, while the Gospel attributes this to an inward conversion, the *Rule* explains it on the basis of conformity to the Law and its interpretation. In both the Gospel and the *Rule,* 'truth' refers to a sphere of operation of worship that conforms to God's character and that is impacted by the Spirit. Although the emphasis in the Gospel is on the new locus and manner of worship that Christ inaugurates, there is nonetheless an increased emphasis on the role of the Spirit in both documents. 'Truth' in both John and the *Rule* also refers to a sphere of belonging, namely that of divine truth. For the former, participation in this sphere is made possible by belief in Christ; for the latter, it is by acceptance into the community through renewal of the covenant. Both documents also use 'truth' as a defining term for the S/spirit. The terminology 'S/spirit of truth' is common to both and the roles in both documents are largely similar, encompassing both ordinary and forensic uses. Unlike the *Rule,* however, the 'truth' that the Spirit leads the disciples into is not the interpreted Law, but Jesus Christ himself. John also makes a clear distinction between Jesus, who is the truth incarnate, and the Holy Spirit, who comes after him to continue his work. Finally, and most significantly, only in the Gospel do 'truth' and the metaphorical use of light refer to that which is both tangible and personal, embodied in a person, namely Jesus Christ himself.

Notes

1. These categories are based on the Ogden and Richards triangle, which distinguishes between symbol, sense and referent. Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 95–96; cf. Silva, *Biblical Words* (1983), 103.

2. These categories of figurative meaning are from Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral,* 124–30.

3. Charlesworth, "Dualism in 1QS," 103.

4. An argument for Exodus 34:5–7 as the source of the linguistic combination, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας and ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια (cf. John 1:14, 17), has been forwarded in chapter 2.

5. Charlesworth, "Dualism in 1QS," 100, 119. Although note Bauckham's objections below. He also points out that in Qumran's *Thanksgiving Hymns* God is described "as perfect light" (QH 4.23) which can be compared to "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (cf. 1 John 1:5).

6. Hence 'sons of light' (cf. Jn 12:36; a similar expression in 1 QS 3:13, 24, 25), are those who receive eternal life by virtue of placing their faith in Jesus. This expression, and τέκνα θεοῦ ("children of God") from the Prologue (1:9–13) are synonymous.

7. Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 97.

8. Leaney, *Rule of Qumran*, 43–46.

9. Aune, "Dualism," 289.

10. Bauckham's view is that there is no case for Qumran influence on John, or even a particular historical connection. See his article for a fuller discussion. Richard Bauckham, "The Qumran Community" 111 ; "Qumran and the Fourth Gospel: Is There a Connection?" in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 267–79.

11. Davies, *Rhetoric,* 92.

12. Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language," 3:132–33, identifies the following shared vocabulary: in the light of life (1QS 3.7)/the light of life (8:12); and they shall walk in the ways of darkness (1QS 3.21; cf. 4.11)/and who shall walk in the darkness (12:35; cf. 8:12); the furious wrath of the God of vengeance (1QS 4.2–3)/the wrath of God (3:36); blindness of eyes (1QS 4.11)/the eyes of the blind (10:21); in the fullness of his grace (1QS 4.4; cf. 4.5)/full of grace (1:14); the works of God (1QS 4.4)/the works of God (6:28; 9:3). However, one should not assume that Charlesworth is saying that the Gospel of John is virtually a Qumran composition. He states clearly with regard to his conception of how these similarities came about that Johannine dualism was not unreflectively borrowed from the Qumranites, but incorporated into the Gospel of John via the "prismatic Christian kerygma." See also Moody Smith on this similar dualistic theological vocabulary. Moody Smith, *Theology of the Gospel of John*, 16.

13. Barrera, "The Essenes of Qumran," 214.

14. Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism," 3:118, 133, argues that "[t]hroughout the ancient world we do obviously find a dualistic use of 'light' and 'darkness'; but only at Qumran is it raised to the level of a paradigm with *termini technici*. Only in Zurvanism, Qumran's *Rule*, and in the Fourth Gospel do we find the *paradigm* and its *termini technici*. And in the Fourth Gospel this paradigm is assumed

and not created. Thus the paradigm must antedate the Fourth Gospel." He concludes that Qumran dualism and its technical terms "shape the *mentalité*–though not the *esprit*–of the Fourth Gospel."

15. Metso, *Textual Development,* 138.

16. Köstenberger, *John*, 387.

17. VanderKam and Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls,* 262, also note that while angelic association with the nations is not new to the Hebrew Scriptures (Deut 32:9–8; Dan 10:10–14), the concept of them ruling over two classes of people is not attested.

18. Aune, "Dualism," 300.

19. Ladd, *Theology of the New Testament*, 271.

20. In addition, God's Torah is sometimes referred to as דְּבַר־אֱמֶת/λόγον ἀληθείας ("word of truth") or even כְּבָב אֱמֶת/ἀπογραφῇ ἀληθείας ("book/writing/record of truth").

21. Schnackenburg, *John*, 2:236.

22. Brown, *John*, 1:500, concludes that "[t]he equation of truth with wisdom and mysteries means that in the Semitic background of the NT there is a strain where truth refers to heavenly reality as does wisdom. We need not go beyond this Semitic background to find truth used in reference to God's plan of salvation which is revealed to men."

23. There is an entire section in the *Rule* that is dedicated to outlining the code of conduct for the community. With regard to interpersonal relationships, אמת is used to describe the manner in which one ought to rebuke fellow members. In its legal context, it carries the sense of 'sincerely,' and 'in accordance with the facts as they stand' (cf. 5.25).

24. A similar concept is found in the expression 'to walk in the truth' in the epistles (cf. 2 Jn 2:4; 3 Jn 3, 4) and in the *Rule* (cf. 1.25b–26a).

25. Michaels, *John*, 62.

26. Other negative characteristics to which אמת is frequently held to be in opposition include sinful actions and transgressions.

27. However, for the community, it is not only 'truth' that plays a purifying role, but the community itself as well. The phrases מוסד אמת ("foundation of truth") and בית האמת בישראל ("house of truth in Israel"; cf. 5.5, 6) identify this community as a cleansing or purifying community that effects atonement for Israel.

28. Brown, *John,* 1: 355.

29. Brown, *John,* 1:181.

30. K. A. Mathews, "John, Jesus and the Essenes: Trouble at the Temple," *CTR* 3/1 (1988):101–126, points out that Jewish literature of this period reflects a general dissatisfaction with the state of the Temple.

31. This both/and position is ably defended by G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in the Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985).

32. See Brown, *John,* 1:181. Matthews, "John, Jesus and the Essenes," 101, rightly points out that the term 'temple cleansing' is better avoided because it suggests actual purification rites.

33. In the text of Prov 14:25, 'witness of truth' is understood in the context of direct juxtaposition to false witness and therefore truth in this context is understood as opposed to lies or falsehood. In some cases, God is referred to as a witness of the truth (cf. *J.W.* 1:595).

34. They are also referred to as אנשי בריתם (men of the covenant).

35. Schnackenburg, *John,* 1: 407.

36. Ibid., 2: 227.

37. In terms of paradigmatic relations, ὁ παράκλητος ("paraclete") and τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ("spirit of truth"), refer to the same thing, namely the Holy Spirit.

38. Davies, *Rhetoric*, 91.

39. Lincoln, *John,* 95.

40. James L. Price, "Qumran and Johannine Theology," in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth ; NY: Crossroads, 1991), 23–24.

41. Charlesworth, "Dualism in 1QS," 98–100, rightly argues that there is no parallel in John's Gospel to the 'spirit of perversity.' However, the clear reference to τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης ("spirit of error/delusion/deception") in the epistle (cf. 1 John 4:6) must be considered when discussing use in the Gospel and connections with the *Rule*.

