

The Original Epilogue (John 20:30–31), the Secondary Appendix (21:1–23), and the Editorial Epilogues (21:24–25) of John’s Gospel

Observations against the Background of Ancient Literary Conventions

ARMIN D. BAUM

1. Introduction

The Gospel of John consists of several clearly distinguishable components: a title (“Gospel according to John”), a theological prologue (1:1–18), a long narrative section (1:19–20:29), a comment on the book’s purpose (20:30–31), a second, shorter narrative section (21:1–23), and two additional comments, one on the author (21:24) and a second one on the length of the book (21:25):

Table 1: Components of the Fourth Gospel

Title	“Gospel according to John”
John 1:1–18	theological prologue
John 1:19–20:29	long narrative
John 20:30–31	first comment (regarding purpose)
John 21:1–23	short Narrative
John 21:24	second comment (regarding author)
John 21:25	third comment (regarding length)

The title probably does not come from the evangelist.¹ Whether this is also true of chapter 21 and the two concluding comments pertaining to the trustworthiness of the author and the extent of the book, is debatable.

¹ Cf. the material presented by Th. K. Heckel, *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium* (WUNT 120; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 207–218, and

1.1 Chapter 21 as an Appendix to the Book

In his magisterial book on the Johannine Question, Martin Hengel argued that neither the last chapter (John 21:1–23) nor the two concluding comments (John 21:24 and 21:25) of the Fourth Gospel are the work of the evangelist:

“The special ‘key verses’ 21.24 and 25 show that the author who is manifested at the end like a *deus ex machina*, the anonymous beloved disciple, cannot be the author of the whole work from A to Z.

At least in v. 24 the plural *oidamen* is no longer a statement by one author but is made by his pupils (or by one of these pupils) as a plurality of witnesses, who guarantee the truth of the work attributed to the beloved disciple.”²

“Die sonderbaren ‘Schlüsselverse’ 21,24f. zeigen, daß der am Ende wie ein *deus ex machina* offenbar werdende Autor, der anonyme Lieblingsjünger, nicht der Verfasser des ganzen Werkes von 1,1 bis 21,25 sein kann.

Die Kirchenväter und die ältere orthodoxe Exegese glaubten zwar, daß der Apostel Johannes den korrigierenden Hinweis auf seinen – zu erwartenden – Tod und die Notiz über den Lieblingsjünger selbst verfaßt habe, um ‘die Brüder’ über ihren Irrtum aufzuklären, ja selbst ein Adolf Schlatter war noch dieser Meinung

Zumindest in V. 25 spricht darum im Plural οἱ δὲ μαρτυροῦν nicht mehr der eine Autor, sondern seine Schüler als eine Mehrzahl von Zeugen, die für die Wahrheit des dem Lieblingsjünger zugeschriebenen Werkes eintreten.”³

According to Hengel, the disciples of the evangelist or a redactor commissioned by them created the final version of the Fourth Gospel and added chapter 21 as an appendix (along with a few other sections):

If we ask where the redactors really made additions, we naturally come to ch. 21, though here too it is probably that there were earlier basic traditions or even a sketch of the text for vv. 1–20; other additions could be in 19.35 (though I can hardly believe that) and then above all in the beloved disciple passages, which may in part have the character of insertions. At this point a relatively small uncertainty factor remains. In itself this or that could have been added or removed. Judgments here are largely estimates, often conditioned by theological prejudices. Here I incline more to restraint. A really far-reaching redaction should truly have strengthened the unity of the whole work again – or must all redactors be stupid in principle, people who can only make things worse? Or must we even suppose that the really decisive theological achievement was that of the last redac-

S. Petersen, “Die Evangelienüberschriften und die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons,” *ZNW* 97 (2006): 250–267.

² *The Johannine Question* (London: SCM, 1989), 84.

³ *Die johanneische Frage: Ein Lösungsversuch* (WUNT 67; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 225.

tor, who in that case would be the true 'evangelist', despite the assertion in 21.24? Surely not!⁴

At least two major commentators before Hengel, Raymond E. Brown and Rudolf Schnackenburg, came to similar conclusions. In 1966, Brown suggested that the Fourth Gospel developed in five stages.⁵ In his later work on John's Gospel, he preferred to talk about three stages without, however, changing his basic hypothesis. Brown assumed that during stage four the evangelist, a protégé of the Beloved Disciple, composed a first edition of the Gospel and concluded it with John 20:30–31. During stage five, an unknown redactor, likewise a protégé of the Beloved Disciple and therefore an associate of the evangelist, added not only chapters 15–17 and a number of other sections but also chapter 21 and finally concluded his book with John 21:24–25.⁶

In the first volume of his commentary, Schnackenburg supposed that the evangelist, a Hellenistic disciple of the apostle, created the first edition of the Fourth Gospel and furnished it with an ending in John 20:30–31. Later, a redactor added – among other passages – chapter 21 and the two final verses in John 21:24–25.⁷ In the third volume of his commentary, however, Schnackenburg changed his mind and assumed that the evangelist had not been a disciple of the apostle and that chapter 21 had been added by a Johannine school. Still, the interpretation of chapter 21 as a secondary appendix remained unaltered.⁸

Recently, R. Alan Culpepper underscored the view that John 21:24–25 came from an editor who spoke on behalf of the Johannine School. More precisely, Culpepper describes John 21:24–25 as an *incipit* that "affirms the narrator as a witness in historiographical and novelistic writings" and as a *sphragis* that "typically identifies the author and certifies the authenticity of the document or its content."⁹

1.2 Chapter 21 as an Original Element of the Book

As is well known, this position has always been contested. Both Franz Overbeck and Adolf Schlatter regarded it as much more convincing to attribute the whole Gospel, including chapter 21, to only one single au-

⁴ *The Johannine Question*, 107 (*Die johanneische Frage*, 273).

⁵ *The Gospel According to John* (AB 29; New York: Doubleday, 1966/70), I, xxxiv–xxxix.

⁶ *An Introduction to the Gospel of John* (ed. F. J. Moloney; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2003), 78–85.

⁷ *Das Johannesevangelium* (HThK IV/1–4; Freiburg: Herder, 1965–84), I, 85–88, 94.

