

# Adam Kubiś

---

## Zechariah 6:12-13 as the Referent of γραφή in John 2:22 and 20:9

---

The Biblical Annals 2/1, 153-194

---

2012

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

## Zechariah 6:12-13 as the Referent of γραφή in John 2:22 and 20:9

### A Contribution to Johannine Temple-Christology

ADAM KUBIŚ

address: Schlossplatz 2, 8510 Stainz, Austria, e-mail: akubis@gmail.com

**SUMMARY:** The explicit references to the *Scripture* (γραφή) in the Johannine cleansing narrative in 2:22 as well as in the Johannine narrative about the empty tomb in 20:9 were always a perplexing mystery which raised a plethora of scholarly proposals. The article presents an argument in favor of Zech 6:12-13 as a scriptural referent in both these occurrences of γραφή. The Zechariah prophecy about the future rebuilding of the temple by a Messianic king perfectly dovetails with the Johannine Temple-Christology, which depicts the resurrection of Jesus as the rebuilding of the temple by the Messiah-King.

**KEYWORDS:** Gospel of John, Zechariah, Temple-Christology, Scripture, γραφή, king, Messiah, temple, temple cleansing, resurrection, angels, Garden of Eden, Mary Magdalene, *noli me tangere*, Jesus' burial

**SŁOWA KLUCZE:** Ewangelia Janowa, Księga proroka Zachariasza, Janowa chrystologia świątyni, Pismo Święte, γραφή, król, Mesjasz, świątynia, oczyszczenie świątyni, zmartwychwstanie, aniołowie, ogród Eden, Maria Magdalena, *noli me tangere*, pochówek Jezusa

One of the most dramatic scenes in John's Gospel occurs right at the beginning, during the first Passover visit Jesus makes to the Jerusalem temple (John 2:13-22). Jesus violently, by means of a whip of cords, drove *all* the sellers, their animals and the money changers out of the temple courts, scattering the coins and overturning the tables. This memorable act impressed itself on Jesus' disciples, who searched the Scriptures to understand it. But what Scriptures helped them to make sense of this? The narrator quotes Ps 69[68]:10 which speaks of the zeal for YHWH's house, which prompted Jesus to act in this way (John 2:17). However, after the dialogue between Jesus and the Jews (2:18-20), the narrator's next reference to the Scripture (γραφή) follows, this time without any explicit quotation (2:22). Is this again a reference to Ps 69 or perhaps to another Scripture? Many commentators argue that the latter possibility is more plausible. Similar uncertainty regarding the referent of γραφή is found in the narrative of the empty tomb in John 20:1-9. On the first day of the week, after Jesus' crucifixion and burial, Peter

and the Beloved Disciple ran to Jesus' tomb and found it empty. At this point, after saying that the Beloved Disciple believed in Jesus' resurrection, the narrator introduces a reference to γραφή that predicted Jesus would rise from the dead (20:9). The reference to γραφή is implicit and begs for some explanation as there is no explicit use of any Scripture in the Johannine resurrection narrative.

It must be noted from outset that there is substantial disagreement among scholars concerning the referents for γραφή found in John 2:22 and 20:9. While this situation might at first discourage any further investigation into the issue, it may on the other hand also be seen as an invitation to look for a new candidate/candidates for the scriptural sources in these two passages. The goal of this article is to present an argument in favor of Zech 6:12-13 as a scriptural referent for γραφή in both John 2:22 and 20:9. In my judgment Zechariah's prophecy about the future rebuilding of the temple by a Messianic king has more explanatory power than currently held opinions.

## I. The Referent of γραφή in John 2:22

### I.1. Current Scholarly Opinions

A brief examination of modern Johannine scholarship provides a wide range of possible referents of γραφή in John 2:22. The most frequently mentioned among modern commentators are Ps 16:10; 68:10 LXX; Isa 53:10-12; and Hos 6:2 (with Jonah 2:1). Many authors see instead a reference to the whole body of Scriptures in John 2:22 (Schneider 1976, 88; Simoens 1997, 2:173; Grasso 2008, 134) or a corpus of *testimonia* (Dodd 1953, 302). However, the main objection to this latter view is the fact that the singular γραφή in the Fourth Gospel (FG) seems to consistently refer to a definite passage of Scripture. If one could prove the contrary, John 2:22 as well as 20:9 would constitute exceptions.<sup>1</sup> Loisy, in the second, revised edition of his commentary (1921, 151-152; cf. 1903, 293), suggested Dan 9:27 as a reference, although his explication of this prophecy in relation to the Johannine cleansing narrative is particularly conjectural and, to my knowledge, found no adherents among later commentators. Recently, Moloney (2005a, 454-468, 2005b, 333-347; 2006, 7-20) argued that γραφή in John 2:22 should be understood as referring to

<sup>1</sup> Bernard 1928, 2:571; cf. 1:97 and 281; Barrett 1978, 201; Haenchen 1980, 203; Michaels 2010, 170 ("When the writer wants to refer to the Jewish Scriptures more generally, he uses the plural (5:39)").

Jesus' words. Despite its unquestionable originality and appealing simplicity, this view seems ultimately unconvincing.<sup>2</sup> Some authors point to other Old Testament (OT) passages and biblical figures that could provide a background for both Jesus' deliberate actions in the temple and their Johannine description. However, none of these authors claimed that these "Scriptures" or "the heroes they speak of" might be a referent of γραφή in John 2:22. Indeed, after a closer inspection one might exclude such a possibility.<sup>3</sup>

An analysis of the structure of the Johannine cleansing narrative (2:13-22) seems to limit the range of possible referents to those that allude to the second part of the narrative and consequently to the theme of the resurrection and/or the temple. The cleansing narrative may be seen as a diptych in two panels: vv. 13-17 and 18-22. The first panel describes what actually happened in the temple (Jesus' *action*). The second one brings a reflection upon this event, the re-*action* of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, their dialogue with Jesus. Verses 17 and 21-22 clearly stand out from the narrative and have many characteristics of parentheses. Consequently, the first reference to the *Scripture* (v. 17) – the narrator's first comment – pertains to the first part of the narrative: Jesus'

- 2 Moloney argues that in John 2:22 the sentence ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς contains καὶ expegetical (the words after καὶ elucidate the words before καὶ) producing the translation: *they believed the Scripture, meaning the word which Jesus had spoken*. Consequently Moloney (2005a, 464) states: "‘the Scriptures’ and ‘the word which Jesus had spoken’ are, for this author, one and the same thing. The word of Jesus, who is the Word of God become flesh (1:1-2, 14), is Scripture, ‘remembered’ by the disciples after Jesus has been raised from the dead (2:22).” The first objection to Moloney’s proposal is that John more likely meant the equal authority of the Scripture and Jesus’ words, but not their ontological identity or sameness. See Labahn 2004, 187; Beutler 2006, 35. Such equality in authority is clearly perceivable when one compares the usage of the same formula ἵνα πληρωθῇ referring both to Jesus’ words (18:9.32) and to OT passages (12:38; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24; 19:36), a feature unique to the FG in the whole New Testament (NT). Besides 2:22, the tendency to place the Scripture on the same level as Jesus’ words is detectable in 5:47 (cf. also 12:16; 15:20). Secondly, the very basis of Moloney’s proposal, namely the presence of καὶ expegetical, is highly improbable. It is almost a rule that such a καὶ is a reflection of Hebrew *Vorlage*. There is no such pair of lexemes in Biblical Hebrew.
- 3 Among those scriptural passages are Mal 3:1-5 (Selwyn 1911, 204-206; Brown 1966, 118; Robinson 1985, 272); Ezek 8–9 (Schuchard 1992, 25-26) and *Pss. Sol.* 17 (Wright 1996, 427). Among the scriptural figures are Maccabean brothers, Judas and Simon, from the First Book of Maccabees (Wright 1996, 492-493) and Hezekiah (in the rabbinic period seen as the Messiah! - *b. Sanh.* 94a.98b.99a) from 2 Chr 29 (Trudinger 1997, 329-330). The reference to Malachi, Ezekiel or Hezekiah might explain only the setting of the temple narrative at the beginning of the FG (as argued by the authors quoted above), but not its meaning. In the case of the Maccabean actions, it is highly improbable that the author of the FG (a work containing much polemic against the synagogue) would draw upon, as his argumentative and prophetic γραφή, a Greek book that was not part of the most widely embraced collection of that time, i.e. the Pentateuch, Prophets and Psalms. Indeed, all the explicit Johannine quotations and allusions derive from these three bodies of scriptures. The same observation is valid also in the case of *Pss. Sol.* 17 (cf. note 31).

temple act (vv. 13-16). The second scriptural reference (v. 22) – the narrator’s second comment – pertains to the second part of the narrative: the dialogue between Jews and Jesus (vv. 18-20). The main point made in the first panel is Jesus’ care or zeal for the *Jerusalem temple* (designated here and elsewhere in the FG by ἱερόν), while the main topic of the second panel is the raising of the *new temple* (designated by ναός; found only here in the FG), i.e. Jesus’ resurrection. Thus, the first scriptural reference (v. 17) would refer to Jesus’ action in the temple and the second (v. 22) to Jesus’ resurrection. Moreover, both *Scripture* and Jesus’ *word* in v. 22 are the grammatical objects of the same verb: *to believe*. Thus, if Jesus’ *word* refers clearly to Jesus’ prediction of his resurrection in the second part of the narrative (v. 19), it seems natural to connect also the *Scripture* to the same idea of Jesus’ resurrection and to the same piece of the narrative. Scholars have proposed the following scriptural passages which refer to the idea of resurrection: Ps 16:10; Isa 53:10-12; Hos 6:2; and Jonah 2:1.<sup>4</sup> Let us have a closer look at these texts in order to evaluate their appropriateness within the Johannine cleansing narrative.

#### 1.1.1. Psalm 16:10

A significant number of authors argue that the referent of γραφή in John 2:22 is Ps 16:10, since this passage was explicitly interpreted as pointing to resurrection by Luke in Acts 2:25-28.31 and 13:35.<sup>5</sup> However, the attempt to explain the Johannine understanding of the resurrection by comparing it to the Lukan choice of OT proof-texts can be deemed as at least methodologically doubtful. Whereas this reference is possible, it can be also regarded as the imposition of an idea extraneous to the FG. On the other hand, the first Christians clearly attempted to connect both Jesus’ death and resurrection to scriptural fulfillment (cf. 1 Cor 15:3-4) and so must have searched

- .....
- 4 Cf. Lapidé 1641, 2:284 [Ps 16:10; Hos 6:2]; Godet 1879, 2:36 [Ps 16; Is 53; Hos 6; Jon 2]; Loisy 1903, 294; 1921, 152 [Ps 16:10; Is 53:10-12; Hos 11:2 (*sic!*)]; Morris 1971, 204 [Ps 16:10; Is 53:12]. Some commentators point to the theme of resurrection, but without referring to any precise OT passages, e.g. Hoskyns 1947, 196; Lagrange 1948, 70; Kysar 1986, 50. Others (Barrett 1978, 201; Carson 1991, 183) point to the OT passages referring to the theme of the vindication of the Messiah. Sloyan (1988, 41) argued that γραφή, cannot allude to any precise passage or passages referring to Jesus’ death and resurrection, but to “the sacred page concerning the house of the Lord.”
- 5 Cf. Westcott 1892, 43 (“[it] can hardly be any other than Ps. xvi.10”); Bernard 1928, 1:97 (“But as it is plain from Acts 2:31; 13:35 that Ps 16:10 [...] was cited by Peter and Paul alike as predictive of the Resurrection of Christ, we may conclude that this is the verse in the evangelist’s mind when he says that the disciples after the Resurrection *believed the Scripture*”); Lightfoot 1956, 130; Wikenhauser 1957, 82; Tasker 1960, 65 (“it is usually supposed that the reference here is to Psalm xvi. 10”).

the Scriptures very thoroughly to explain these events to themselves and to outsiders. So, Psalm 16:10 may not be a Lukan proof-text, but part of a more general Christian corpus of texts.

### 1.1.2. Isaiah 53:10-12

At least four arguments might be advanced in favor of the hypothesis that the prophecy of Isa 53:10-12 is the referent of γραφή in John 2:22: (1) The activity of the servant figure after his death might be understood as an allusion to resurrection. (2) The earliest Christian tradition, originating in Jesus himself (cf. Luke 22:27), identified the servant-figure with Jesus (cf. Matt 8:17; Acts 8:32-33). (3) Isaiah 53 is known to the author of the FG as it is quoted in John 12:38 (= Isa 53:1).<sup>6</sup> (4) Finally, the Synoptic cleansing narratives (Mark 11:17 and Matt 21:13) are influenced by Deutero-Isaiah as they quote Isa 56:7. There is little doubt concerning the value of the second and third points. However, it is important to note that even if the idea of the servant's resurrection might be read in the Isaianic text (Wright 2003, 116) this oracle was never used in the NT scriptural rhetoric as a proof-text for Jesus' resurrection.<sup>7</sup> Secondly, the independence of the Johannine cleansing narrative from its Synoptic counterparts is incontrovertible. Indeed, the foremost Johannine scholars view the description of the temple act itself (2:14-16) either as an autonomous elaboration of the tradition common with Mark or – and this is the majority view – as an account based on yet another independent source.

### 1.1.3. The Third Day Hypothesis

Schnackenburg (1965, 367) saw it as a possibility, while Proctor (2006, 132) is convinced, that the referent of γραφή in John 2:22 is the notion of *three days* (ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις) in Jesus' logion in 2:19. There are only two other places in the NT where the notion of (1) the Scripture, (2) Jesus' resurrection and (3) the third day temporal frame all occur together, to wit 1 Cor 15:4 and Luke 24:46. The commentators of these two passages most frequently point to Hos 6:2 and Jonah 2:1 as the most probable scriptural referents to

<sup>6</sup> The index of UBS<sup>4</sup> lists four quotations (John 1:23 citing Isa 40:3; John 6:45 quoting Isa 54:13; John 12:40 quoting Isa 6:10) and twenty-one allusions to Isaiah found in the FG.

<sup>7</sup> See 1 Pet 2:22 quoting Isa 53:9 as a proof-text for Christ's exemplary suffering and Luke 22:37 quoting Isa 53:12 to highlight the idea that though innocent, Christ dies as if he were a criminal.

the idea of the third day found there.<sup>8</sup> The former text mentions both the resurrection of the dead and the precise three-day span of time. The latter also speaks of the three days (and three nights) and, most importantly, is quoted in the Gospel of Matthew, in a context which many commentators see as alluding to Jesus' resurrection (12:38-42).

The view that the authors of 1 Cor 15:4; Luke 24:46 and John 2:22 had in mind Jonah as an OT proof-text is fraught with difficulties. Firstly, the mention of τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας (Matt 12:40 = Jonah 2:1 LXX) is not identical with the expressions τῆ ἡμέρᾳ τῆ τρίτῃ (1 Cor), τῆ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (Luke) and ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις (John), although the lack of any direct literary dependence does not exclude a borrowing on the level of ideas or themes. Secondly, the connection between *the sign of Jonah* and Jesus' resurrection is only (vaguely) implied in the Matthaean text and absent from the Lukan narrative.<sup>9</sup> The MT of Jonah does not support any resurrection interpretation. Thirdly, except the mention of *the sign of Jonah* in Matt and Luke there is no other explicit use of this book in the entire NT.

- 8 Bacon (1923, 426-441) proposed other referents, to wit 2 Kgs 20:5 (the promise of restoration to Hezekiah: *on the third day you shall go up to the house of the Lord*) or Lev 23:4-21, esp. v. 11. Another explanation states that the reference to the *scriptures* reflects a popular Jewish belief that corruption set in only after the third day; thus Jesus was raised on the third day to fulfill Ps 16:9-11 LXX so that his body would not suffer corruption (cf. Hill, 1967, 266-267). Christensen (1990, 101-113) argues that the phrase κατὰ τὰς γραφάς specifically points to the third day of creation from Gen 1, on which, according to some interpreters contemporary with Paul, the garden of Eden with its tree of life was created. Another solution was proposed by Lehmann (1968) who saw in κατὰ τὰς γραφάς (1 Cor 15:4) a reference to the OT traditions of divine action (*das Eingreifen Jahwes*) on the third day found in Exod 19:11, Gen 22:4; 2 Kgs 20:5.8; Esth 5:1; Hos 6:2. The majority of Pauline commentators, even if pointing to some precise scriptural passage, ultimately concur with the explanation that the term τὰς γραφάς refers to the OT as a whole. Virtually all the aforementioned suggestions can be applied to Luke 24:46. It should be noted that a recently discovered and described Hebrew text, *Hazon Gabriel*, might speak of the resurrection on the third day (line 80) and most importantly, according to Knohl (2008, 151 and 155-158; 2009, *passim*), the resurrected character ought to be seen as a Messianic figure: *the prince of the princes* (line 81). Obviously, it is unlikely that *Hazon Gabriel* is a scriptural referent of both John 2:22 and 1 Cor 15:4 / Luke 24:46. Nevertheless, if Knohl's interpretation is correct, this apocalyptic text might be a crucial testimony of the belief, prior to the Christian era, that the Messianic leader is to be raised from the death on the third day.
- 9 It has been argued that the *sign of Jonah* mentioned in Matt 12:39 could be connected with Jesus' descent to Sheol. Consequently, this *sign* can be understood as Jesus' proclamation of God's liberation and salvation to the righteous dead (based on Matt 12:40) and Jesus' proclamation of judgment to the unrighteous living of the present (as suggested by Matt 12:41). As it results, the idea of resurrection is rather a side issue, and the reference (if it exists at all) is implied and understood more as a means than a primary goal (*tertium comparationis*). Cf. Landes 1983, 665-684. The absence of a straightforward reference to the idea of resurrection in the *sign of Jonah* material is even more evident in the Lukan context (Luke 11:29). The majority of commentators see Jonah's judgment proclamation to the Ninevites (found in Jonah 3-4) as providing a more likely definition of the *sign of Jonah* in Luke. Cf. Landes 1996, 133-163.