42. Davies, *Rhetoric,* 91. Unfortunately, she appears to limit the use of 'truth' in this context to fidelity, which is unnecessary and probably not accurate in this context.

43. Carson, *John*, 500.

44. Price, "Qumran and Johannine Theology," 24.

45. With regard to the spirit of truth, Cross, *Ancient Library*, 153, points out that, "[i]n the Qumran *Rule* the Spirit of Truth has a 'greater distance' from God; the hypostasized Spirit of God has become largely identified with an angelic creature, the spirit *from* God, and their functions combined" (emphasis original). See also F. F. Bruce, "Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts," *ALUOS* 6 (1966-68):49–55.

46. Cf. 'spirit of truth' found in direct juxtaposition to the 'spirit of deceit' (*T. Jud.* 20:1–4).

6

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this work was to demonstrate that certain linguistic parallels exist between the Gospel of John and the sectarian Qumran document, the *Rule,* which may provide linguistic clues that illuminate our understanding of how the author of the Fourth Gospel used truth terminology and expected it to be understood. This was achieved by investigating the degree of semantic continuity in their respective uses of truth terminology. A corollary question that was investigated was whether this continuity should be attributed merely to a general shared milieu or to a common dependence on a shared tradition as well as knowledge of the terminology found in the linguistic matrix of the Qumran literature.

The findings reveal a marked emphasis in the two documents in terms of characteristic terminology and dominant imagery related to 'truth.' Even while the similarities need not be overstated, the evidence shows that there is an observable degree of semantic continuity with regard to truth terminology in these two documents. This having been said, in many contexts noted above, the similarities may also be attributed to a development of the common tradition shared by both the Gospel and the Qumran literature. Considering that John's primary conceptual background was the Old Testament and Septuagint, to which he frequently referred whether directly or in allusion, it is likely that these were a primary resource for his terminology.

However, the results of the previous chapter indicate that there are instances where the linguistic combinations and use of truth terminology in the Gospel cannot be adequately explained by this common tradition or even the early Christian writings as represented in the New Testament. While the influence of ideology must be taken into consideration,[1] the close similarities with the *Rule* make it likely that the author of the Fourth Gospel was familiar with the mode of thought and terminology represented in the Qumran literature. It is also likely that he followed this in articulating his ideas in certain parts of his Gospel. One must account for the dualism, the formulae, and the literary expressions found in John's Gospel, which find a clear parallel in the Qumran literature. In such cases, explanations are to be sought in the current use of the term, in the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, and particularly the Qumran literature.

As noted in chapter 1, there is by no means a consensus in Qumran studies regarding the influence of the Scrolls on the Gospel of John. There is a

spectrum of views ranging from no influence whatsoever, to indirect influence, and finally to theories of direct influence. The first group consists of those, such as Bauckham, who find no influence or particular historical connection between John and the Qumran literature. For Bauckham, a number of factors argue against dependence. He notes that this contrast of light and darkness is the most obvious of dualisms observable in the natural world. In his view, arguing that a connection must be present because both John and the Qumran texts place a greater emphasis on this imagery is insufficient and proves little since both authors could have developed their use independently of each other. He also argues, in addition to the fact that the light/darkness imagery is prominent in other Jewish texts, that since the expression "sons of light" only appears once in John, it is not significant. Regarding the issue of dualism, he notes that at the basic level, Johannine dualism contrasts the "world above" and the "world below." He points out that the spatial imagery "from above" and "from below" (8:23) and "not from this world" and "from this world" (8:23; 18:36; cf. 15:19; 17:14, 16) is not found in the scrolls. The best parallels to these Johannine usages are in James (1:17, 27; 3:15, 17). For him, since James and the Johannine literature show no other similarities, the only answer is to be found in a common dependence on a Jewish terminology which does not seem to have been preserved in extant Jewish texts.[2] His point is well taken. However, these differences in the two corpora does not in itself prove that the evangelist did not borrow at least one mode of expression from the scrolls, while simultaneously developing his own unique terminology. In addition, positing a common dependence on Jewish texts that have not preserved similar expressions is unnecessary, particularly since the Qumran literature clearly evidences use of this terminology.

The second group comprises those who propose an indirect influence from the Qumran literature. Brown points out that "there is not a single quotation in John from any known DSS and in my judgment the parallels are not close enough to suggest a direct literary dependence of John upon the Qumran literature. Rather they suggest Johannine familiarity with the type of thought exhibited in the scrolls."[3] Brown's proposal is that at the root of the Johannine tradition, were Judean disciples of Jesus who had been disciples of John the Baptist. Since the place where John the Baptist bore witness was not far from the Qumran settlement, his disciples might well have been the corridor whereby influence from the Qumran literature came into Johannine thought. Brown suggests that there is a remote chance that John the Baptist grew up under the influence of the Qumran Essenes, or at least knew them, and vice versa.[4] It has been noted, in the preceding chapters, that some of this shared vocabulary is also evident in other Jewish literature. However, the observed occurrence of this shared vocabulary in other Jewish literature is not in itself significant enough to rule out a relationship between John and the *Rule*. Noting that both documents have a common root in the Old Testament, Brown points out that

The real question is whether the other occurrences give evidence of the emphasis that is shared by John and Qumran. For instance the OT has examples of moving from darkness to light (Isa 9:1, 42:6–7; 60:1–3), and references to light as something spiritually good; Ps 27:1 says, "The Lord is my light." But the OT does not portray a world consisting of children of light and children of darkness that is a *major factor* in the theology of Qumran and of John. Both Qumran and John have roots in the OT; but if these two literatures have capitalized on relatively insignificant OT terms and have developed them in much the same way, then we have significant parallels.[5]

However, unlike Brown, this work holds that the similarities with the *Rule* are too close to be attributed merely to an acquaintance with similar ideas circulating in the general Jewish religious milieu.

Finally, there are those who argue for a direct Qumran influence. A number of explanations for how this influence could have come about have been forwarded. For instance, Charlesworth documents five hypotheses held by those who believe that the Qumran literature has influenced the Fourth Gospel.[6]

1. John the baptizer had once been a member of the Qumran Community, Jesus was his disciple, and Jesus passed some of the unique Qumran terms on to his own disciples.
2. The Beloved Disciple, Jesus' intimate follower had been a disciple of the Baptizer who had been a member of the Qumran Community, and he influenced Jesus and some of his followers.
3. Jesus met Essenes on the outskirts of towns and cities in Galilee and Judea; he discussed theology with them and was influenced by some of their ideas and terms.
4. Essenes lived in Jerusalem (or Ephesus) near the Johannine community and influenced the development of Johannine theology.
5. Essenes became followers of Jesus and lived in the Johannine School, shaping the dualism, pneumatology, and technical terms found in the Fourth Gospel. This could have happened in numerous places, including Jerusalem.