⁸ *Das Johannesevangelium*, III, 323–328.

⁹ "John 21:24–25: The Johannine *Sphragis*," in *John, Jesus, and History* (ed. P. N. Anderson; Leiden: Brill, 2007), II, 349–364 (353–354, 357–359).

thor.¹⁰ Several more recent commentators on the Fourth Gospel, particularly Donald A. Carson,¹¹ Craig S. Keener,¹² Andreas Köstenberger,¹³ and Hartwig Thyen¹⁴ also regard it as improbable that chapter 21 is a secondary appendix and maintain that only one author was responsible for John 1:1–21:25.

In comprehensive articles, Martin Rese,¹⁵ Howard M. Jackson,¹⁶ and Andreas Köstenberger¹⁷ have come to the same conclusion. Richard Bauckham also ascribed the Fourth Gospel as a whole, including chapter 21 and its two last verses in John 21:24–25, to one single author, though he opts for the Presbyter John.¹⁸

According to Jackson, the fallacy behind the view that John 20:30–31 was the original end of the book “lies in its anachronistic assumption that the structural conventions of ancient documents are identical with those of modern ones or, worse still, that they must conform to the standards for composition demanded of a modern academician.”¹⁹

I maintain, however, that *the arguments Hengel presented in defense of his interpretation are still valid and can be supplemented by a number of additional observations, particularly against the background of ancient literary conventions (and the literary-critical evidence of John 21)*. In this context, the exact meaning of the comments in John 20:30–31 und 21:24–25 will also be relevant.

In what follows, I will analyze the purpose statement in John 20:30–31 (part 2), the origin of the 21st chapter (part 3), and the statements about the Gospel’s author and extent in John 21:24–25 (part 5). As an indispensable background, the conventions of ancient literature pertaining to epilogues and appendices will be adduced (part 4).

¹⁰ F. Overbeck, *Das Johannesevangelium: Studien zur Kritik seiner Erforschung* (ed. C. A. Bernoulli; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1911), 434–455; A. Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1975), 363–364, 375–377.

¹¹ *The Gospel According to John* (Leicester: IVP, 1991), 684.

¹² *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), II, 1240–1241.

¹³ *John* (BECNT 4; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 583–586.

¹⁴ *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 794–795.

¹⁵ “Das Selbstzeugnis des Johannesevangeliums über seinen Verfasser,” *ETHL* 72 (1996): 75–111 (85–90).

¹⁶ “Ancient Self-Referential Conventions and their Implications for the Authorship and Integrity of the Gospel of John,” *JTS* 50 (1999): 1–34 (17–24).

¹⁷ A. J. Köstenberger, “‘I Suppose (οἶμαι)’: The Conclusion of John’s Gospel in its Literary and Historical Context,” in *The New Testament in its First Century Setting* (FS B. W. Winter; ed. P. J. Williams et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 72–88 (73–74).

¹⁸ *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 369–381.

¹⁹ “Ancient Self-Referential Conventions,” 3–8.

2. The Original Epilogue of the Fourth Gospel (John 20:30–31)

Among the New Testament history books, the Fourth Gospel alone contains a concluding statement that mentions the purpose of the book. The comment in John 20:30–31 is a counterpart to the prologues in Luke 1:1–4 and Acts 1:1ff.

2.1 *The First Epilogue as the Original Closure of the Book*

(1) *John 20:30–31 as an Epilogue.* Epilogues were common in different ancient literary genres, Greek and Roman speeches and rhetorical treatises among them.²⁰ With respect to narratives, an epilogue may be defined as the final part of an epic or dramatic text in which the author leaves his role as narrator and directly addresses his hearers or readers.²¹ This is exactly what happens in John 20:30–31 where the last words of the evangelist are addressed to the audience of his Gospel. Since the following chapter 21 ends with another concluding statement, John 20:30–31 should be called the *first* epilogue of the Fourth Gospel.

(2) *The Reference Point of John 20:30–31.* John 20:30–31 can refer back either to the whole Gospel or just to chapter 20. The thesis that it forms the conclusion only of chapter 20 (and the Easter narratives contained therein)²² cannot be sustained. The first of the “signs” that are mentioned in John 20:30–31 already occurred in John 2:1–11. Faith in the messianic identity and divine sonship of Jesus, which according to the first epilogue arises from his signs, is also frequently referred to prior to chapter 20 (e.g., in John 9:35–38; 11:45, 48 etc.). Moreover, the fact that John 20:30 explicitly mentions “this book” supports the view that this concluding statement refers to the Gospel as a whole.

2.2 *The Self-Introduction of the Author in the First Epilogue*

(1) *The Deliberate Anonymity of the Author.* As is typical throughout the Gospel, so in John 20:30–31 the author does not mention his name. The

²⁰ Cf. M. Wachtler, “Der Epilog in der römischen Rhetorik” (Ph.D. diss, University of Innsbruck, 1973). The Latin equivalents are *peroratio*, *conclusio*, *cumulus*, *exitus* and *determinatio* (ibid., 8).

²¹ “In der Literatur tritt der E[pilog] als abschließender Textteil in der epischen und dramatischen Gattung auf. Seine Funktion besteht im allgemeinen darin, das Ende des Textes zu markieren. Dabei wird zwangsläufig eine neue Ebene eingeführt, die mit jener des eigentlichen Textes nicht mehr identisch ist und sie somit durchbricht ... Ähnlich verhält es sich in epischen Werken, wenn sich am Ende der Erzähler direkt an Leser (oder Zuhörer) wendet ...” (C. F. Laferl, “Epilog,” *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* 2 [1994] 1286–1291 [1287]).

²² P. S. Minear, “The Original Function of John 21,” *JBL* 102 (1983): 85–98 (87–90).

Gospel heading “According to John” or “Gospel according to John” was probably added during the first part of the second century.²³ Originally, the Fourth Gospel was written anonymously.

(a) In terms of the history of literature, the anonymity of the Fourth Gospel corresponds to the anonymity of Old Testament historiography, which for its part conformed to the literary conventions of Ancient Near Eastern historical literature. In the Ancient Near East and in the Old Testament, wisdom literature and prophetic writings usually carried their authors’ names while historical works were published anonymously. The same general phenomenon can be observed in the New Testament: Only epistles (and not even all of them) and the Apocalypse carry the names of their authors while the narrative books remain nameless.