There is a quite long list of authors who argue that the best referent for the NT idea of *Jesus' resurrection on the third day* is the prophecy of Hos 6:2.<sup>10</sup> The first and most obvious argument in favor of the Hosean prophecy is the precise span of time (*on the third day*) which the oracle provides and the presence of the verb ἀνίστημι (LXX) which makes a clear allusion to resurrection. The direct literal dependence between Hosea and John is however improbable (Greek versions – ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ; Jn – ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις; LXX – ἀνίστημι; α' and σ' – ἀναζωώσει; Jn – ἐγείρω; albeit cf. John 20:9). Thus one would rather speak of dependence on the level of meanings and ideas. Secondly, unlike the Targum to Hos 6:2 which explicitly speaks of the resurrection, the Masoretic and Septuagintal texts of this prophecy were not intended to refer to the resurrection. In the case of the MT, the context shows that recovery from sickness is intended. Both the images and language are medical.<sup>11</sup> In the case of the LXX, the “resurrectional” ἀνίστημι stands in parallel with medical ὑγιάσει (the verb ἀναζωώσει found in α' and σ' is much more promising at this point, albeit not unequivocally). Moreover, ἀνίστημι is commonly used (also in the future tense) in order to express any kind of physical movement, described in MT by קָם. Nevertheless, a Hebrew reader would have understood the MT of Hos 6:2 in the resurrectional sense much later (for instance, at the time of the creation of the NT) by virtue of the comparison with the same vocabulary (the fixed verbal pair הָיָה and קָם) found in Isa 26:14a.19a and 2 Kgs 13:21 which explicitly point to resurrection. Indeed, at least from the second or third century AD the rabbis interpreted Hos 6:2 in terms of resurrection (McArthur 1971-1972, 83-85).

In favor of the Hosean candidacy one could also refer to the affinity of the Johannine cleansing narrative with the Markan redaction of the same episode which, according to Krause (1994, 235-248), has more or less explicit points of contact with Hos 9:10-17. Krause believes the Hosean prophecy influenced the evangelist in his selection, arrangement, and editing of material in Mark 11:12-25. Since the temple act narrative as reflected in John betrays many common features with the passion narratives as recounted in the Synoptics, Krause's observation would support the view that γραφή in John 2:22 alludes to Hosea. It would also be one more argument in favor of John's dependence on Mark in the temple act material. Our reservation is twofold: John does not mention the fig tree episode (found in Mark 11:12-14.20-25)

<sup>10</sup> Beginning in antiquity with Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem*, IV, 43,1-2; *Adversus Judaeos*, XIII, 23), through Martin Luther to modern authors such as Dodd 1952, 77 and 103; Lindars 1961, 60-66; Tödt 1965, 185; McArthur 1971-1972, 86.

<sup>11</sup> It has to be noted that even *Peshittā* does not differ essentially from Hebrew. That is to say, it does not seem to be more explicit in suggesting the resurrectional imagery.



and Mark does not clearly allude to Hos 6:2 (resurrection, third day) in the temple narrative. As to the second issue, the inference would be that γραφή in John 2:22 refers to the whole book of Hosea, yet it does not add any essential interpretative insight to the understanding of the Johannine pericope. To sum up, the argument is speculative and ultimately unconvincing.

The same suggestion regarding the Hosean influence on the NT narratives was put forward with reference to the resurrection account in Luke 24:1-9.21-24.46. According to Perry (1986, 644-645), the Lukan account of Jesus' resurrection (24:1-9.21-24.46) contains a series of "apologetic allusions" to five Septuagintal verses from Hos 5:15–6:4. It is a pertinent observation, since Luke 24:46 has three salient points of contact with John 2:22, to wit *Scripture*, *resurrection* and *three days*.

The candidacy of Hos 6:2 as the referent of γραφή in John 2:22 might be objected to by the simple fact that an undoubted resurrectional understanding of this prophecy is attested only in the Targum Jonathan (its final redaction is dated to the late seventh century AD) and rabbinic sources. Consequently, one cannot be certain if the resurrectional interpretation of Hos 6:2 was current in the first century AD. The most serious objection however is the fact that Hos 6:2 is never explicitly quoted in the NT (McCasland 1929, 131).<sup>12</sup> McArthur (1971-1972, 85) rejects this objection stating that Hosea 6:2 could have been absorbed into the primitive kerygma at a very early date, which may have absolved the NT writers of any responsibility to quote a precise scriptural proof-text. McArthur's reasoning however is as hypothetical and ingenious as it is difficult to prove. Furthermore, Proctor (2006, 134; cf. Perry 1986, 664) hypothesizes that "since Hos. 6.2 employs plural verbs (ἀναστησόμεθα and ζήσόμεθα), the verse does not lend itself naturally to direct quotation and application to Jesus' story" and consequently it may at least have steered the NT authors away "from any straightforward citation." Nevertheless, he himself admits the weakness of this argument in light of our knowledge of first-century AD exegetical practices. To sum up, Hos 6:2 is a much better candidate for the OT referent of γραφή in John 2:22 than other proposals, as it perfectly fits the content of the second part of the Johannine cleansing narrative, namely the notion of resurrection and the three-day span of time.

<sup>12</sup> This passage is also absent in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the ancient apologists who would have easily employed it as a proof-text. Cf. Wolff 1979, 150 and our note 10.

## I.1.4. Psalm 69(68):10

A longer comment is necessary in the case of Ps 68:10 LXX as it is favored by the overwhelming majority of commentators.<sup>13</sup> The choice of this text seems to be self-evident, if one takes into account the fact that Ps 68:10 LXX in John 2:17 is the only explicit quotation from the OT within the immediate context of John 2:22. This proposal could also be corroborated by the parallel character of vv. 17 and (21-)22. They both share some common features, which could hardly be accounted for by sheer coincidence. First of all, their parenthetical character is conspicuous from the viewpoint of the narrative art: as the explanatory remarks of the omniscient narrator they interrupt the flow of the narrative.<sup>14</sup> Secondly, both contain the same terms and themes: recollection (the verb μνησκόμαι), the disciples (οἱ μαθηταί) and the Scripture (γεγραμμένον ἐστίν – v. 17; τῆ γραφῆ – v. 22). Finally and most importantly, it has been argued that both verses allude to Jesus' resurrection. In light of our previous remark about the structure of the Johannine cleansing narrative, the quotation from v. 17 could be taken into consideration as the referent of γραφή in v. 22 only if it referred to one of the basic themes found in the second part of this narrative, to wit resurrection and/or the temple. While the reference to the temple is obvious (οἶκος), the link to the idea of resurrection is not so evident.

The resurrectional dimension of this quotation must be hidden in the meaning of the verb καταφάγεται which can be understood in two different ways. Surprisingly, for some authors verse 17 speaks only of Jesus' zeal for the temple that *consumes* him as an inner fire and prompts him to perform his temple act.<sup>15</sup> However, if the Scripture was already fulfilled in Jesus'

<sup>13</sup> E.g. Dodd 1953, 302; Sanders and Mastin 1968, 120; Lindars 1972, 144; Haenchen 1980, 203; Mateos and Barreto 1982, 173; Becker 1985, 124; Léon-Dufour 1988, 268; Moloney 1990, 449; Trocmé 1996, 259; Beasley-Murray 1999, 41; Wengst 2000, 1:113; Schnelle 2004, 77; Köstenberger 2004, 110; Lincoln 2005, 141; Thyen 2005, 179; Theobald 2009, 237; Michaelis 2010, 170. As a possible referent: Schnackenburg 1965, 367; Brown 1966, 116.

<sup>14</sup> In v. 17 there is no connection with the preceding context, namely v. 16. Moreover, the inferential coordinating conjunction οὖν of v. 18 does not fit v. 17, but rather expresses a natural continuation of the narrative from v. 16. It is a resumptive particle that may mean *consequently*. Moreover, the verb ἀπεκρίθησαν in v. 18 is a natural answer to Jesus' action and words in vv. 15-16. Admittedly, both vv. 21 and 22 are the narrator's explanatory remarks, but v. 22, due to its explicit temporal specification (ὅτε οὖν ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν), stands out more distinctively than v. 21 against the rest of the narrative. An implied reader moves within the narrated time from the temporal setting of the cleansing narrative (vv. 18-20) into the post-Easter temporal frame, i.e. the narrator's temporal setting (vv. 21-22). Van Belle (1985, *passim*) gives ample bibliographical references to authors who discuss both stylistic and redactional characteristic of vv. 17 and 22.

<sup>15</sup> Westcott 1892, 42; Freed 1965, 9; Barrett 1978, 201.

action in the temple, the change of verbal tense from an aorist κατέφαγεν found in Ps 68:10 LXX to a future καταφάγεται in John 2:17 was unnecessary. Indeed, for John, the OT passages in the preterite still announce the prophecies concerning Jesus (e.g. John 12:38 – Isa 53:1; John 12:40 – Isa 6:10; John 13:18 – Ps 41:10).<sup>16</sup> It might be then assumed that καταφάγεται refers also to Jesus' death. The use made of Ps 69 in other parts of the FG and in the entire NT clearly shows that its employment is generally confined to the passion apologetic.<sup>17</sup> In the context of the psalm itself the consuming zeal in v. 10 might be understood negatively as it brings the Psalmist to a point of near extinction, almost death. The semantics of the verb כָּלַא also allows such reading. The verb literally means *to eat*, but metaphorically can signify *to devour, consume* in the sense of *to destroy* by fire (Exod 3:2; Zech 9:4) or *to slay* by sword (Deut 32:42; Isa 1:20). As the whole cleansing narrative is the interplay of two temporal perspectives: *pre-Easter* (vv. 13-16, 18-20) and *post-Easter* (vv. 21-22), verse 17 can reflect these two perspectives and consequently have two meanings, being another example of the typically Johannine feature of the *double entendre* (Kreitzer 1993, 93-101; Klauck 2004, 146).<sup>18</sup>

Is there however in v. 17 an allusion to Jesus' resurrection? Virtually no commentator sees a reference to Jesus' resurrection in the quotation in 2:17. It might, however, be argued that Jesus' death implies also his resurrection since both his death and his resurrection are seen as one *paschal* event, for instance, in the Synoptic predictions of Jesus' death *and* resurrection.<sup>19</sup> It is also true that the end of Ps 69 changes mood dramatically. From the lament (vv. 2-14ab) and petition (vv. 14cd-30) it shifts to an expression of confidence

16 According to Menken (1996, 39), John evidently quoted after the Septuagint because at two points (at least) alternative translations of the Hebrew were possible and in both instances John 2:17 agrees with the Septuagint (בית as οἶκος instead of οἰκία and כָּלַא as ἐσθίειν or καταναλίσκειν [cf. σ'] instead of κατεσθίειν). Menken also convincingly argued that the aorist κατέφαγεν is the original reading in the LXX.

17 Cf. John 19:29; Matt 27:34.48; Mark 15:36; Luke 23:36; in the broader sense also John 15:25 and Rom 15:3. Two remaining quotations (Rom 11:9-10; Acts 1:20) are used within the frames of general apologetics. Cf. Lindars 1961, 99-104.

18 A third (complementary) meaning of καταφάγεται was suggested by Daly-Denton (2000, 125-128), who argued that (1) the *cultic locale* of the Johannine cleansing narrative, both spatial (the temple) and temporal (the Passover), (2) the use of κατεσθίω in descriptions of *sacrifices* offered by Aaron, Gideon, Solomon and Elijah (cf. Lev 9:24; Judg 6:21; 2 Chr 7:1; 1 Kgs 18:38) and (3) the Elijah-like Johannine christology (Elijah's zeal is one of the prophet's most distinctive characteristics - 1 Kgs 19:10; Sir 48:10) point to the *sacrificial* understanding of Jesus' consummation in John 2:17.

19 Such a point however is made by Simoens (1997, 2:173) who clearly states that Ps 69:10 is quoted as an anticipation of "la mort-résurrection" and that Ps 69 should be taken in its entirety. Nonetheless, he argues that γραφή in John 2:22 refers to the whole OT.

in YHWH who hears the needy looking for his help (vv. 31-34) and saves Zion, Judah and the offspring of his servants (vv. 35-37). The exegetical rule that the quotation of one sentence brings or implies the whole context of this sentence is a commonplace.<sup>20</sup> As a counterbalance it is worth noting that there is no explicit usage of this psalm within the framework of resurrection. Moreover, it is indeed difficult to see the idea of resurrection in the expectation of YHWH's intervention found at the end of Ps 69. It might be perhaps implied, but there is no such explicit statement. It is indeed only conjecture: if John saw Jesus' death in the Psalmist almost near extinction, he could also see Jesus' resurrection in the Psalmist's rescue and vindication enacted by YHWH.<sup>21</sup>

To sum up, if one wants to make a link between γραφή in John 2:22 and the quotation in 2:17, it is not enough to argue that this γραφή refers to Ps 68:10 LXX, understood as the prediction of Jesus' death. Instead, this γραφή should be seen as alluding to the whole Ps 69[68] with special emphasis on its final verses which would underscore Jesus' vindication in the resurrection event.

## 1.2. Zechariah 6:12-13 as a Solution

In my opinion, the superiority of Zech 6:12-13 as the scriptural reference in John 2:22 over the above discussed texts can be convincingly demonstrated. My first impetus for looking in such a direction came from a century-old article by Carr (1909, 41-49). He argued that Zech 6:13 underlies Jesus' words in John 2:19, although he did not say that this prophecy should also be understood as the referent of γραφή in John 2:22. I later learned that Loisy (1903, 294) saw Zech 6:12 as a remote possibility ("peut-être") of being the referent

<sup>20</sup> Lindars 1961, 106 ("perhaps the 'scripture' connected with the 'word' of Jesus referred to in John 2:22 was the final verses of this psalm"). Nevertheless, he does not follow this intuition in his later commentary (1972). See also Hossfeld and Zenger 2000, 281 ("der ganze Psalm als Kontext mitgehört werden muß, um zugleich die Funktion der Tempelreinigungssperikope im Gesamtenwurf des Johannesevangelium zu erfassen"); Keener 2003, 2:1184, note 154 ("John 2:22 could refer to Ps 69:9 in John 2:17, but that is likely only if the entire psalm is in view"). Interestingly, Brown (1966, 124) states: "John cites only 9a [MT], but the Psalm was known to early Christians and the context of the verse may have been intended as well." Brown accepts the interpretation of v. 9a as a prophecy referring to Jesus' death, but he intends by its context only the immediate verses 8 and 9b. The separation of brothers in v. 8 may only be significant in relation to John 2:12 (cf. 7:5; also Daly-Denton 2000, 129). The insults mentioned in v. 9b are also appropriate to the challenge of "the Jews" in John 2:18.20.

<sup>21</sup> Indeed, according to Haenchen (1980, 203), it requires an unusual stretch of imagination ("eine ungewöhnliche Anstrengung") to derive an allusion to Jesus' resurrection from Ps 69.

of γραφή in John 2:22. Loisy's suggestion, however, to the best of my knowledge, was never followed by any author. He himself omitted the reference to Zechariah in the second revised edition of his commentary (1921, 152).<sup>22</sup>

The following arguments might be advanced in favor of the reference to Zech 6:12-13 in John 2:22. *Firstly*, the Zecharian prophecy is employed in the first part of the diptych (John 2:13-16). It has been argued that the specifically Johannine details found in vv. 14-16 (such as πρόβατα, φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων<sup>23</sup> and οἶκον ἐμπορίου<sup>24</sup>), can each be traced to some passage in the Book of Zechariah. This can hardly be accounted for by sheer coincidence; rather it is more reasonable to assume that the Book of Zechariah shaped this narrative. Consequently, many contemporary "historical Jesus scholars" argue that Jesus' temple act was a deliberate re-application of Zechariah by Jesus himself.<sup>25</sup> If this is the case, it might be assumed that some Zecharian influence might also be present in the second part of the narrative (vv. 18-20).

