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Greetings:

From the faculties of Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary in St. Catharines and Concordia Lutheran Seminary in Edmonton, greetings.

When the faculties of the two seminaries of Lutheran Church-Canada met for the first time in December, 1984, we recognized that while each of us had our individual history there were things to celebrate which we had in common. Our fervent desire was that we see ourselves and that others see us as partners together in the task of preparing confessional, Gospel-oriented and mission-minded Lutheran pastors for the Canadian church.

We also saw ourselves as colleagues not competitors in the task of providing theological leadership to our church as it was becoming a structural reality and in the task of addressing the theological issues in our country in our time. It was with this in mind that we determined to publish a theological journal and to do so jointly. After some delays, the Lutheran Theological Review is herewith being launched. We confidently anticipate that it will appear regularly twice a year.

Although it bears the same name as an earlier publication by the St. Catharines faculty, it is in reality a new publication. We pray that it will sound forth a clear witness to the truth of God and that it will help the readers to grapple with the complex theological issues facing them in our day. —NJT

In This Issue:

"This do in remembrance of Me." As Lutherans we endeavour to be faithful to this gracious injunction by which our Lord invites us to receive that very Body and Blood which have effected our salvation.

"This do." But does the command include even young infants? Over the centuries the Greek Orthodox Church, for example, has answered, "Yes." More recently some notable Lutherans have also advocated infant communion. What are the pertinent theological factors which should determine our practice? Edward Kettner deals with this issue in our first article.

"This do." But what is one to do if the would-be communicant is an alcoholic who fears for his continued sobriety and very life should he or she consume even the smallest amount of alcohol? Is it possible to maintain the Dominical injunction intact and at the same time deal pastorally with the alcoholic individual? And if so, would not a consistent practice be
desireable in our congregations? E. Edward Hackmann offers theological and pastoral guidelines towards this end.

"This do." But what is to be done in a developing national church where the "fruit of the vine" is not a local product? This question from the mission field was recently put to the St. Catharines faculty. Their response is included in this issue.

The final offering is exegetical and presents a detailed investigation of the way in which St. John has formally cited the Old Testament in the composition of his Gospel. It represents the distillate of studies extending over a number of years. A recent sabbatical in Cambridge, England, provided the opportunity to put the material in the form in which it is here presented.

We trust that these offerings will be stimulating and helpful — enough so, at least, that you will look forward to LTR, Vol. I, No. 2 (Spring/Summer 1989). —RJH
The Practice Of Infant Communion: An Examination
Edward G. Kettner

At first glance, it would seem that there is little need to examine the practice of infant communion from a Lutheran perspective. In the past, Lutherans have said very little on the subject, other than to reject it in passing. This, for example, was done as late as 1978, when the joint ALC-LCA “Statement on Communion Practices” was ratified by both Church bodies. The practice of infant communion has not been an issue in the Church in the West since the Middle Ages.

The issue, however, is of great interest now, in that some Lutherans in both the United States and Canada have suggested that the practice be re-examined, and indeed brought into the Lutheran Church. Among the proponents of the practice of infant communion are Robert Jenson of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, professor at Lutheran Theological Seminary in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and co-editor of the recently published Christian Dogmatics (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); and J. Robert Jacobson, currently the Bishop of the Alberta-North Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Canada.

The arguments set forth in favour of the practice of infant communion include evidence of its practice in the ancient Church (and its continued practice in the Eastern Church), the fact that baptism was apparently the sole criterion for acceptance at the altar in the ancient Church, clear parallels between baptism and the Lord’s Supper and their close relationship to one another, and the fact that by excluding infants Lutherans are excluding a part of the family of God from a great God-given benefit and are, in fact, “excommunicating” them.

In the West, the key argument against the practice has been the requirement of self-examination, found in 1 Cor. 11:27-30. The purpose of this paper is therefore on the one hand to examine the arguments in favour of infant communion in order to see if the Church in the West has unjustly excluded the very young from the sacrament, and on the other hand to see if the West thereby has been misinterpreting Paul’s exhortation to self-examination by its exclusion of infants.

Proponents of the practice of infant communion note the antiquity of
the practice as evidence for the need to, at the very least, re-examine the practice. Jacobson notes:

There isn’t a particle of evidence to indicate when and how Infant Communion was introduced at a later time, whereas we can easily point to dates and means by which it was excluded in the Western Churches.¹

If, in fact, this is the case, the argument in favour of infant communion would be strengthened, for it would indicate the understanding of the sacrament at a time close to the Apostolic Age to be such that infants should be included.

Indeed, there is evidence of the practice of infant communion at a very early time. Jacobson cites Cyprian’s De lapsis, written in the mid-third century, as evidence of the practice. In particular, Cyprian declares that the unworthy participation of parents will implicate their children in unworthy participation as well. In doing so, he cites the example of an infant too young to eat meat or to talk, who vomited the wine because her parents had made her eat and drink of a pagan sacrifice during persecution.² In two other places as well, he warns against involving young children in the sins of their parents by allowing the parents to partake unworthily of the sacrament.³

There is also evidence of the practice in the Western Church at early times, as seen in Augustine’s comments regarding the destiny of children who die at a very young age. He notes that they, just as much as the aged, will be judged by what they have done in the body. Here he specifically mentions what they have believed or not believed through the hearts and minds of those who carried them, indicating that he is referring to children who have not yet come to an age at which they can confess their own faith. Yet he then goes on to mention as their works whether they have eaten Christ’s flesh or drunk his blood, thus indicating that they would have had the opportunity to partake of the sacrament at a very young age.⁴

If the practice is so old, why then did it stop in the West? Jenson blames the cessation of the practice on the withholding of the cup from

---

³ Cyprian, 9, 15.
⁴ Augustine, Letters 217. 5.
the laity. He declares:

Infants had been given the cup, which they could always share one way or another, but not the bread, which the youngest could not swallow. When the cup was taken from the congregation, infants were left with nothing.\(^5\)

Jacobson notes that it was the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215 which removed the cup and moved the reception of first communion to an unspecified "age of discretion." He notes that in the West it was also the custom to allow the parish priest only to baptize, while the act of chrismation and the offering of first communion were to be performed only by the bishop. What in the East remained together as three parts of Christian initiation, with the parish priest allowed to perform all three functions, became separated in the West into three separate acts taking place at three separate times: baptism, first communion, and confirmation.\(^6\)

Thus, the practice of infant communion can be seen to have come into existence well before the middle of the third century, and to have been practiced in both the East and the West. But is there evidence of its having been practiced in the years immediately following the close of the Apostolic Age? Jacobson notes that both the Didache and the First Apology of Justin Martyr make baptism the sole requirement for reception of the sacrament. Though he acknowledges that the comments are addressed to adults, with their mention of living a Christian life in fellowship with God’s people, he does not see them as specifically excluding infants and children.\(^7\) Yet a look at the documents themselves indicates that the documents are not so much setting criteria for reception, but are rather addressing the fact that those who are not baptized should specifically be excluded from the sacrament.\(^8\) To move from there to Cyprian’s references to the practice as evidence that these works would allow the inclusion of infants, as Jacobson does, goes much farther than the texts allow.

What about scriptural evidence for the participation of infants and children at the Lord’s Supper? There certainly is no evidence of such


\(^6\) Jacobson, pp. 41-43.

\(^7\) Ibid., pp. 36-37.

\(^8\) Didache 9:5; Justin Martyr, *First Apology* I. 66. 1.
participation in any of the passages directly pertaining to the Supper. The accounts of the institution deal with the apostles alone, so that the words "Drink of it, all of you," apply in that context only to the apostles themselves. The command to continue to do this in remembrance of Jesus expands the "all of you" to the Church, but does not eliminate the possibility that other qualifications might need to be met. St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 11 clearly sets forth the qualification of self-examination, and in a way which implies an awareness of which the very young are not capable. Thus, only if other passages clearly permit or demand the inclusion of the very young can the practice of infant communion be justified.

It is only by looking beyond the accounts directly dealing with the Lord's Supper to other feeding stories in the Gospels that the possibility of infant participation in the meal presents itself. Jacobson points in particular to the feeding of the five thousand and the feeding of the four thousand as presented in Matthew as evidence of such participation, citing Joachim Jeremias, who used these accounts as evidence that women participated in Christian meals. After noting this, Jacobson goes on to say:

The fact that these passages became keys for the Church's understanding of the Lord's Supper is abundantly clear from even a casual glance at John vi. 35-58....

One thing is certain: no baptized woman sitting in a Matthean congregation could hear these passages read aloud and conclude that the Lord's meal was not for her and her children!

There are two problems with Jacobson's exegesis here. First, the Bread of Life discourse in John to which he refers speaks about a spiritual eating and drinking of Jesus' flesh and blood, and not to the oral eating and drinking of the sacrament. Second, Jesus is clearly contrasting this spiritual eating and drinking with the purely physical eating and drinking of purely physical bread in the wilderness. Indeed, Jesus rebukes those who had begun to follow him simply because they had been fed of the loaves, and urges them to feed on the food which will give them eternal life. Thus, simply because children ate of the meal in the wilderness

10 Jacobson, p. 18.
11 John 6:26-27.
does not necessarily mean that they are prepared to eat of the body and blood of the Lord in his Supper.

Neither is the fact that Jewish children participated in the eating of the Passover meal an indication that they were meant to participate in the Lord's Supper. While there is a relationship between the two meals, and the Passover Lamb is clearly to be seen as a type of Christ, the Passover involved the deliverance of a physical nation from physical slavery, and the meal served as a memorial of that deliverance, as well as a reminder of the further deliverance God would give to his people. No reference to another meal, even as important a one as the Passover meal, can aid in setting the criteria for participation in the Lord's Supper.

Yet it must be granted that, simply because there is no mention of infant participation in the Lord's Supper in the New Testament does not mean that infants are per se to be excluded. There is, after all, no specific mention of the baptism of any infant in the New Testament (though the mention of the baptisms of households at the very least leaves open the possibility), yet the Church from the very beginning baptized infants. Perhaps a look at the very nature of the sacrament itself might give some justification for the inclusion of the very young among the partakers of the sacrament, just as the very nature of baptism demands that infants be included in that sacrament.

What, then, is the nature of the Lord's Supper? Francis Pieper describes the Lord's Supper in this way:

We maintain that the Lord's Supper brings forgiveness of sins, the same forgiveness which the Word of the Gospel and Baptism offer.

Peculiar to the Lord's Supper, however, is the wonderful feature that Christ confirms and seals His assurance of the remission of our sins by giving us His body to eat, which was given into death for us, and His blood to drink, which was shed for the remission of our sins. In the Lord's Supper the remission of sins is therefore signed over and sealed to us by giving us the ransom paid for it.  

Pieper's understanding of the Lord's Supper is that what is offered in the Supper is the same as that which is offered in the other means of grace--the forgiveness of sins. The difference lies in the mode of

transmission of that forgiveness, and not in the gift offered.