(b) The significance of New Testament anonymity can also be deduced from the conventions of Ancient Near Eastern literature. In contrast to the Greco-Roman historian who was interested in gaining recognition and honor for his literary accomplishments from contemporaries and posterity, the historiographers in the Ancient Near East hid behind their material and wanted to become its nameless mouthpiece. *In adopting the stylistic device of anonymity from Old Testament historiography, the author of the Fourth Gospel signified that he understood himself as a relatively unimportant mediator of material to which his audience should pay full attention.* In other words, the anonymity of the Fourth Gospel evidences the strong conviction of the evangelist regarding the priority of his material.²⁴

(c) We may assume, however, that the identity of the Fourth Evangelist was known to his original readers and listeners who were addressed in the second person in John 19:35 and 20:30–31. Later readers, however, had to learn about the author’s identity from the Gospel’s heading (“Gospel according to John”) or – if they wanted to ascertain its veracity – to extrapolate the author’s identity from the evidence that was available in the Gospel itself (and from the oldest information found in the writings of the early fathers). The most meaningful clues in the Gospel can be found in its theological prologue (John 1:14–16) and in the two concluding comments (21:24–25).

(2) *The Avoiding of the First Person.* (a) In keeping with his tendency, already visible in the anonymity of his work, to ascribe priority to his subject matter, the Fourth Evangelist has formulated his purpose statement as impersonal as possible. Even in John 20:30–31, where he addresses his readers, he completely abandons the first person singular. At the same

²³ See the literature mentioned above in the introduction.

²⁴ A. D. Baum, “Anonymity in the New Testament History Books: A Stylistic Device in the Context of Greco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature,” *NTS* 50 (2008): 120–142.

time, in 20:30–31 he also avoids a self-reference in the third person (in contrast to 19:35: “he who saw this has testified”). Instead of the phrase “I have written” he uses a passive expression: “these are written.” The author of the anonymous book *First Maccabees* proceeded in a similar way (1 Macc 9:22). Thus, *the Fourth Evangelist completely avoided a self-reference in the first and third person in his epilogue in order to become as invisible as possible.*

(b) In order to make the veiled author of the epilogue more visible, one can transform his passive phrase into the first person singular. By doing so, a close parallel with the purpose statement of First John (in 1 John 5:13) emerges, which the evangelist (in keeping with the generic letter conventions) has formulated in the first person.²⁵ That the terms “life” and “faith” in 1 John 5:13 occur in reverse order is irrelevant.

Table 2: Self-references in John 20:30–31 and 1 John 5:13

<i>John 20:30–31</i>	<i>John 20:30–31 (1. pers. sing.)</i>	<i>1 John 5:13</i>
Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of <i>his disciples</i> , which <i>are not written</i> in this book.	[Now Jesus did in <i>our</i> presence many other signs, which <i>I have not written</i> in this book.	
But these <i>are written</i> so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name.	But these <i>I have written</i> so that you may come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, and that through believing you may have life in his name.]	<i>I write</i> these things to you so that you may know that you have eternal life, you who believe in the name of the Son of God.

The impersonal and passive manner of speaking in the purpose statement of the epilogue is a further expression of the authorial reservation of the evangelist. Behind it stands the only slightly veiled “I” of the author.

(3) *The Author of the Epilogue.* Who is this demure author of the epilogue? In Greco-Roman literature, outside the New Testament, prologues and epilogues were written as a rule by the authors of the books themselves and not by someone else. Neither the content nor stylistic (or even text-critical) indications suggest that John 20:30–31 forms an exception to this rule and does not stem from the author of the rest of the book (1:1–20:29). Therefore, *the purpose statement of the book can most naturally be ascribed to the evangelist* and not to some later editor or scribe. The first Johannine epilogue (20:30–31) – like the Lukan prologues – is likely to have originated from the author of the Gospel.

²⁵ Cf. γράφω in 1 John 2:1, 7, 8, 12, 13 and ἔγραψα in 1 John 2:14, 21, 26; 3 John 9.

2.3 The First Epilogue in Literary-Historical Perspective

Why did the Fourth Evangelist use a technical epilogue and not a technical prologue comparable to the prologues of Greco-Roman historiography? This question can be answered when John 20:30–31 is put in the context of Old Testament and Greco-Roman literary conventions.

(1) *Prologues in Greco-Roman Literature.* Prologues were common in different genres of Greco-Roman literature. Aristotle ascribed the same effect to the proems of forensic speeches, the prologues of dramas, and the proems of epics.²⁶ Since the times of Herodotus and Thucydides, prologues were common components of historiographical works.²⁷ Just as Aristotle compared the prologue of a speech to the head of a body,²⁸ Lucian later depicted historical writings without a prologue as bodies without heads.²⁹ Since it lacks just such a technical prologue, the Gospel of John clearly falls into this category.

(2) *Epilogues in Greco-Roman Literature.* By way of contrast, epilogues were not regarded as indispensable in Greco-Roman historiography. Accordingly, they were comparatively uncommon. Furthermore, since Greek and Roman historians usually opened their works with a prologue, an epilogue, when it appeared, was always paired with a prologue. Thus, even though Lucian's biography of Demonax (from the 2nd century A.D.) does in fact end with an epilogue by the author, it begins with a comparatively long technical prologue, which therefore forms an *inclusio* with the shorter epilogue.³⁰ In the same way, Aphthonius, in his rhetorical handbook (from the 3rd/4th century A.D.), concluded an *encomium* on Thucydides with an epilogue which serves as the counterpart to the prologue with which Aphthonius had introduced his *encomium*.³¹ A more familiar example is Josephus, who opened all his works with a prologue and concluded them with an epilogue – not only his apologetic treatises *Contra Apionem*³² but also his *Antiquitates*³³ and his *Bellum Judaicum*.³⁴ At first glance, Josephus' *Vita* appears to be an exception since it has an epilogue without a preceding

²⁶ *Ars Rhetorica* III 14 = 1415a, 8–10 (176 Ross).