*Secondly*, the reference to Zechariah not only explains the *origin* of the temple act, but also accounts for the *meaning* of Jesus' action. Both the traditional view that interprets Jesus' action as a protest or an attempt to reform the temple<sup>26</sup> and the "new perspective" introduced by Sanders (1985, 61-90), that sees this act as a dramatic symbol of the imminent destruction of the temple,<sup>27</sup> fit into a program of eschatological expectation envisioned by Zechariah. It is Zechariah's prophecy that envisions YHWH's spiritual dwelling among his people in the city with a divine flaming wall (2:14), the universal extension of YHWH's reign (14:9), the worship of all nations in Jerusalem (14:16-19) and the extension of the sanctity of the temple to the whole city and land of Judah (14:21). It fits the Johannine vision of the new

22 He mentioned only Ps 16:10; Isa 53:10-12; Hos 11:2 [*sic!*] and Dan 9:27. It must be also noted that the prophecy of Zechariah (as a whole) was also mentioned by Slovan (1988, 41) but only in order to dismiss it as a possible referent.

23 See Zech 11:4-17. Cf. Trudinger 1997, 329-330; Selwyn 1911, 209-213.

24 There is almost unanimous scholarly agreement that the Johannine phrase οἶκον ἐμπορίου (2:16) alludes to the last sentence of the Book of Zechariah (14:21). For a detailed analysis of this allusion see Luzarraga 2000, 277-281 and 284-289; Nobile 2005, 65-66. At this point it is also worth noting that the final verse of a biblical book, or even of a synagogue lection, was regarded as especially memorable and thus very significant. Cf. Guilding 1960, 22. Thus, for any Jewish reader conversant with the biblical prophetic tradition, John's allusion to this single hemistich, indeed, the last verse of the book, was likely to bring to mind at once the whole content of Zechariah's prophecy.

25 Meyer 1992, 262-263; Sanders 1993, 254; Wright 1996, 422.427.586; Evans 2006, 72.

26 Theissen 1978, 47-48; Freyne 1988, 178-190; Bauckham 1988, 72-89; Evans 1989a, 522-539; 1989b, 237-270; 1992, 235-253; 1993, 93-110; 1997, 417-442; Richardson 1992, 507-523; Betz 1997, 455-472; Yarbro Collins 2001, 57-61; Powell 2007, 277-282.

27 Cf. also Sanders 1990, 49-51; 1992, 47-76. There is also a plethora of authors who took the basic point of Sanders' hypothesis and incorporated it within their own ideas. See a very short summary in Wright 1996, 413-414.

spiritual temple made up of Jesus' resurrected body as well as the spiritual dwelling of the Father, the Son and the Spirit, within Jesus' disciples (John 14:2-3.23) recruited from among all the nations (11:52; 12:19-20).

*Thirdly*, concentrating on the immediate context again, it is clear that by τῷ λόγῳ ὃν εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς in v. 22 is intended Jesus' saying in v. 19. Its straightforward message is actually the rebuilding of the temple and not the resurrection (this idea is only found in the narrator's comment in v. 20). Thus, the theme of the *temple* – first its “cleansing” (first panel of the diptych), then its “destruction/rebuilding” (second panel) – appears as the main thread woven through the whole cleansing narrative. The idea of resurrection is subordinate to it, as Jesus' resurrection is understood as “only” the means of achieving the rebuilding of the temple. Therefore, the reference to γραφή in v. 22 should also be looked for in v. 19. Consequently, the scriptural referent of γραφή in v. 22 may not refer to the idea of resurrection (which is only implied in v. 19), but to the theme of the rebuilt temple (which is explicit in v. 19). Indeed, the theme of the temple is the main focus of the prophecy of Zech 6:12-13, yet is completely absent from other proposed referents.<sup>28</sup> There is a special emphasis in the portrayal of בָּנִים on the action of building the temple, as it is repeated twice (6:12.13) and it is the first action in the description of the Messianic *shoot*, preceding even the ruling activity.

*Fourthly*, later interpretations of Zech 6:12-13 (e.g. LXX, Philo, Targum, rabbinic literature),<sup>29</sup> corroborated by the Messianic understanding of the

- <sup>28</sup> A commentator with the username “Hiram” published on 7 July 2010 (accessed on 16 March 2012) an online post (<http://involvedgenealogies.wordpress.com/>) in which he argued that Ezra 6:13-22, which speaks of the rebuilding and dedication of the temple after the Babylonian exile, is the referent of γραφή in John 2:22. There are two pertinent elements in Ezra 6:13-22 which are also found in John 2:13-22: (1) the temple was finished *on the third day* (Ezra 6:15; cf. John 2:19.20), and (2) the celebrations of the dedication (3<sup>rd</sup> Adar) are followed by the *Passover* (14<sup>th</sup> Nisan) (Ezra 6:19; cf. John 2:13). “Hiram” also turns his attention to the theme of the sin-offering for all Israel (Ezra 6:17) and the appointment of the priests (Ezra 6:18) which accompanied the dedication. Both themes are also present in the FG: Jesus is both the sacrifice and the priest (Heil 1995, 729-745). I would also draw attention to the mention of the prophet Zechariah, who actively helped in the rebuilding of the temple (Ezra 6:14). Both Ezra 5–6 and Zech 1–8 refer to the same temple; what Zechariah describes in terms of a future promise, Ezra describes as already present reality. It is tempting to hypothesize that both texts might have been read by pious Jews in a complementary way. There is also no doubt that the oracles of Zechariah were eschatological and seen as not yet realized (cf. *Tg. Zech* 6:12-13). The future coming of the *Shoot-Messiah* (Zech 3:8), mysteriously united with the high priest (Zech 6:13; cf. Ezra 5:2), connected with the rebuilding of the temple and removing the sins of Israel (Zech 3:9; cf. 13:1) was still expected. According to the authors of the NT this prophecy was realized fully in Jesus, the Messiah (see note 33 below). Did Ezra 6 provide a temporal setting for such an expectation? The possibility cannot be excluded, although I doubt it, as the references to the Passover (Ezra 6:19) and the third day (6:15) seem too general and causal respectively.
- <sup>29</sup> LXX uses in both Zech 3:8 and 6:12 the word ἀνατολή (*rising* above the horizon of any heavenly body; *the quarter of sunrise, east; growing*). In ancient Egypt the pharaoh was regarded as the

title *צמח* in other sources (e.g. DSS, *Hazon Gabriel*),<sup>30</sup> identified the royal agent of this rebuilding as the Messiah. In fact, in the milieu of first century AD Judaism, the Messiah was expected to take a stance toward the temple: either by its rebuilding (e.g. *Sib. Or.* 5.414-433; *Tg. Isa.* 53:5) or at the very least by some significant act with regard to it (*Pss. Sol.* 17:22.30-32).<sup>31</sup> Thus Jesus' temple act and his comment on this action were seen as an intrinsic part of his Messianic claim.<sup>32</sup>

*Fifthly*, it is indisputable that the presence of numerous quotations of and allusions to Zechariah, dispersed throughout the whole FG, makes this proposal something more than a mere possibility.<sup>33</sup> This is most persuasively

*son of Ra*, which in fact meant the *son of the Rising Sun*. In Ptolemaic Egypt, the kings had a right to use the royal titles of the pharaohs. Excluding the notion of divine sonship (which could be offensive to the Greek mentality), Ptolemaic kings used to be called by a more general and abstract term, namely *ἀνατολή*, which explicitly alluded to the ancient Egyptian royal title *νιός* 'Pā. Cf. van der Branden 1964, 60-72, esp. 69. If one takes for granted the Egyptian origin of the Septuagint, the royal (and consequently Messianic) overtone of the term *ἀνατολή* becomes obvious. Cf. Rinaldi 1966, 185. In Philo's interpretation of Zech 6:12 found in *Conf.* 62-63, the title-name *ἀνατολή* reflects the "incorporeal divine image" that dwells in the first-born son of God-the-Father. Some see this description as Messianic. Cf. Wright 1996, 630, note 74. Besides *Tg. Zech* 6:12 the identification of *צמח* with *משיחא* is found in *Tg. Isa.* 4:2 (*צמח יהוה* → *משיחא דיוי*); *Tg. Jer* 23:5 and 33:15 (*צמח צדיק* → *משיח דצדקא*) and *Tg. Zech* 3:8 (*עבדי צמח* → *עבדי משיח*). The Messianic exegesis of Zech 6:12 is also found in *Midrash Rabbah* on Num 28:21; *Lamentations Rabbah* on Lam 1:16.

<sup>30</sup> The expression *צמח דוד* as a Messianic title is found in 4Q174 1-3 I 11; 4Q252 V 3-4; 4Q285 IV (frg. 7) 3-4 and in 4Q161 8-10 17 where the word *צמח* is restored. Lines 21-22 of *Hazon Gabriel*, dated to the end of the first century BC, mention the *wicked shoot* (*הצמח הרע*) which by YHWH's decree was destined for destruction. It has been argued (Knohl 2008, 149-150; 2009, 52-83) that *הצמח הרע* refers to "a wicked Messianic king," the opposite of the righteous shoot.

<sup>31</sup> *Pss. Sol.* 17 speaks of the king, the Messiah, who will *cleanse* Jerusalem from *Gentiles* (understood as *sinners*). Though there is no explicit mention of the cleansing of the *temple*, it is, however, logically implied since the temple was always taken as an integral part of Jerusalem. Indeed, both the temple and Jerusalem were many times used interchangeably in Jewish tradition.

<sup>32</sup> Let me quote two noted NT scholars. Meyer (1979, 199) states: "The entry into Jerusalem and the cleansing of the temple constituted a Messianic demonstration, a Messianic critique, a Messianic fulfilment event, and a sign of the Messianic restoration of Israel." In the same vein, Wright (1996, 490) argues: "Jesus' action in the Temple constitutes the most obvious act of Messianic praxis within the gospel narratives." The Messianic overtones of the temple incident are corroborated when one connects the cleansing narratives with the trial narratives. This linkage is direct in the Synoptics but indirect in the FG, although still clearly identifiable in the latter by means of the paschal interpretation of Ps 68:10 LXX and the temple logion in John 2:19. According to the gospel reports, Jesus was put to death as a false Messianic pretender. If the temple act became the catalyst for the decision to kill Jesus (the stand of Mark and Matt) and the temple logion became the main charge against Jesus (again Mark and Matt), this indicates that Jesus' temple act was indeed intended as a Messianic one.

<sup>33</sup> There are two explicit quotes of Zech in the FG: Zech 9:9 in John 12:15 and Zech 12:10 in John 19:37. The conflated quotation in John 7:38 has Zech 14:8 as its primary scriptural source. Besides Zecharian allusions in the cleansing narratives noted above, authors indicate many other

demonstrated by the presence of the explicit quotation of Zech 9:9 in the entry narrative (John 12:15) which, in all probability, was coupled with the cleansing narrative in the earlier version of the FG. Indeed, the *eschatological* and *violent-zealous* aspects of the Johannine cleansing narrative appear more intelligible when this account is read as following the Johannine entry narrative. First, John itemized the merchandise (*oxen, sheep, and pigeons*) – and this set of terms from the merchandise domain is then purposely repeated in the narrative – in order to underline that Jesus is cleansing the temple from the *merchants* in fulfillment of the scriptural passage of Zech 14:21 which explicitly speaks of the absence of *merchants* in the temple. The whole prophecy of Zech 14 describes the eschatological day of YHWH. Jesus' action in the temple could then be explained by his status as YHWH-King who is coming to his possession, his temple, in the *eschaton*. The title that Jesus receives in John 12:13, *King of Israel*, is then easily understood as a reference to Zech 14:9.16.17 where YHWH is called the *king*. Similarly, Jesus' *violence* (a whip of cords, a detail not mentioned by the Synoptics) and *zeal* (Ps 69:10) is all of a piece with the Zecharian description of God, the king and the warrior, found in Zech 9:1-17 and Zech 14 (esp. 14:3). For this reason the adjective *humble*, present in the Matthean quotation (21:5), was removed from the Johannine citation of Zech 9:9. The connection of the two Johannine narratives with Zech 14 might be additionally corroborated by the mention of the palm branches and the cry *Hosanna* (as in the Hallel psalms) in John 12:13. Both elements occur during the Feast of Tabernacles which is explicitly mentioned in Zech 14:16-19.

*Sixthly*, the Zecharian backdrop might also explain the chronological *setting* of Jesus' temple act in the Johannine narrative. There are many Jewish texts predating the destruction of the second temple (AD 70) and the redaction of the FG, that expect the new (third) temple; in some cases the revelation or descent of the heavenly (fourth?) temple.<sup>34</sup> Clearly, this new or heavenly temple is meant to replace the present earthly temple in the *eschaton*. Analysis of Zech 6:12-13 corroborates the view that the temple

points of contact (both *allusions* and *echoes*): Zech 9:1 (12:1) and the idea of the Johannine Logos, Zech 2:14 (2:10 LXX); 8:3 and John 1:14; 14:3.23; Zech 4 and John 1:41; Zech 3:8.10 and John 1:45-51; Zech 14:1-2.16-17 and John 4:21.23; Zech 7:9 and John 7:24; Zech 14:4 and John 8:1; 18:1; Zech 1:5 and John 8:52-53; Deut-Zech Shepherd passages and John 10:1-18; 16:32; Zech 14:16 and John 11:52; 12:20; Zechariah and John 12:29; Zechariah and John 18:1-27; Zech 6:12-13 and John 18:5.7; 19:19; Zech 6:11-12 and John 19:2.5; Zech 13:9 and John 20:28; the Feast of Tabernacles in Zech 14 and the whole narrative of the FG. Cf. Kubiś 2012, 411-479.

<sup>34</sup> Tob 14:5; 1 En. 90:29; 91:13 (= 4Q212 IV.18); 2 Bar. 6:8-9; 32:2-4; Jub. 1:15-17.26-29 (= 4Q216 IV.7-8); Sib. Or. 5:266-281; 5:414-433; Tg. Isa. 53:5; 4Q174 III.2-69; 11Q19 XXIX.8-10; 4Q554 I.I.4.



in the present form of this text should be understood as the *eschatological, future* temple. Thus, the eschatological expectation of the Messiah's or God's intervention in rebuilding the temple accounts for not only the *origin* and *meaning* of Jesus' temple act, but also its *setting* at the beginning of the FG. If the rebuilding of the temple was a sign of the eschatological era, Jesus' temple act set at the very beginning of his public ministry declares that with Jesus' arrival the *eschaton* is ushered in. The very juxtaposition of the sign in Cana, an allusion to the eschatological banquet (both divine and Messianic), and the action in the temple, another marker of the eschatological era, indicates the commencement of the *eschatological* age with the inauguration of Jesus' ministry.

## 2. The Referent of γραφή in John 20:9

In the FG there is no prediction of Jesus' death and resurrection in the fashion found in the Synoptics: that the Son of Man had to suffer, be delivered into the hands of men, be rejected and killed, and then would rise on the third day (cf. Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:33-34 and par.). In the FG only the cleansing narrative (2:13-22) attests an explicit combination of the two themes of Jesus' death (2:17) and resurrection (2:19-22).<sup>35</sup> If the understanding of Jesus' resurrection in John 2:19-22 is tantamount to the idea of a royal and Messianic rebuilding of the temple as reflected in Zech 6:12-13, one might wonder whether the same concept and the same scriptural reference might be hidden behind the narrator's vague remark οὐδέπω γὰρ ἤρδισαν τὴν γραφὴν ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι (*for as yet they did not understand the scripture that he must rise from the dead*) found in John 20:9. The disciples did not know yet the γραφή which testified that Jesus must be raised, namely that he, the Messiah-King, had to build the new temple (as reflected in Zech 6:12-13) by means of his bodily resurrection or, to put it differently, that Jesus' resurrection was indeed the (re)building of the (new) temple predicted by this γραφή. This hypothesis might be corroborated both by absence and presence: the striking absence of agreement among commentators regarding the scriptural referent of γραφή in John 20:9 (as far as I know, nobody has considered Zech 6:12-13 as a possible referent), and by the presence, *firstly*, of some similarities between the cleansing narrative (where the reference

<sup>35</sup> The passages which speak of the necessity (δεῖ) of the exaltation/glorification of the Son of Man in John 3:14 and 12:34 (cf. also 8:28) *imply* Jesus' death and resurrection, and as such can also be understood as *indirect* predictions of Jesus' death and resurrection.

to Zech 6:12-13 was already demonstrated) and John 20:9 and its context, and *secondly*, by the presence of the *royal* and *temple* motifs in John 20. The vagueness of the scriptural reference – and the consequent impressive disagreement among authors – though intriguing, has no persuasive value on its own. A positive line of argument points more directly to an implicit allusion to Zech 6:12-13 in the Johannine paschal narrative.