Pieper is in good company in this understanding of the sacrament. Luther says much the same thing in his Large Catechism. He declares:

We go to the sacrament because we receive there a great treasure, through and in which we obtain the forgiveness of sins. Why? Because the words are there through which this is imparted! Christ bids me eat and drink in order that the sacrament may be mine and may be a source of blessing to me as a sure pledge and sign—indeed, as the very gift he has provided for me against my sins, death, and all evils.13

What is offered, then, is the objective gift of the body and blood of Christ as a seal of the forgiveness of sins. This gift is to be apprehended, then, by faith. Pieper notes, "The Gospel is intended for all men, believers and unbelievers alike. The Lord's Table, however, is appointed only for the people who have already come to faith in Christ."14 Luther likewise says that it is he who believes what the words say and what they give who has the power and benefit of the Supper.15

As Luther himself notes in this context, those words regarding faith can be (and by him indeed were) said about baptism as well. Faith is just as necessary to apprehend the benefits of baptism as it is to apprehend the benefits of the Lord's Supper. If, then, we baptize infants, and thereby declare that they are capable of having faith, why then do we not commune infants? Our baptism of them is testimony that we believe that they are sinners in need of forgiveness. Why then deny them the opportunity to eat and drink forgiveness? Jenson is quite strong in denouncing the withholding of communion from the newly baptized. He declares:

In fact, the separation of baptism and first communion lacks all justification, and can only be regarded as a catastrophic deprivation, both of the baptized children and of the communing congregation. Whatever arguments could disqualify persons of such-and-such age or attainments from the Supper would disqualify them also from baptism. Moreover, there can be no such arguments, for while there are indeed considerations that tell directly against infant baptism, in the nature of the case

13 LC V 22.
14 Pieper, 3:381.
15 LC V 33.
there can be nothing against infant communion. The one thing we do well at any age is to participate in fellowship by accepting nourishment.\textsuperscript{16}

The clearest response to be made against this type of argument is that there is an extreme sense of urgency about baptism that does not exist surrounding the Lord’s Supper. Infants are baptized to bring them into the family of God. Without it, the infant remains in its sins. The Lord’s Supper is given to those who are already within the family of faith, to give reassurance and strength during the journey through life. To withhold communion from an infant does not deprive it of the forgiveness of sins, whereas withholding baptism would do just that. Infants in fact have available to them all the benefits conveyed by forgiveness as a result of their baptisms, and so already have the same benefits as are conveyed in the Lord’s Supper.

But this, then, creates another issue. Infants have forgiveness, and therefore do not need communion. But certainly adults also have full and free forgiveness by virtue of their baptisms as well. Why then do they need the Lord’s Supper? Why celebrate it at all, if it conveys nothing new? To this Pieper replies:

The Lord’s Supper is of special consolation...to the Christian with his burden of sin, since the Lord’s Supper offers the assurance of grace to the individual and confirms it to the individual by a most singular pledge or seal, namely by giving him to eat and to drink the very body of Christ which was given for him, and the very blood of Christ which was shed for him.\textsuperscript{17}

In other words, the sacrament becomes of special significance when one grows in awareness of his sins. The greater awareness one has and the greater the weight of those sins upon the conscience, the greater the need of assurance of forgiveness. Thus there is not as great a need for that type of assurance at a young age as there is as life goes on. This is not to denigrate the importance of the sacrament nor to trivialize its significance. Rather, it is to point out that the need for forgiveness in this particular manner comes about as the individual grows in both the ability and the need to perform self-examination, and therefore in the ability to understand and appreciate the gift offered in the Supper.

\textsuperscript{16} Jenson, p. 164.
\textsuperscript{17} Pieper, 3:391-92.
A look at the arguments in favour of infant communion shows that the proponents of the practice clearly teach that the central benefit of the sacrament goes beyond the forgiveness of sins, and offers something which is not available anywhere else. The Eastern Orthodox practice of bringing together baptism, chrismation, and first communion into a single act implies that none of these acts alone offers anything complete, but that all three must take place in order for the full benefits of life in Christ to be made manifest. For example, Demetrios Constantelos notes that through baptism one enters the earthly Kingdom of God through the forgiveness of sins, and becomes a member of the Church; through chrismation the newly baptized receives the seal and the gifts of the Holy Spirit, and thus completes baptism; and in the Lord’s Supper one receives spiritual nourishment for the preservation and cultivation of one’s spiritual life. In describing the Eastern Orthodox understanding of the Lord’s Supper, Constantelos declares:

This mystery of the body and blood of Christ is a realization of the unity of all true believers with Christ and with all the members of his holy body—the Church. Through the sacrament of the Eucharist, human nature enters into union with the divine nature of Christ. Our humanity becomes consubstantial with the deified humanity of Christ....Thereby, through Holy Communion, a corporeal unity of man with Christ is achieved.

Thus, the Eastern Orthodox understand the sacrament of holy communion to bring about a special unity of Christ and the believer which is not available otherwise, and thereby also to bring about a unity among believers which could exist in no other way than through participation in this sacrament. If one understands the sacrament in that way, then it becomes understandable, and indeed imperative, that the very young participate in the sacrament. To deny it to them would be to deny them a special blessing from God given in no other way.

This understanding of the Supper is clearly held by Jacobson. As he explains the significance of the institution of the Supper to those present, Jacobson states that Jesus “planted the seeds of the next installment of

---


19 Constantelos, p. 65.
their Baptism into Him, namely, their rising again with Him." Yet this understanding of the sacrament contradicts what Saint Paul says regarding baptism in Romans 6, when he says that we have been baptized into Christ's death, and that being united in the death of Christ, we will certainly also be united in His resurrection. All the benefits of Christ, including union with Christ, come about through baptism. Communion adds nothing new.

But what about the other benefits which Scripture attaches to the Lord's Supper? For example, St. Paul does indeed note that all believers, who are many, are one body, for all partake of the one loaf. The sacrament clearly unites believers, but it does it in no other way than by the offer of the forgiveness of sins. Since the offer is given to those who by baptism are already united with Christ, what the sacrament in fact does is create a deeper realization of the unity already there; the unity into which all Christians have been brought through their baptisms.

In noting the proper understanding of the benefits of the Lord's Supper, Pieper notes that all benefits that go beyond the forgiveness of sins are benefits precisely because they stem from the forgiveness of sins. He states:

All other effects of the Lord's Supper are not co-ordinate but subordinate to the bestowal of the forgiveness of sins. These other effects have been listed as follows: a) strengthening of faith, b) communion with Christ, c) communion with the spiritual body of Christ, the Church, d) furtherance in sanctification, e) kindling of love of God and the neighbour, f) growth in patience and in hope of eternal life. But all these effects rest not in part only, but entirely on the fact that the Lord's Supper is a means of remitting sins.

Furthermore, since all of these effects are ours through baptism, it might be said that, rather than give us these things, the Lord's Supper increases our awareness of what has in actuality become ours through baptism. To be able to grow in awareness means to have the ability to understand what is going on in the Supper; namely what is given (the true body and blood of Jesus for the forgiveness of sins), and what is given as

20 Jacobson, p. 12.
21 Rom. 6:3-5.
22 1 Cor. 10:17.
23 Pieper, 3:379.
an outgrowth of that forgiveness.

Simply put, faith must accept what is being offered, and to do so it must be a conscious, or reflective, faith. If it is not, then the communion meal must be effective *ex opere operato*, that is, through the mere act of eating and drinking. Indeed, Jenson's statement, that the one thing an infant can do is accept nourishment, implies just such an operation of the sacrament.

But does not the baptism of infants then imply the same type of operation? Jenson's statement implies that it does, and even more so than it does with the Supper. Jacobson, too, while not denying that the infant has faith created by baptism, tends more to speak about the faith of the household into which the infant is baptized than to the faith of the infant itself. He notes that in Acts 16 the entire household of the Philippian jailer was baptized on the faith of the head of the household, thus illustrating that faith comes apart from human decision-making, and that "individualism" is thereby rejected. He says:

When an infant is part of a family that belongs to the New Covenant, his life in Christ begins in infancy and infancy is the only possible time for him to receive a New Testament Baptism. If he doesn't receive it then, whatever baptism he receives later on has no New Testament examples and makes no New Testament sense.24

Thus, if infants can experience baptism as a part of their families, so should they experience communion as part of their families. No faith other than the faith required for baptism may be required for the Lord's Supper. In fact, the act of "discerning the body" is something which must be done in regard to baptism as well as the Lord's Supper. Jacobson declares:

...requirements for worthy reception both of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper are identical. And only adults can meet them. In no way does Baptism require, by New Testament standards, any less discernment of self-examination than the Lord's Supper just because it stands at the beginning of our life in Christ.25

This also means that the requirement for self-examination and for

---

24 Jacobson, p. 27.
25 Ibid., p. 34.
discerning the body found in 1 Cor. 11:27-29 can be met for the infant by
the community as a whole, and does not have to be met by the infant
itself. Jacobson, in explaining the phrase “discerning the body” gives it
two senses: a “sacramental” sense, which the Corinthians violated by
turning the meal into a drinking party, and a “churchly” sense, which
they violated by denying the inclusive quality of the Church.26 He goes
on to say:

If discerning the body is required for the Lord’s Supper in the
sacramental sense of being aware that Christ is present and at
work in the bread and wine, then being aware that Christ is
present in the saving action involving the water is required for
Baptism....If discerning the body is required for the Lord’s
Supper in the churchly sense of assuring that all members of
Christ are included in the meal, then recognizing how our
Baptism unites us with one another in Christ’s body is
prerequisite to its proper celebration. Thus, requirements for
worthy reception both of Baptism and of the Lord’s Supper are
identical.27

As this applies to infants, he says:

...if a baptized child belongs to a community that discerns the
body without despising the Church of God by neglecting its
weaker members, that child will be included at the Lord’s Table
and that community’s discernment will envelope and condition
the child’s discernment as he grows up within it.28

Jacobson’s understanding of “discerning the body” is clearly not an
understanding of the real presence in the classic Lutheran sense, but
more of a personal presence which makes union with Christ and one’s
fellow believers the essence of the sacrament rather than the forgiveness
of sins. But is this what Saint Paul means by the term? Paul is clearly
aware of possible abuse of the Lord’s Supper and of the possibility of
receiving the sacrament to one’s judgment, but there is never any concern
expressed in this regard concerning baptism. It is true that the
Corinthians were guilty of failing to distinguish the body of Christ in the
“churchly” sense, with their division into factions as a result of

26 Ibid., p. 30.
27 Ibid., pp. 33-34.
28 Ibid., p. 34.
allegiance to persons, and as a result of their awareness and perpetuation of class distinctions. But Paul indicates that if the Corinthians truly discerned the body in the "sacramental" sense (the sense in which he is actually using the term), the other divisions would disappear. It is recognizing the gift of forgiveness which overcomes division.

The passage also indicates the need for a conscious faith in order for the benefits of the sacrament to be obtained. However important the idea of community is, the individual aspect, in both the sense of God coming to the individual through the means of grace and of an individual's faith being necessary to obtain the benefits offered, is vital to a proper reception of the sacrament. While faith per se does not need to be conscious or reflective, as is the case with infants, the words of Paul indicate that the Lord's Supper benefits those who are conscious of what is being offered, and indeed warns that the failure to recognize the real presence is detrimental to the individual who partakes in that manner. Given the clear sense of the passage, it is not fair to claim, as Jenson does, that this particular interpretation was placed on the passage after infant communion was abolished in the West as an ad hoc justification for an action which had been in reality determined by the removal of the cup from the laity.29 What is clear is that Paul commands a minimal understanding of what is taking place in the sacrament. The benefit of this sacrament cannot be obtained without the ability to understand what is being received. Therefore, while the passage does not specifically speak to the question of including or excluding infants, the words that he uses speak to a requirement that infants do not possess.

This, of course, is not meant to turn faith into a good work. The faith which apprehends the benefits of the sacrament is itself a gift of God. Jacobson claims:

Our practice has inculcated into many of our people a positive paranoia about producing in their heads just the right formulation of a doctrine at the moment of receiving the elements in order to avoid eating and drinking damnation upon themselves.30

If this has been the case, then the doctrine concerning the sacrament has not been taught properly. A proper understanding would turn faith from such self-analysis to the gift being offered, and would receive that gift with joy.

29 Jensen, pp. 163-64.
30 Jacobson, p.57.
To summarize: though infant communion was practiced by the early Church in both the East and the West, there is no scriptural evidence in those passages dealing directly with the sacrament which demands their inclusion, and there is a very clear passage with speaks of a level of awareness which would exclude them. Furthermore, those who support infant communion must do so by ascribing an *ex opera operato* benefit to the sacrament, thereby demanding that the sacrament be understood as essentially offering something that is not available through the other means of grace, and separating this benefit from the forgiveness of sins. These arguments thus deny complete reception of the benefits of salvation in baptism.