²⁷ D. Earl, "Prologue-Form in Ancient Greek Historiography," *ANRW* I.2:842–856; A. D. Baum, "Lk 1,1–4 zwischen antiker Historiografie und Fachprosa: Zum literaturgeschichtlichen Kontext des lukanischen Prologs," *ZNW* 101 (2010): 33–54.

²⁸ *Ars Rhetorica* 3.14 = 1415b, 8–9 (178 Ross).

²⁹ *De historia conscribenda* 23.

³⁰ Lucian, *Demonax* 1–2 (prologue) and 67 (epilogue).

³¹ Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata* 8 (prologue and epilogue).

³² Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 1.1ff (prologue), 1.320 (epilogue), 2.1ff (prologue), 2.296 (epilogue).

³³ Josephus, *Antiquitates* 1.1–26 (prologue), 20.259–266 and 20.267–268 (epilogues).

³⁴ Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 1.1–30 (prologue) and 7.454–455 (epilogue).

prologue,³⁵ but the absence of a prologue is probably due to the fact that the *Vita* formed an appendix to the *Antiquities* and was therefore introduced by the prologue to the larger work. Even *Second Maccabees* has not only an epilogue at its end but also a prologue at its beginning.³⁶

If the Fourth Gospel is read against this background, it becomes obvious that its author did not follow the conventional rules of Greco-Roman historiography and related literary genres. To be sure, the theological prologue in John 1:1–18 is not comparable to the technical prologues of Greco-Roman historiography. Also those Greco-Roman works possessing both a technical prologue and an epilogue cannot have served as models for the solitary Johannine epilogue. This observation raises the question as to whether other literary models were available for the author of the Fourth Gospel.

(3) *Epilogues in Old Testament and Early Jewish Literature*. While in Greco-Roman literature technical prologues were common and conceived of as necessary, in Old Testament narrative literature they were unknown. Epilogues, however, without preceding prologues, occurred more often. Yet, Old Testament epilogues were rather short and often did not only conclude whole books but also particular sections of books. Such succinct epilogues appear in Old Testament wisdom literature, prophetic literature, and historiography:

“The prayers of David son of Jesse are ended” (Psalm 72:20; cf. Job 31:40).

“Thus far are the words of Jeremiah” (Jer 51:64).

“These are the commandments and the ordinances that the LORD commanded through Moses to the Israelites in the plains of Moab by the Jordan at Jericho” (Num 36:13).

“Now the rest of the acts of Solomon, all that he did as well as his wisdom, are they not written in the Book of the Acts of Solomon?” (1 Kgs 11:41; cf. 1 Kgs 14:19, 29 etc. and 1 Macc 9:22).

By making use of a solitary technical epilogue (without a preceding technical prologue) the Fourth Evangelist did not follow a Greco-Roman but, if anything, an Old Testament (and Early Jewish) literary convention.

2.4 The Content of the First Epilogue

The content of ancient epilogues was diverse. In its simplest form, an epilogue merely stated that the end of a book (or of a section of a book) had been reached. This fact could also be expressed in more elaborate statements:

³⁵ Josephus, *Vita* 430 (epilogue).

³⁶ 2 Macc 2:19–32 (prologue) and 15:37–39 (epilogue).

Such are the events of my whole life; from them let others judge as they will of my character. Having now, most excellent Epaphroditus, rendered you a complete account of our antiquities, I shall here for the present conclude my narrative.³⁷

With this I shall conclude my Antiquities, contained in twenty books with sixty thousand lines. God willing, I shall at some future time compose a running account of the war and of the later events of our history up to the present day, which belongs to the thirteenth year of the reign of Domitian Caesar and to the fifty-sixth of my life ...³⁸

This book, however, having already run to a suitable length, I propose at this point to begin a second, in which I shall endeavor to supply the remaining portion of my subject.³⁹

The most elaborate epilogues would discuss the same topics as the technical prologues. They could contain statements about the author (for instance, a self-introduction, an expression of humility, an explanation of the conditions under which the author wrote), about the book (for example, its content, sources, predecessors), or about its purpose (for instance, truth or profit).⁴⁰

The Johannine epilogue speaks about the incompleteness of the book and about its purpose. These topics have many parallels in other ancient epilogues (and prologues):

(1) *The Incompleteness of the Book*. That the preceding book (or section of the book) is only fragmentary and incomplete is also expressed in a number of other epilogues:

Now the rest of the acts of Judas, and his wars and the brave deeds that he did, and his greatness, have not been recorded, but they were very many. (1 Macc 9:22)

These are a very few things out of many which I might have mentioned, but they will suffice to give my readers a notion of the sort of man he was.⁴¹

There were many other things that could be said about Thucydides, if the abundance of his praises would not preclude saying everything.⁴²

And other prophets became hidden, (E¹: which we have not mentioned), whose names are contained in their genealogies in the books of the names of Israel; for the whole race of Israel are enrolled by name.⁴³

(2) *The Purpose of the Book*. Aristotle was among the first to discuss the main function of a prologue:

³⁷ Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 1.320 (Thackeray, LCL).

³⁸ Josephus, *Antiquitates* 20.267–268 (Feldman, LCL).

³⁹ Josephus, *Vita* 430 (Thackeray, LCL).

⁴⁰ Cf. E. Herkommer, "Die Topoi in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke" (Ph.D. diss., Tübingen University, 1968), 22–174, on the content of ancient prologues.

⁴¹ Lucian, *Demonax* 67 (I, 57, 14–16 Macleod; trans. by Harmon, LCL).

⁴² Aphthonius, *Progymnasmata* 38 (*Rhetores Graeci* 10, 24, 20–21 Rabe).

⁴³ *Lives of the Prophets* 24:1 (OTP 2.399).