## 2.1. Current Scholarly Opinions

The Syriac versions (*Sinaiticus*, *Peshîttâ*, *Heraklensis*) and some mss of Vetus Latina (e.g. *aur f Codex Fossatensis*) read the plural *Scriptures* (*scripturas*) instead of the singular (e.g. *scripturam* – *e a b d c [scriptura] ff<sup>e</sup> q r<sup>l</sup> j δ gat*). This lection reflects quite a common view among commentators that the singular γραφή in John 20:9 refers to the testimony of the *entire Scripture* rather than that of a single passage.<sup>36</sup> Menken (2002, 204) narrows the range of possible references and argues that the singular γραφή in John 20:9 refers

to the passages on the vindication of the suffering righteous one which are found in the OT context of most of his quotations that concern the rejection and death of Jesus. Just as he [John] considers Jesus' resurrection as the "inside" of his death, he considers, in the relevant parts of the OT, the vindication passages as the "inside" of the rejection passages, and he refers to these vindication passages in general.

An impressive number of commentators point to Ps 16:10, due to its use in the context of Jesus' resurrection in Acts 2:27 and 13:35.<sup>37</sup> Among other possible passages that are usually mentioned are Hos 6:2; Jonah 2:1; Isa 26:19-21 and 53:10-12. Some have even suggested NT narratives such as Luke 24:46 (Freed 1965, 57-58) or the FG itself (Moloney 1998, 520 and 523; 2005a, 464-466). Interestingly, all those proposals (with the exception of Isa 26:19-21 and Luke 24:46) were also suggested by commentators for the scriptural referent in John 2:22.<sup>38</sup> According to Draper (2002, 70.72-76) several elements – the emphasis on the clothes (John 20:6-7), the remark

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Marsh 1968, 167; Schnackenburg 1975, 369; Schneider 1976, 88.319-320; Kysar 1986, 298; Carson 1991, 639; Simoons 1997, 1:173-174; 3:876-878; Beasley-Murray 1999, 373; Wengst 2000, 2:280; Michaels 2010, 993.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Westcott 1892, 290; Bernard 1928, 2:662; Lightfoot 1956, 130; Sanders and Mastin 1968, 422, note 3; Morris 1971, 835; Lindars 1972, 603; Lincoln 2005, 491.

<sup>38</sup> Already Godet (1879, 3:309) saw the connection between scriptural references in John 2:22 and 20:9: "John had quoted no other prophecies regarding His resurrection than that of ch. ii; he was not, therefore, obliged to make special allusion here [20:9] to such prophecies." However, in his understanding those OT passages were: Ps 16; Isa 53; Hos 6; and Jonah 2. Cf. note 4.

that the disciple *saw and believed*, the reference to a specific passage of the Scripture (singular γραφή), and the previous use of Isa 6 in the Johannine narrative (ch. 12) – all suggest that the Isaianic vision in ch. 6 is the referent of γραφή in John 20:9. Rather surprisingly, Reim (1974, 49) argued that John was referring to a *Scripture* which was otherwise unknown to him since this scriptural allusion was handed down to him by tradition. Others content themselves with the argument that the precise scriptural passage must remain unknown (cf. Brown 1970, 987; Schulz 1972, 242). Since the FG does not stress the images connected with Jesus' suffering, the scriptural references resorting to the idea of restitution, e.g., in the case of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah and Psalms (including the vision of Hos 6:2), do not seem likely. The Johannine vision is *positive*, i.e. Jesus' crucifixion is the *hour* of his glorification. Thus, the resurrection, as well as the *Scripture* referring to it, should both resonate as clear, final notes of this positive vision. In my opinion Zech 6:12-13 fits perfectly such a vision: Jesus' resurrection is understood as the building of the new temple by the Messiah-King.

## 2.2. The Cleansing Narrative and John 20:9

The following similarities between John 2:13-22 and John 20 can be noted: (1) Besides John 2:22, the only occurrence of γραφή in the whole of John's Gospel with no explicitly defined scriptural referent is found in John 20:9. In fact, both passages create an *inclusio* since they are the *first* (2:22) and the *last* (20:9) instances of the noun γραφή in the FG. (2) Most importantly, both contexts speak about the *resurrection* of Jesus. Moreover, both contexts have in view (3) Jesus' *disciples*, (4) the concept of *faith* in Jesus' resurrection (2:22; 20:8) and (5) the time frame of *the third day*. In the case of the cleansing narrative the third day is mentioned explicitly (2:19.20 - ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις), while in the case of the paschal narrative, John 20:1 makes an implicit allusion to it by mention of τῆ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων (*on the first of the Sabbaths = on the first day of the week*), equivalent to *the third day* in the chronology of Jesus' passion. (6) In both contexts there is found the same theme of the *lack of knowledge of the Scripture* on the level of the narrated time, plus the same *illumination of the disciples* after Jesus' resurrection (they remembered – 2:17.22 or they came to know – 20:9). The historically precise moment of Jesus' resurrection opens the period of time which constitutes the temporal perspective from which the author of the Gospel was writing. The same temporal gap in the disciples' understanding of the *Scripture* and its later *recollection* is described in John 12:16 where

the clear scriptural referent is – I believe not by chance – another passage from the prophecy of Zechariah (9:9). (7) Finally, the particular use of the noun *σῶμα* in the FG should be noted. The term occurs only in 2:21 and in the passion-resurrection narratives (19:31.38.40; 20:12). In the former case Jesus' *body* is explicitly identified with the *temple*, and in the latter Jesus' *body* is mentioned only in connection with his *burial* (19:38.40) and *resurrection* (20:12).<sup>39</sup> Thus, the attentive reader of the Johannine narrative would logically expect that the burial of Jesus' *σῶμα* is a prelude to the *rebuilding of the temple*, i.e. *resurrection*, as stated in 2:21.

### 2.3. The Temple and Royal Motifs in John 20

The presence of both *temple* and *royal* motifs or imagery in the paschal narrative of John 20 would be more proof of the thesis that the Johannine vision of Jesus' resurrection, as described in John 20, is seen as the royal rebuilding of the temple with its source in Zech 6:12-13. It must be noted that in the period of the origin of the NT the Zion/Temple traditions were imbued with the Paradise/Eden traditions, to the point that Zion/Temple was identified with the Garden of Eden and vice versa.<sup>40</sup> Thus, any *paradise* motif found in John 20 corroborates the presence of the *temple* imagery in this narrative.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Regarding the burial narrative, Grappe (2009a, 287) rightly notes that “[l]’insistance avec laquelle est mentionné le corps de Jésus à ce moment précis de la narration [19:38-42] ne peut qu’attirer l’attention.” Consequently, Grappe (291) argues that the motif of Jesus' *body* identified as the temple creates “une correspondance [...] entre la scène initiale de l’intervention de Jésus au Temple et la scène finale de l’ensevelissement puis du relèvement dans un jardin.”

<sup>40</sup> *Zion* (and its temple) is understood as *Eden* in Isa 53:1; Ezek 28:13-14; 20:40; 36:35; 40:2; 47:1-12; *Jub.* 8:19; *T. Dan* 5:12; *Odes Sol.* 20:7; 4Q500; Rev 22:1-2; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 2:15; *Pirqe R. El.* § 12. According to Stordalen (2000, 410-414) the concept “Zion-as-Eden” is also at work in Lam 2:6; Ezek 34:29; Ps 80:13-14; 2 Kgs 19:21b-24 and Isa 60:13. Wyatt (1990, 27; cf. Stordalen 2000, 419-421), after a slight correction of the MT, pointed out the linkage of three elements – the Jerusalem temple, Eden and a river/well – in Ps 36:9-10: *They drink their fill from the abundance of your temple and you give them to drink from the stream of your Eden, for with you is the fountain of life, in your well we see light.* Stager (1999, 187\*-188\*) mentions also Ps 1:3; 2:6-8; 24:1-3; 89:25-26; and 92:12-14. The reverse concept, i.e. “Eden-as-Temple,” is corroborated by some parallels in the descriptions of Paradise in Gen 2-3 and the tent sanctuaries and the Jerusalem temple. For a list of these parallels see Wenham 1994, 400-403. It has been also argued that this concept is present in the paradise narrative of *Jub.* 3 (see Van Ruiten 1996, 305-317; 1999a, 75-79) as well as in *1 En.* 24-27 (Van Ruiten 1999b, 223); 4Q174 (אֲדָם – נִקְרָא אֲדָם – Baumgarten 1994, 8-10); 4Q265 frg. 7, line 14; 4Q421 frgs. 11 and 12 (Brook 1999, 295) and *Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch* (Stordalen 2000, 410).

<sup>41</sup> The same principle was expressed by Zimmermann (2008, 232): “Because the anticipation of the eschatological temple was, in early Judaism, explicitly connected to garden symbolism [...], one can conclude that the Evangelist in John 20 has created a conscious connection between the garden symbolism and temple metaphor.”

## 2.3.1. Two Angels

It has been suggested that the position of the two angels in white mentioned in John 20:12, sitting respectively at the places where Jesus' head and feet had been, might be an allusion to the two cherubs of the Ark of the Covenant.<sup>42</sup> Consequently, Jesus could be identified with the "mercy-seat" (כַּפֶּרֶת; ἱλαστήριον) to which he was indeed compared in other NT writings, i.e. Rom 3:25 and Heb 9:5.12.14.24-26. In fact, the text of John 20:12 is quite similar to the description of כַּפֶּרֶת found in Exod 25:19 – two cherubs are placed on the mercy seat, one cherub on one end and one cherub on the other. According to Exod 25:22 God will speak with Moses *from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubim that are over the ark of the testimony*. Interestingly enough, the Targums to Exod 25:22 state that God will establish over the mercy-seat his Word: *And I will appoint my Memra* (מִמְרָא – Tg. Neof., Tg. Onq.; מִימְרָא – Tg. Ps.-J.) *to meet you there*. The fact that Jesus is described in the FG as *the Word* – ὁ λόγος (1:1-18), which *pitched his tent* (ἔσκηνωσεν) among the people (1:14), makes the association between the temple symbolism and the two angels in Jesus' tomb in John 20:12 even more striking.<sup>43</sup>

While stating that "it is hard to prove that the reader was meant to pick up this allusion" to Exod 25:17-22, Lincoln (2005, 492) draws attention to a more plausible link, namely to John 1:51, the only other Johannine passage that links Jesus directly with angels.<sup>44</sup> Jesus' resurrection would then, in Lincoln's opinion, fulfill Jesus' own prediction about the angels *ascending and descending* on the Son of Man. In my opinion, however, the angels in John 20:12 would first of all echo the theme of the *temple*, the *house of God* (בֵּית־אֵל), alluded to in John 1:51. This theme is present in John 1:51 by means of the reference to Gen 28. Two cherubs were present in the midst of the inner part of the Jerusalem temple (1 Kgs 6:23-27; 8:6-7) and their images adorned the temple walls (6:29) and utensils (7:29.36). The symbolic

42 This symbolism was already noted by Wettstein (1751, 1:959) and later by Westcott 1892, 291; Brown 1970, 989; Simenel 1992, 71-76; Léon-Dufour 1996, 218; Simoens 1997, 3:879; Lee 2002, 223; Chennattu 2006, 149-150; Grappe 2009a, 293-294; 2009b 169-177. Bernard (1928, 2:664) argues that there is no evidence that such a thought was in the mind of the author of the FG. According to Keener (2003, 2:1188, note 192) an allusion to the cherubs of the Ark of the Covenant "is possible but may be overreaching; after all, Jesus' presence was gone from the site." Zumstein (2007, 277, note 8) deems this intertextual connection "invérifiable."

43 For a detailed discussion of this allusion see Grappe 2009b, 169-177. He (177) states: "[...] les deux anges, sis de part et d'autre du tombeau ouvert, du lieu où l'on avait déposé le corps de Jésus, pourraient signaler, en Jn 20,12, la présence mystérieuse du Logos, du Seigneur: pour être ailleurs que dans le tombeau désormais vide, il n'en est pas moins, désormais et à jamais, le véritable sanctuaire."

44 This *inclusio* was also noted by Draper 2002, 63-76. In John 12:29 there is singular ἄγγελος.

significance of the presence of the two angels in John 20 might be corroborated by the fact they do not utter any message about Jesus' resurrection as it is attested in the Synoptics. Their presence itself is the manifestation of the presence of Jesus, the new temple, who, in fact, is discovered on that spot (20:14). For this reason the only words the angels pronounce – γύναι, τί κλαίεις; (*Woman, why are you weeping?* – 20:13) – may express their incomprehension toward Mary's behavior, "a mild rebuke" (Carson 1991, 641). These words are repeated verbatim by Jesus (20:15) since both Jesus and two angels are two elements of the same reality: the manifestation of God's glory in the new temple of Jesus' resurrected body.

Some authors see in the presence of two angels in John 20:12 a reference to the *cherubim* (plural) placed at the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:24).<sup>45</sup> In their opinion, whereas those cherubim barred the way to the Tree of Life, the Johannine angels, by contrast, connote the imminent presence of Jesus, the source of life. The curse from Genesis is lifted by Jesus, the new *man-Adam* (cf. ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος – John 19:5). If Eden is identified with the temple (and vice versa), the allusion to Gen 3:24 in John 20:12 only corroborates our thesis. I would also draw attention to Philo's argument (*Cher. 27-28; QG 1, 57*) that the *two (!) cherubim* of Gen 3 represent the *creative* and *royal* virtues or powers of God. Indeed, both *creation* and *royalty* are at play in the Johannine resurrection narrative.

### 2.3.2. Garden

The *garden* (κῆπος) is mentioned in John 18:1.26 and 19:41*bis*. It creates an *inclusio* which encompasses the whole passion narrative, emphasizing that Jesus' arrest, crucifixion, burial, resurrection and first appearance to Mary Magdalene all happened in the *garden*. Obviously, in terms of topography, the narrative deals with two different *gardens*. Yet, in terms of the narrative art, the occurrences of κῆπος at the beginning and the end of the passion account (18:1; 19:41) as well as its intentional repetitions (18:26; 19:41*bis*) demonstrate the interpretative importance of this term. In the symbolic language of the OT, a *garden* is (1) a metaphor for lovers as beautiful and desirable (cf. Song 1:6; 2:15; 4:12-16; 5:1; 8:11) and (2) God's garden of paradise (cf. Gen 2–3; Ezek 28; 31; 36). Indeed, in the case of John 20, both symbolic meanings have been suggested but the reference to the Garden of Eden seems to be dominant.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Suggit 1999, 167; Rosik 2004, 48-50; 2008, 91-93.

<sup>46</sup> On the reference to *the Song of Songs* see Mateos and Barreto 1982, 837 and Roberts-Winsor 1999, *passim*, esp. 42.54-55. The existence of the allusion to the Garden of Eden was already argued by some Church Fathers (e.g. Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine and Cyril of Alexandria)

The victory of the Johannine Jesus, which commences in the arrest in the *garden* (ch. 18) and ends with resurrection in the *garden* (ch. 20), should be seen in contrast with Adam's fall in the *garden* and its consequences: mortality and expulsion from the *garden* (Gen 2–3). Jesus, the new Adam, is then the conqueror of evil and death, the source of immortal life, who re-creates humanity and brings it back to the garden.

Many authors provide other arguments which likewise support the existence of an allusion to Gen 2–3 in John 20: (1) Jesus' title κηπουρός in John 20:15 may allude to the presentation of God as the *gardener* in Gen 2–3.<sup>47</sup> (2) Jesus' imparting of the Spirit to the disciples in John 20:22 is described by means of the verb ἐμφυσάω, which is the only instance of this verb in the NT. Interestingly, the same verb, in the same morphological form, occurs in Gen 2:7 LXX when *God formed the man of the dust of the earth, and breathed (ἐνεφύσησεν) upon his face the breath of life; and the man became a living soul.*<sup>48</sup> The choice of this particular verb in John 20:22 could be an intentional allusion to the history of man's creation in the Garden of Eden,<sup>49</sup> which would imply in the Johannine context the re-creation of men – that is, Jesus' disciples – by freeing them from sin (cf. John 20:23).<sup>50</sup> Moreover, (3) the Hebrew Bible, Targums and rabbinic sources all locate the Garden of Eden on the Temple Mount in Jerusalem or in its

and medieval authors (e.g. Rupert of Deutz, Thomas Aquinas). Among modern commentators see, e.g.: Hoskyns 1920, 214-215; 1947, 509; Robinson 1966, 5; Marsh 1968, 585 and 623; Boismard and Lamouille 1977, 452; Manns 1987, 53-80; 1991, 410-429; Wyatt 1990, 36-38; Simoens 1997, 3:744-745; Suggit 1999, 161-168; Reinhartz 1999, 62-63; Zimmermann 2004, 156-163; 2008, 226-234; Schaper 2010, 17-27.