In view of the fact that infants are full members of the Church and receive all the benefits of union with Christ at baptism, and that, given the requirements for self-examination and discerning the body which indicate the need for awareness to receive the benefits of the sacrament (thus meaning an increasing awareness of the need for forgiveness), there is no reason to abandon the practice of reserving communion for those who have been properly instructed and are aware of the significance of the sacrament.

*Edward G. Kettner is Associate Professor of Systematic Theology at Concordia Lutheran Seminary, Edmonton, Alberta.*
Theological Principles Underlying Communion Practices With Respect To Alcoholics

E. Edward Hackmann

The question of communion practice with respect to alcoholics has become a live question in our time due to the contemporary understanding of the nature of alcoholism. While the term "alcoholism" is used in a variety and not always consistent variety of ways, what seems to be commonly maintained by people who work with alcoholism is that alcohol is a drug which through persistent use may become increasingly addictive until it affects the human organism as a disease which, with continued use of alcohol, becomes increasingly life-threatening.

It is maintained, furthermore, that there are some persons who are genetically prone to alcoholism; and when the mechanism is triggered, continued use of alcohol produces the full ravages of the disease. Thus alcoholics may range from the habitual social drinker; to the person who regularly seeks the solace of alcoholic inebriation to escape the stressful reality of life-problems; to the person who has developed a physical and psychological dependency on alcohol, and finds that he needs to consume it in increasing amounts with increasing frequency; to the person who has become physically and mentally ravaged by alcohol to the point of incapacitation. At any stage in this continuum an alcoholic may realize his predicament and want to halt the accelerating skid into self-destruction. Depending at what stage the alcoholic undertakes abstinence from alcohol, he may be able occasionally to indulge in small quantities of alcohol without reverting back to the progressive addiction of the drug; or he may be at the stage where he can tolerate no alcohol at all, and even a small amount, such as is received in the drinking of the wine in the Lord's Supper, is sufficient to trigger a relapse into over-indulgence, drunkenness, and possibly death.

It is with respect to alcoholics who want to abstain from alcohol, and yet desire to partake of the Lord's Supper, that the question of pastoral counsel and communion practice arises.

It needs to be noted at the outset that unless the pastor is experienced and thoroughly knowledgeable regarding the nature and treatment of alcoholism, he would be well-advised to seek professional help in evaluating the stage of alcoholism in which an individual currently is. In
cases where the alcoholic can tolerate occasional small amounts of alcohol pastoral counsel should emphasize the sacred nature and spiritual power of the Sacrament. Then, in instances where the pastor is convinced that the communicant can partake beneficially of the Sacrament, the communicant may be counseled to partake of both elements in the Sacrament. If the communicant is concerned about the amount or strength of alcohol he may receive, he may partake of the wine merely by sipping a small amount, or by intinction, or by diluting a small amount of the wine with water. Such cases may be readily accommodated through prudent pastoral counseling.

The cases, however, which seem to present an insoluble conundrum for pastoral counseling are those in which a communicant, either because of the stage of alcoholism to which he has advanced or because of the danger which he perceives, can tolerate no alcohol at all. While no solution to this problem may seem entirely satisfactory, it would seem prudent for the congregations of the synod to adopt a uniform practice in such cases for the sake of order in communion practice, as well as for the spiritual welfare of all concerned. The goal should be to enable the advanced alcoholic to receive the spiritual benefits of the Sacrament without raising doubts in the minds of, or giving offense to, the members of the Body of Christ; and at the same time to remain faithful to the observance of the Lord’s Supper as it was instituted by Christ.

This essay will confine its attention to those cases where the alcoholic can tolerate no alcohol and yet desires to receive the Lord’s Supper. With respect to these cases, there seem to be four possible responses which a pastor might make: 1) He might counsel the alcoholic to abstain altogether from participation in the Lord’s Supper. 2) He might counsel the alcoholic to partake of the wine in the Sacrament and trust God to keep him from consequent drunkenness. 3) He might substitute a non-alcoholic liquid for the wine, and counsel the alcoholic to drink such liquid in the Sacrament. 4) He might counsel the alcoholic to participate in the congregation’s celebration of the Lord’s Supper, but without drinking the wine. These would seem to exhaust the possible counseling alternatives applicable to these cases.

To formulate principles on the basis of which an alternative might be selected and common practice adopted, it is necessary to turn first of all to God’s Word and seek the direction it provides.

Scripture testifies that Christ’s institution of the Lord’s Supper was for the purpose of providing a means whereby the Communion of Saints, His
Church, might receive all the spiritual benefits which He obtained for each believer through His vicarious atonement on Calvary.

In the light of Christ's institution, the counsel that the alcoholic should abstain altogether from participation in the Lord's Supper,—particularly when the person desires to participate—does not seem viable. However, if an alcoholic sincerely believed that his condition did not permit him to partake of the Lord's Supper, one would have to honour such a decision, while at the same time assuring such a person that God's forgiveness for his sin and assurance of salvation is full and free for him in Jesus Christ; that, finally, partaking of the Lord's Supper is not absolutely necessary for one's salvation. It is not the lack of the Sacrament, but the despising of it or participation of it in unbelief which condemns.

The second alternative, to counsel the alcoholic to partake of the wine in the Sacrament and to trust that God will keep him from any evil consequences, is also a non-viable option. This would be nothing less than tempting God, a practice which Scripture condemns and which could result in the eternal loss of an immortal soul.

The third alternative, the substitution of some other element for wine in the Sacrament is also non-viable. In instituting this Sacrament for His Church, Christ says, "Do this"; so the Church is to celebrate the Sacrament as Christ instituted it. The constituent acts of Christ's institution were, first of all, the consecration of the bread and the contents of the cup, thus the bread and the contents of the cup are essential; secondly, the distribution of the bread and the contents of the cup, in this too the bread and the contents of the cup are essential; and thirdly, the eating of the bread and drinking of the contents of the cup, in which again both bread and the contents of the cup are essential. It is evident from Christ's institution of the Sacrament that the elements He used were the unleavened bread and wine used at Passover. Therefore, to prevent any doubts as to whether the Sacrament is being celebrated according to Christ's institution the elements of unleavened bread and wine should be used.

It is interesting to note, incidentally, that while Christ used unfermented bread and fermented fruit of the vine in instituting the Sacrament, modern wisdom often advocates just the opposite, namely fermented bread and unfermented fruit of the vine.

The usual argument, advocating the use of unfermented fruit of the vine appeals to the fact that none of the words of institution of the Lord's Supper recorded by the evangelists or St. Paul specify wine as the element in the Sacrament. Jesus blesses a cup and the disciples drink of
it. The only reference to the content of the cup is the subsequent words of Jesus, "I tell you I shall not drink again of this product (or fruit) of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom." The argument is that since Jesus does not use the word "wine," but "product (or fruit) of the vine," it is permissible to use grape juice which is fruit of the vine.

But does this argument hold? It seems evident that it does not. For it seems evident that when Jesus says "this product (or fruit) of the vine" He is referring specifically to wine as the element in His Sacrament. There doesn't seem to be any doubt that Jesus Himself used wine in His institution of the Lord's Supper, and when He says, "I shall not drink again of this product (or fruit) of the vine," it is evident that He does not mean just any fruit of the vine—else we might like to liberalize our communion practice to serving watermelon juice, or squash juice, or some even more exotic fruit of the vine! No, Jesus specifies "this product (or fruit) of the vine" and the specific product of the vine He was indicating was fermented juice of grapes, wine.

On this matter, Lenski writes:

When Matthew 26:29 writes of this fruit of the vine, i.e., that which the Passover cup contained he shuts out any and all other products of the vine save actual wine and thwarts all modern efforts that speak of unfermented grape juice, raisin tea, or diluted grape syrup. The expression "fruit of the vine" is derived from the Hebrew pheri hagiphen, a choice liturgical formula for wine. The matter is of utmost importance and lies beyond our powers to alter. To alter a testament is to invalidate that document. Hence the use of any other liquid than actual wine that is made from grapes—this alone was wine in Christ's day, this alone was used in the Passover—renders the Sacrament invalid so that it ceases to be the Sacrament. Christ's testament is valid only in the form in which he made it and not as men today may alter it.¹

The elements, then, which are specifically designated in connection with the institution of the Lord's Supper are undoubtedly bread and wine. These are the elements which were used everywhere throughout the Church from Apostolic times. Variations from these elements, particu-

larly with respect to the wine, which are mentioned by the third century, soon disappeared from practice, or else were identified with the practice of heretical groups. Among such groups bread and water were the most common elements used.

For Luther, the Confessions, and our orthodox theologians, no other earthly elements than bread and wine were recognized for use in the Sacrament. In the Confessions, Luther writes in the Small Catechism:

What is the Sacrament of the Altar?

Answer: Instituted by Christ Himself, it is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the bread and wine, given to us Christians to eat and to drink.

In the Large Catechism he writes:

Now what is the Sacrament of the Altar?

Answer: It is the true body and blood of the Lord Christ in and under the bread and wine which we Christians are commanded by Christ's word to eat and drink.

In the Smalcald Articles:

We hold that the bread and the wine in the Supper are the true body and blood of Christ and that these are given and received not only by godly but also by wicked Christians.

The Augsburg Confession declares:

It is taught among us that the true body and blood of Christ are really present in the Supper of our Lord under the form of bread and wine and are there distributed and received.

The Apology reaffirms:

...we defend the doctrine received in the whole church - that in the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present and are truly offered with those things that are seen, bread and wine.

The Epitome of the Formula of Concord affirms:

We believe, teach, and confess that in the Holy Supper the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present and are truly distributed and received with the bread and wine.

The Solid Declaration of the Formula of Concord simply recites the testimony of the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald
Articles, the Small Catechism and the Large Catechism. In its further discussion the only earthly elements of the Sacrament repeatedly mentioned are bread and wine.

The orthodox dogmaticians likewise know no other elements in the Lord’s Supper than bread and wine, and Christ’s body and blood. In regard to Sacraments in general, orthodoxy asserted that for an act to be called a Sacrament in the proper and strict sense, it was necessary that: 1) It was an act commanded by God; 2) that it had divinely prescribed visible elements; 3) that it had the promise of the grace of the Gospel. Invariably in the discussion of divinely prescribed elements in the Lord’s Supper, two kinds of elements are distinguished, the earthly and the heavenly. The earthly elements designated are true bread and true wine. The form of the wine, whether it is red or white, or whether it is diluted with water or not, is a matter of Christian liberty, as long as it is truly grape wine.

Within the Missouri Synod it is only in the twentieth century that some of her theologians began opening the door to using an element other than wine, specifically grape juice, in the Sacrament. This certainly has not been the *publica doctrina* of the Missouri Synod. Thus, Fritz in his *Pastoral Theology* writes:

> It is with some a moot question whether the mere juice of the grape, which has not yet undergone the process of fermentation may be used. There is no doubt, however, that the Lord used wine when He instituted the Lord’s Supper and that the practice of our Lutheran Church in using only wine in administering the Sacrament should be continued. Only by so doing will every Christian have the absolute assurance that he is receiving that Sacrament which the Lord Himself instituted.\(^2\)

In regard to the Confessions and the orthodox dogmaticians the suggestion has been made that they do not address the substitution of grape juice in the Sacrament because alcoholism was not understood at their time. The implication is that if they had understood alcoholism they would have provided for such a substitution. But such argumentation is clearly fallacious. Of course, the sixteenth century confessors and the seventeenth century dogmaticians did not understand alcoholism as it is understood in the twentieth century. But that provides no warrant for

---

inferring that they would have had anything different to say about the elements with which Christ instituted the Sacrament, and therefore the only elements which should be used in the Sacrament.

With respect to the Missouri Synod's position, it has been argued that the reason why the Lutheran Church—Missouri Synod has advocated the exclusive use of wine in the Sacrament is specifically to oppose the Reformed practice of insisting upon the use of grape juice or some other non-alcoholic beverage. Now, while this was one of the reasons for the position of the Missouri Synod, the more fundamental reason was to remain faithful to the way in which Christ instituted the Sacrament. Opposition to the Reformed was not simply because they were legalistically advocating something which was a matter of Christian liberty, but primarily because they were advocating a practice which was not in accordance with Christ's institution of the Sacrament.