This, then, is the most essential function and distinctive property of the introduction, to show what the aim (τὸ τέλος) of the speech is.⁴⁴

Such statements of an author's literary purpose occur regularly in Greco-Roman prologues, but they are unusual in the (narrative) texts of Old Testament authors, even in their epilogues. The closest any ancient Jewish literature comes to this Greco-Roman convention is the elaborate epilogue at the end of *Second Maccabees*, which repeats the purpose statement already made in the prologue (2 Macc 2:19–32):

This, then, is how matters turned out with Nicanor, and from that time the city has been in the possession of the Hebrews. So I will here end my story. ... For just as it is harmful to drink wine alone, or, again, to drink water alone, while wine mixed with water is sweet and delicious and enhances one's enjoyment, so also the style of the story delights the ears of those who read the work. And here will be the end.⁴⁵

Similar epilogues from other Early Jewish books can be added:

There you have, Philocrates, as I promised, my narrative. These matters, I think, delight you more than the books of the mythologists, for your inclination lies in the direction of concern for things that benefit the mind, and to them you devote the greater time. I will also attempt to write down the remainder of what is worthwhile, in order that in going through it you may achieve the very noble reward of your purpose.⁴⁶

For this reason I have written out this, my testament, in order that those who here might pray about, and pay attention to, the last things and not the first things, in order that they might finally find grace forever. Amen.⁴⁷

I have given an exact account of our laws and constitutions in my previous work on our Antiquities. Here I have alluded to them only so far as was necessary for my purpose, which was neither to find fault with the institutions of other nations no to extol our own, but to prove that the authors who have maligned us have made a barefaced attack on truth itself. I have, I think, in the present work adequately fulfilled the promise made at the outset. I have shown that our race goes back to a remote antiquity, whereas our accusers assert that it is quite modern. I have produced numerous ancient witnesses ...⁴⁸

Furthermore, John 20:30 (and John 21:24) has been interpreted as a conscious allusion to the concluding statement of the Pentateuch, which talks about the “signs and wonders,” that Moses did on behalf of God:⁴⁹ “Never since has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face. He was unequaled for all the signs and wonders that the Lord

⁴⁴ *Ars Rhetorica* 3.14 = 1414a, 22.24 (177 Ross; trans. by Roberts).

⁴⁵ 2 Macc 15:37–39 (NRS).

⁴⁶ *Letter of Aristeas* 322 (OTP 2.34).

⁴⁷ *Testament of Solomon* 26:8 (OTP 1.987).

⁴⁸ Josephus, *Contra Apionem* 2.287–295 (Thackeray, LCL).

⁴⁹ D. Markl, “Spielen Joh 1,1; 20,30f; 21,24f auf den Rahmen des Pentateuch an?” in *Führe mein Volk heraus. Zur innerbiblischen Rezeption der Exodusthematik* (FS G. Fischer; ed. S. Paganini; Frankfurt: Lang, 2004), 107–219 (110–113).

sent him to perform (ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν, ὃν ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν κύριος ποιῆσαι αὐτὰ) in the land of Egypt, against Pharaoh and all his servants and his entire land, and for all the mighty deeds and all the terrifying displays of power that Moses performed in the sight of all Israel” (Deut 34:10–12). However, it is difficult to show that the contingencies between John 20:30 and Deut 34:10–12 are the result of a conscious reference of the Fourth Evangelist to the conclusion of Deuteronomy.

By providing a purpose statement in the epilogue of his book (John 20:30–31), the Fourth Evangelist went beyond the literary model offered by Old Testament literature, which did not contain comparable statements by its authors. In accordance with Greco-Roman conventions, the Fourth Evangelist (like Luke) wanted to state explicitly the purpose of his book – even though (in contrast to Luke) the place he chose for his purpose statement did not follow Greco-Roman but Old Testament conventions.

Table 3: Epilogues in OT and Greco-Roman historiography

OT Historiography	Fourth Gospel	Gr.-Rom. Historiography
solitary epilogue	solitary epilogue	prologue (+ epilogue)
no purpose statement	purpose statement	purpose statement

2.5 The Reason for an Epilogue

Why did the Fourth Evangelist dispense with a conventional prologue but include a solitary epilogue? Several reasons could lead an ancient author to make his technical comments at the end of his book:

(1) *The Safest Location*. An author could prefer an epilogue because the end of the scroll was the safest place, since it “was inside (of the scroll) and therefore most protected against damage.”⁵⁰ Not until the invention of the codex was the beginning of a writing as well protected as the end, “since in the codex the beginning was protected by the book cover.”⁵¹ The Fourth Evangelist may have written his Gospel on a scroll and thus picked the most protected spot for his purpose statement. However, historians like Polybius frequently used prologues, even though they wrote on scrolls. Moreover, on the other hand, it is entirely possible that the Fourth Gospel was written down in the form of a codex from the beginning. In any case, all the papyri of New Testament texts (with the exceptions of p¹², p¹³, p¹⁸,

⁵⁰ W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern* (Handbücher der staatlichen Museen zu Berlin; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1921), 98–104 (100).

⁵¹ Ibid., 103.

and p²²) derive from codices, including p⁵² (with verses from John 18) from the first half of the second century.⁵²

(2) *The Traditional Location.* An epilogue could appear preferable because the end of a book was the traditional location for technical statements. This was already the case when texts were written on clay tablets. Following these precursors, the end of a text was considered an appropriate place for information about the book even in scrolls and codices.⁵³ Possibly, with his epilogue the Fourth Evangelist wanted to be faithful to an ancient literary tradition. However, at the same time the Gospel author departed freely from the Old Testament conventions when he included a statement about his purpose.

Further, the evangelist must have sensed that a statement of his book's purpose in an epilogue at the very end of his text was probably less helpful for his readers than in a prologue right at the beginning. Due to such considerations, even in modern literature epilogues (or postfaces) are much less frequent than prologues (or prefaces). This has a practical reason which results from the normal reading direction. According to Gérard Genette, "for the author, and from a pragmatic point of view, the postface is much less effective, for it can no longer perform the two main types of function we have found the preface to have: holding the reader's interest and guiding him by explaining how and why he should read the text."⁵⁴ That even ancient authors used their prologues with the intention to guide their readers is evident from Aristotle's above quoted statements regarding proems and prologues. It is therefore not likely that the evangelist considered it desirable to hold fast to a purely external tradition against such practical considerations and without conceptual reason.