In his opinion, all the above are possible and it is likely that "*the influence in the Fourth Gospel may come from all levels, and in an increasing dimension, as one moves from the first to the fifth hypothesis*."[7] He reiterates his conviction that while John did not borrow from the Qumran theology, he did borrow his dualism and its accompanying technical terminology. Conceding that the zeitgeist in Jerusalem, after Herod was shaped by Essene theology and terminology, and hence this may account for some of the influence on the Fourth Gospel, he nevertheless argues that "the degree to which the Fourth Evangelist seems to know the Essene paradigm for an explanation of evil and sinning suggests that he was somehow directly influenced by Essene thought."[8] This unique system of thought, the dualistic paradigm and its termini technici, and not just the general thought and the terms, is clearly reflected in the Fourth Gospel. For Charlesworth, the

similarities are an indication that the evangelist inherited this as a technical term from the Essenes. Charlesworth rightly observes that while John probably did not copy from the Rule, he was probably strongly influenced by its particular expressions and terminology, conveyed within a particular paradigm.[9]

The geographical proximity of the site at Qumran as well as the fact that the Qumran literature antedates John's Gospel increases the possibility that he may have been aware of it, or at the very least, the ideas represented in this body of literature. The fragment from cave 4 noted above (4Q502) does raise the question as to how widely disseminated the dualistic doctrine of the two spirits was. It is also possible that the ideas contained in the library at Qumran were in wider circulation than originally proposed and hence were not the exclusive property of the community living there. The implication therefore, is that the author of the Fourth Gospel may well have been exposed to these ideas, whether in Jerusalem or Ephesus. Moreover, the close semantic similarities, particularly with the *Rule,* make it likely that he was familiar with their mode of thought and followed their model in articulating his ideas in certain parts of his Gospel. The position of this work is that while this does not require a direct literary dependence on the scrolls, the close semantic continuity calls for a closer familiarity with their ideas and terminology than would be provided for merely by a shared milieu.

This is not to say that these documents are virtually identical in their use of truth terminology. In addition to the similarities, one finds some expected differences, particularly with regard to referents. However, concluding that there is no relationship between the two documents on these grounds would be an oversimplification.[10] After all, one is a Christian document and the other is not. John was significantly impacted by the Christ-event and his post-resurrection narration of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ is naturally reflected in his theological reflections on certain aspects of 'truth.'

Following Frye's scheme, which suggests that only influences established at the terminological level are considered legitimate basis for borrowing, it seems certain that the terminological links point to some kind of direct relationship.[11] However, as pointed out in the first chapter, it is not the intention of this work to attempt to definitively define the nature of the relationship between these two corpora, particularly given the obvious link with biblical and post-biblical traditions for both and the difficulty in establishing an undisputed theory of a relationship between the two. Consequently, going beyond this to postulate more specifically how this influence came about is going beyond the boundaries defined by the evidence of the respective texts and results in hypothetical reconstructions that cannot be verified.

In conclusion, it seems likely that the semantic continuity between the Gospel and the Rule *is to be attributed not just to a common dependence on a shared tradition, but to a probable knowledge of the terminology found in the linguistic matrix of the Qumran literature.* Hence, while one impact of the *Rule* is that it emphasizes the Palestinian background behind the Gospel of John, a further

contribution is that it proves to be a valuable and valid linguistic resource for the study of truth terminology as employed in this Gospel. The following section will provide a discussion of the implications of the conclusions drawn for the study of the Gospel of John with regard to its interpretation.

Implications for the Interpretation of the Gospel

These conclusions have implications for reading and understanding the Fourth Gospel. Use of extra-biblical resources to establish what a particular biblical text says is a particularly dangerous venture. One must be cautious not to assume that the extra-biblical text provides the definitive word on the biblical meaning. Moreover, one must remember that the extra-biblical resource is not inspired Scripture and therefore can never be an authoritative source for Christian faith and life. This caution is particularly applicable to the Qumran literature, which has a demonstrated similarity to some biblical texts in terms of ideas, symbolism and terminology. Nevertheless, when one understands that the general socio-religious context out of which these texts arose shares many similarities with the context that gave rise to Christianity and its Scripture, it is clear that these texts provide valuable background material for analyzing the biblical texts. All too often Christians study the Bible in a vacuum, little realizing that it did not develop in isolation from other literature of the time. The authors of the biblical texts were impacted by the environment in which they lived. The language in which they expressed what today constitutes Scripture was the language of the day. An exposure to different texts written in the period just prior to and during New Testament times is of invaluable help to anyone wishing to gain an accurate understanding of the Bible. The Fourth Gospel is no exception.

The first area that is impacted by a study of the *Rule* relates specifically to the topic under study. Because certain linguistic combinations are so well represented in the *Rule,* 'truth' can be extensively analyzed within its linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts. The historical, linguistic, religious and socio-cultural proximity to the Gospel's own context allows the interpreter to use these findings as a legitimate starting point for the analysis of 'truth' in the Gospel. That is, the results of the study of 'truth' in the *Rule* provide the interpreter with a semantic range within which he can compare his/her findings from the Gospel. This is particularly useful for two expressions in the Gospel.

The first expression is found in John 3:21 (cf. 1 John 1:6) in the relative clause ὁ ποιῶν ἀλήθειαν ("the one who does truth"). An accurate understanding of this rare linguistic combination in the Gospel is enhanced by a study of its use in the *Rule*. The analysis of this phrase revealed that it is a typically Semitic expression that means 'to act faithfully' or 'to act honorably,' with the understanding that this is only possible through belief in Christ. The expressed contrast with ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων (cf. Rev 22:15) also indicated that ἀλήθεια goes beyond a mere practice

of morality—it reveals that one is of God through saving faith in his Son, as appropriated through the spiritual rebirth and eternal life that he offers. It was observed in the previous chapter that in both contexts, the typically Semitic expression 'to do, practice or achieve the truth' (ὁ ποιῶν ἀλήθειαν, אמת לעשות) is expressed in a strikingly similar linguistic combination. This combination occurs frequently in the Qumran literature where 'truth' generally occurs in combination with other moral qualities and is used with reference to the conduct expected of a member of the covenant community. As in the Gospel, there is the explicit contrast with negative traits such as walking in stubbornness, evil, and wickedness. Hence, אמת, not as an abstract concept, but as a characteristic that demonstrated itself in outward, visible action, was required by God and constituted the norm of behavior in the covenant community. This standard could be achieved only with the help of God and his spirit of truth. Although the motivation in the two documents is different (obedience to the Law vs. inner transformation), the rare phrase 'doing the truth,' that is found in both documents, conveys a commitment of life that is grounded in a close relationship with God and evidenced in outward action.

The second is the expression τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ("the Spirit of truth") found in the Farewell Discourse (cf. 14:17; 15:26; 16:13). A study of the *Rule* is useful in this area in that it presents the S/spirit of truth in similar contexts. It therefore functions as an invaluable comparative text for the Gospel, clarifying "new" roles and functions of the Spirit. The terminology is common to both documents, and while it is possible that the source of this terminology is to be found in the religious milieu of the time, it is significant that the roles in both documents are largely similar, encompassing both ordinary and forensic use.

The forensic role of the Spirit is clarified by comparisons with the *Rule*. For instance, in the discussion of John 15:26, it was noted that the genitive could either be understood as "the Spirit who communicates truth" or "the Spirit who bears witness to the truth, namely the truth which Jesus is." The conclusion arrived at was that while both are appropriate, the legal context prevalent in this section suggests that the latter communicates the role of the Spirit in a more accurate manner. It was observed in the previous chapter that within the Qumran conception of the role of the Spirit is the idea of the Spirit as God-appointed, as an advocate and as a witness to the truth. This evidence from the *Rule* shows that there are close affinities with the forensic activities of the Spirit in the Gospel.[12] Naturally, the use in the *Rule* is not what ultimately determines the use in the Gospel—after all, the 'truth' in the case of the Gospel in this particular context is understood in its ultimate sense as revealed and embodied in Christ. However, the fact that this same linguistic combination, as well as the role of the Spirit of truth as a witness to truth, was already represented in Jewish literature predating John provides valuable background data. At the very least, this linguistic combination, and the similarities in roles in both documents, shows that a particular way of understanding 'truth' in relation to the Spirit was already present by the

time John wrote his Gospel. Consequently, it is valid to conclude that the Spirit of truth has the forensic role of one who bears witness to the truth, a function that has already been identified within a Jewish context. Here, the *Rule* aids in bolstering interpretive decisions.