Within the Missouri Synod, perhaps the most prominent theologian who defended the idea that the use of grape juice in the Sacrament was a matter of Christian liberty was Theodore Graebner. His position, however, seems quite paradoxical (if not flatly inconsistent). First of all, he doesn't answer the argumentation of our earlier theologians—simply says he isn't convinced. But then he writes:

I would say without any reservation that grape juice should not be substituted for fermented wine in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. I would not partake of Communion where it is celebrated under that condition and would not affiliate with any congregation that introduced the use of grape juice.

He then goes on to offer four reasons why he was personally opposed to the use of grape juice in the Lord's Supper:

a) It is wrong to depart from the established usage of the entire Christian Church through all the centuries. b) Grape juice is not fermented wine, and the use of it will raise in many people a doubt whether they are actually receiving the Sacrament, since to them the fruit of the vine has always meant, and means today, fermented wine. c) The use of grape juice has been first advocated by Reformed sectarians, who condemn the use of all alcoholic liquour as sin. It is our duty to oppose this restriction of Christian liberty while it is in our power, not by word, but by

---

act, and for this reason to continue to use fermented wine in the Lord’s Supper. d) The giving of offense involved in the above three points is an additional reason for refusing the use of grape juice.\(^4\)

While Graebner and his followers introduced confusion on this matter in the synod, it seems evident that the practice of the Christian Church down through the centuries and the position of our orthodox Lutheran theologians is the Scriptural position, namely, that no other elements than bread and wine are to be used in the Lord’s Supper, and therefore we cannot substitute some other elements in the Sacrament as a concession to alcoholism.

This brings us then to the final alternative: May the alcoholic be counseled to partake of the Lord’s Supper without drinking the wine? This seems to be the only pastoral alternative open for ministering to the advanced alcoholic.

Although the 1983 report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations on the Lord’s Supper finds difficulty with this alternative “in view of confessional texts which strongly urge the Biblical paradigm of both kinds...,”\(^5\) what should be recognized explicitly is that the various statements of the confessions urging the celebration of the Sacrament in both kinds were specifically directed against the Roman Catholic practice of insisting on the celebration in one kind. These texts are concerned with the proper celebration of the Sacrament in both kinds, according to Christ’s institution, so that communicants are not refused one of the elements. It is the legalistic withholding of the cup from the laity with which these passages are concerned. Therefore, it should be recognized that these texts are not concerned with whether a person who receives only one physical element in the Sacrament truly receives the Sacrament, and so cannot really be determinative for counsel in the case of an alcoholic.

It is important, with respect to these passages, to recognize that although an alcoholic might be counseled to abstain from drinking the wine, the Sacrament would still be celebrated by the congregation in both kinds. It would only be the individual alcoholic who would voluntarily refrain from partaking of the wine in order to avoid all temptation to

---


\(^5\) “Theology and Practice of the Lord’s Supper,” A Report of the Commission on Theology and Church Relations of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod, pp. 16-17.
subsequent over-indulgence. For anyone who might be disturbed by the fact that he is not receiving the Sacrament in both kinds, Luther’s counsel is quite appropriate when he writes,

In the first place, you have, after all, the words of the Sacrament and these are the most important part of the Sacrament. These words you can take and use just as well whether you receive one element or both elements, or even none at all. So you are in no danger whatever, and yet you do receive the real power of the Sacrament.6

This counsel of Luther would also apply to the objection that in instituting the Lord’s Supper Christ invited all the disciples to drink of the cup, and that Scripture records “they all drank of it.” In answer to this concern, we must first of all acknowledge that certainly that is the way in which the Sacrament should be celebrated—with the invitation to all the congregation to partake of the elements, and the congregation joyfully partaking, each person receiving the body and blood of Christ. However, in such celebration, if someone should not receive the wine, either through inadvertance of the person distributing the wine, or through the voluntary exclusion of oneself from drinking of the wine, this does not invalidate the Sacrament in any way, nor does the person who truly believes in Christ and acknowledges the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament receive any less spiritual benefits of the Sacrament than does one who partakes of both bread and wine.

Thus also the alcoholic may be assured that partaking of the Sacrament, celebrated according to Christ’s institution, although he may voluntarily refrain from partaking of the wine, yet through faith in the words of the Sacrament: “This is my body which is given for you ... This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you,” he receives the full spiritual benefits of the Sacrament. At the same time there is no offense given to anyone by the substitution of some other element than bread and wine; nor will doubts be raised as to whether the alcoholic actually received the blood of Christ as occurs when some other liquid is substituted for the wine in his particular case.

In conclusion, although this final alternative may not be a completely satisfactory solution to the problem of communion practice with respect

---

to the advanced alcoholic, for the sake of remaining faithful to Christ’s institution of the Sacrament, for the sake of uniform practice in synod, and for the sake of pastoral care of advanced alcoholics, we suggest that this alternative is the only viable one to adopt.

_E. Edward Hackmann is Professor of Systematic Theological at Concordia Lutheran Theological Seminary, St. Catharines, Ontario._
A question has been raised with respect to communion practice in a foreign mission field. The situation is one where the missionary is in the process of planting a national church. It is in an area of the world where grapes do not grow, thus precluding the possibility of using wine produced within the country for the Sacrament of the Altar. The requirement of wine would mean a dependency upon foreigners for the developing national church. There is a readily available local fermented drink made from grain which is used for special occasions.

**Question:** Would it be permissible to use the local fermented drink instead of wine in the celebration of the Sacrament?

The following reply addresses this concern from the perspectives of the Incarnation, Revelation, and the Church.

**I. Incarnation**

The “only-begotten Son of God...for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the virgin Mary and was made man” (Nicene Creed). This confession stands at the heart of the Christian faith and it acknowledges that the Incarnation was a one-time historical event. The fact that our Lord was a Jew, lived in Judea, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, is part and parcel of God’s plan in history to provide salvation for all people.

It is within this context that we view the Lord’s Supper. The Sacrament was instituted by this Incarnate Lord in a specific place, on a specific occasion, and with specific elements which convey that very body and blood of the Son of God which were given and shed for our redemption. The continued use of the divinely prescribed elements helps to assure that we do not stray from the precise historical reality of the Christian faith.

**II. Revelation**

It is helpful to keep in mind the old dogmatic distinction between the *Deus absconditus* and the *Deus revelatus*. Here we have to do with the *Deus revelatus*. His revelation is inerrantly vouchsafed for us in the
written Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Thus the only basis for all teaching and practice in the Christian Church is the clearly revealed will and word of God, the Bible (sola Scriptura principle).

We do not have the freedom to try and pry behind God’s ‘veils’, to seek to ascertain what His will might be apart from His revelation to us in Scripture. We cannot develop church practice on the basis of what we think God “might have done” under different circumstances. We have no way of knowing what God “might have done”; we do know what He has done because He has told us. With respect to the Sacrament we have a clear word: “This do.” Only when we do as He has commanded can we be assured that we have a valid Sacrament.

III. The Church

There may be many good and valid reasons (political, cultural, etc.) for organizing ‘national churches’. The recent establishment of Lutheran Church--Canada is a case in point. Nonetheless, the organization and administration of congregations along national lines is a matter of Christian liberty. ‘National churches’, per se, have no warrant or basis in Scripture.

The New Testament knows of the una sancta, and of the church existing locally in congregations gathered around the Word and Sacraments. This church is not ‘national’ (see Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11; 1 Cor. 1:2). Furthermore, within this church independence is considered neither a virtue nor a goal. Rather, the nature of the church as the Body of Christ calls for mutual interdependence (see 1 Cor. 12:12-27). The specific situation of needing to rely on other Christians for the provision of wine for the Sacrament of the Altar may serve to inculcate the divine reality of the interdependence of the members of the Body of Christ.

One final point: A developing ‘national church’ will want to avoid undertaking any practice that might well be deemed ‘sectarian’. The substitution of anything other than the fermented “fruit of the vine,” namely, grape wine, is surely outside the bounds of historic church practice. Throughout the centuries, in many countries and territories also devoid of viticulture (England, Norway, Finland, Sweden, etc.), the fermented “fruit of the vine” has always been used in obedience to the clear Word of God.
The Function And Form Of The Explicit Old Testament Quotations In The Gospel Of John

Roger J. Humann

It has long been noted that "John stands apart from the other Evangelists in materials and manner of citation" of the Old Testament. While it is true that John has far fewer direct Old Testament quotations than the other Gospels, to conclude from this that he was therefore less interested or less knowledgeable in the Old Testament would be a serious mistake. On the contrary, "John reflects even more clearly than the Synoptic Gospels the great currents of Old Testament thought." The fact that John's Gospel "would be unthinkable without the Old Testament basis which supports it," underscores the importance of the explicit Old Testament quotations which do appear in it.

The purpose of this study, therefore, is to investigate the explicit Old Testament quotations in John's Gospel with the following two questions in mind: 1) what role or function do these quotations have within the structure of the Gospel? and, 2) what is the significance, if any, of the form in which the quotations appear?

We shall limit our study to those passages which indicate a conscious and deliberate appeal to the Old Testament, specifically, to where a reasonably definable unit of Old Testament Scripture is cited in conjunction with an introductory formula or other means of identification. Thirteen passages in the Fourth Gospel meet these criteria: 1:23; 2:17; 6:31 and 45; 10:34; 12:14-15, 38 and 39-40; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24, 36 and 37. On this basis 7:38 is omitted since it is virtually impossible to identify a unit of the Old Testament as a text source. Such passages as 7:42; 17:12; and 19:28 are not treated because, although they refer to the content of the Old Testament, there is no explicitly quoted passage. Finally, 12:13 is not discussed because it is not cited by means of an introductory formula.

I.
The Function Of The Quotations Within The Structure Of The Gospel

A. Their Location

The Old Testament quotations in John’s Gospel do not occur in a haphazard or random manner. Rather they give every evidence of a deliberate and careful selection and incorporation into the over-all structure of the Gospel. These quotations may be introduced into the text by the evangelist himself as he explains or comments on some action (2:17; 12:14-15, 38, 39-40; 19:24, 36, 37), or they may be originally adduced by someone else, John the Baptist (1:23), the Jews (6:31), or Jesus (6:45; 10:34; 13:18; 15:25), and then included in the narrative by the evangelist. In either case they are found regularly at key points throughout the Gospel.

The Fourth Gospel divides naturally into two main units with a prologue (1:1-18) and an epilogue (ch. 21). An indication of this twofold structure is given by John himself in the prologue: 1) “He came to His own home, and His own people did not receive Him,” v. 11 (which represents 1:19-12:50). 2) “But as many as received Him, to them He gave authority to become children of God, to those who believe on His name,” v. 12 (which represents 13:1-20:31). We note the rather even distribution of these Old Testament citations throughout the Gospel and the fact that subsequent to the prologue, at least one quotation is included in every major part of the book through the Passion narrative, but none after that. The following outline will serve to indicate the location of these citations:

Prologue, 1:1-18

I. Jesus manifests His glory to Israel that rejects Him, 1:19-

---

4Richard Morgan writes that the “author makes sure that the Old Testament is present at every crucial moment in the Gospel. This explains the significance of the Johannine quotations from the Old Testament. Their significance does not lie in the frequency of their occurrence, but rather in their presence at every vital moment in the Messiah’s life. It is striking that at every crisis in this moving drama of redemption, the Old Testament is there.” “Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel,” Interpretation, 11:156-7. In this same connection Edwin D. Freed also writes: “But in no other writer are the O.T. quotations so carefully woven into the context and the whole plan of composition as in Jn.” Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John, Vol. II, Supplement to Novum Testamentum (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1965), p. 129.

5This outline is based to some extent on that offered by Martin Franzmann, The Word of the Lord Grows (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961), pp. 257-60.
HUMANN: O.T. QUOTATIONS IN JOHN

12:50 ("He came to His own home, and His own people received Him not," 1:11).