(3) *The Prominence of the Theological Prologue.* A third explanation is that for the Fourth Evangelist a technical prologue was not convenient since the beginning of the work was being employed for other purposes and an epilogue was the only feasible option. This very simple circumstance may have led the evangelist to make use of an epilogue. He wanted to open his book not with some technical statement about its literary purpose but rather with a dense and artistic summary of its main theological motives. This he accomplished by means of a theological prologue (John 1:1–18). *A weighty theological introduction such as John 1:1–18 would have lost much of its immediate power had the evangelist put a technical*

⁵² Cf. K. and B. Aland, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982), 85, 111.

⁵³ Schubart, *Das Buch beiden Griechen und Römern*, 103, 139; C. Wendel, *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung verglichen mit der des vorderen Orients* (HM 3; Halle: Niemeyer, 1949), 28–29.

⁵⁴ G. Genette, *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation* (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 238.

prologue in front of it. For this reason, the most obvious solution for the Fourth Evangelist was to place his much less artistic purpose statement in an epilogue.

(4) *The Priority of the Subject Matter.* In addition, I would like to suggest a supplementary explanation for the Fourth Evangelist's preference of an epilogue. When compared with the beginning, the end of a work was the more self-effacing location. According to Genette, "many an author considers the terminal location more tactful and modest."⁵⁵ This understanding has led several modern authors to abstain from a prologue and rather to employ an epilogue, even against the practical considerations that have just been mentioned. This interpretation of the epilogue as an expression of authorial modesty is also applicable to the Fourth Gospel. While its author, in contrast to Old Testament history writers, did not want to completely refrain from commenting on the content and purpose of his text, he put his statement as discretely as possible at the end of his book. The Fourth Evangelist was not intent on hiding completely behind his work. Nevertheless, with self-imposed reserve he revealed himself to his readers only at the end of his book. Thus, he did not come into the focus of his audience from the beginning and his readers could give their full attention to the narrative of the deeds and words of Jesus – and to the much more important theological prologue.

3. Chapter 21 as an Editorial Appendix

Between the epilogue of the evangelist in John 20:30–31 and the next comments in John 21:24–25, we find a narrative section with additional Easter stories. Since the introduction of the chapter division it has been designated chapter 21 of John's Gospel. The relationship of this chapter to the rest of the Gospel is contested.

3.1 *The Literary-Critical Interpretations*

The question as to the origin of chapter 21 has been answered differently. Either the Gospel was intended to end with chapter 21 from the beginning (model 1) or the Gospel initially ended with John 20:30–31, and chapter 21 should be considered an appendix. In this case, the authorship of chapter 21 becomes an issue (models 2–4).

⁵⁵ Genette, *Paratexts*, 172.

Table 4: Literary-critical interpretations of John 21

	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>	<i>Model 3</i>	<i>Model 4</i>
John 1:1–20:29	evangelist	evangelist	evangelist	evangelist
John 20:30–31	evangelist	evangelist	evangelist	evangelist
John 21:1–23	evangelist	evangelist	evangelist/editor	editor
John 21:24	evangelist	editor	editor	editor
John 21:25	evangelist	editor	editor	editor

(1) *Chapter 21 as an Original Element of the Book.* The thesis that the evangelist himself intended to close his book with chapter 21 from the very beginning⁵⁶ was proposed rather early. Thus Augustine interpreted chapter 21 accordingly:

This paragraph [i.e. 20:30–31] indicates, as it were, the end of the book; but there is afterwards related how the Lord manifested Himself at the sea of Tiberias, and in the draught of fishes made special reference to the mystery of the Church, as regards its future character, in the final resurrection of the dead. I think, therefore, it is fitted to give special prominence thereto, that there has been thus interposed, as it were, an end of the book, and that there should be also a kind of preface to the narrative that was to follow, in order in some measure to give it a position of greater eminence.⁵⁷

In addition, several modern exegetes assume that the evangelist himself has intentionally separated chapter 21 from the rest of the Gospel by the purpose statement in John 20:30–31. According to Schlatter, the reason was that in his last chapter the Gospel author wanted to deal with a new and different topic, the calling of the apostles Peter and John for their future ministry.⁵⁸

Thyen underscores “the original and insoluble connection of John 21 with the preceding chapters 1–20 and that exactly this assumed ‘addendum’ is an indispensable key to our Gospel.” According to Thyen, John 20:30–31 concluded the corpus of the Gospel with its testimony *for* Jesus as the messianic Son of God and at the same time introduced its final section, which contains the testimony *of* Jesus for this Gospel. The main task of the bridge passage John 20:30–31, however, is to introduce the very important final chapter. Together, John 20:30–31 and John 21:24–25 form an *inclusio* around the last chapter of the book. For Thyen, such an interpreta-

⁵⁶ M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Études bibliques; Paris: Lecoffre, 1948), 520; Minear, “The Original Function of John 21,” 91–94.

⁵⁷ Augustinus, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 122.1 (CCL 36, 668 Willems; *NPNF* VII, 439).

⁵⁸ Schlatter, *Der Evangelist Johannes*, 363.

tion avoids the false conclusion that the Fourth Gospel has two closures and a secondary appendix.⁵⁹

According to Bauckham, the final narrative section of the Gospel in John 21 (which he calls an epilogue) is framed by one conclusion “divided into two carefully designed stages (20:30–31 and 21:24–25).” Just as the theological prologue in John 1:1–18 “sketches the prehistory of the Gospel’s story,” its narrative epilogue “foresees its posthistory.” In addition, the two stages of the conclusion consist of 43 words each. John 20:30–31 indicates the end of the author’s long narrative in John 1–20 about the “signs,” while John 21:24–25 is the author’s signal for the end of the whole Gospel. Therefore, according to Bauckham, the evangelist must also be the author of chapter 21.⁶⁰

(2) *Chapter 21 as an Appendix by the Evangelist.* According to model 2, some time after he already had concluded his book with John 20:30–31 the evangelist himself appended additional Easter stories to his already existing manuscript without modifying its original conclusion.⁶¹

(3) *Chapter 21 as an Appendix by a Disciple.* Others assume that during the lifetime of the evangelist a *disciple* added chapter 21. The evangelist provided the writer of John 21:1–23 with his material and authorized him to append his notes to his own Gospel.⁶²

Hugo Grotius, in 1641, was apparently the first who held the view that after the death of the evangelist, one of his disciples who was bishop of the church in Ephesus (21:25) wrote the appended chapter 21 based on oral accounts of the apostle. Subsequently, he published this expanded Gos-

⁵⁹ H. Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 772–774.