<sup>47</sup> Hoskyns 1920, 214-215; 1947, 542; Lightfoot 1956, 322; Wyatt 1990, 35-36; Reinhartz 1999, 62-63; Zimmermann 2004, 158-163; 2008, 227-228.230-231; Thyen 2005, 762; Brown 2010, 280-281.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. also Wis 15:11; 3 Kgdms 17:21; Ezek 37:9. Interestingly, according to Hatina (1993, 196-219) the Johannine account (20:22) betrays some similarities with *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* of Gen 2:7.

<sup>49</sup> The suggestion was noted by Hoskyns 1920, 215-216; Bernard 1928, 2:677; Goppelt 1969, 221-222; Brown 1970, 1037; Lindars 1972, 611; Barrett 1978, 570; Léon-Dufour 1996, 237; Zimmermann 2004, 162-163; Thyen 2005, 767; Zumstein 2007, 286; Grappe 2009a, 288-289; Brown 2010, 282-283.

<sup>50</sup> In the context of our investigation it is worth noting the suggestion that the description of the descent of the *Spirit* in Acts 2 is an allusion to a descent of the heavenly *temple*. Cf. Beale 2005, 63-90. In fact, in Beale's opinion, John 20:22 is a development of the promise of the *Spirit* in John 7:39 which enables the disciples to become part of the *new temple*. He observes (80) that John 20:22 is the first time since 7:39 where the language of "receiving the Spirit" in reference to Jesus' followers occurs (cf. the verb λαμβάνω). The theme of the *temple* also explains the following reference to the *forgiveness of sins* (John 20:23). Whereas in the OT the *forgiveness of sins* was connected with the animal sacrifices in the *temple*, "in the new age forgiveness comes through Christ's sacrifice that is announced through the covenant community," *the new temple* (Beale 2005, 80).

vicinity.<sup>51</sup> Thus, this connection might have occurred in the thought of the author of the FG, and undoubtedly it would facilitate the identification between Jesus, the temple in Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden in the minds of readers / auditors of the FG. (4) Taking into account the ancient Near Eastern context, the mention of the *garden* would almost automatically bring to the fore an allusion to the theme of *the temple* and *the king*. In fact, a *garden* was part of a temple complex (as was also the case in the Solomonic temple; cf. Stager, 1999, 183\*-189\*), and moreover, it was often understood as a figure for the whole of the king's realm (Wyatt 1990, 36).<sup>52</sup>

One can also take issue with the view that John 20 intentionally alludes to the Garden of Eden of Gen 2–3. These objections may be noted as follows. First, Gen 2–3 LXX uses *παράδεισος* instead of *κῆπος* (Wevers 1974, *ad loc.*).<sup>53</sup> Moreover, the Johannine tradition, to wit Rev 2:7, likewise designates

<sup>51</sup> See notes 40 and 69.

<sup>52</sup> Among less convincing arguments are: (1) The mention of the first day of the week (John 20:1) evokes the first day of creation in Genesis 1 and alludes to the idea of the *new creation*, and consequently a new paradise (e.g. Mateos and Barreto 1982, *passim*). (2) In the same vein, the mention of the *darkness* (σκοτία) in John 20:1 might also be seen as a reference to the first day of creation (Simoens 1997, 3:867). (3) The Johannine *πρωί* (*in the morning*) (20:1) may allude to the geographical setting of the Garden of Eden *in the east; where the sun rises* – κατὰ ἀνατολάς (Gn 2:8), a symbol of awakening life (Rosik 2004, 54; 2008, 86). (4) The change of the verbs describing Mary Magdalene's way of seeing (20:12.14.18) might be contrasted with the change of seeing in the case of Adam and Eve when their eyes were opened (Gen 3:17) (Rosik 2008, 89-90). (5) God, the gardener, searching for man and calling him by his name (only in Gen 3:9 LXX) might be contrasted with Mary's "searching" and being called by name in John 20 (Rosik 2008, 87-90). (6) The burial linen clothes left by Jesus in the tomb (John 20:6-7), since Jesus, the new Adam, does not need any clothes, might be in contrast with preparing the clothes for Adam and Eve after their sin (Gen 3:21) (Rosik 2008, 94-95). (7) The presence of the vocative κύριε (John 20:15) expresses Jesus' divinity and indirectly alludes to God's presence in the Garden of Eden (Wyatt 1990, 38). (8) The lack of agony in John 18:1-12 could allude to the concept of *the garden of delight* (παράδεισος τρυφῆς / κῆπος τρυφῆς - cf. Gn 3:23.24 LXX; Ezek 31:9.13; 36:35; Joel 2:3 LXX). (9) The name Κεδρών of John 18:1, translated as *of cedars*, may allude to *the cedars in the garden of God* in Ezek 31:8 (Robinson 1966, 5 and 7). (10) Manns (1987, 70-71; 1991, 417-418) suggested that the concept of *the glory of Adam* describing the situation of Adam in the Garden of Eden, widely attested in the intertestamental literature, might also correspond with the presentation of Jesus' glory revealed in the garden at the moment of his arrest (John 18:1-12). Moreover, (11) Manns (1987, 74; 1991, 422) submits that the threefold repetition of ἐγώ εἰμι in John 18:1-12 might allude to the concept of the glory of God's *Shekinah* which was believed to dwell in the Garden of Eden. Finally, (12) the presence in the *garden* (John 18:2-3.5) of Judas, who embodies *Satan* (cf. John 13:27), might connote the presence of the *serpent* in the Garden of Eden (Gen 3), which is identified in the biblical and intertestamental tradition with *Devil* (cf. Wis 2:24; *Apoc. Mos.* 16:4-5; Rev 12:9).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Sanders and Mastin 1968, 415-416 ("it is unlikely that an allusion to the Garden of Eden is intended, as then one would expect the word used in the LXX (παράδεισος) to be used."); Brown 1970, 806; 1993, 1:149, note 5; Lindars 1972, 594; Barrett 1978, 465; Léon-Dufour 1996, 29.186; Keener 2003, 2:1077.



the Garden of Eden by παράδεισος. On the other hand, however, Aquila and Theodotion used the lexeme κῆπος in Gen 3:1.<sup>54</sup> The possibility cannot be excluded that John either followed an early tradition current in the first century AD, later by α' and θ' (cf. Sanders and Mastin 1968, 416), or offered his own free translation (Keener 2003, 2:1077). It has been also argued that “when *gan* is used to describe the Garden of Eden and the garden of God, the LXX translates it with the foreign word *parádeisos*” (Jacobs-Horing 1979, 3:36). This claim is not entirely accurate, however, since in Ezek 36:35 LXX the term κῆπος is used to designate the Garden of Eden (כַּנְיָן עֲדָרָה → ὡς κῆπος τρυφῆς).

Secondly, it has been argued that the allusion to Gen 2–3 is improbable since “John nowhere else uses an explicit Adam Christology” (Keener 2003, 2:1077). This argument is not entirely convincing. An explicit reference to Adam Christology elsewhere is not a *sine qua non* for recognizing a unique presentation of Jesus as a new Adam in John 18–20. Moreover, the FG many times alludes to the Book of Genesis. Perhaps the echoes of Gen 1:1 in John’s Prologue provides us with sufficient direction to read the whole Johannine narrative in light of a connection with the Book of Genesis.<sup>55</sup>

Third, Brown (1993, 1:149, note 5) argued that while “John is the Gospel that employs symbolism,” in the case of the term κῆπος there is “little in the text to encourage such speculation.” In his opinion the gap of centuries that separates the FG from the Church Fathers who saw such a symbolism is enough of a warning for an interpreter not to impose such “imaginative interpretations” on the evangelist. Brown’s opinion was expressed in connection with the arrest narrative in John 18:1–12. In my opinion, however, the *global* use of the *garden* motif which connects Jesus’ arrest, death, burial and resurrection (18:1; 19:41; 20:15) in fact encourages such a symbolic reading.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Wevers 1974, 89. According to Field (1875, 1:13) Aquila also used κῆπος in Gen 2:8. In Isa 51:3 and Ezek 31:8 Aquila and Theodotion read ὡς κῆπον κυρίου and ἐν τῷ κήπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, while LXX translated ὡς παραδείσου κυρίου and ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ respectively (Field 1875, 2:528.854). Moreover, Theodotion also uses κῆπος in Ezek 28:13 (LXX - ἐν τῇ τρυφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ θεοῦ; Field 1875, 2:847).

<sup>55</sup> Zimmermann (2008, 233–234) illustrated some links between Adam and Jesus in the FG. See also Suggit, 1983, 333–334; Wyatt 1990, 38; Brown 2010, 281–282.

<sup>56</sup> Yet Wyatt (1990, 37) notes with derision that “the ecclesiastical interpretation of the Johannine scene [he refers to John 19:38–42] as paradisaic was surely built on more than pious fancy in the early Church.” Léon-Dufour (1996, 29) seems to underplay the significance of the mention of κῆπος by arguing that Jesus eventually *left* the garden and his arrest took place outside of it (εἰσῆλθεν, 18:1 → ἐξῆλθεν, 18:4). The mention of the *garden*, specifically the *entering* and *leaving* of it, serves then to show the *movement* of Jesus, which underscores Jesus’ *initiative*, “élément fondamental du récit” (30). It might be argued, however, that Jesus in fact did *not* leave the garden. The analysis of the Synoptic accounts, the testimonies of the ancient pilgrims to Jerusalem (Egeria, Theodosius, Arculf), and the archeological excavations of the Franciscans

2.3.3. *Noli me tangere*

It has been suggested that Jesus' command μή μου ἅπτου (*do not touch me* – John 20:17) alludes to the prohibition of touching the tree of knowledge of good and evil in Gen 3:3 (μή ἄψησθε LXX; cf. Gen 2:9.17; 3:5).<sup>57</sup> In both cases there is the same verb ἅπτομαι.

Chapter 3 of *Jubilees* is regarded as a re-interpretation or re-writing of Gen 2–3. In it (*Jub.* 3:10-13) Eve could enter the Garden of Eden only after her period of impurity.<sup>58</sup> This prohibition stemmed from the fact that every tree planted in the garden was holy and Eve could not *touch* anything holy or enter the sanctuary. Apparently, the Garden of Eden is identified with the temple. If Garden of Eden symbolism is at work in John 20, especially along the lines developed in *Jub.* 3:10-13, the episode with Mary Magdalene in John 20:17 might signify that Jesus is *holy* (as he belongs to the realm of paradise and the sanctuary) and cannot therefore be *touched*.<sup>59</sup>

at the traditional site of Gethsemane (1956-1957) all bear witness to the existence of a cave. During even very cold weather (cf. John 18:18) such a cave could provide some shelter. Thus, Jesus could simply have *entered* (εἰσῆλθεν, 18:1) *the garden (and the cave)* and later *left the cave (but not the garden)* (ἐξῆλθεν, 18:4). This interpretation is in harmony with the subsequent statement that one of the servants of the chief priest saw Peter with Jesus *in the garden* (ἐν τῷ κήτῳ - 18:26). The whole scene of Jesus' arrest then could take place *in the garden*.

<sup>57</sup> Zimmermann 2004, 159-161; 2008, 231; Grappe 2009b, 174, note 30. See also Jasper 1993, 112-113; Reinhartz 1999, 63. Another frequently identified OT intertextual link points to Song 3:1-4. Cf. Roberts-Winsor 1999, 40-41.56-57. Antoniotti (1996, 302-311) sees here an allusion to the prohibition against touching the mountain in Exod 19:12-13 LXX (ἅπτομαι). Jesus' command would point to his identity as a new Moses, since the prohibition in Ex is pronounced by Moses. This interpretation, however, seems incompatible with the immediate context. See Grasso 2008, 766, note 21. Recently, Draper (2002, 74) argued that the OT background should be seen in Isa 6. Various possible explanations of Jesus' command not to touch him are amply summarized in Brown 1970, 992-993.

<sup>58</sup> Eve's defilement lasted 80 days and Adam's 40 days before each of them entered the Garden of Eden. According to Lev 12:1-5 and *Jub.* 3:10-13, a woman is unclean after a birth of a male for 40 days and of a female for 80 days. According to *Jub.* 3:8 male defilement normally lasts seven days, whereas female defilement fourteen days (cf. also Lev 12:5).

<sup>59</sup> This reasoning however raises some questions, aptly expressed by Zimmermann (2008, 231): "is Mary Magdalene in childbed? Who has just been born? In what way is the resurrected one holy, so that he may not be touched?". Zimmermann (2008, 232-233, cf. 2004, 160-161) himself gives the following answer to the above difficulties: "A certain tradition of exegesis on the paradise garden (*Jub.* 3; 4Q265) could be linked here to the metaphor of birth, which is decisive for John. In Gen 3:16 the pain of birth is identified as a punishment for women – a motif that without doubt has been taken up in John 16:21. The analogy in 16:21, however, promises joy after the labor of birth as soon as the child is born, which, in the context of the farewell speech, refers to a reunion with Jesus after he departs. Exactly this departure, the ascendance to the Father, is still to come, according to John 20:17. The birth from above (John 3:3) has been completed, but the afterbirth pains are clearly not over. Thus Mary could not throw off the chains of the curse of paradise (16:21) and enter into the sanctuary. The symbolic tradition of the garden-temple (*Jub.* 3), above all, claims different times of purity for men and women,

In *Apoc. Mos.* 31:3-4 Adam gives to Eve some prescriptions regarding the treatment of his body after his death and among them, interestingly enough, is the prohibition of touching his body. D'Angelo (1990, 532-533) noted a number of interesting parallels with John 20:17:

Adam uses words that are strikingly similar to those of Jesus (μηδείς μου ἅψηται / μή μου ἅπτου) to prohibit touch. He then goes on to announce that God will take him, just as Jesus announces that he goes to God. And their situations are similarly liminal: Adam describes what is necessary for the time when he is dead but not yet buried; Jesus is raised but describes himself as not yet ascended to God. In both cases the function of the command seems to be to call attention to the unique state of each. There are lesser correspondences; both the command of Jesus and that of Adam are given to a woman, and both involve a setting in a garden. As the encounter between Mary and Jesus takes place in the garden where Jesus was buried (John 19:41), so also Adam's soul appears to be taken to a Paradise in the third heaven (*Apoc. Mos.* 37. 5), while his body is buried in Paradise (38.1–42.1).

D'Angelo does not propose the dependence of one text upon another, which, in fact, cannot be absolutely excluded, but draws attention to the similar function of the two passages. In her opinion (534-535), “the touching of Jesus' or Adam's body in some way would constitute a violation, a danger not only to Mary or Eve but also to Jesus or Adam in his strange state, or perhaps to the holy and awesome process each undergoes.” The prohibition of touching would then underscore the difference in the state of Jesus when he first meets Mary and his later state when he meets the disciples and invites Thomas to touch him. Important for our argument, however, is the fact that the number of parallels between John 20:17 and *Apoc. Mos.* 31:3-4, especially the possible identification of Jesus with Adam, might give credence to the thesis of the intertextual link between John 20 and Gen 2–3.

From my part I would make three observations that might also help to corroborate the royal and paradisiacal / temple background of the Johannine *noli me tangere* scene.

*First observation.* In the traditions of the ancient Near East the *king* was regarded as a *gardener*. In fact, it was an important cult-title of a king in Mesopotamia. The *king* was depicted as tending *the tree of life* situated in or near the sanctuary, and sometimes he was symbolically *identified* (!) with *the tree of life* or, to put it differently, *the tree of life* was the king's cultic symbol.<sup>60</sup> Widengren (1951, 42) noted that there is

which may help to explain why Mary, in contrast to Peter and the favorite disciple (20:6, 8), does not enter the tomb or why Thomas, as a man, is permitted to touch Jesus – after fulfilling the week's waiting period (John 20:26-27).”