The *Rule* also proves useful in analyzing certain problematic phrases in the Gospel, for instance ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ ("in S/spirit and Truth"; cf. John 4:23–24). As noted above, there is disagreement on exactly what this phrase means. The analysis of this phrase revealed that καί has an epexegetical or explicative use, in which case it is understood as "in Spirit, that is, in truth." This is indicative both of the sphere in which worship occurs, as well as the attitudes that characterize one's approach to the worship of God. While this phrase is absent in the *Rule*, the *Rule* nevertheless proves useful in that it reflects a religious context that links worship and the Spirit closely together. In his Gospel, John explains that the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit is inaugurated by Jesus Christ. Only with his departure can the permanent presence of the Holy Spirit become a reality in the lives of believers (cf. the Farewell Discourse). The Qumran community also held to the expectation of an eschatological outpouring of the Spirit that would purify them in readiness for their service to God. While the linguistic combination "worship in spirit and truth" does not occur in the Qumran literature, it is evident that the perspective towards worship in both documents nevertheless shares many similarities. Taking into account the shared religious milieu and the expectation in both documents of an outpouring of the Holy Spirit, one can legitimately conclude that at least one meaning of this linguistic combination points to worship that is inspired by the Spirit (whatever else the phrase might mean).

The implications extend even further afield, beyond the narrower topic of truth terminology. Given the semantic continuity between the *Rule* and the Gospel, the *Rule* proves to be a valuable resource in uncovering the sets of assumptions that characterize the socio-cultural and religious culture that both documents hold in common. This information is exceedingly valuable for the interpreter. For instance, the worldview expressed through the technical terminology John employs and the dualism that pervades his thinking is illuminated by a study of the *Rule*. Even a cursory reading of the Gospel reveals that the evangelist does not arbitrarily insert this characteristic terminology and dualistic pattern. His very worldview, expressed through the language he uses, displays a pattern that is inherently dualistic.[13] By this is meant that he thinks in terms of oppositions—a thinking that is itself a product of his background, but also significantly impacted by the Christ event. The plot itself is a conflict between belief and unbelief, and as it unfolds he uses key terms like light/darkness, from above/ from below, sons of light or of this world/not of this world, truth/falsehood, and judgment/salvation to express this conflict. There is also evidence of a horizontal dualism expressed in his already/not yet eschatology. Hence, given that these concepts run from the prologue to the epilogue, it is possible to speak of a dualism pervading the entire

Gospel of John. Whereas studies in the past emphasized a Gnostic background behind the dualism of the Fourth Gospel, recent studies have since found closer connections with the dualism that is characteristic of the Qumran literature, and in particular the *Rule*. The similarities clarify that John's dualism is rooted in a Palestinian Jewish background. An understanding of the dualism in the *Rule* therefore sheds light on its use in the Gospel.

The *Rule* also serves to further confirm the Jewishness of the thought behind the Gospel of John. For instance, there is the expectation in the *Rule* of an eschatological temple that transcends physical realities as well as the notion of the temple as being present in the community. Similarly, the Gospel also anticipates the replacement of the physical temple in the person of Jesus Christ. The *Rule* therefore provides evidence that the thought or expectation that the Temple extends beyond physical realities was not confined to the author of the Fourth Gospel, but formed an integral part of the religious beliefs of at least one Jewish sect.

In conclusion this work has shown that certain linguistic parallels exist between the Qumran document, the *Rule,* and the Gospel of John. The semantic continuity observed between the two documents is to be attributed first to a common dependence on a shared tradition. At the same time, it seems evident that the author of the Fourth Gospel was also exposed to the terminology found in the linguistic matrix of the Qumran literature. However, even while this terminology is similar to that of the Qumran sect, the Evangelist reshapes it by placing it in a context that distinguishes it from any other religious group of the time, Jewish or otherwise.

While these parallels are worth exploring if only to provide a better understanding of the cultural milieu that gave rise to the New Testament, the Qumran literature is surely of greater significance than this. This literature offers more than just a knowledge of Palestinian Judaism in the first century. This semantic continuity in the use of truth terminology identifies the *Rule* as a valid linguistic resource for the Gospel of John. The approach followed provides concrete linguistic evidence of Johannine dependence on some aspects of Qumranic modes of expression. Given that this is a specific case study that effectively reveals the linguistic connections between these two corpora, as well as the Qumran literature in general, this work establishes that other linguistic combinations and ideas represented in both corpora can be similarly studied. Linguistic use, interpretive decisions, use of symbolism, patterns of thought and so forth, can effectively be confirmed via a comparative study of the Qumran literature. Further study is therefore recommended.

Notes

1. With regard to the influence of ideology on the use of certain words in the non-biblical scrolls as compared to the Masoretic text, Elwolde notes with

regard to the greater frequency of light: "[t]he figure for אור 'light' (116) is accounted for in part by the frequent use of 'light' as a symbol of righteousness at Qumran, notably in the expression בני אור (14 times), but also in such phrases as בית האור 'house of light' (twice in 4QCrytpic [4Q186], גורל אור (and variants) 'lot of light' (six times, if reconstructions accepted), שערי אור 'gates of light' (three times in 4QPrQuot [4Q503]) etc." This ideological status of truth and light found at Qumran is also reflected in the Fourth Gospel. Elwolde, "From Bible to Mishnah," 36; Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 389, notes that while this symbolism of light and darkness is found occasionally in the Synoptics (cf. Mk. 13:24), its importance in John is evident from the outset. Note the identification of the *logos* with the light and Jesus' declaration that he is the light in 8:12, one of the "I Am" sayings.

2. Bauckham, "Qumran Community," 107–111, esp. 107.
3. Brown, *Introduction*, 142–43.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid., 142.
6. This information is reproduced from Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language," 151.
7. Ibid. (emphasis original).
8. So also Martin Hengel from discussions with Charlesworth. Ibid., 118.
9. For a more complete discussion of these shared formulae see Charlesworth, "Dualism in 1QS," 103. His disappointment with scholars such as Lindars (*John*, 1972, repr. 1995), who identified this similarity in the expression of the contrast between light and darkness, and the technical terminology employed in this paradigm, yet failed to make a direct connection with the *Rule,* proposing rather that these ideas were widespread and influential in Second Temple Judaism, is evident. He writes, "Barnabas Lindars rightly pointed out that the Qumran Scrolls, especially the *Rule,* contain 'the clearest expression of the contrast between light and the darkness, which is a central theme of John.' He offered the following conclusion: 'Some kind of influence of the sect on John seems inescapable.' This is superb scholarship; yet, it is disappointing to read his subsequent judgment that the Fourth Evangelist may have obtained this knowledge without any contact with Qumranites or Essenes, since Qumran's 'ideas were probably widespread and influential.'" Charlesworth, "Shared Symbolism and Language," 117–18.
10. Thus, Brown argues that although Teeple stresses that there are theological concepts and terms that are found often in Qumran literature but not in John, and vice versa, it is of little significance unless one is trying to show that the Qumran literature was the only and direct source of John's thought. Brown, *Introduction,* 142.
11. As pointed out in chapter 1, Frye, "Qumran and Iran," 167–73.
12. See Price, "Qumran and Johannine Theology," 23–24.
13. It should be noted that there are a number of ways of conceiving the dualism in John. For instance, Ashton identifies a dualism that is understood in terms

of content: a horizontal, spatial, moral/ethical opposition between those who belong the world and those who don't; the opposition between light and darkness (included in this is the contrast between truth and falsehood); and the opposition between life and death (with life being conceptually very close to salvation); and the dominant theme of judgment with its narrative counterpart trial. Ashton, *Understanding the Fourth Gospel*, 287–417.