A. Jesus reveals Himself to all Israel, 1:19-4:54.
   1. The opening days of the revelation of Jesus, 1:19-51.
      1:23/Is. 40:3
   2. From Cana to Cana, 2:1-4:54.
      2:17/Ps. 69:9

(N.B. This first sketch of Jesus' activity covers all Israel: Judea, Samaria, and Galilee).

B. Jesus is rejected by Israel, 5:1-12:50.
      6:31/Ex. 16:4 (and/or Ps. 78:24)
      6:45/Is. 54:13
      10:39/Ps. 82:6
   2. Jesus moves toward the hour of death and glory, 11:1-12:36.
      12:14, 15/Zech. 9:9
   3. The rejection is final: conclusion to first half of the Gospel, 12:37-50.
      12:38/Is. 53:1
      12:39, 40/Is. 6:9, 10

II. Jesus manifests His glory to the disciples who received Him, 13:1-20:31 ("To all who received Him, who believed in His name, He gave power to become children of God," 1:12).

      13:18/Ps. 41:9
      15:25/Ps. 35:19 (and/or 69:4)

   19:24/Ps. 22:18
   19:36/Ex. 12:46 (and/or Ps. 34:20)
   19:37/Zech. 12:10
D. That you may believe: conclusion to the Gospel, 20:30, 31.
Epilogue, 21:1-25

B. Contexts of Controversy

We observe that in almost every instance these quotations occur in contexts of controversy with the Jews. The Old Testament citations explicate the theme of the rejection of Jesus, the promised Messiah, by His contemporaries.6 Thus they serve the apologetic function of demonstrating that this rejection of the Messiah is included in the revealed will of God.

The first activity narrated in the Gospel is the testimony of John the Baptist when he is challenged by Jewish officialdom to account for his activity. The Baptist defines himself and his mission in terms of the Old Testament Scripture (1:23).7 Shortly thereafter we have Jesus’ first official visit to Jerusalem recorded by John. It takes place at the time of the Passover and involves a dramatic action in the temple.8 The action is coupled with words of Jesus which point to Himself, first destroyed and then raised from the dead, as the true temple, the place of God’s presence among His people.9 Here Jesus first encounters that opposition from ‘the Jews’ which leads ultimately to His death. The inclusion of the Old Testament at this point in the Gospel (2:17) characterizes the nature of Jesus’ commitment to God’s service and worship, and it places the opposition which results from it in a messianic perspective.10

The Jews introduce the first Old Testament passage cited in chapter 6 (v. 31). Jesus, if indeed He is the Messiah, is challenged to do something more wonderful than feeding the five thousand: as Messiah He should

---

6 This observation is not quite the same as that of Schnackenburg: “The decisive element in the choice and formulation is how useful and significant the text may be in Christology.” John, p. 122.
7 The Fourth Gospel is the only account that definitely states that it is John the Baptist himself who applies the Isaiah text to himself. In the Synoptics the quotation is always adduced by the evangelist in explanation of John.
8 “Here we have the first item in the Johannine ‘Calendar of Feasts.’” Schnackenburg, John, p. 345.
9 Schnackenburg speaks of “the abrogation of the Jewish cult by Jesus” and its replacement by Himself and the church. John, p. 356.
10 “St. John, by his citation at 2:17 of words from Ps. 69, which is quoted in all the gospels and in other parts of the New Testament in reference to the passion, has already brought the Lord’s cleansing of the temple into connection with His death.” R.H. Lightfoot, St. John’s Gospel, ed. C.F. Evans (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1956), p. 114.
renew the miracle of manna.\textsuperscript{11} The quotation becomes the text upon which Jesus delivers a major discourse, but one to which the Jews take exception and after which even many of His disciples “drew back and no longer went about with Him” (v. 66). The second citation in the discourse (6:45) is adduced by Jesus and serves to explain the murmuring of the people against Him. The people were under the illusion that they had the option of debating and evaluating the merits and claims of Jesus, that they were at liberty to accept or reject Him at will. The Old Testament passage makes it clear that coming to Jesus is the result of the special action of God.\textsuperscript{12}

Chapter 10 finds Jesus again in the temple area, this time at the Feast of Dedication. The Jews are about to stone Him for blasphemy and Jesus introduces the quotation in defense of His right to call Himself the ‘Son of God’ (10:34). The argumentation of Jesus is rabbinic; He meets His contemporaries on their own ground.\textsuperscript{13} Psalm 82 contains a passage in which God addresses men, who were “called by the ‘word of God’ to carry out divine functions for Him,” as ‘gods’.\textsuperscript{14} If these judges, who showed themselves unworthy of the designation, still bore the title, “then it follows - \textit{a minori ad maius} - that Jesus is all the more entitled to call himself God’s Son.”\textsuperscript{15}

The narrative of Jesus’ triumphal entry into Jerusalem is found in all four Gospels. In John, just as Jesus’ first official visit to Jerusalem was illuminated by the use of an Old Testament quotation, so His final visit is understood in the light of a specific Old Testament text (12:14). This is the only quotation in John where the immediate context does not in some way involve controversy or Jesus’ rejection. Yet it does stand at the beginning of that final week which marks the ultimate rejection of the One hailed as δ βασιλεύς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (12:13).

\textsuperscript{11} “And it shall come to pass at that selfsame time that the treasury of manna shall again descend from on high, and they shall eat of it in those years, because these are they who have come to the consummation of time.” Quoted from 2 Baruch (late 1st century A.D.) by Barrett, \textit{John}, p. 240.


\textsuperscript{13} Jesus’ approach is what any first century rabbi would have recognized as “\textit{gal wahomer}: what applies in a less important case will certainly apply in a more important case.” Richard Longenecker, \textit{Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period} (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), p. 34.

\textsuperscript{14} Lightfoot, \textit{John}, p. 209.

Beginning in chapter 12 there follow in succession four citations, each of which deals specifically with the rejection of Jesus. The two in chapter 12 are introduced into the narrative by the evangelist and comment with finality on the unbelief of the Jews and serve to bring the first half of the Gospel to a close. The first of these two passages (12:38) describes succinctly the whole ministry of Jesus: His words (‘what we have heard’) and His signs (that which has been accomplished by the Lord’s ‘arm’). In other words, “neither the truth which Jesus proclaimed nor the miracles which He wrought moved the Jews to faith.” The ‘fulfillment’ is rather literal and speaks to the unbelief and rejection which marks the end of Jesus’ ministry. This quotation laments the fact of Jewish unbelief, the following quotation comments on the why.

The second of the two quotations at this point (12:39-40) is “the classical Old Testament passage used in the New Testament to explain Israel’s failure to believe in Jesus.” The use of the passage in this way goes back to Jesus Himself (Matt. 13:14-15; Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10). It is also cited by Paul (Acts 28:26-27). The quotation emphasizes that just as coming to Jesus is solely the result of divine action (and this truth was undergirded by the Old Testament citation at 6:45), so too is unbelief a working out of divine judgement. In Jesus men saw God’s glory (cp. 1:14; 2:11 and 12:41) and this revelation could harden hearts as well as awaken faith. The rejection of the Lord’s glory in Jesus spelled the final and irrevocable judgement of God upon ‘the Jews’ (i.e. “His own who did not receive Him,” 1:11). From this point on in John’s Gospel Jesus devotes Himself only to His disciples.

“With the departure of Judas the faithful remnant is finally selected out of the unbelieving world.” Yet Jesus had not blundered in admitting Judas to the intimate circle of His followers. He was well aware of what

16 "The message was not believed; the signs were not interpreted." Westcott, John, p. 133. N.B. ‘Arm’ is used in Deut. 5:15 to describe God’s power at work in the ‘signs’ of the Exodus.
18 The significance of this concept, first introduced in the introductory formula used with this quotation, will be discussed below.
20 It is after quoting this same Old Testament text that St. Paul declares: “Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen” (Acts 28:28).
21 C.H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: The University Press, 1960), p. 402. Or as Barrett comments: “At the end of this section [13:1-30] Judas goes out into the darkness; from this point Jesus is alone with the faithful. They are slow of heart, and their loyalty is about to be shaken to the foundations, but to them the mystery of God may be unfolded.” John, p. 364.
the result would be: the treacherous betrayal to His enemies by an intimate friend and table companion. But this too was part of God's plan for the messianic king (13:18). The final citation before the crucifixion

narrative serves simply to emphasize the unmerited nature of Jesus' rejection by the Jews (15:25). The quotation speaks "of hatred which lacks any reasonable foundation."22

The final three quotations pertain to the crucifixion itself and serve to relate the various activities of the Roman soldiers to the fulfillment of Scripture: 1) they cast lots for His seamless tunic (19:24); 2) they did not break Jesus' legs which meant that He died "as the perfect Passover offering" (19:36);23 3) they pierced the side of Jesus which led to an effusion of blood and water (19:37). This final quotation points to Jesus as the one spoken of by the prophet Zechariah. He died as a result of the action of the people of Jerusalem. Yet His death provides the occasion for repentance for the people and opens a fountain "to cleanse them from sin and uncleanness" (Zech. 13:1). Thus these final citations unite to confirm that what happened at the climax of Jesus' rejection was part and parcel of God's redemptive will and plan.

C. Introductory Formulas
(See Appendix A)

Beyond this, however, we further observe that the formulas which introduce these quotations in the body of the Gospel serve to focus this rejection in such a way as to develop a certain theological schema within the book, one which relates to its basic structure: God's purpose in sending His Son reaches its goal when the rejection is sealed and it is 'time' for Jesus to die and rise again. Then, and only then, are the


23 Morris, John, p. 823. Westcott writes: "That which was offered to God might not be arbitrarily mutilated. It was fitting that it should be brought to Him in its full strength." John, p. 321. Or Bultmann: "Jesus is the true Passover lamb...The end of the Jewish cultus, or the uselessness of its further observance, is thereby affirmed." John, p. 677. Again, D. Daube: "When we consider that a verse like 'The Lord keepeth all the bones of the righteous, not one of them is broken' occurs in an ancient Jewish prayer for the dead, or that Ezekiel's vision of the revival of the dried up bones forms the prophetic lesson on the mid-festival Sabbath of Passover, it appears probable that, even before Joh, the inviolability of the bones of the Passover lamb was widely regarded as symbolizing the individual's hope of resurrection as well as the nation's of a glorious future." The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism (University of London: The Athlone Press, 1956), p. 309.
Scriptures which point to this rejection ‘fulfilled’. We can see how John develops this. Prior to 12:38 the phrase ἐστίν γεγραμμένον is included in every introductory formula except 1:23 (which reads: καθὼς ἐπευν Ἡσαίας ὁ προφήτης). This formula reflects, of course, the abiding and authoritative nature of that Old Testament revelation which pointed to the coming Messiah and His rejection. Beginning with 12:38, however, and in connection with every citation from this point on, John uses the phrase ἰνα πληρώθη. This must be deliberate on the part of the evangelist. What is its significance?

We note that the first occurrence of this second formula comes at the turning point in the Gospel. In the first half of his Gospel John has narrated seven ‘signs’ which Jesus did. These signs attested the fact that Jesus was the Messiah, the Son of God, who was doing the works of the Father who sent Him (5:19-23; 10:37-38; 14:10-11). Through these signs Jesus manifested His glory as the Father’s only Son (1:14; 2:11, 23). John recorded them so that his readers might believe “that Jesus is the Christ [Messiah], the Son of God,” and by believing have life in His name (20:31). The raising of Lazarus recorded in chapter 11 was the climax and last of these signs. There was nothing more Jesus could do, and so we read: “Even after Jesus had done all these miraculous signs in their presence, they still would not believe in Him” (12:37).

Co-extensive with that period in His ministry, when Jesus was manifesting Himself to Israel through signs, is His use of the concept ‘hour’. In 2:4, at the occasion of the first of His signs, Jesus indicated that His hour (ὥρα) had not yet come. In chapter 7 Jesus delays going to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles because the Jews there were seeking to kill Him and His time (καιρός) had not yet fully come (vv. 6 and 8). Later at the feast no one laid hands on Jesus “because His hour (ὥρα) had not yet come” (v. 30). The same thing is true in 8:20.