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Widengren 1951, *passim*. In this context it is worth noting that the depiction of individual people (whether prosperous or poor) as trees is frequent in biblical and intertestamental

the conception of a garden of paradise where a gardener supervises the Tree of Life growing at the Water of Life, a tree from whose branches he has taken a twig which he carries as his rod or scepter. But the idea of the Tree of Life has other, still more important implications, for it has been seen by other scholars that this Tree of Life is nothing but a mythic-ritual symbol of both god and king.<sup>61</sup>

Thus, Jesus might be seen not only as the *king-gardener* (this identification is explicitly alluded to in John 20:15) who opened access to the *tree of life* (cf. Rev 2:7; 22:2.14.19), but also as the untouchable *tree of life* itself. Interestingly, the trees, and among them the *tree of life*, were created on the *third day* (Gen 1:11-12), and Jesus, the *new tree of life* is raised from the death *on the third day* (John 2:19-20; cf. 20:1). Objections might reasonably be raised to this observation as the temporal gap between ancient Mesopotamia and first century AD Palestine seems too wide. On the other hand, in light of the impressive vitality of various ideas, images, symbols and traditions in the ancient Near East which were handed down in their essence through the centuries, such a connection cannot be decisively excluded. Indeed, Briant (1996, 2:244-250) demonstrated the existence of a strong connection between trees / gardens and the kings in the Persian period (chronologically closer to the NT times).

*Second observation.* In *1 En.* 25:4 the archangel Michael explains to Enoch that (1) no mortal is permitted to *touch the tree of life* until (2) the great judgment. Moreover, the next verse adds that (3) the tree will be given to the righteous and the pious, and its fruits to the chosen, and (4) the tree itself will be transplanted to the holy place, the temple of God.<sup>62</sup> Besides the mention of not touching the *tree of life* (cf. John 20:17 – *ad* 1), three other motifs here find suitable counterparts in the Johannine presentation of Jesus (*ad* 2). The judgment is already active in terms of the Johannine realized eschatology (John 5:22-27; 12:31; 16:8-11) and, from this perspective, Mary can touch Jesus. At the same time, however, Jesus' (undoubtedly eschatological) mission is *not yet* accomplished (οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα – 20:17) and Mary cannot touch Jesus. Thus, the ambiguous verbal aspect of

literature. See Von Gemünden 1993.

- 61 Widengren (48-52) also quotes texts in which the Mesopotamian king is called a *shoot*. In his opinion, it is the most probable background for the biblical descriptions of the future Davidic king in Isa 4:2; 11:1; Jer 23:5; 33:15; Zech 3:8 and 6:12.
- 62 The Greek version of *1 En.* 25:4-5 reads as follows: *And (as for) this fragrant tree, and no flesh has the authority to touch it until the great judgment (καὶ οὐδεὶς σὰρξ ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ἄψασθαι αὐτοῦ μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης κρίσεως), in which there will be vengeance on all and a consummation forever. Then it will be given to the righteous and the pious, and its fruit will be food for the chosen. And it will be transplanted to the holy place, by the house of God, the King of eternity.* Cf. Black 1970, 35; Nickelsburg and VanderKam 2004, 45. The Ethiopic version does not differ in any way that would be significant for our argument.

μή μου ἄπτου might be another example of a Johannine intentional *double entendre*<sup>63</sup> (ad 3). Jesus, *the Tree of Life*, is giving himself as the *Bread of Life* to the righteous, pious and chosen (John 6).<sup>64</sup> According to *1 En.* the *tree of life* is transplanted to the temple of God, to the new Jerusalem, which is the garden, the paradise, the realm of *the King of Eternity*.<sup>65</sup> Jesus, *the Tree of Life*, is raised to life in the same location, the paradisiacal garden, but, going beyond the vision of Enoch, he himself is the temple as well. The prohibition against touching found in John 20:17 would then underscore the identification of Jesus as *the king* and the source of (true) life, *the Tree of Life* (cf. John 11:25; 14:6).<sup>66</sup> Both motifs, *king* and *life*, are prominent in the FG, which gives greater plausibility to such a symbolic reading of John 20.

*Third observation.* If the symbolic identification of the temple with the Garden of Eden is at work in John 20, and the resurrected Jesus is to be understood as the *temple*, or even more precisely, the *mercy seat* of the Ark of the Covenant, then it is certainly possible to see in the prohibition of touching Jesus an echo of the OT ban regarding entering the temple (or more precisely the Holy of Holies) or, less plausibly, the prohibition against *touching* the Ark of the Covenant (2 Sam 6:7; 1 Chr 13:10; cf. Num 4:15). Indeed, according to *Jub.* 8:19 the Garden of Eden is seen not only as the

63 The present imperative coupled with the negation means that an action already in progress is to be stopped. Therefore Mary either has already touched Jesus (hence the translation *Stop touching me*) or has attempted to do so (thus the translation *Do not try to touch me*). Some witnesses of minor importance add the phrase that Mary ran forward to touch Jesus after she recognized him (καὶ προσέδραμεν ἅπασθαι αὐτοῦ - 20:16), which would favor the latter translation but does not exclude the former. Cf. Baarda 1988, 24-38. If one compares John 20:17 with Matt 28:9, where the women seize Jesus' feet (ἔκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας), it is preferable to understand that Mary did touch Jesus.

64 The motif of giving / restoring the Tree of Life to the righteous is also found in *3 En.* 23:28 (*the righteous and godly who shall inherit the Garden of Eden and the tree of life in the time to come*). The image of *eating* from the Tree of Life is explicitly found in the Johannine tradition in Rev 2:7 where *Jesus* is the one who is giving the fruits. *1 En.* 25:7 states it is the *God of Glory, the King of eternity, who has prepared such things for people (who are) righteous*. Another text, *T. Levi* 18:10-11, expresses an interesting merger of motifs which are relevant for John 20: the Messiah (a priestly figure), the entering into the paradise, the abolition of the curse of Adam, eating from the Tree of Life (ἐκ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς) by saints, and the resting of the Holy Spirit on the saints. According to Aune (1997, 152) the verbal similarity between *T. Levi* 18:11 and Rev 2:7 in the mention of eating from the Tree of Life is so evident that the former must be a gloss dependent on the latter. The motif of eating of the fruit of the Tree of Life is also attested in *Apoc. Mos.* 28:4 and *Apoc. El.* 5:6 where it is to be understood as a metaphor for salvation. Cf. Manns 1987, 71-73; 1991, 418-420; Aune 1997, 152.

65 Grelot (1958, 43) comments on Enoch's vision: "Au jour du jugement, il plantera l'arbre de vie dans la Jérusalem nouvelle où vivront les justes; comme l'Éden primitif, cette ville sainte sera alors la réplique terrestre de la demeure divine."

66 Some would argue that the image of the Tree of Life in Rev is dependent on *1 En.* 25 (and Ezek 47). Cf. Olson 1997, 499-500. In my judgment, the influence of the ideas found in *1 En.* 25 on John 20 is not impossible, but it is difficult to prove.

temple in general, but as a part of the temple called the Holy of Holies where the Ark of the Covenant was placed (see Van Ruiten 1999b, 218-220). This conclusion might be corroborated by the use of two different nouns *ἱερόν* and *ναός* to describe respectively the *physical Jerusalem temple* and the *new spiritual temple* in John 2:13-22. It might be assumed that *ναός* refers to the *sanctuary*, the Holy of Holies, as it denotes only Jesus' resurrected body (cf. John 2:19.20.21), while *ἱερόν* defines the *temple as a whole* (cf. John 2:14.15; 5:14; 7:14.28; 8:2.20.59; 10:23; 11:56; 18:20). While in John 20:17 this ban serves to emphasize the identification of Jesus with the sanctuary / atonement seat, i.e. to express the understanding of Jesus' resurrection as the rebuilding of the temple, in the subsequent narrative, 20:19-29, this ban is lifted and Thomas is encouraged to *touch* Jesus. The radical newness of the Risen Jesus / the new sanctuary / the Holy of Holies / the Ark of the Covenant / the atonement seat consists in its *availability* or *accessibility* which is even physical. This truth could be figuratively alluded to in the Synoptics in the episode of the rending of the temple veil (Mark 15:38; Matt 27:51).<sup>67</sup> The fullest expression of this *accessibility* is the Eucharist (cf. John 6), and it has indeed been argued that John 20:19-29 might have a Eucharistic setting (see Suggit 1976, 52-59; Coloe 2007, 171-187).<sup>68</sup>

#### 2.3.4. Jesus' Burial in the Garden

The fact that Jesus was buried in the *garden* (John 19:41) might carry both *Eden* and *royal* connotations. The motif of burial in the *paradisiacal* setting is found in the intertestamental literature. *Apoc. Mos.* 40:6 states that Adam and Abel *were buried according to the command of God in the regions of Paradise* (εἰς τὰ μέρη τοῦ παραδείσου) *in the place from which God had found the dust*. Interestingly enough, this luxurious burial was accompanied by *many fragrances* (εὐωδίας πολλάς) brought by seven angels sent by God (40:7; cf. John 19:39). *Apoc. Mos.* 43:1 adds that Eve was also buried in the same place. *T. Adam* 3:6 specifies that Adam was buried *at the east of Paradise*. *Jub.* 4:29 simply states that Adam was buried *in the land of his creation*. In *T. Dan* 5:12 one reads about those who already passed away:

<sup>67</sup> Geddert (1989, 140-145) lists 35 (!) different interpretations of this episode, among which one (no. 9) is close to that suggested above: "all barriers between people and God being removed" (142).

<sup>68</sup> There are at least seven features which could be set in parallel with later Eucharistic gatherings: (1) Sunday as the day of gathering, (2) the disciples are gathered inside a house, (3) the gathering of disciples behind closed doors, (4) the arrival of Jesus, (5) Jesus shows the marks of the crucifixion, (6) Jesus' greeting of "Peace," (7) faith as the response of the disciples.

*the saints shall refresh themselves in Eden; the righteous shall rejoice in the new Jerusalem.* This same idea may also be attested in *1 En.* 61:12 (cf. also *3 En.* 23:28). To sum up, if there is then any analogy between Adam and Christ, creation and re-creation in the FG, the paradisiacal/garden location of Adam's grave<sup>69</sup> has its significance in the interpretation of the Johannine burial narrative.

The *royal* dimension of Jesus' burial in the garden may also be informed by biblical precedents. According to 2 Kgs 21:18 King Manasseh *laid down with his fathers* (עַם-אֲבֹתָיו) and was buried *in the garden of his house, in the garden of Uzza* (בְּגַן-בֵּיתוֹ / בְּגַן-עֲזַיָּא) / ἐν τῷ κήπῳ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἐν κήπῳ Οὐζᾶ). In the Greek translation of 2 Chr 33:20, which describes the same event, the Hebrew *in his house* (בֵּיתוֹ) is rendered by *in the garden of his house* (ἐθάψαν αὐτὸν ἐν παραδείσῳ οἴκου αὐτοῦ; cf. also *A.J.* X, 3,2 § 46 - ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ παραδείσοις). According to 2 Kgs 21:26 Manasseh's son, King Amon, was also buried *in the garden of Uzza* (גַּן / κήπος), although *in his tomb*. Josephus Flavius (*A.J.* X, 4,1 § 48) explains that Amon was buried with his father.<sup>70</sup> *2 Esd.* 13:16 (= *Neh* 3:16 LXX) speaks of repairs being carried out in Jerusalem *as far as the garden of David's sepulcher* (ἕως κήπου τάφου Δαυιδ; *Neh* 3:16 MT has only *in front of David's tomb* - עַד-נֶגֶד רֹיֵד קִבְרֵי דָוִד, and *Neh* 3:15 MT speaks only of *the wall of the Pool of Shelah of the king's garden* - לִגְנֵי-הַמֶּלֶךְ). Interestingly, Josephus Flavius speaks of the burial of King Azariah *in his own gardens* (ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ κήποις - *A.J.* IX, 10,4 § 227). The *king's garden* (גַּן הַמֶּלֶךְ / ὁ κήπος τοῦ βασιλέως) is also mentioned in 2 Kgs 25:4; *Jer* 39:4 (only MT); 52:7, all of which speak of Zedekiah and his troops fleeing Jerusalem, after the breaching of the city walls by the Babylonians, via a certain gate located next to the royal garden.<sup>71</sup>

<sup>69</sup> In this context, let us recall (cf. note 40) the identification of Eden-as-Temple and Temple-as-Eden, current in the first century AD. Moreover, *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 2:7 states that Adam was created out of the dust *from the site of the sanctuary*. *Pirqe R. El.* § 11 identifies the place of man's creation with the navel of the earth. *Ezek* 38:12 (cf. Josephus Flavius, *B.J.* III, 3,5 § 51-52) and *Jub.* 8:19 (cf. *1 En.* 26:1-3; *b. Sanh.* 37a), in turn, refer to Jerusalem and Mount Zion respectively as the navel of the earth. *Pirqe R. El.* § 20 and *b. 'Erub.* 19a states that the gates of Paradise are next to the Mount Moriah which according to 2 Chr 3:1 is to be identified with the Temple Mount. In fact, the site where Jesus died (Calvary) and was buried (next to Calvary in the same *garden* - *John* 19:41-42) was one of the hillocks on Moriah's range.

<sup>70</sup> In the case of 2 Kgs 24:6 describing death of Jehoiachim the LXX<sup>1</sup> version adds *he was buried in the garden of Uzza with his ancestors*, while MT and LXX do not mention his burial place. See Na'aman 2004, 245-246.252-253. The parallel text, 2 Chr 36:8 LXX, reads *he was buried with his fathers in Ganoza* (Γανοζᾶ stems from גַּן-עֲזַיָּא). The MT of 2 Chr 36:8 does not mention any burial place.

<sup>71</sup> A survey of the death formulae of the kings of Judah ("and so-and-so slept with his fathers and was buried with his fathers in the City of David; and so-and-so his son reigned in his stead") demonstrates that the royal tombs from David till Ahaz were located *in the City of David*: David

Consequently, for any Johannine audience versed in the Jewish scriptures and traditions the description of Jesus' burial in a *garden* (John 19:41) located in the *vicinity of Jerusalem* (John 19:20.42) may have alluded to the burial place of the Kings of Judah and consequently Jesus' *royalty* and *Davidic messiahship*.<sup>72</sup> Tracing such an allusion had already been prepared by the continuous emphasis on Jesus' kingship in the Johannine passion narrative (18:33-40; 19:2-3.14-15.19-22).

### 2.3.5. Spices of Jesus' Burial

The Johannine description of Jesus' funeral speaks of an extraordinary abundance of *μίγμα σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης* (*the mixture of myrrh and aloes* – John 19:39) brought by Nicodemus. Its quantity amounts to *ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν* (*about a hundred pounds*). The Roman *λίτρα* was about 12 ounces or 327.45 grams. Thus, the amount of one hundred *λίτραι* was about seventy-five pounds or thirty-two and a half kilograms.<sup>73</sup> Interestingly, there are some biblical

(1 Kgs 2:10), Solomon (11:41), Rehoboam (14:31), Abijah (15:8), Asa (15:24), Jehoshaphat (22:51), Joram (2 Kgs 8:24), Ahaziah (9:28), Joash (12:22), Amaziah (14:20), Azariah (15:7), Jotham (15:38), Ahaz (16:20). From King Hezekiah onward (Manasseh, Amon, Josiah, Jehoiachim) the death formula changes; the mention of the City of David disappear. The king is buried *with his fathers* (Hezekiah – 2 Kgs 20:21, Jehoiachim – 24:6), *in the garden of his house*, *in the garden of Uzza* (Manasseh – 22:18), *in his tomb in the garden of Uzza* (Amon – 22:26), *in Jerusalem*, *in his tomb* (Josiah – 23:30). (In the case Jehoahaz (23:34), Jehoiachim (24:15) and Zedekiah (25:7) there is no death formula, as they died and were buried in exile.) It has been suggested that till Ahaz the kings of Judah were buried *within* the City of David, *in* the royal palace located in the proximity of the temple (see Ezek 43:7-9). Royal burial in the palace, or near to it, was the practice common to many ancient Near Eastern kingdoms. Hezekiah, the perpetrator of the cultic reform (2 Kgs 18:4.22; 2 Chr 29–31), was supposedly the first one to be buried *outside* the city, in king's garden (the garden of Uzzah), which was planted by him on the slopes of the Kidron Valley near the city walls at the southeast of the City of David. The choice of the new royal burial place outside the city was motivated by a sense of the impurity attached to graves (see again Ezek 43:7-9). It cannot however be excluded that there were two royal gardens: one *inside* the City of David and one *outside*, in the Kidron Valley. Both of them might be connected with the royal palaces. See Na'aman 2004, 245-254.

<sup>72</sup> The same conclusion was reached by Schaper (2010, 25): "realizing that the location of the historical King's Garden is likely to have been in the Kidron valley, it becomes extremely likely that the mention of the garden, and indeed of a garden in the Kidron Valley (John 18.1), in the Gospel of John was intended to make an extremely important symbolic point: the tomb of Jesus, like that of David and other Davidic rulers, is located in a garden (most likely in the traditional King's Garden mentioned in the Scriptures). [...] The implicit statement is that Jesus is the legitimate heir of David and the Messiah of Israel." This conclusion is repeated in connection with Jesus' resurrection at another place (26): "The main point is that Jesus is painted, in the Gospel of John, as the true Davidide and King Messiah, buried in the King's Garden and demonstrating his messiahship by rising from the grave in the very same garden in which, according to tradition (cf. Neh. 3.16 LXX), David's tomb was located."