APPENDIX

Semantic Relationships[1]

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Coordinate	Additive	Equivalent *John is stupid;* *he is dumb.*		
		Different (parallel or unfolding)	Consequential *John stopped reading and looked up.* Non-consequential *John was reading and Mary was sewing.*	
	Dyadic	Alternative (or) *John will do it or die in the attempt.*		
		Contrastive (but) *He came but did not stay.*		
		Comparative (than, as) *She is more intelligent than Jane.* *He did as fine a job as Bill did.*		
Subordinate		Substance	Content *He said he would go.* *He yelled, "Stop."* Generic-Specific *John travels a lot; each year he goes to the orient; he's in Europe each summer; and is not in South America.*	

Subordinate				
	Qualificational	Character	Characterization *Working for John is terrible.*	
			Manner *He came to town riding on a horse.*	
		Setting	Time *When he came, we left.*	
			Place *Being in the house, he noticed a strange noise.*	
			Circumstance *As Jim turned, Alice disappeared.*	
	Logical	Cause-Effect *John's leaving made Mary despondent.*		
		Reason-Result *Because John left, he did not see Mary.*		
		Means-Result *By coming, John saw Mary.*		
		Means-Purpose *John came in order to see Mary.*		
		Condition-Result *If John comes, he will see Mary.*		
		Basis-Inference *Since John came, he must have seen Mary.*		
		Concession-Result *Though John came, he did not see Mary.*		

1. Categories from E. A. Nida, *Exploring Semantic Structures* (Munchen: Fink, 1975), 50–65; *Style and Discourse: With Special Reference to the Text of the Greek New Testament* (ed. E. A. Nida et. al.; Cape Town: Bible Society, 1983, 1991), 102–103.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aalen, S. "'Truth,' A Key Word in St. John's Gospel." Edited by F. L. Cross. *Studia Evangelica* 2. Berlin: Akademie, 1964: 2–24.

Abegg, Martin G. Jr. *The Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts*. © 1999, 2000, 2001 (Bible Works 7).

Abegg, Martin G. Jr., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance.* Volume 1. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland, eds. *The Greek New Testament.* 4th rev. ed. United Bible Societies, 2001.

Albright, William F. "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John." Pages 153–71 in *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology.* Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

Alexander, T. Desmond, and Brian S. Rosner, eds. *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.

Allegro, John M. *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity Within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1970.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative.* New York: Basic Books, 1981.

Alter, Robert, and Frank Kermode, eds. *The Literary Guide to the Bible.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Ashton, John. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1991, 1993.

——. *Understanding the Fourth Gospel.* 2d. ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Aune, David E. "Dualism in the Fourth Gospel and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reassessment of the Problem." Pages 281–303 in *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen.* Edited by David E. Aune, Torrey Seland and Jarl Henning Ulrichsen. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 106. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

Austin, J. L. *How to do Things with Words.* 2d ed. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Ball, David Mark. *'I Am' in John's Gospel: Literary Function, Background and Theological Implications.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 124. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Barlan, John R. "'Truth' in John's Gospel." Th.M. thesis, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1971.

Barnett, Paul. *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. New International Commentary of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Barr, James. "Common Sense and Biblical Language." *Biblica* 49 (1968): 377–387.

——. "Etymology and the Old Testament." In *Language and Meaning: Studies in Hebrew Language and Biblical Exegesis, Papers read at the Joint British-Dutch OT Conf, London 1973*, 1–28. Oudtestamentische Studien 19. Leiden: Brill, 1974.

——. *The Semantics of Biblical Languages*. Glasgow: Oxford, 1961.

Barrett, Charles K. *The Gospel of John and Judaism*. Translated by D. Moody Smith. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

——. *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978.

——., ed. *The New Testament Background: Writings from Ancient Greece and the Roman Empire that Illuminate Christian Origins*. Rev. ed. San Fransisco: HarperSanFransisco, 1995.

Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

——. "The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John." Pages 105–115 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after their Discovery*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman, Emmanuel Tov, James C. VanderKam, and Galen Marquis. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society in cooperation with The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.

Bauer, W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 2d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.

Baumbach, Gunther. *Qumran und das Johannes-Evangelium*: *eine vergleichende Untersuchung der dualistischen Aussagen der Ordensregel von Qumran und des Johannes-Evangeliums mit Berücksichtigung der spätjüdischen Apokalypsen*. Aufsatze und Vortrage zur Theologie und Religionswissenschaft 6. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1958.

Baur, F. C. *Kritische Untersuchungen uber die kanonischen Evangelien*. Tübingen: Fues, 1847.

Beale, G. K. *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Beck, David. *The Discipleship Paradigm: Readers and Anonymous Characters in the Fourth Gospel*. Biblical Interpretation 27. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Beekman, John, and John Callow. *Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

Beekman, John, John Callow, and Michael Kopesec. *The Semantic Structure of Written Communication*. 5th rev. ed. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1981.

Best, Ernest. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians.* International Critical Commentary. New York: T. & T. Clark, 1998.

Betz, Otto. *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960.

Black, David Alan. *Linguistics for Students of New Testament Greek: A Survey of Basic Concepts and Applications.* 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995.

Blass Friedrich, and Debrunner Albert. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Edited and translated by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Blomberg, Craig L. *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001.

Bock, Darrel. *Acts.* Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

Borchert, Gerald L. *John 1–11.* Vol. 1. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1996, 2002.

Borgen, P. "The Logos was the True Light. Contributions to the Interpretation of the Prologue of John." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 115–130.

Boring, M. E. "The Influence of Christian Prophecy on the Johannine Portrayal of the Paraclete and Jesus." *New Testament Studies* 25 (1978): 113–123.

Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament.* 14 vols. Translated by John T. Willis. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Briggs, Richard S. "The Uses of Speech-Act Theory in Biblical Interpretation." *Currents in Research* 9 (2001): 229–276.

Broek, Reolof van den. "Gnosticism and Hermeticism in Antiquity: Two Roads to Salvation." Pages 1–20 in *Gnosticism and Hermeticism: From Antiquity to Modern Times.* Edited by Reolof van den Broek and Aouter J. Hanegraaff. SUNY Series in Western Esoteric Traditions. NY: State University of New York, 1998.

Brooke, G. J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in the Jewish Context.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.

Broshi, Magen. "Qumran and the Essenes: Purity and Pollution, Six Categories." *Restoration Quarterly* 87 (2006): 463–474.

Brouwer, Wayne. *The Literary Development of John 13–17: A Chiastic Reading.* Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 182. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

Brown, Colin, ed. *New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology.* 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.

Brown, Raymond E. "The Ego Eimi ('I am') Passages in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 117–126 in *A Companion to John.* Edited by Michael J. Taylor. New York: Alba House, 1977.

——. *The Gospel According to John*. 2 Vols. The Anchor Bible. Volume 29–29A. New York: Doubleday, 1966.

——. *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by F. J. Moloney. New York: Doubleday, 2003.

——. "The Paraclete in the Fourth Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1967): 113–132.

——. "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 17 (1955): 403–419, 559–574.

Brownlee, William Hugh. *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*. Bulletin of the American Schools of Research Supplement Series 10–12. Connecticut: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.

——. "Whence the Gospel According to John?" Pages 166–194 in *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. New York: Crossroad, 1991.

Bruce, Fredrick F. *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.

——. "Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts." *Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 (1966–68): 49–55.