But in chapter 12 this changes. Jesus has performed His last sign. He has royally entered the city as the messianic King on a mission of peace and to observe His final Passover. Now He can say, “The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified” (v. 23).24 It is the hour for which He has come (v. 27). Jesus is now ready to be ‘lifted up’ and draw ‘all men’ to Himself (v. 32). From this point on in the Gospel we hear that the hour has come for Jesus to be glorified, namely, to die and rise again (13:1, 31; 17:1). And from this point on every Old Testament passage is cited ἰνα πληρώθη!

24 The coming of the Greeks to Jesus occasions the statement (vv. 20-22).
The sole purpose of Jesus' coming into the world was to die and rise again for men. Therefore His hour comes when it is the right time for this to happen. His ultimate rejection and crucifixion is His hour of glorification. This hour is set in accord with the eternal purposes of God revealed in Holy Scripture. This Scripture is 'fulfilled'—it reaches its goal—when the 'hour' comes for Jesus to die and rise again.

II.
The Form Of The Quotations
(See Appendix B)

An examination of the form of the Old Testament citations within the Fourth Gospel reveals that there is no single textual tradition which can clearly be designated as the source for these quotations. Although there is no single text (e.g. MT, LXX, etc.) which John cites regularly, nonetheless there is a certain consistency: the form of the quotation is always appropriate to the context in which it is used in the Gospel and serves to reinforce the meaning intended by the evangelist. This can be variously demonstrated.

A. From The MT (against the LXX)

It would be difficult to charge John with ever violating the intent of the MT and we can therefore accord this text a certain priority. Thus in two places where the LXX does not accurately convey the meaning of the MT, yet where the significance of the citation for its Johannine context demands it, John apparently renders directly from the Hebrew using his own vocabulary.

The first instance is in 13:18: δι τρόφων μου τὸν ἀρτον ἐπηρεῖν ἐπὶ με τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.25 At two points in this passage John more nearly

25 In this quotation there is one important variant in the Johannine text itself: μου τὸν ἄρτον (B C L 892 pc q) vs. μου τὸν αρτον of P 66 N A D W Ψf 1,13 lat sy bo. Although rather poorly attested, μου is the reading of the LXX and corresponds to the MT. It is the preferred reading of Nestle-Aland and a number of modern English versions (e.g. RSV). The reason is no doubt the one suggested by Bruce M. Metzger, "because μετ ἐμοι may be an assimilation to Mk 14:18." A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 240. On the other hand, μου may be an assimilation to the LXX. A scribe, with the LXX in mind, substituted μου for μετ ἐμοι; this would account for the rather unnatural position of μου in the passage. It is difficult to argue against the strong manuscript evidence for μετ ἐμοι. The μετ ἐμοι indicates a shift away from an emphasis on possession, 'my bread,' to the companionship involved in the eating.
approximates the MT than the LXX. He reads ἐπιβοέων (lifted up - MT ἐπιβίων) for the LXX ἐμεγαλύνεν (made large), a reading clear in sense and reasonably close to the Hebrew whereas the LXX "is crude translation Greek and barely intelligible." John's τὴν πτέρναν (heel) parallels the LXX πτέρνισμον (from πτερνίζω, strike with the heel, supplant; hence, supplanting, subtlety). Πτερνίσμος occurs only once else in the LXX, 2 Kings 10:19, where it translates נָבָרָפ (insidiousness). The Hebrew term in Ps. 41:10 may be read either 'heel' (כִּפָּר) or 'deceitful' (כִּפָּר). The most natural understanding of כִּפָּר in this context is as the Masoretes have pointed it, 'heel'. The πτέρνα of John is unambiguous and nearer the MT than the LXX.

John's reading of δρόμων is unique in contrast to the LXX ἐσδιώ, which is the usual Greek translation of וָנָא, the MT term at this point. John's use of τρόμων has occasioned varying opinions. The term occurs several times in chapter 6 (vv. 54, 56, 57, 58) along with ἔφαγον (the aorist of ἐσδιώ; vv. 26, 31, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 58). Some commentators maintain John always uses τρόμω as eucharistically. On the other hand, in late Greek τρόμων was often used "instead of ἐσδιέιν as a suppletive to φαγεῖν in the present tense." We further note that John never uses ἐσδιώ in the present tense, but always τρόμων; he habitually uses ἔφαγον as the aorist and βεβρώκα (6:13) as the perfect. The simplest explanation therefore is that John, who for the sake of clarity is casting the Hebrew into Greek, simply does so on the basis of his own usage and style.

The second instance where John manifestly renders directly from the Hebrew is in 19:37 where not a single word, as far as Greek vocabulary is concerned, is held in common by John and the LXX. John uses

---

26 Of lesser significance, John has τὸν ἀρτον for the LXX ἀρτοῦς and the MT οἶτος. This may be another instance of John using the singular for the MT plural (see John 6:31 and Ex. 16:4).
28 On the assumption that Jesus originally spoke these words in Aramaic, we hold John responsible for the choice of wording in the Greek. ἔφαγον "applies to somewhat noisy feeding (like 'munch' or 'crunch'). There is often the notion of eating with enjoyment (so in Matt. 24:38)." Morris, John, p. 379.
29 For example: "Τρόμων is probably best understood as indicating always the eating of the Eucharist, without necessarily carrying spiritual overtones." Arthur Homer Maynard, "The Function of Apparent Synonyms and Ambiguous Words in the Fourth Gospel" (University of Southern California, 1950), p. 303. See also Brown, John I-XII, p. 283.
δ̄ψονται in place of the LXX ἐπιβλέψονται for the MT 7 οὐκ ἔδει. This is probably more a matter of current usage than anything else. ἐπιβλέπω occurs only three times in the New Testament (Js. 2:3; Luke 1:48; 9:38), while δράω is used frequently. John, in translating the Hebrew, simply uses the more familiar term.33

The most significant difference is John’s use of εξεκέντησαν instead of the LXX κατωρχήσαντο. Ἐκκέντω (pierce someone, kill) is a much better translation of the Hebrew ἐγκαταλάβω (pierce through; Jdg. 9:54; 1 Chr. 10:4) than κατωρχήσαμαι (dance in triumph over one, treat spitefully). John’s term not only renders the MT much more accurately than does the LXX, but also describes more precisely the scene relating to Jesus’ death. Interestingly enough he uses νόσσω in his narrative to describe the action of the soldier,34 which probably represents an “example of John’s love for slight variation.”35

John’s εἰς δόν for the MT 7 ἐν (LXX πρὸς μέ) is an example of what we might term ‘interpretive paraphrase’. The change from ‘Me’ to ‘Him’ applies the passage specifically to Jesus. Nor do we have any reason to doubt that,

32 "Clearly John is not dependent upon the LXX, but whether he himself translated the Hebrew or used some existing version...is impossible to say." Barrett, John, p. 464. "The most natural understanding of it, however, is that John knew and used the Hebrew." Morris, John, p. 823, n. 105. Freed notes that 'ἐκκεντεῖν (or some closely related form) is the reading not only of both Jn and Rev but also in places where Zech 12:10 is cited among early Christian writers." He suggests that "one may tentatively conclude that the reading of Jn and Rev, including the verb ὀδηγεῖ was of Christian origin...and that the reading was derived from a translation of some Heb. text and originated with Jn himself (or the writer of Rev, if a different person)," Quotations, p. 114. An example of early Christian usage is quoted by Bernard: "(Justin, Tryph. 32, who distinguishes the two advents): δύο παροιμίας αὐτοῦ γεννητεθαν ἐξελθήσαμαι μιᾶν μὲν ἐν ἐκείνηνθη ὑπ’ ὑμῶν, δευτέραν δὲ ὑπὸ ἐπιλαυσάμεθα εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκείνηνθεαν." John, p. 651-2.

33 The use of ὀφένται in Matt. 24:30 (and parallels) in a context of Jesus’ return in glory for judgment, and the citation of Zech. 12:10 in Rev. 1:7 in a similar context, of course suggest that “John alludes to the parousia... The verse then becomes a threat of judgment upon those who pierced Jesus.” Raymond E. Brown, The Gospel according to John (XIII-XXI, Vol. 29A in The Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1970), p. 954. G.H.X. MacGregor writes in the same vein: "See also Rev. 1:7, where the passage is alluded to in the sense that one day the crucified will triumph over his executioners--an idea which is doubtless present in the Evangelist’s mind also," The Gospel of John, in Moffat New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1929), p. 352. On the contrary, however, Bultmann is quite specific. He notes that “only the fact of the piercing is of importance.” The subject of ὀφένται was the Jews, and ‘there is no thought of the sight of the Christ returning at the parousia, as in Rev. 1:7...[which] does not refer to the lance thrust but to the crucifixion generally, or the piercing of the hands and feet of Jesus." John, p. 677, n. 3.

34 Arndt-Gingrich, Greek-English Lexicon, notes that "νοσσων w. a dagger serves to determine whether a person is dead" (Plut. Cleom, 37, 16), p. 549.

35 Morris, John, p. 818, n. 86. It is obvious that if verbal exactness were important for John, and he had a text before him that read ἐκκέντω, he could easily have used that verb in his narrative. The choice of both verbs is best attributed to John.
since in the MT it is Yahweh Himself who is pierced, John intends to imply the divinity of Jesus.36

B. From the LXX (aganist the MT?)

There is one significant case where John may read the LXX (B and $ \text{NT}$ MSS only) against the MT. In 2:17 he uses the future καταφαγέται in contrast to the perfect (καταφαγιται) of the MT.37 The reading is important in that it reflects a messianic application of the text to the life of Jesus. The future tense points beyond Jesus’ action of cleansing the temple to the consequences of that action: “his zeal for the house of God ‘will cost him his life.’ ”38

C. From the LXX

There are three instances where John quotes the LXX verbatim. The first is in 10:34 where the citation of Ps. 81:6 (LXX) is identical to the text of the LXX which accurately translates the MT. Jesus counters the Jewish charge of blasphemy by basing His response on this citation.

John 12:38 contains a verbatim quotation from the LXX which reproduces the MT with one addition, it prefaces the verse with κυρίε. As indicated above, this verse summarizes the ministry of Jesus: His words (“what we have heard”) and His signs (that which has been accomplished by the Lord’s ‘arm’),39 and points to the rejection which marks the end of His ministry to the Jews.

We note that in citing passages which contain Hebrew parallelism John is concerned for verbal exactness where it is required by his context. Therefore in 19:24 he quotes the LXX verbatim and retains both members of the poetic

36 "It was God who spoke through the prophet, declaring that the Jews had pierced him, and John would teach us by his change of the pronoun that it was the same God whom they pierced on the cross...He expresses thus his identification of the Jehovah of the Old Testament with the Christ of the New." Franklin Johnson, The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old Considered in the Light of General Literature (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896), p. 78.

37 However as Barrett notes: "the future is a possible rendering of the Hebrew perfect." John, p. 23. It is possible that both forms were extant in first century manuscripts and John need not be charged with an independent rendering, unless LXX $ \text{NT}$ has been changed to conform with the Fourth Gospel in the interest of Christian apologetics. This is a distinct possibility.

38 Schnackenburg,John, p. 347. Again, Bultmann,John, p. 124; “the Evangelist...is looking forward to what is to come -- or alternatively at the whole of Jesus’ ministry -- and he means that Jesus’ zeal will lead him to his death.”