<sup>73</sup> Rigato (2001, 53) noted that the term *μίγμα* (*mixture, compound*), a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, is found only once in the Septuagint, in Sir 38:7 as *μεῖγμα*. In the preserved Hebrew version



and extra-biblical parallels to the Johannine description of the burial with aromatics. In Brown's opinion (1993, 2:1260-1261) the biblical background of John 19:39 could be the prophecy of Jer 34:5 referring to King Zedekiah: *you will die in peace, and like [there was] the burning [of incense] for your fathers, the former kings who were before you, so will they burn [incense] for you*. The only problem with this parallel is that Jer speaks of *burning* the incense and not about being *buried* with incense. Nevertheless three crucial elements, namely *king*, *burial* and *incense*, do occur in both texts.<sup>74</sup> According to 2 Chr 16:14 Asa, king of Judah, was buried in the city of David *and they caused him to lie on a bed that one has filled with spices, and diverse kinds of mixtures, with perfumed work* (LXX: *with spices and types of myrrh of the perfumers* - ἀρωμάτων καὶ γένη μύρων μυρεψῶν; cf. John 19:40 - μετὰ τῶν ἀρωμάτων); *and they burned for him a very great burning (bonfire)*. Josephus Flavius gives two further examples of splendid funerals accompanied by spices, namely those of Aristobulus III († 36 BCE) and Herod the Great († 4 BCE). During the burial of the seventeen-year old Aristobulus, the high priest and the last scion of the Hasmonean dynasty, *a great quantity of spices* (τὸ πλῆθος τῶν θυμιαμάτων) was used (*A.J.* XV, 3,4 § 61). In turn, the funeral of Herod the Great was accompanied by five hundred servants *carrying spices* (ἀρωματοφόροι) (*B.J.* I, 33,9 § 673; *A.J.* XVII, 8,3 § 199). Thus, the large quantity of *spices* mentioned by John, viewed in the context of the aforementioned biblical and extra-biblical examples, has led some commentators to the conclusion that Jesus' burial as described by John must allude to *royal burials* and consequently is another allusion to Jesus' *royal dignity*.<sup>75</sup>

of this passage μείγμα corresponds to מִרְקָחַת. This noun is found only three times in the MT (Exod 30:25; 1 Chr 9:30; 2 Chr 16:14) and, according to Rigato (53), the contexts of these occurrences demonstrate that מִרְקָחַת is a *technical temple term* ("termine tecnico templare") designating a mixture of aromatic substances prepared by Levites. In her opinion, this precise meaning is intended in John 19:39. Therefore μίγμα συμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης designates a specific, carefully prepared product ("un prodotto finito, già mescolato con arte"). This view is in harmony with her hypothesis that Nicodemus got both *the mixture of the aromatics and linen cloths* (ὀθόνια - used to produce priestly garments) from the temple stocks thanks to John who was a Levite or a priest. Cf. Rigato 2001, 76-77.

<sup>74</sup> Brown (1993, 2:1260-1261) also noted that *b. 'Abod. Zar.* 11a speaks of seventy or eighty minas of aromatic substances which were burned at the burial of Rabban Gamaliel the Elder, who "was worth more than a hundred useless kings."

<sup>75</sup> E.g. Brown 1970, 960; La Potterie 1986, 198; Rigato 2001, 48 ("nella Bibbia e presso due famosi scrittori guidei del primo secolo, Filone Alessandrino e Giuseppe Flavio, NON SI CONOSCE L'USANZA di sistemare per la tomba un giudeo commune con lini ed aromi. [...] L'«usanza» a cui allude Giovanni poteva riguardare solamente un re"); Draper 2002, 69 ("the reference to the anointing of the grave clothes with myrrh and aloes suggests the enthronement of Jesus as king and matches the emphasis on the grave clothes in the tomb scene"); Dietzfelbinger 2004, 2:315; Thyen 2005, 755.

Recently, Zangenberg (2007, 887-888) concluded that, in light of archeological discoveries concerning Jewish burial practices in the first century AD, John's account of Jesus' burial cannot be linked to *royal funerals* ("as is often suggested on the basis of royal imagery that indeed permeates the passion narrative"), but ought to be seen as an example of a *civic burial of a wealthy upper class family*.<sup>76</sup> However, Zangenberg's argument that "the amount of spices does not seem big enough" is asserted rather than proved. Taking into account the size of Jesus' grave (it is by no means the monumental Herodion where Herod the Great was buried), the quantity of spices (over thirty-two kilograms) is undoubtedly an exaggeration, which demands an explanation. The fact that other Johannine numerical exaggerations (2:6; 21:11; cf. also 12:3; Thyen 2005, 754) imply their *symbolic* meanings suggests that the large quantity of spices used during Jesus' funeral also has a *symbolic* significance.<sup>77</sup> Obviously, the most plausible symbolism behind it is the *royal* one.<sup>78</sup> In light of *Tg. Ps.* 45:3.8-9, which speaks of the *anointed*

- <sup>76</sup> Zangenberg (888) argues: "The depiction of Nicodemus and Joseph as members of the local upper class fits well into this picture, and the burial practices using spices and layered textiles are also entirely plausible on the basis of the cosmopolitan Jewish upper class of 1<sup>st</sup> c. CE Jerusalem. For a royal burial, e.g. like that of Herod, the amount of spices does not seem big enough. What is important for us is not to judge how likely such a burial is in the case of an executed insurgent like Jesus, but first of all to realize how detailed John's knowledge of 1<sup>st</sup> c. upper class Jewish burials turns out to be if compared to material evidence from archeological contexts. It is well conceivable that John in his description also follows a theological agenda by demonstrating the extraordinary affection that Joseph and Nicodemus bestow upon Jesus, but it is not primarily by transgressing the ordinary into simple exaggeration, but by setting particular accent within the realm of what people usually practiced."
- <sup>77</sup> On the one hand, Zangenberg (2007, 887) states that the amount of a hundred λίτρα "is certainly not entirely fantastical" and "aromatics were available in many different levels of quality, so that even such a high amount of aromatics would not be totally unaffordable." He suggests that Nicodemus could have bought aromatics of lower quality, and thus not so expensive. Otherwise the value of 32 kilograms of high-quality spices would be 30,000 denarii (cf. Schnelle 2004, 295). In fact, according to John 12:3.5 the amount of one λίτρα of spices was 300 denarii, yet μίγμα σμύρνης και ἀλόης of John 19:39 are not the same thing as μύρον νάρδου πιστικῆς in John 12:3, and consequently their cost could vary. On the other hand, Zangenberg (2007, 887) is convinced that the Johannine number is exaggerated and is "a consequence of an all-pervasive Johannine tendency to increase the emphasis on the decency and luxury of Jesus' burial per se." Eventually, Zangenberg (2007, 887, note 44) following Thyen (2005, 754) argued that "John seems to use exaggeration as a means to emphasize that Messianic fullness is present wherever Jesus appears." Thus, Zangenberg himself agrees that the amount of spices has a symbolic ("Messianic") meaning.
- <sup>78</sup> As a result, by ironic contrast with the complaint of Judas (one of Jesus' disciples) in 12:3-5, the action of Nicodemus (never explicitly called Jesus' disciple) should be seen *positively* as the *royal homage* paid to Jesus, which refers back to Mary's anointing of Jesus in anticipation of his burial (12:3.7). Cf. Auwers 1990, 495; Brown 1993, 2:1259-1270; Thyen 2005, 753-754. On a *negative* understanding of Nicodemus' act (as, for instance, an expression of his lack of faith in Jesus' resurrection) see Meeks 1972, 54-55 ("His ludicrous 'one hundred pounds' of embalming spices indicate clearly enough that he has not understood the 'lifting up' of the

king whose clothes are perfumed with myrrh, aloes and cassia, a *Messianic* connotation might be also present.

\* \* \*

Verse 2:22 itself indicates that the referent of both Jesus' λόγος and of γραφή is to be found in the second part of the Johannine cleansing narrative, to wit 2:19. Thus, both Jesus' *word* and the *Scripture* refer to the rebuilding of the temple by means of Jesus' resurrection. Zech 6:12-13 is the scriptural prophecy that refers to Messianic rebuilding of the eschatological temple. In fact, Zechariah is explicitly alluded to in the first part of the cleansing narrative and widely employed in other parts of the FG. The equally mysterious scriptural referent of γραφή in John 20:9 may also be identified with Zech 6:12-13. Many striking similarities between the cleansing narrative in John 2 (and v. 22 in particular) and the paschal narrative in John 20 (especially v. 9) point to such a conclusion. Moreover, the fact that the whole paschal narrative in John 20 is permeated with royal and temple imagery (the latter intrinsically connected with Eden motifs) may also corroborate the reference to Zechariah's vision. These two references pertain to the first and the last occurrences of the noun γραφή contextualized in the post-Easter reflection of the disciples. They create an overarching *inclusio* in John's Gospel, which highlights the concept of Jesus' resurrection seen as the rebuilding of the temple by the Messiah-King.

It must, however, be stressed that the Johannine vision of the rebuilt temple is not limited to the *royal-Messianic* motifs present in Zech 6:12-13. The whole prophecy of Zechariah is evoked. First, by means of its Zecharian references, the cleansing narrative points toward Jesus' identity as a Messianic king (Zech 6), shepherd of Israel (Zech 11) and even to YHWH-King himself (Zech 14). Second, the allusion to Zech 14:21 in John 2:16 indicates the arrival of the *eschaton*, the age of YHWH's decisive intervention. The cleansing of the temple in John 2 is only a *prolepsis* of another cleansing: the purification of the world by casting out *the ruler of this world* (John 12:31) and purification of the disciples (John 13–17). Indeed, the first of Jesus' actions after entering Jerusalem (again a reference to Zech 9) is not the cleansing of the Jerusalem temple, as in the Synoptic accounts, but the

---

Son of Man" – 55); Culpepper 1983, 136; Sylva 1988, 148-149; Goulder 1991, 153-168 ("John's bitter dislike of him [Nicodemus] is to be felt in every line about him: when correctly viewed, everything is rude" – 168).

cleansing of the disciples by means of washing their feet (deed – John 13) and Jesus' teaching (word – John 15:3). Judas, defined as not clean (13:11), is described as the one into whom Satan *enters* (εἰσέρχομαι – 13:27) and, consequently, abides. Similarly, to be a part of God's temple, the *Father's dwelling place* (14:2-3.23), means to experience the *coming* (ἔρχομαι) of the Father and the Son (14:23). John's setting of the cleansing narrative at the beginning of the Gospel was not then haphazard but a deliberate, proleptic and symbolic indication that Jesus' ministry, culminating in his *hour*, was meant as the construction of the new temple. Ultimately, the new temple is not only Jesus' resurrected body, but the *Father's household which has many rooms*: the communion of the Father, the Son and the Spirit (4:23; 20:22) with the Father's sons and daughters (20:17). For this very reason, the narrative of Jesus' resurrection in John 20 explicitly alludes to the re-creation of humanity. The restored community, initiated by means of Jesus' resurrection and consisting in the innermost unity between the Creator (the Trinity) and his creation, is the new temple.

### Bibliography

- Antoniotti, L.-M. 1996. L'apparition de Jésus à Marie de Magdala. *Revue thomiste* 96:302-311.
- Aune, D.E. 1997. *Revelation 1-5*. Dallas: Word Books.
- Auwers, I.M. 1990. La nuit de Nicodème (*Jean* 3, 2 ; 19, 39) ou l'ombre du langage. *Revue biblique* 97:481-503.
- Baarda, T. 1988. 'She Recognized Him.' Concerning the Origin of a Peculiar Textual Variation in John 20,16 Sy<sup>s</sup>. Pages 24-38 in *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F.J. Klijn*. Edited by T. Baarda et al. Kampen: Kok.
- Bacon, B.W. 1923. Raised the Third Day, *Expositor* 26:426-441.
- Barrett, C.K. 1978. *The Gospel According to St John*. London: SPCK.
- Bauckham, R. 1988. Jesus' Demonstration in the Temple. Pages 72-89 in *Law and Religion: Essays on the Place of the Law in Israel and Early Christianity by Members of the Ehrhardt Seminar of Manchester University*. Edited by B. Lindars. Cambridge: James Clarke.
- Baumgarten, J.M. 1994. Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees. Pages 3-10 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceeding of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Paris 1992*. Edited by G.J. Brooke and F. García Martínez. Leiden – New York – Köln: Brill.
- Beale, G.K. 2005. The Descent of the Eschatological Temple in the Form of the Spirit at Pentecost: Part 2: Corroborating Evidence. *Tyndale Bulletin* 56/2: 63-90.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. 1987.<sup>2</sup>1999. *John*. Nashville et al.: Thomas Nelson.
- Becker, J. 1979.<sup>2</sup>1985, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes. Kapitel 1-10*. Gütersloh: Mohn – Würzburg: Echter.

- Bernard, J.H. 1928. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Betz, H.D. 1997. Jesus and the Purity of the Temple (Mark 11:15-18): A Comparative Religion Approach. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116:455-472.
- Beutler, J. 2006. *L'ebraismo e gli ebrei nel Vangelo di Giovanni*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Black, M. 1970. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*. Leiden: Brill.
- Boismard, M.-É. and Lamouille, A. 1977. *L'évangile de Jean*. Paris: Éd. du Cerf.
- Brook, G.J. 1999. Miqdash Adam, Eden and the Qumran Community. Pages 285-301 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego and A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Brown, J.K. 2010. Creation's Renewal in the Gospel of John. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72:275-290.
- Brown, R.E. 1966-1970. *The Gospel of John*. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday.
- . 1993. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. New York et al.: Doubleday.
- Briant, P. 1996. *Histoire de l'Empire perse de Cyrus à Alexandre*. 2 vols. Paris: Fayard.
- Carr, A. 1909. Christus Aedificator: A Comparison between St. John II. 19 and Zechariah VI. 13. *Expositor* 7:41-49.
- Carson, D.A. 1991. *The Gospel According to John*. Leicester: Apollos – Grand Rapids: Erdmans.
- Chennattu, R.M. 2006. *Johannine Discipleship as a Covenant Relationship*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Christensen, J. 1990. And that He Rose on the Third Day According to the Scriptures. *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 4:101-113.
- Coloe, M.L. 2007. *Dwelling in the Household of God: Johannine Ecclesiology and Spirituality*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Culpepper, R.A. 1983. *Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- D'Angelo, M.R. 1990. A Critical Note: John 20:17 and Apocalypse of Moses 31. *Journal of Theological Studies* 41:529-536.
- Daly-Denton, M. 2000. *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms*. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill.
- Dietzfelbinger, Ch. 2001.<sup>2</sup>2004. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. 2 vols. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- Dodd, C.H. 1952. *According to the Scriptures. The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet.
- . 1953. *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Draper, J.A. 2002. What Did Isaiah See? Angelic Theophany in the Tomb in John 20:11-18. *Neotestamentica* 36:63-76.
- Evans, C.A. 1989a. Jesus' Action in the Temple and Evidence of Corruption in the First-Century Temple. Pages 522-539 in *SBL 1989 Seminar Papers*. Edited by D.J. Lull. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

*Zechariah 6:12-13 as the Referent of γραφή in John 2:22 and 20:9*

- . 1989b. Jesus' Action in the Temple: Cleansing or Portent of Destruction? *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51:237-270.
- . 1992. Opposition to the Temple: Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Pages 235-253 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. New York et al.: Doubleday.
- . 1993. Jesus and the 'Cave of Robbers': Toward a Jewish Context for the Temple Action. *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 3:93-110.
- . 1997. From 'House of Prayer' to 'Cave of Robbers': Jesus Prophetic Criticism of the Temple Establishment. Pages 417-442 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. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2006. Zechariah in the Markan Passion Narrative. Pages 64-80 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels. I. The Gospel of Mark*. Edited by T.R. Hatina. London – New York: T. & T. Clark.
- Field, F. 1875. *Origenis Hexaplorum*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Freed, E.D. 1965. *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John*. Leiden: Brill.
- Freyne, S. 1988. *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels. Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations*. Dublin: Gill & Macmillan.
- Geddert, T.J. 1989. *Watchwords: Mark 13 in Markan Eschatology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Godet, F. 1879. *Commentary on the Gospel of St. John with a Critical Introduction*. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Goppelt, L. 1969. *Typos. Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen. Anhang: Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Goulder, M. 1991. Nicodemus. *Scottish Journal of Theology* 44:153-168.
- Grappe, C. 2009a. Du sanctuaire au jardin: Jésus, nouveau et véritable Temple dans le quatrième évangile. Pages 285-296 in *Studien zu Matthäus und Johannes / Études sur Matthieu et Jean. Festschrift für Jean Zumstein zu seinem 65. Geburtstag / Mélanges offerts à Jean Zumstein pour son 65<sup>e</sup> anniversaire*. Edited by A. Dettwiler and U. Poplutz. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.
- . 2009b. Les deux anges de Jean 20,12. Signes de la présence mystérieuse du Logos (à la lumière du targum d'Ex 25,22)? *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 89:169-177.
- Grasso, S. 2008. *Il Vangelo di Giovanni. Commento esegetico e teologico*. Roma: Città Nuova.
- Grelot, P. 1958. La géographie mythique d'Hénoch et ses sources orientales. *Revue biblique* 65:33-69.
- Guiling, A. 1960. *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Haenchen, E. 1980. *Das Johannesevangelium. Ein Kommentar*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hatina, T.R. 1993. John 20,22 in Its Eschatological Context: Promise or Fulfillment? *Biblica* 74:196-219.
- Heil, J.P. 1995. Jesus as the Unique High Priest in the Gospel of John. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 57:729-745.
- Hill, D. 1967. On the Third Day. *Expository Times* 78:266-267.
- Hoskyns, E.C. 1920. Genesis I-III and St John's Gospel. *Journal of Theological Studies* 21:210-218.
- . 1940.<sup>2</sup>1947. *The Fourth Gospel*. Edited by F.N. Davey. London: Faber & Faber.