——. "The Trial of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel." Pages 7–20 in *Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Vol. 1. Gospel Perspectives. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.

Brueggemann, Walter. *Exodus. The New Interpreter's Bible* 1. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.

Bruns, J. Edgar. *The Christian Buddhism of St. John: New Insights into the Fourth Gospel*. NY: Paulist Press, 1971.

Bultmann, Rudolph. *The Gospel of John*. Translated by G. R. Beasley-Murray. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Burge, Gary M. *Interpreting the Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.

——. *John*. New International Version Application Commentary. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000.

Burney, C. F. *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926.

Bush, L. Russ. "Knowing the Truth." *Faith and Mission* 11 (Spring 1994): 3–13.

Caird, G. B. *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Callow, Kathleen. *Man and Message: A Guide to Meaning-Based Text Analysis*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998.

Calvin, John. *Commentary on the Holy Gospel of Jesus Christ According to John*. Translated by Rev. William Pringle. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1848, 1999.

Carmignac, J. *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness*. Translated by Katharine Greeleaf Pedley. Baltimore: Helicon Press, 1962.

——. "Conjecture sur la première ligne de la Règle de la Communauté." *Revue de Qumran 2* (1959): 85–87.

Carson, D. A. *Exegetical Fallacies*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984.

——. *The Gospel According to John.* The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

——. "The Function of the Paraclete in John16:7–11." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98 (1979): 547–567.

Carson, D. A., and Douglas J. Moo. *An Introduction to the New Testament.* Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Carson, D. A., Peter O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid, eds. *Justification and Variegated Nomism.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2 vols. Grand Rapids, Baker, 2004.

Casselli, Stephen J. "Jesus as Eschatological Torah." *Trinity Journal* 18 NS (1997): 15–41.

Charles, R. H., trans. and ed. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.* London: Adam and Charles Black, 1908.

Charlesworth, James H. "Intertextuality: Isaiah 40:3 and the Serek Ha-Yahad." Pages 197–224 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by C. A. Evans and S. Talmon. Biblical Interpretation 28. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

——., ed. *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Princeton Symposium on Judaism and Christian Origins.* 3 vols. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.

——., ed. *John and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* NY: Crossroads, 1991.

——. ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

Charlesworth, James H., and Frank M. Cross, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with Translations.* The Princeton Theological Dead Sea Scrolls Project 1. Louisville: Westminster, 1994.

Collins, C. John. "John 4:23–24, 'In Spirit and Truth': An Idiomatic Proposal." *Presbyterion* 21/2 (1995): 118–21.

Conzelmann, Hans. *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament.* Translated by John Bowden. NY: Harper & Row, 1969.

Cotterell, Peter & Max Turner. *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation.* Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1989.

Cross, Frank Moore. *The Ancient Library of Qumran.* 3d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.

Culpepper, R. Alan. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

——. "What Makes John Unique?" Pages 18–26 in *The Gospel and the Letters of John.* Edited by R. Alan Culpepper. Interpreting Bible Texts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.

Culpepper, R. Alan, and C. Clifton Black, eds. *Exploring the Gospel of John.* Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1996.

Daise, Michael A. *Feasts in John: Jewish Festivals and Jesus' 'Hour' in the Fourth Gospel.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 229. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.

Daly-Denton, Margaret. *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms.* Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Danker, Frederick William, ed. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Davies, Margaret. *Rhetoric and Reference in the Fourth Gospel.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 63. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992, 69.

Davis, Charles Sidney. "The Hebrew root [omen] as background for [alethia] in the Fourth Gospel." Th.D. thesis, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1971.

De la Potterie, Ignace. "The Truth in Saint John." Pages 53–66 in *The Interpretation of John.* Ed. and trans. John Ashton. Issues in Religion and Theology 9. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.

De Saussure, Ferdinand. *Course in General Linguistics.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.

——. *Deuxième Cours de Linguistique General (1908–1909) : d'après les Cahiers d'Albert Riedlinger et Charles Patois.* Edited and translated by Eisuke Komatsu and George Wolf. Oxford: Pergamon, 1997.

——. *Premier Cours de Linguistique Generale (1907): D'après les Cahiers d'Albert Riedlinger.* Translated by George Wolf. New York: Pergamon, 1996.

——.*Troisième Cours de Linguistique Générale (1910–1911): D'après les Cahiers d'Emile Constantin*. Translated by Roy Harris. New York : Pergamon, 1993.

Deasley, Alex R. G. *The Shape of Qumran Theology.* Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000.

Dimant, Devorah, and Lawrence H. Schiffman, eds. *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran scrolls by fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Dodd, C. H. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1958.

Douglass, Caldwell Clifford. "The Meaning of Truth in the Fourth Gospel." Th.M. thesis, Union Theological Seminary, 1961.

Duke, Paul D. *Irony in the Fourth Gospel.* Atlanta: John Knox, 1985.

Dunn, James. *Romans 1–8.* Word Biblical Commentary 38A. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1988.

Dupont-Sommer, Andre. *Apercus Preliminaires sur les Manuscripts de la Mer Morte.* L'Orient Ancient Illustre 4. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950.

Durham, John I. *Exodus.* Word Biblical Commentary 3. Waco: Word, 1987.

Efird, James M., ed. *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1972.

Elder, Prentice Lloyd. "John's Concept of Truth in the Fourth Gospel and Epistles." Th.D. thesis, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1966.

Elledge, C. D. *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.

Ellis, Peter. "Understanding the Concentric Structure of the Fourth Gospel." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 47 (2003): 131–154.

Eslinger, Lyle. "The Wooing of the Woman at the Well: Jesus, the Reader and Reader Response Criticism." Pages 165–182 in *The Gospel of John as Literature: An Anthology of Twentieth Century Perspectives.* New Testament Tools and Studies 17. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Evans, Craig A. *Noncanonical Writings and New Testament Interpretation.* Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992.

——. *Word and Glory: On the Exegetical and Theological Background of John's Prologue.* Journal for the Society of the New Testament Supplement Series 89. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Evans Craig A., and Stanley E. Porter. *Dictionary of New Testament Background.* Downers Grove, ILL: Intervarsity, 2000.

Evans, Craig A. and W. Richard Stegner, eds. *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel.* England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Fitzmeyer, Joseph A. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

——. *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls.* New York: Paulist Press, 1992.

——. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Flusser, David. *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity.* Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988.

Fokkelman, J. P. *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide.* Louisville, KN: Westminster/John Knox, 1999.

Freed, Edwin. D. "Did John write the Gospel Partly to Win Samaritan Converts?" *Novum Testamentum* 12 (1970): 241–256.

——. "The Manner of Worship in John 4:23f." Pages 33–48 in *Search the Scriptures: New Testament Studies in Honor of Raymond T. Stamm.* Edited by J. M. Myers, O. Reimherr and H. N. Bream. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

Frei, Hans. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.

Frye, Richard. "Qumran and Iran: The State of Studies." Pages 167–173 in *Christianity, Judaism and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty.* Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. *Philosophical Hermeneutics.* Edited and translated by David E. Linge. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.

——. *Truth and Method.* Edited and translated by Garrett Barden and John Cumming. New York: Seabury Press, 1975.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew and Chaldee lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures.* Translated by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. *An Introduction to the New Testament.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937.

Green, Joel B., and Scott McKnight, eds. *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.

Green, Joel B., and Max Turner, eds. *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies & Systematic Theology.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Groothuis, Douglas. "The Biblical View of Truth Challenges Postmodernist Truth Decay." *Themelios* 26, no. 1 (Autumn 2000): 11–33.

Hanson, A.T. *The New Testament Interpretation of Scripture.* London: SPCK, 1980.