⁶⁰ Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 364–369.

⁶¹ B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975 [1881]), 299; J. B. Lightfoot, “Internal Evidence for the Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John’s Gospel,” in idem, *Biblical Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1893), 194–195; W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, ³1933), 234–235; E. Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums: Der gegenwärtige Stand der einschlägigen Forschung* (1951; NTOA 5; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1988), 134–149; S. E. Porter, “The Ending of John’s Gospel,” in *From Biblical Criticism to Biblical Faith* (FS L. M. McDonald; ed. W. H. Brackney and C. A. Evans; Macon: Mercer, 2007), 55–73 (73), as a possibility.

⁶² Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Leipzig: Erlangen, ^{5/6}1921), 689–690, 706–707.

pel.⁶³ Others think that the author of the appendix may have drawn on written source material.⁶⁴

According to Marie-Émile Boismard, chapter 21 is the work of a close disciple of the evangelist, who had heard the material from the mouth of his teacher and shortly after his master's death wrote it down and added it to John 1–20.⁶⁵

Boismard emphasized that this assumption is not in conflict with the (Roman-Catholic) doctrine of inspiration: "Such a hypothesis does not contradict in any way the Johannine authenticity of this chapter or the teaching about inspiration. This section, which faithfully perpetuates the thinking of the apostle and in many details even reflects his style, is altogether no less his own work than a letter of Saint Paul or of Saint Peter which is regarded as coming from a disciple who wrote at the more or less direct suggestion of his teacher. Also here we can admit without difficulty that this chapter was appended according to an explicit intention of the old apostle."⁶⁶

(4) *Chapter 21 as a Later Appendix.* A fourth model suggests that the work of the evangelist (1:1–20:31) was complemented by chapter 21 in the course of the preparation of a canonical edition of the New Testament in the second century. John 21 was thus an editorial by the publisher of this canonical edition.⁶⁷ In this case, also the concluding statements in 21:24–25 have to be ascribed to the canonical publisher.

3.2 The Literary-Critical Evidence

The question concerning the origin of John 21 cannot be answered on the basis of text-critical evidence. A statement by Tertullian is sometimes adduced as proof for an original edition of the Fourth Gospel that ended with 20:30–31.⁶⁸ Tertullian wrote:

⁶³ See W. Schmithals, *Johannesevangelium und Johannesbriefe: Ein Forschungsbericht* (BZNW 64; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 46–48; cf. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1077–1082; Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, III, 407–410, 415–417; F. F. Bruce, *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 398.

⁶⁴ R. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (KEK 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1964), 542–547.

⁶⁵ M.-É. Boismard, "Le chapitre XXI de Saint Jean. Essai de Critique Littéraire," *RB* 54 (1947): 473–501 (495–97).

⁶⁶ Boismard, "Le chapitre XXI," 495–497.

⁶⁷ D. Trobisch, *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments: Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel* (NTOA 31; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1996), 125–154.

⁶⁸ M. Lattke, "Joh 20,30f. als Buchschluß," *ZNW* 78 (1987): 288–292 (291): "Es gab noch im frühen 3. Jahrhundert – vielleicht u. a. – eine 'Auflage' des Johannesevangeliums, die mit 20,30f als besiegelndem Buchschluß endete."

Wherefore also does this Gospel, at its very termination (*clausula euangelii*), intimate that these things were ever written, if it be not, to use its own words, 'that you might believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?'⁶⁹

However, in light of the unanimous text-critical evidence and the references to John 21 in the work of Tertullian it is improbable that Tertullian's Gospel of John ended after chapter 20. Therefore, in the determination of the probable origin of chapter 21, other literary-critical criteria play a role:

(1) *The Content of Chapter 21*. Bultmann adduced several observations against the composition of chapter 21 by the evangelist on the basis of its content: After the fundamental words of the risen Jesus to Thomas about seeing and believing (20:19–29), no further Easter appearance can be expected. – In 21:1–14 it is presupposed that the disciples are fishermen, even though this was nowhere mentioned in John 1–20. – While all the Easter appearances of John 20 occurred in Jerusalem, chapter 21 reports appearances of Jesus in Galilee without mentioning a tour of the disciples to Galilee. – Whereas John 20 was concerned with the topics of revelation and faith, the Easter stories in chapter 21 deal with individual disciples and their authority.⁷⁰

These kinds of arguments, however, are exceedingly contestable and do not allow any verdict about the chapter's origin.⁷¹ *While it has to be admitted that the final pericope in John 20 could serve as a fitting climax to the Fourth Gospel, in terms of content, John 21 could easily have originated with the evangelist.*

(2) *The Syntax of Chapter 21*. More important is the style-critical evidence regarding chapter 21. The syntax contains obvious similarities with John 1–20.⁷² The sentence structure is as simple as that found in the rest of the book.⁷³

(a) Furthermore, chapter 21 uses the same *asyndetical sentence connections* as John 1–20, especially in the introduction of direct speech.⁷⁴ Instead of ὁ δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος λέγει αὐτοῖς, chapter 21 repeatedly says in asyndetical manner (without particle) λέγει αὐτοῖς Σίμων Πέτρος. This

⁶⁹ Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean* 25.4 (CCL 2,1196 Kroymann/Evans; *ANF* III, 621).

⁷⁰ Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 543.

⁷¹ Cf. Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit*, 134–142; Porter, "The Ending of John's Gospel," 62–67.

⁷² Cf. E. Ruckstuhl and P. Dschulnigg, *Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage im Johannesevangelium: Die johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des Neuen Testaments und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums* (NTOA 17; Freiburg: Herder, 1991), 202–203, 229, 232.

⁷³ Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 542.

⁷⁴ Cf. F. Blass, A. Debrunner and F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1984), § 462.1–2.

feature is already present in the first sentences of the final chapter (21:2–3; cf. 21:12, 13, 16, 17):

“Gathered there together were Simon Peter, Thomas called the Twin, Nathanael of Cana in Galilee, the sons of Zebedee, and two others of his disciples. *Simon Peter said to them, ‘I am going fishing.’ They said to him, ‘We will go with you.’* They went out and got into the boat, but that night they caught nothing.”