39 See n. 16.
couplet. The fact that he retains the full parallel here must be taken seriously: the soldiers both divided Jesus' garments among themselves and they cast lots for His cloak.\footnote{A number of commentators have suggested that in his application of the passage John has overlooked the synonymous parallelism of the verse which indicates "one action pertaining to one set of apparel." Brown, \textit{John XIII-XXI}, p. 920. The evangelist has been charged, therefore, with "a curious misunderstanding of the Septuagint text, which is a reproduction of the Hebrew synonymous parallelism," and "is analogous to Mt's misunderstanding of his text of Zech. 9:9. This misunderstanding led to his embellishment with respect to the story of the \(\tau\iota\omicron\delta\omicron\omega\) and \(\chi\iota\omicron\tau\iota\omicron\)". Freed, \textit{Quotations}, p. 103. To suggest, however, that first-century Jews (such as Matthew and John) would be so ignorant of the basic poetic form of the Psalter is naive.}

\section*{D. Peculiarly Johannine}

The greater number of Old Testament quotations (7) manifest a form which in varying degree can best be described as peculiarly 'Johannine'. We turn now to these.

1. Distinct from MT and LXX

In 6:45 the most notable difference from both the LXX and the MT is the omission of \(\tau\sigma\delta\omicron\varsigma\ \upsilon\iota\omicron\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\) by which John indicates that that which was anticipated for the descendents of those whom Isaiah originally addressed is now happening.\footnote{It is not possible to determine whether John is dependent upon the LXX or MT for his quotation. In the Fourth Gospel the passage is an independent clause in the nominative; this parallels the MT. In the LXX the entire phrase (minus the copula which has no equivalent in either the LXX or MT) is in the accusative and evidently dependent upon the verb \(\theta\iota\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omega\) of the preceding verse. But interestingly, the LXX uses \(\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) to translate \(\tau\iota\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) instead of \(\kappa\omicron\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\), and \(\delta\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\) is the reading we have in John.} Thus the form of the citation indicates the fulfillment of the prophecy.

Of greater interest is John's quotation of Is. 6:9-10 at 12:39-40 which is again distinct from both the MT and LXX as well from other New Testament citations of the same passage.\footnote{Matt. 13:14-15; Acts 28:26-27.} We note first that the elements of Is. 6:10 fall into a distinct literary pattern: (1) heart, (2) ears, (3) eyes, (3') eyes, (2') ears, (1') heart, (4) turn, (5) heal. Its citation by John is in marked contrast: 3 1 3' 1' 4 5. John rearranges the sequence and omits the references to 'ears' and 'hearing'. This is most easily explained by noting that John was at this point speaking especially of the signs done by Jesus and seen by the Jews: although Jesus "had done so many signs before them, yet they did not believe in Him" (v. 37). John then gives the reason for such rejection: it was intended by God.

Of the six phrases which John has in common with the LXX, there is agreement in only two verbs: \(\delta\omicron\omega\iota\omicron\nu\) and \(\iota\alpha\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\nu\alpha\iota\iota\). Where he differs,
however, he does not violate the sense of the MT, yet the differences are significant.

For example, we note the differences in the forms of the first two verbs in John’s citation and their counterparts in the MT and LXX. The MT has the imperative addressed to the prophet (‘make dull’, ‘shut their eyes’); in the LXX the verbs have become passive and descriptive of the people (‘have become dull’, ‘have shut their eyes’). In John the verbs describe the completed action of God (‘He hardened’, ‘He blinded’).\(^{43}\) The form of the quotation in John makes clear that what God commanded the prophet was indeed God’s action and that it has now taken place.\(^{44}\)

Again John’s terms τετύφλωκεν and ἐπιδρόωσεν are unique to him but are nonetheless accurate renderings of the intent of the MT. Although πυρόω occurs only here in John, it is used elsewhere in a similar sense.\(^{45}\) John uses the verb τυφλῶ with only here, but τύφλασι occurs frequently in chapter 9, which chapter is an excellent commentary on this verse (cf. esp. vv. 35-41).

In the last phrase John reads ἰάσομαι αὐτοῦ with the LXX, but it appears that in John the healing is ascribed to Jesus.\(^{46}\) This identity of Jesus with the Lord of the Old Testament is explicitly made in the verse which follows the quotation: “Isaiah said this because he saw His [Jesus’] glory and spoke of Him” (v. 41).\(^{47}\) In the signs which Jesus did men saw God’s glory and this revelation could harden hearts as well as awaken faith.

---

\(^{43}\) C.F. Burney says that John’s reading is a reasonably accurate rendering of the Hebrew and is nearer to it than the LXX in reading the singular τετύφλωκεν in place of the plural ἐκαμπτότεν which makes the people the subject. *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922), p. 121.

\(^{44}\) In adapting this passage to present circumstances, the evangelist changes the imperatives of Isaiah to past indicatives...because the prophecy has now reached its fulfillment in the Messianic Age.” W. Hendriksen, *Exposition of the Gospel according to John*, 2 vol., New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1953), p. 212.

\(^{45}\) Mark 6:52; 8:17; Rom. 11:7; 2 Cor. 3:14. In a study of πυρωσις J. Armitage Robinson makes a number of observations that are pertinent. In respect of John 12:40 he writes: “πυρωσι here denotes the obscuration of the intellect as τυφλοιν denotes the obscuration of the sight...[With respect to πυρωσι,] obtuseness, or a dulling of the faculty of perception equivalent to moral blindness, always gives an appropriate sense.” St. Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians, 2nd ed. (London: James Clarke and Company, Limited, n.d.), p. 267.

\(^{46}\) “Since the imperatives of the Hebrew text are changed into past indicatives, God...appears as the one who effects the obduracy, and Jesus becomes the subject of ιασομαι.” Bultmann, *John*, p. 453. “St. John transfers to God what is represented by Isaiah as the mission of the prophet (Isa. vi. 10); while the healing, on the other hand, is ascribed to Christ...The Targum renders the original words of Isaiah, ‘I saw the Lord’, by ‘I saw the Lord’s glory.’” Westcott, *John*, p. 135.

\(^{47}\) There is one more example of the way in which John has made this quotation his own. The LXX has μητοτε ἰδωσιν; John has να μη. Bernard observes: “Now Jn. (and it is one of the notable features of his style) never uses μητοτε. Instead, he has να μη here and elsewhere.” *John*, p. 450.
2. Restatement of Parallel

It has been seen above that John quotes Old Testament parallelism verbatim when his context calls for it. In two other instances John is much freer in his citation. In 1:23 he prefaces the quotation with εγώ thereby making it evident that John the Baptist himself is the ‘voice’ spoken of by Isaiah. He then omits the second line of the couplet and substitutes ευθύνατε for the ἐτοιμάσατε of the LXX (or perhaps combines both lines into one and reads ευθύνατε48 for the εἰθείας ποιέτε of the second line). The choice of ευθύνατε may be a way of applying the meaning of the text: ἐτοιμάσατε should be understood not with respect to the surface of a road, but of the heart and life.49

Zech. 9:9 is cited in 12:15 as an explanation or interpretation of Jesus’ action on Palm Sunday. The original passage in Zechariah contains six lines, three couplets. The citation in John consists of three lines, each of which (with variations we shall note) represents the first line of the original couplet.50 John presents the sense of the passage quoted but makes no attempt for verbal accuracy.

In his first line John reads μη φοβῶσθαι for the χαίρε σφόδρα of the LXX.51 There are perhaps three possibilities as to why: 1) John simply quoted loosely and from memory.52 In this case no particular significance ought to be attached to the specific Johannine wording. 2) John consciously substituted μη φοβῶσθαι for χαίρε σφόδρα. In his mind the two phrases were roughly equivalent to one another,53 but the former was

---

48 The term is rare in the New Testament; its only other occurrence is in James 3:4.
49 "Ευθύνω or a word derived from the same stem is used to translate "'I will turn' in a majority of passages where the ethical and moral element prevails. If one includes its use in Sirach, the fact is the more striking." Freed, Quotations, p. 5. In Sirach ευθύνω occurs with οδος at least three times: 2:6; 37:15; 49:9. In this connection Morris notes: "ευθύνω was used not only in the literal sense, 'to straighten', but also with the derived meaning, 'to correct.'" John, p. 137, n. 26.
50 From εἰδον on, the Johannine quotation, to a certain extent, parallels Matt. 21:5 and does not include any LXX material omitted by Matthew. John does omit πρωτεός καὶ which is included in Matt.
51 The words μη φοβῶσθαι (or μη φοβερθεται) occur frequently for the corresponding Hebrew term נא תָּכָת with נא (Is. 35:4; 40:9; 41:10, 13; 43:1, 5; 44:2; 51:7; 54:4; Jer. 46:27, 28). But the four words, μη φοβου, δυνατηρ Σιων, are not found in the same context in the LXX. They do occur in the MT of Zeph. 3:14-17. There, however, the נא תָּכָת-נא (verse 16) is rendered in the LXX with דָּהַדֶּנֶּד and is roughly parallel in meaning to the χαίρε σφόδρα of v. 14. Furthermore, v. 14a (LXX) of Zeph. 3 (there are differences in the MT) is verbally identical with the first couplet of Zech. 9:9 (LXX).
52 Perhaps he was subconsciously influenced by other OT texts with which he was familiar, e.g., Is. 40:9; 44:2; Zeph. 3:14-17.
53 We note that נא תָּכָת-נא (LXX דָּהַדֶּנֶּד, דָּהַדֶּנֶּד) and "כָּכָת (כָּכָת, כָּכָת) are parallel twice in Jool 2:21, 23, as well as what has been noted with respected to Zeph. 3:14-17 (n. 51).
more appropriate in view of the dire impending events of Holy Week.\(^5\)

3) John is conflating two different Old Testament texts.

Allowing John a fair degree of sophistication, this latter possibility may commend itself, the second text being Zeph. 3:14-17 (cf. n. 54) which in many ways is complementary to Zech. 9:9. Freed writes: "Perhaps Jn translated the Heb. of Zeph and either condensed it as a sort of introduction to the main quotation from Zech or quoted bits of it from memory."\(^5\) There is one factor which lends weight to this suggestion. John alone records, as part of the crowd’s acclamation, the phrase καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰσραήλ. This resembles Zeph. 3:15 where the ‘daughter of Zion’ (v. 14) is assured that ‘the King of Israel’ who is ‘the Lord’ is in her midst. It is on that day, the prophet writes, that it shall be said to Jerusalem, ‘Fear not’.

John’s second line is virtually identical to the LXX. As noted he omits the second member of the couplet, perhaps because it does not add substantially to the basic idea of Jesus as ‘King’. This is a theme which may be more prominent in John’s passion narrative than in the Synoptics.

The third line of John’s citation is again uniquely his. Καὶ ἡμαῖ, substituted for ἐπιβεβηκὼς, is by no means the usual term for ‘mounted’ upon a beast of burden. ‘Sitting’ is, however, “a mark of particular distinction,”\(^5\) and denotes the sitting of a king upon a throne (e.g. 1 Kg. 1:17, 35, 46; 8:25; Ps. 110:1), the ‘Son of Man’ at the right hand of power (Matt. 26:64), or God upon His throne (Rev. 4:2, etc.). It is, moreover, the same verb John has used in the preceding verse of his narrative to describe the action of Jesus (ἐκάθισεν). John’s quotation here again

---

\(^5\) R.H. Strachan holds this view: "Fear not is an expression often on Jesus’ lips, and is used in His message of encouragement to the ‘little flock’ of disciples who are the ‘church in miniature’ (Hort) and are promised the Kingdom’ (Luke xii 32). In the early Triumphal Entry, the ‘King’ is about to end His earthly mission, which He conceived as the evangelization of Israel (Matt. xv 24). That mission in the eyes of men, is about to end in failure through death at the hands of ‘His own’ (i 11). It is as though God Himself, by the mouth of His prophet, said ‘Fear not’ to the church just coming into being, as it faces with Christ the sombre and disabling event of the Crucifixion of the King." The Fourth Gospel: Its Significance and Environment (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1955), p. 252. Freed interprets John’s motive as literary: "The coming of the messianic king is a time for rejoicing without fear... The words ‘do not fear’, in the sense of ‘rejoice,’ used with ὁμοθυμία in vs. 13 give excellent balance and variation to Jn’s style." Quotations, p. 79.

\(^5\) Freed, Quotations, p. 78.