Harvey, A. E. *Jesus on Trial: A Study in the Fourth Gospel.* Atlanta: John Knox, 1977.

Hawkins, David J. "The Johannine Concept of Truth and its Implications." *Evangelical Quarterly* 59 (Jan 1987): 3–13.

Helyer, Larry R. *Exploring Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period: A Guide for New Testament Students.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2002.

Hengel, Martin. "Bishop Lightfoot and the Tübingen School on the Gospel of John and the Second Century." *Durham University Journal* 84 (January 1992): 23–51.

——. *Die johanneische Frage.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 67. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.

——. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine in the Early Hellenistic Period.* Translated by J. Bowden. 2 vols. London: SCM, 1974.

Hill, David. *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Hirsch, E. D. *The Aims of Interpretation.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

——. *Validity in Interpretation.* London: Yale University Press, 1967.

Hoehner, Harold. *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002.

Jeremias, Gert. *Der Lehrer der Gerchtigkeit.* Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testament. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.

Jonas, H. *The Gnostic Religion.* 2d ed. Boston: Beacon, 1963.

Käsemann, Ernst. *The Testament of Jesus: A Study of the Gospel of John in the Light of Chapter 17.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.

Kautzsch, E., ed. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.* Rev. A. E. Cowley. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.

Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary.* 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.

Kellum, L. Scott. *The Unity of the Farewell Discourse: The Literary Integrity of John 13:31–16:33.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 256. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2004.

Kittel, R., ed. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bebelgesellschaft, 1997.

Klein, William W., Craig L. Blomberg, and Robert L. Hubbard Jr. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation.* Rev. ed. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005.

Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community.* Cambridge: University Press, 1987.

Koester, H. "Gnostic Writings as Witnesses for the Development of the Sayings Tradition." Pages 238–246 in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism.* Edited by B. Layton. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1980.

——. *Introduction to the New Testament, V. 2: History and Literature of Early Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Köstenberger, Andreas. J. "The Destruction of the Second Temple and the Composition of the Fourth Gospel." *Trinity Journal* 26 NS (2005): 205–242.

——. *John.* Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.

——. "John," Pages 415–512 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament.* Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

——. "'What is Truth?'" Pilate's Question in its Johannine and Larger Biblical Context." *Journal for the Evangelical Theological Society* 48 (2005): 33–62.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Peter T. O'Brien. *Salvation to the Ends of the Earth.* Edited by D. A. Carson. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001.

Köstenberger, Andreas J., and Raymond Bouchoc. *The Book Study Concordance of the Greek New Testament.* Nashville, TN: Broadman and Holman, 2003.

Kucenski, Daniel P. "The Saving Truth in Saint John's Gospel." MDiv thesis, Concordia Theological Seminary, 1984.

Kümmel, Werner. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems.* Translated by S. McLean Gilmour and Howard C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.

Kümmel, Georg. *Introduction to the New Testament.* Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Rev. ed. NY: Abingdon, 1975.

Kuhn, Karl Georg. "Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament." *Zeitschrift fur Theologie und Kirche* 47 (1950): 192–211.

——. "Zur Bedeutung der neuen palästinischen Handschriftenfunde für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft." *Theologische Literaturzeiutung* 75 (1950): 81–86.

Kuyper, Lester J. "Grace and Truth. An OT Description of God and its Use in the Johannine Gospel." *Interpretation* 18 (1964): 3–19.

Ladd, George Eldon. *A Theology of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Laperrousaz, Ernest-Marie, ed. *Qumran et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte.* Paris: Cerf, 2000.

Larson, Mildred L. *Meaning-Based Translation: A Guide to Cross-Language Equivalence.* 2d ed. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1998.

Lasor, William Sanford. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

Leahy, T. "Studies in the Syntax of 1QS." *Biblica* 41 (1960): 135–157.

Leaney, A. R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning.* London: SCM Press, 1966.

Lee, Dorothy. "In the Spirit of Truth: Worship and Prayer in the Gospel of John and the Early Fathers." *Vigiliae Christianae* 58 (2004): 277–297.

Lee, John A. L. *A History of New Testament Lexicography.* New York: P. Lang, 2003.

Lightfoot, R. H. *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel According to Saint John.* Black's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Hendrickson, 2005.

——. *Truth on Trial: The Lawsuit motif in the Fourth Gospel.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2000.

Lindars, Barnabars. *John.* Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Lindsay, Dennis R. "'What is Truth?' Ἀλήθεια in the Gospel of John." *Restoration Quarterly* 35 (1993): 129–145.

Loisy, Alred F. *Le Quatrieme Evangile.* Paris: Picard, 1903.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period.* 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Longman, Tremper III. *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation.* Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 3. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987.

Louw, J. P. *Semantics of New Testament Greek.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.

Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains.* New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

Lyons, John. *Semantics.* 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Makaryk, Irena R., ed. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory: Approaches, Scholars, Terms.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.

Marguerat, D., and Y. Bourquin. *How to Read Bible Stories: An Introduction to Narrative Criticism.* London: SCM, 1999.

Martin, Ralph P. *2 Corinthians.* Word Biblical Commentary 40. Waco, Texas: Word, 1986.

Martin, Ralph P., and Peter H. Davids, eds. *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and its Developments.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1997.

Martínez, Florentino García. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated.* Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. The Qumran Texts in English. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Martínez, Florentino García, and Julio Trebelle Barrera, eds. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices.* Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Martínez, Florentino García, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition.* 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Mathews, K. A. "John, Jesus and the Essenes: Trouble at the Temple." *Criswell Theological Review* 3.1 (1988): 101–126.

May, Herbert. "Cosmological Reference in the Qumran Doctrine of the Two Spirits and in Old Testament Imagery." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963): 1–14.

McDonald, J. Ian H. "What Did You Go Out to See? John the Baptist, the Scrolls, and Late Second Temple Judaism." Pages 55–64 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context.* Edited by Timothy H. Lim. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000.

Metso, Sarianna. "Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 11 no. 3 (2004): 315–35.

——. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule.* Edited by Florentino García Martínez and A. S. Van Der Woude. Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judea 21. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament.* 3d ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Michaels, J. Ramsey. *John.* New International Biblical Commentary. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989.

Mlakuzhyil, George. *The Christocentric Literary Structure of the Fourth Gospel.* Rome: Pontificio Ist Biblico, 1987.

Moloney, Francis J. *The Gospel of John.* Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Moo, Douglas J. *The Letter of James.* Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Morris, Leon. *The Gospel According to John.* Rev. ed. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Mounce, William D. *Pastoral Epistles.* Word Biblical Commentary 46. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000.

Mulholland, Robert. "Sociological Criticism." Pages 295–316 in *New Testament Criticism & Interpretation.* Edited by David Alan Black and David S. Dockery. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991.

Muraoka T., and John F. Elwolde. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira, Proceedings of a Symposium held at Leiden University 11–14 December 1995.* Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 26. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Murphy, Roland E. *Proverbs.* Word Biblical Commentary 22. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome and James H. Charlesworth, eds. *Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls.* New York: Crossroad, 1990.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Qumran and the New Testament." Pages 55–71 in *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters.* Edited by E. J. Epp and G. W. MacRae. The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Nicole, Roger. "The Biblical Concept of Truth." Pages 387–411 in *Scripture and Truth.* Edited by D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992.

Nida, Eugene A. *Exploring Semantic Structures.* Munich: Fink, 1975.

———. *Toward a Science of Translating: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill, 1964.