- Hossfeld, F.-L. and Zenger, E. <sup>2</sup>2000. *Psalmen 51-100*. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder.
- Jacobs-Horing, B. 1979. “גָּבַר”. Pages 34-39 in vol. 3 of *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren and H.J. Fabry. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1974-2006.
- Jasper, A. 1993. Interpretative Approaches to John 20:1-18: Mary at the Tomb of Jesus. *Studia Theologica* 47:107-117.
- Keener, C.S. 2003. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Klauck, H.-J. 2004. Geschrieben, erfüllt, vollendet: Die Schriftzitate in der Johannespassion. Pages 140-157 in *Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannesevangelium. Festgabe für Johannes Beutler SJ zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by M. Labahn and K. Scholtissek and A. Strotmann. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Knohl, I. 2008. ‘By Three Days, Live’: Messiahs, Resurrection, and Ascent to Heaven in *Hazon Gabriel*. *Journal of Religion* 88:147-158.
- . 2009. *Messiah and Resurrection in ‘The Gabriel Revelation’*. New York: Continuum.
- Köstenberger, A.J. 2004. *John*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Krause, D. 1994. Narrated Prophecy in Mark 11.12-21: The Divine Authorization of Judgment. Pages 235-248 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by C.A. Evans and W.R. Stegner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kreitzer, L.J. 1993. The Temple Incident of John 2.13-25: A Preview of What is to Come. Pages 93-101 in *Understanding, Studying and Reading. New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton*. Edited by C. Rowland and C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Kubiś, A. 2012. *The Book of Zechariah in the Gospel of John*. Pendé: Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup>.
- Kysar, R. 1986. *John*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- La Potterie, I (de). 1986. *La passion de Jésus selon l’évangile de Jean. Text et Espirt*. Paris: Éd. du Cerf.
- Labahn, M. 2004. Jesus und die Autorität der Schrift im Johannesevangelium. Überlegungen zu einem spannungsreichen Verhältnis. Pages 185-206 in *Israel und seine Heilstraditionen im Johannesevangelium. Festgabe für Johannes Beutler SJ zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by M. Labahn, K. Scholtissek and A. Strotmann. Paderborn: Schöningh.
- Lagrange, M.-J. 1925.<sup>7</sup>1948. *Évangile selon Saint Jean*. Paris: Gabalda et C<sup>ie</sup>.
- Landes, G.M. 1983. Matthew 12:40 as an Interpretation of ‘The Sign of Jonah’ Against its Biblical Background. Pages 665-684 in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by C.L. Meyers and M. O’Connor. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- . 1996. Jonah in Luke: The Hebrew Bible Background to the Interpretation of the ‘Sign of Jonah’ Pericope in Luke 11.29-32. Pages 133-163 in *A Gift of God in Due Season: Essays on Scripture and Community in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by R.D. Weis and D.M. Carr. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Lapide, C. 1641. *Commentarii in Evangelia*. 2 vols. Lugduni: G. Boiffat & Laurentij Aniffon.
- Lee, D.A. 2002. *Flesh and Glory: Symbol, Gender, and Theology in the Gospel of John*. New York: Crossroad.
- Lehmann, K. 1968. *Auferweckt am dritten Tag nach der Schrift. Früheste Christologie, Bekenntnisbildung und Schriftauslegung im Lichte von 1 Kor. 15, 3-5*. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder.

*Zechariah 6:12-13 as the Referent of γραφή in John 2:22 and 20:9*

- Léon-Dufour, X. 1988. *Chapitres 1-4*. Vol. 1 of *Lecture de l'évangile de Jean*. Paris: Éd. du Seuil.
- . 1996. *L'heure de la glorification (chapitres 18-21)*. Vol. 4 of *Lecture de l'évangile de Jean*. Paris: Éd. du Seuil.
- Lightfoot, R.H. 1956. *St. John's Gospel. A Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Lincoln, A.T. 2005. *The Gospel According to Saint John*. London: Continuum.
- Lindars, B. 1961. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM.
- . 1972. *The Gospel of John*. London: Oliphants.
- Loisy, A. 1903. *Le quatrième évangile*. Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils.
- . 1921. *Le quatrième évangile. Deuxième édition refondue. Les épîtres dites de Jean*. Paris: Émile Nourry.
- Luzarraga, J. 2000. La Escritura en Jn 2,16-17. Pages 273-301 in *Mysterium Regni ministerium Verbi (Mc 4,11; At 6,4)*. *Scritti in onore di mons. Vittorio Fusco*. Edited by E. Franco. Bologna: EDB.
- Manns, F. 1987. Le symbolisme du jardin dans le récit de la Passion selon St Jean. *Liber Annuus* 37:53-80.
- . 1991. *L'Évangile de Jean à la lumière du Judaïsme*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press.
- Marsh, J. 1968. *Saint John*. Philadelphia: Westminster.
- Mateos, J. and Barreto, J. 1979.<sup>2</sup>1982. *El Evangelio de Juan. Análisis lingüístico y comentario exegético*. Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad.
- McArthur, H.K. 1971-1972. On the Third Day. *New Testament Studies* 18:81-86.
- McCasland, S.V. 1929. The Scripture Basis of "On the Third Day". *Journal of Biblical Literature* 48:124-137.
- Meeks, W.A. 1972. The Man from Heaven in Johannine Sectarianism. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91:44-72.
- Menken, M.J.J. 1996. *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*. Kampen: Kok Pharos.
- . 2002. Interpretation of the Old Testament and the Resurrection of Jesus in John's Gospel. Pages 189-205. *Resurrection in the New Testament. Festschrift J. Lambrecht*. Edited by R. Bieringer and V. Koperski and B. Lataire. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
- Meyer, B.F. 1979. *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM.
- . 1992. *Christus Faber: The Master-BUILDER and the House of God*. Allison Park: Pickwick.
- Michaels, J.R. 2010. *The Gospel of John*. Grand Rapids – Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Moloney, F.J. 1990. Reading John 2:13-22: The Purification of the Temple. *Revue biblique* 97:432-452.
- . 1998. *The Gospel of John*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- . 2005a. The Gospel of John as Scripture. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 67:454-468.
- . 2005b. *The Gospel of John: Text and Context*. Boston – Leiden: Brill.
- . 2006. What Came First – Scripture or Canon? The Gospel of John as a Test Case. *Salesianum* 68:7-20.
- Morris, L. 1971. *The Gospel According to John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.



- Na'aman, N. 2004. Death Formulae and the Burial Place of the Kings of the House of David. *Biblica* 85:245-254.
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E. and VanderKam, J.C. 2004. *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nobile, M. 2005. Le citazioni di Zaccaria nel Vangelo di Giovanni. Pages 61-69 in "Il vostro frutto rimanga" (Gv 16,16). *Miscellanea per il LXX compleanno di Giuseppe Ghiberti*. Edited by A. Passoni dell'Acqua. Bologna: EDB.
- Olson, D.C. 1997. 'Those Who Have Not Defiled Themselves with Women': Revelation 14:4 and the Book of Enoch. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 59:492-510.
- Perry, J.M. 1986. The Three Days in the Synoptic Passion Predictions, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48:637-654.
- Powell, M.A. 2007. On Deal-Breakers and Disturbances. Pages 277-282 in *John, Jesus, and History. Volume 1: Critical Appraisals of Critical Views*. Edited by P.N. Anderson and F. Just and T. Thatcher. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Proctor, M. 2006. 'After Three Days He Will Rise': The (Dis)Appropriation of Hosea 6.2 in the Markan Passion Predictions. Pages 131-150 in *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels. I. The Gospel of Mark*. Edited by T.R. Hatina. London – New York: T. & T. Clark.
- Reim, G. 1974. *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reinhartz, A. 1999. To Love the Lord. An Intertextual Reading of John 20. Pages 53-69 in *The Labour of Reading. Desire, Alienation, and Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by F.C. Black and R. Boer and E. Runions. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Richardson, P. 1992. Why Turn the Tables? Jesus' Protest in the Temple Precincts. Pages 507-523. *SBL 1992 Seminar Papers*. Edited by E.H. Lovering. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Rigato, M.-L. 2001. La sepoltura regale e provvisoria di Gesù secondo Gv 19,38-40. Pages 47-81 in *Atti del VIII simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni Apostolo*. Edited by L. Padovese. Parma: Associazione Culturale Eteria / Frati Cappuccini – Roma: Istituto Franceseano di Spiritualità. Pontificio Ateneo Antoniano.
- Rinaldi, G. 1966. Il 'germoglio' Messianico in Zaccaria 3,8; 6,12. Pages 179-191 in *Il Messianismo. Atti della XVIII Settimana Biblica. Associazione Biblica Italiana*. Brescia: Paideia.
- Roberts-Winsor, A. 1999. *A King is Bound in the Tresses: Allusions to the Song of Songs in the Fourth Gospel*. New York, NY et al.: Peter Lang.
- Robinson, B.P. 1966. Gethsemane: The Synoptic and the Johannine Viewpoints. *Church Quarterly Review* 167:4-11.
- Robinson, J.A.T. 1985. *The Priority of John*. London: SCM.
- Rosik, M. 2004. Interpretacja Janowej narracji o otwartym grobie (J 20,1-18) w świetle mitu o rajskim ogrodzie. *Collectanea Theologica* 74/1:39-63.
- . 2008. Discovering the Secrets of God's Gardens. Resurrection as New Creation (Gen 2:4b-3:24; Jn 20:1-18). *Liber Annuus* 58:81-98.
- Sanders, E.P. 1985. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM.
- . 1990. *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies*. London: SCM – Philadelphia: Trinity.
- . 1992. *Judaism. Practices and Beliefs 63 BCE – 66 CE*. London: SCM – Philadelphia: Trinity.
- . 1993. *The Historical Figure of Jesus*. London: Penguin Books.

*Zechariah 6:12-13 as the Referent of γραφή in John 2:22 and 20:9*

- Sanders, J.N. and Mastin, B.A. 1968. *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St John*. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- Schaper, J. 2010. The Messiah in the Garden: John 19.38-41, (royal) gardens, and Messianic concepts. Pages 17-27 in *Paradise in Antiquity. Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by M. Bockmuehl and G.G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schnackenburg, R. 1965. *Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1-4*. Vol. 1 of *Das Johannesevangelium*. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder.
- . 1975. *Kommentar zu Kap. 13-21*. Vol. 3 of *Das Johannesevangelium*. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Herder.
- Schneider, J. 1976. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Schnelle, U. 1998. 2004. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Schuchard, B.G. 1992. *Scripture within Scripture: The Interrelationship of Form and Function in the Explicit Old Testament Citations in the Gospel of John*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Schulz, S. 1972. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Selwyn, E.C. 1911. *The Oracles in the New Testament*. London – New York – Toronto: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Simenel, P. 1992. Les 2 anges de Jean 20/11-12. *Études théologiques et religieuses* 67:71-76.
- Simoens, Y. 1997. *Selon Jean*. 3 vols. Bruxelles: Éd. de l'Institut d'Études Théologiques.
- Sloyan, G.S. 1988. *John*. Atlanta: John Knox.
- Stager, L.E. 1999. Jerusalem and the Garden of Eden. *Eretz Israel* 26:182\*-194\*.
- Stordalen, T. 2000. *Echoes of Eden. Genesis 2-3 and Symbolism of the Eden Garden in Biblical Hebrew Literature*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Suggit, J. 1976. The Eucharistic Significance of John 20:19-29. *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 16:52-59.
- . 1983. John 19<sup>5</sup>: 'Behold the Man.' *Expository Times* 94:333-334.
- . 1999. Jesus the Gardener: The Atonement in the Fourth Gospel as Re-Creation. *Neotestamentica* 33:161-168.
- Sylva, D.D. 1988. Nicodemus and his Spices. *New Testament Studies* 34:148-151.
- Tasker, R.V.G. 1960. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity – Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Theissen, G. 1978. *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity*. London: SCM.
- Theobald, M. 2009. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes. Kapitel 1-12*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet.
- Thyen, H. 2005. *Das Johannesevangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Tödt, H.E. 1965. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. London: SCM.
- Trocme, E. 1996. L'arrière-plan du récit johannique de l'expulsion des marchands du Temple (Jean 2, 13-22). Pages 257-264 in *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Bd 3. *Frühes Christentum*. Edited by H. Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Trudinger, P. 1997. The Cleansing of the Temple: St John's Independent, Subtle Reflections. *Expository Times* 108:329-330.
- van Belle, G. 1985. *Les parenthèses dans l'évangile de Jean. Aperçu historique et classification. Texte grec de Jean*. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
- van der Branden, A. 1964. I titoli tolemaici 'Sâ Râ', שמח שדק e ἀνατολή δικαίων. *Bibbia e Oriente* 6:60-72.

- van Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. 1996. The Garden of Eden and Jubilees 3:1-31. *Bijdragen* 57:305-317.
- . 1999a. Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4-3:24 in *the Book of Jubilees*. Pages 63-94 in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by G.P. Luttikhuisen. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill.
- . 1999b. Visions of the Temple in the *Book of Jubilees*. Pages 214-227 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by B. Ego and A. Lange and P. Pilhofer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- von Gemünden, P. 1993. *Vegetationsmetaphorik im Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Eine Bildfelduntersuchung*. Fribourg: Universitätsverlag Freiburg Schweiz – Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wengst, K. 2000. *Das Johannesevangelium*. 2 vols. Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln: Kohlhammer.
- Wenham, G.J. 1994. Sanctuary Symbolism in the Garden of Eden Story. Pages 399-404 in *“I studied Inscriptions from before the Flood:” Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*. Edited by R.S. Hess and D.T. Tsumura. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Westcott, B.F. 1892. *The Gospel According to St. John*. London: John Murray.
- Wettstein, J.J. 1751-1752. *Novum Testamentum graecum editionis*. 2 vols. Amstelaedami: ex officina Dommeriana.
- Wevers, J.W. 1974. *Genesis. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum* 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Widengren, G. 1951. *The King and the Tree of Life in Ancient Near Eastern Religion (King and Saviour IV)*. Uppsala: Lundequistska Bokhandeln – Leipzig: Harrassowitz.
- Wikenhauser, A. 1957. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet.
- Wolff, H.W. 1976. *Hosea*. Vol. 1 of *Dodekapropheton*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Wright, N.T. 1996. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Vol. 2 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- . 2003. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Vol. 3 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Wyatt, N. 1990. ‘Supposing Him to Be the Gardener’ (John 20,15). A Study of the Paradise Motif in John. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 81:21-38.
- Yarbro Collins, A. 2001. Jesus’ Action in Herod’s Temple. Pages 45-61 in *Antiquity and Humanity. Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70<sup>th</sup> Birthday*. Edited by A. Yarbro Collins and M.M. Mitchell. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Zangenberg, J. 2007. ‘Buried According to the Customs of the Jews.’ John 19,40 in Its Material and Literary Context. Pages 873-900 in *The Death of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel*. Edited by G. van Belle. Leuven: Leuven University Press / Peeters.
- Zimmermann, R. 2004. *Christologie der Bilder im Johannesevangelium. Die Christopoetik des vierten Evangeliums unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von John 10*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2008. Symbolic Communication Between John and His Reader: The Garden Symbolism in John 19-20. Pages 221-235 in *Anatomies of Narrative Criticism: The Past, Present, and Futures of the Fourth Gospel as Literature*. Edited by T. Thatcher and S.D. Moore. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Zumstein, J. 2007. *L’évangile selon saint Jean (13-21)*. Genève: Labor et Fides.