\(^5\) Carl Schneider, "καὶ ἡμαῖ" in Theological Wordbook of the New Testament, p. 441.
combines the parallel reference to the ‘ass’ into a single one.\textsuperscript{57} The significance of the animal lies not only in its lowliness, but also in its connotation of a mission of peace.

John’s quotation at this point, therefore, is concerned more with sense than verbal accuracy. “John sees accordingly not only a fulfilment of prophecy, but such a fulfilment of prophecy as indicates a special kind of King.”\textsuperscript{58} Jesus came as the Prince of Peace. In each instance of a Johannine peculiarity, the emphasis on ‘kingship’ can be seen as a likely motivating factor.

3. Ambiguous Old Testament Source

There are three quotations where there is some question as to the exact Old Testament passage intended by the citation. The first is in 6:31 where Ex. 16:4, 15 and Ps. 78 (LXX 77): 24, 25a are possible sources. The quotation in John contains elements from both Hebrew and Greek texts. Thus \(\delta\rho\tau\omicron\nu\varepsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\nu\ \delta\omicron\beta\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\) reproduces exactly the MT of Ex. 16:4, but not the \(\delta\rho\tau\omicron\omicron\upsilon\) of the LXX. Two factors, however, may point to the psalm verse as primary: 1) all principle terms in John, except for \(\varepsilon\phi\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu\) occur in the same sequence in Ps. 77:24, 25a (LXX), the \(\varepsilon\phi\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu\) probably drawn from the preceding parallel phrase; 2) the combination of \(\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{n}\nu\acute{a}\) and \(\delta\rho\tau\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) in the psalm also occurs in the Johannine context (vv. 31, 48-50).

This quotation is brought forward by the Jews in their discussion with Jesus following the feeding of the 5000. They use it to substantiate their claim that their “fathers ate manna in the wilderness” (v. 31), with the implication that Moses had effected the provision of the heavenly bread. The citation provides the occasion and the text for a major discourse by Jesus: the manna was not given by Moses, but came from God; nor was it that true bread from heaven.\textsuperscript{59} This bread is Jesus who is received by faith.

The second instance of ambiguity with respect to source is in 15:25 where two identical phrases, both in the LXX and MT, could serve as the

\textsuperscript{57} Freed argues that \(\varepsilon\pi\tau\omicron\pi\omega\lambda\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\) is intelligible as a condensation of Matthew. “The Entry into Jerusalem in the Gospel of John,” \textit{Journal of Biblical Literature}, 80:329-38. On the other hand, D. Moody Smith counters that neither the similarities or differences are such as to compel one to conclude that John must have been using Matthew as his source. “Jn 12:12ff. and the Question of Jn’s Use of the Synoptics,” \textit{Journal of Biblical Literature}, 82:58-64.

\textsuperscript{58} \textit{Morris, John}, p. 587.

textual basis for the quotation in John: Pss. 35 (LXX, 34):19 and 69(LXX, 68):5. The only difference between John and the LXX, which accurately translates the MT, is that John substitutes the verb ἐμίσησαν for the participle μισοῦντες. Both psalms are attributed to David and both lament the unmerited contempt and scorn suffered by the psalmist. Ps. 69 has been cited previously in the Gospel (2:17). On the other hand, Ps. 35 is “certainly in the vein of the ‘Passion’ psalms.”

Furthermore, in Ps. 35 the emphasis on ‘without cause’ is a more prominent theme (vv. 7, 12, 16) and we note that others, in addition to the psalmist, are the objects of attack (v. 20). This parallels the situation of both Jesus and His followers being hated by the world. It is not necessary to make a final decision between the two psalms; both the form and significance within John remain the same in either case.

The citation in 19:24 is conceivably traceable to Ex. 12:46, Num. 9:12, or Ps. 34(LXX 33):21. In general John follows the text of Ex. 12:46 which is part of God’s original Passover command. The same command occurs in Nu. 9:12 as part of the Sinai legislation. Where John differs from Ex./Num. is that he reads ὄντος ἀδικήσατο in common with Ps. 34. Ps. 34, however, is in no way related to the Passover but is speaking of God preserving the bones of the righteous sufferer. In the case of the psalm, the significance would lie in a typological correspondence between David, as a ‘righteous sufferer’, and Jesus.

It is more probable that the reference is to the Passover sacrifice for, even though His legs were not broken, Jesus was not preserved from death, which would seem to be the original intent of the psalm. Furthermore, the theme of the Passover is important throughout this Gospel. The fact that not one bone of Him was broken points to Jesus “as the perfect Passover offering.” The verb form which John supplies


61 Beyond that, some have suggested the possibility of an adumbration of the resurrection. Daube writes that “in popular belief at least, the bones played a particular part: a person whose skeleton was damaged might not be able to rise at all.” *Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 303. The fact that God does not allow Jesus’ bones to be broken assures that He is not deprived of the victory of the resurrection. This citation, therefore, “might well suggest to a Christian reader familiar with rabbinic exegesis a promise of the resurrection of Christ, as the Righteous Sufferer.” Dodd, *Historical Tradition*, p. 44. See also n. 23.

62 E.g. 2:13, 23; 6:4; 11:55; 12:1; 13:1

63 The identification of Jesus with the Passover lamb is by no means dependent upon a chronology which has the crucifixion take place at the exact time in which the lambs were being slaughtered at the temple. There is no discrepancy between John and the Synoptics in this matter. Jesus and His disciples (along with the rest of the population of Jerusalem) ate the Passover on Thursday evening; He was crucified on Friday morning. The suggestion that, according to John, Jesus died on Thursday comes from a mis-reading of the chronological references.
(συντριβήσεται) serves to underscore the typological/prophetic significance of the original Passover; he quotes in a way as to apply the Old Testament text to the current situation.

Summary

I.

The formula quotations of the OT are: 1) carefully incorporated by the evangelist at key points throughout the Fourth Gospel, 2) where they serve the apologetic function of explicating Jesus’ rejection by His contemporaries, and 3) where they are introduced in such a way as to focus upon the hour of Jesus’ glorification (death and resurrection) as the fulfillment of the Father’s purpose in sending the Messiah.

II.

While the text-form of these various citations does not consistently reflect a single OT text tradition, nonetheless the form is always appropriate to its Gospel context. Thus the evangelist will render directly from the MT where the significance of the quotation demands it, or he will cite the LXX verbatim where this is appropriate. Frequently John cites ‘interpretively’, that is, in such a way as to indicate the fulfillment or application of the OT passage to the current situation; or again, the wording of the quotation may simply reflect his own style and vocabulary.
Appendix A: Introductory Formulas

I. ἔστιν γεγραμμένον: The period when Jesus the Messiah does the works of the Father; Jesus manifests His glory through ‘signs’, but His ‘hour’ has not yet come.

1:23 - καθὼς εἶπεν Ἡσαίας δ' προφήτης
   Sign: Water transformed into wine (2:1-11)
2:17 - γεγραμμένον ἔστιν
   Sign: Official’s son healed (4:43-54)
   Sign: Invalid healed at pool called Bethesda (5:1-14)
   Sign: 5000 fed (6:1-15)
   Sign: Jesus walks on water (6:16-21)
6:31 - καθὼς ἔστιν γεγραμμένον
6:45 - ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις
   Sign: Man born blind receives sight (9:1-12)
10:34 - ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ἡμῶν
   Sign: Lazarus raised from the dead (11:1-44)
12:14 - καθὼς ἔστιν γεγραμμένον

II. ἵνα πληρωθῇ: Scripture is ‘fulfilled’ when the ‘hour’ comes for the Messiah to be glorified by the Father, to die and rise again.

12:38 - ἵνα δ' λόγος Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ δὲν εἶπεν
12:40* - πάλιν εἶπεν Ἡσαίας
13:18 - ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ
15:25 - ἵνα πληρωθῇ δ' λόγος δ' ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν
19:24 - ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ ἡ λέγουσα
19:36 - ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ
19:37* - καὶ πάλιν ἔτερα γραφή λέγει

* Although the phrase ἵνα πληρωθῇ is not expressly used, this formula is joined to the one immediately preceding by πάλιν.
Appendix B: The Quotation Texts

I. From the MT (Against the LXX)

John 13:18

δ τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον ἐπηρέαν ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.

Ps. 40:10 (LXX)

Ps. 41:10 (MT)

Zech. 12:10 (LXX)

Zech. 12:10 (MT)

II. From the LXX (Against the MT?)

John 2:17

δ ζηλὸς τοῦ ὦκου σου καταφάγεται με.

Ps. 68:10 (LXX Β A' )

Ps. 69:10 (MT)

III. From the LXX

John 10:34

ἐγὼ εἶπα θεό εστε.

Ps. 81:6 (LXX)

Ps. 82:6 (MT)
John 12:38
κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;

Is. 53:1 (LXX)
kύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;

Is. 53:1 (MT)

John 19:24
dιεμερίσαντο τὰ ἰμάτια μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἰματισμὸν μου ἔβαλον κλήρον.

Ps. 21:19 (LXX)
dιεμερίσαντο τὰ ἰμάτια μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἰματισμὸν μου ἔβαλον κλήρον.

Ps. 22:19 (MT)

IV. Peculiarly Johannine
A. Distinct From MT and LXX
John 6:45
καὶ ἔσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ θεοῦ.

Is. 54:13a (LXX)
kαὶ πάντας τοὺς νῦν ὑπὸ σοῦ διδακτοὺς θεοῦ.

Is. 54:13a (MT)

John 12:40
tετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς δραχμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοὺς δραχμοὺς καὶ νοησώσων τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἴδομαι αὐτοὺς.

Is. 6:9-10 (LXX)
Πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπὼν τῷ λαῷ τοῦτῳ Ἀκοῇ ἀκούστε καὶ ὁ μὴ σύνητε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψτε καὶ ὁ μὴ ἴδητε· ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς δραχμοὺς αὐτῶν

Is. 6:9-10 (MT)
B. Restatement of Parallel

John 1:23

ἐγώ φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ εὐθύνατε τὴν ὅδὸν κυρίου

Is. 40:3 (LXX)

φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ εὐθύμασατε τὴν ὅδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

Is. 40:3 (MT)

Zech. 9:9 (LXX)

Χαίρε σφόρα, θυγάτερ Σιων· κήρυσσε, θυγάτερ Ιερουσαλήμ· ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεται σοι, δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτός, πραΰς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον.

Zech. 9:9 (MT)

C. Ambiguous OT Source

John 6:31

ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν.

Ex. 16:4 (LXX)

Ἐδωκὼς ἐγὼ ὅμως ὑμῖν ἄρτους ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Ex. 16:4 (MT)

Ex. 16:15 (LXX)

Ὀδτος ὁ ἄρτος, ὥν ἔδωκεν κύριος ὑμῖν φαγεῖν.

Ex. 16:15 (MT)
Ps. 77:24, 25a (LXX)  
καὶ ἔβρεξαν αὐτοῖς μαννα 
φαγεῖν καὶ ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ 
ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἄρτον ἀγγέλων 
ἐφαγεν ἄνθρωπος.

Ps. 78:24, 25a (MT)  

John 15:25  
ἐμίσησαν με δωρεάν.

Ps. 34:19 (LXX)  
oἱ μυσοῦντές με δωρεάν
Ps. 68:5 (LXX)
oἱ μυσοῦντές με δωρεάν

Ps. 35:19
Ps. 69:5 (MT)

John 19:36  
δόστοιν οὐ συντριβήσεται αὐτῶν.

Ex. 12:46 (LXX)  
καὶ δόστοιν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπὸ 
αὐτῶν.

Ex. 12:46 (MT)

Num. 9:12 (LXX)  
καὶ δόστοιν οὐ συντρίψουσιν ἀπὸ 
αὐτῶν.

Num. 9:12 (MT)

Ps. 33:21  
κύριος φωλάσσει πάντα τὰ 
δόστα αὐτῶν, ἐν εἴ ἄντων ὡ 
συντριβήσεται.

Ps. 34:21 (MT)
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