Nida, Eugene A. and J. P. Louw. *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament: A Supplement to the Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains.* Society of Biblical Literature 25. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Nida, Eugene A., Cronje J. Van W, J. P. Louw, and A. H. Snyman. *Style and Discourse: With Special Reference to the Text of the Greek New Testament.* Cape Town: Bible Society, 1983, 1991.

Osborne, Grant R. *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation.* 2d ed. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2006.

Paul, Andre. *Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte: La Voix des Esseniens Retrouves.* Paris: Bayard, 1997.

Porter, Stanley E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament: With Respect to Tense and Mood.* New York: P. Lang, 1993.

Porter, Stanley E., and D. A. Carson, eds. *Linguistics and the New Testament: Critical Junctures*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Porter, Stanley E., and David Tombs, eds. *Approaches to New Testament Study.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Porter, Stanley E., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After.* Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Poythress, Vern. "Truth and Fullness of Meaning: Fullness Versus Reductionist Semantics in Biblical Interpretation." *Westminster Theological Journal* 67 (2005): 216–17.

Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls.* Harvard Semitic Studies 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt/ Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta: Id Est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bebelstiftung, 2006.

Ridderbos, Herman. *The Gospel of John: A Theological Commentary.* Translated by John Vriend. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Roberts, Michael David. "The Idea of Truth as the Revelation of Covenant Faithfulness in the Gospel of John." Th.D. thesis, University of South Africa, 2003.

Ryken, Leland. *Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987.

Ryken, Leland and Tremper Longman III, eds. *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993.

Safrai, S., and M. Stern, eds. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions.* Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.

Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Schelkle, Karl Hermann. *Die Gemeinde von Qumran und die Kirche des Neuen Testaments*. Dusseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1960.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity.* Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1995.

Schiffman, Lawrence H., and James C. VanderKam, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament.* 6th ed. Stuttgart: Calwar Verlag, 1927, 1982.

Schlatter, Adolf. *The Theology of the Apostles: The Development of New Testament Theology.* Translated by Andreas J. Köstenberger. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *The Gospel According to St. John.* 2 vols. New York: Seabury Press, 1980.

——. *The Truth Will Make You Free.* New York: Herder & Herder, 1966.

Schnelle, Udo. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes.* 2d ed. Leipzig, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1998.

Schottrof, Luise. *Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt: Beobaachtungen zum gnostischen Dualismus und seiner Bedeutung für Paulus und das Johannesevangelium.* Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1970.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans.* Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Schürer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B. C.–135 A. D.)*. Revised and edited by Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1983.

Scott, R. B. Y. *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes.* Anchor Bible 18. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1965.

Searle, John. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Shanks, Hershel, ed. *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review.* New York: Random House, 1992.

Shemesh, Aharon "Expulsion and Exclusion." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 9.1 (2002): 44–74.

Silva, Moises. *Biblical Words and their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

——. *God, Language and Scripture: Reading the Bible in Light of General Linguistics.* Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 4. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1990.

Sire, James W. *Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept.* Downers Grove, IL.: InterVarsity, 2004.

Smith, D. Moody. *John.* Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.

——. "John." Pages 96–111 in *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context.* Edited by John Barclay and John Sweet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

——. *Johannine Christianity: Essays on its Setting, Sources and Theology.* Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1984.

——. *The Theology of the Gospel of John.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Staley, Jeff. "The Structure of John's Prologue: It's Implications for the Gospel's Narrative Structure." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986): 241–64.

Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Taufer und Jesus.* Freiburg: Herder, 1993.

Stendahl, Krister, and James H. Charlesworth, eds. *The Scrolls and the New Testament.* New York: Crossroad, 1992.

Stibbe, Mark W. G. *John As Storyteller: Narrative Criticism and the Fourth Gospel.* Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 73. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Stone, Michael E., ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo.* Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Strachan, R. H. *The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment.* 3d ed. London: SCM Press, 1941.

Straton, Douglas. "Christ as Truth." *Journal of Religious Thought* 17 (Winter-Spring 1960): 15–26.

Stuart, Geert H.C. *The Struggle in Man between Good and Evil.* Kampen: Kok, 1984.

Stuhlmacher, Peter, ed. *The Gospel and the Gospels.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Swain, Scott R. "Truth in the Gospel of John." Th.M. thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1998.

Taffesse, M. N. "'What is Truth?': Thesis on St. John's Gospel." MA thesis, Catholic Theological Union, 1980.

Talbert, Charles H. "Artistry and Theology: An Analysis of the Architecture of JN 1, 19–5,47." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32 (1970): 341–66.

Talbert, Charles H. *Reading John: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles.* New York: Crossroad, 1994.

Thetayil, Benny. *In Spirit and Truth: An Exegetical Study of John 14:1 –26 and a Theological Investigation of the Replacement Theme in the Fourth Gospel.* Contributions to Biblical Theology and Exegesis 46. Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2007.

Thiede, Carsten P. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Jewish Origins of Christianity.* Oxford: Lion, 2000.

Thiering, Barbara E. *The Qumran Origins of the Christian Church.* Sidney: Theological Explorations, 1983.

Thiselton, Anthony C. "Semantics and New Testament Interpretation." Pages 75–104 in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods.* Edited by I. Howard Marshall. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

——. *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer and Wittgenstein.* Exeter: Paternoster, 1980.

Thompson, Marianne Meye. *The God of the Gospel of John.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

Tolmie, D. F. "A Discourse Analysis of John 17:1–26." *Neotestamentica* 27 (1993): 406–408.

Torrance, T. F. "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith." *Expository Times* lxviii (1956–57): 111–14.

Torrey, C. C. *The Four Gospels: A New Translation.* New York: Harper, 1933.

——. *Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence.* New York: Harper & Brothers, 1936.

Trites, Allison A. *The New Testament Concept of Witness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Turner, Max. "Modern Linguistics and the New Testament," Pages 148–153 in *Hearing the New Testament: Strategies for Interpretation.* Edited by Joel B. Green. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Ullmann, Stephen. *The Principles of Semantics.* 2d ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957.

Van Gemeren, Willem A., ed. *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.

VanderKam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. 58 min. Biblical Archeological Society, 1999, videocassette.

——. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

VanderKam, James, and Peter Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity.* New York: T. & T. Clark, 2002.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is There a Meaning in this Text?: The Bible, the Reader and the Morality of Literary Knowledge.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1998.

——., ed. *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005.

Vermes, Geza "Biblical Studies and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1947–1987, Retrospects and Prospects." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 39 (1987): 113–28.

——. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English.* Rev. ed. London: Penguin Books, 2005.

——. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies.* Leiden: Brill, 1961.

Vos, Geerhardus. "'True' and 'Truth' in the Johannine Writings." *Biblical Review* 12 (1927): 507–20.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.

Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Watson, Francis. *Text and Truth: Redefining Biblical Theology.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Weise, Manfred. *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der Ordensregel vom Toten Mer.* Studia Post Biblica 3. Leiden, Brill, 1961.

Weiss, Johannes. *Das Urchristentum.* Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.

Welleck, Rene, and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature.* 3d ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc., 1956.

Wernberg- Møller, P. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction.* Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 1. Leiden: Brill, 1957.

Westcott, B. F. *The Gospel According to John.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1881, 1975.

Whitacre, Rodney A. *John.* The IVP New Testament Commentary Series 4. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999.

Wilson, Edmund. *The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1947–1969*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Wise, Michael, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation.* San Fransisco: HarperSanFransisco, 1996.

Witherington, Ben. *John's Wisdom: A Commentary on the Fourth Gospel.* Louisville, KN: Westminster John Knox, 1995.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *On Certainty.* Edited by G. E. M. Anscombe and G. H. von Wright. Translated by Denis Paul and G. E. M. Anscombe. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

INDEX

217