(b) As in John 1–20, we repeatedly find the *narrative* οὖν, which carries the narrative forward, in chapter 21, four times in verses 5–7 alone (cf. 21:11, 15, 21, and 23):⁷⁵

Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat? They answered him, No. And he said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast *therefore*, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes. *Therefore* that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. *Now* when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea. (KJV)

This syntactical evidence favors the view that ascribes the wording of chapter 21 to the evangelist.

(3) *The Vocabulary of Chapter 21.* In addition, the vocabulary of chapter 21 is similar to the one of John 1–20.⁷⁶ Most noticeable is the double “Amen” in 21:18. At the same time, small deviations from Johannine style can be recognized. Due to a lack of space, this evidence will here be demonstrated for John 21:1–14 only:

(a) The following words and phrases from chapter 21 have a close parallel in John 20 and are (almost) without parallel in the Synoptic Gospels:

The only other place where in the New Testament the Sea Genesareth is called “Sea of Tiberias” (21:1) is in John 6:1. – As in 11:16 and 20:24, Thomas is introduced in 21:2 with the words ὁ λεγόμενος Δίδυμος. – Apart from 21:2, Nathanael is mentioned only in the Fourth Gospel (1:45–49). – “Cana in Galilee” is mentioned in 21:2 and otherwise only in the Fourth Gospel (2:1, 11; 4:46). – Peter is called “Simon Peter” in chapter 21 (21:2, 7, 11, 15, 17) and regularly elsewhere in the Gospel (a total of 22 times), while this designation is seldom found in Matthew (three times), Mark (twice), and Luke (twice). – πιάζειν occurs in 21:3, 10 and six times in John 1–20, but never in the Synoptics. – ἔσται Ἰησοῦς εἰς appears only in 21:4 and in 20:19, 26. – οὐ μέντοι is used in 21:4 and 20:5 only. – ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστίν appears only in 21:4 and in 5:15 and 20:14. – ἔλκειν occurs in 21:6, 11 and three times in John 1–20, but never in the Synoptics. – The Beloved Disciple (21:7, 20) is introduced in chapters 1–20. – The only New Testament parallel to ὡς ἀπὸ with an indication of measurements (21:8) can be found in John 11:18. – ὡς οὖν occurs in 21:9 and five times in John 1–20, but never in the Synoptics. – The phrase βλέπουσιν κειμένην in 21:9 has a close parallel in 20:5 (βλέπει κείμενα). –

⁷⁵ Cf. Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 451.1.

⁷⁶ Cf. E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Four Gospels with those of the Three* (London: Black, 1905).

ὁψάριον occurs in 21:9, 10, 13 and otherwise only in John 6:9, 11 and never in the Synoptics. – The question σὺ τίς εἶ occurs in 21:12 and otherwise only in John 1:19 and 8:25.

(b) Chapter 21 contains 28 words that do not occur in John 1–20.⁷⁷ This is partly due to the topics of the final chapter.

This is true of “to fish (ἀλιεύειν)” (21:3), “daybreak (πρωΐα)” (21:4), “beach (αἰγιαλός)” (21:4), “fish (προσφάγιον)” (21:5), “net (δίκτυον)” (21:6, 8), “fish (ἰχθύς)” (21:6, 8, 11), “naked (γυμνός)” (21:7), “clothes/garment (ἐπενδύτη)” (21:7), “cubit (πῆχυς)” (21:8), “drag (σύρειν)” (21:8), and “to have breakfast (ἀριστᾶν)” (21:12).

In other places, however, the wording in chapter 21 is slightly different from the normal language of the Gospel:

Instead of a causal ἀπὸ in 21:6, in John 1–20 διὰ with accusative is used (45 times). – Instead of οὐ μακρὰν in 21:8, in John 1–20 ἐγγύς occurs (3:23; 6:19, 23; 19:20, 42). – Instead of the partitive ἀπὸ in 21:10, in John 1–20 we find ἐκ (6:11, 13, 26 etc.). – While in John 21:12 ἐξετάζειν is used, in John 1–20 the evangelist says ἐρωτᾶν (28 times).

As counterarguments one could mention that the Fourth Evangelist has ὅπως only in 11:57, while he otherwise uses the final ἵνα. In addition, ἐξ ἑμαυτοῦ occurs in 12:48 only, while eight other times we have ἀπ’ ἑμαυτοῦ.⁷⁸ Yet, the clustering of uncommon expressions in John 21 still remains conspicuous.⁷⁹ Thus far, it has not been established that other chapters or pericopes of the Fourth Gospel contain a similar number of linguistic peculiarities as John 21.

This semantic evidence, though not conclusive in itself, speaks against unreservedly attributing the wording of the text to the evangelist. We thus have to reckon with the possibility of a (very moderate) influence of a second hand.

(4) *The “Sons of Zebedee” (21:2).* Also peculiar is the phrase “the (sons) of Zebedee (οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου)” in John 21:2. For in John 1–20 – in contrast to the Synoptics – not only are the names of the brothers James and John consistently concealed, but also the names of their parents, Salome and Zebedee.⁸⁰ It is more likely that an editor deviated from this rule than the evangelist.

The proposal that the words καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου are a gloss inserted subsequent to the composition of John 21⁸¹ solves the problem but has no text-critical evidence in its favor.

⁷⁷ Boismard, “Le chapitre XXI,” 484.

⁷⁸ Ruckstuhl, *Die literarische Einheit*, 148; cf. Porter, “The Ending of John’s Gospel,” 61–62.

⁷⁹ Boismard, “Le chapitre XXI,” 494–495.

⁸⁰ Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 691.

⁸¹ Boismard, “Le chapitre XXI,” 522–523.

3.3 The Origin of Form and Content

In sum, we may conclude: There are no satisfactory arguments against the assumption that the content of chapter 21 does indeed go back to the evangelist. Also in terms of its style chapter 21 is quite similar to the rest of the Gospel. The close semantic and conceptual resemblance of chapter 21 with John 1–20 speaks against the ascription of chapter 21 to a final redactor of a canonical edition in the second century. However, several minor stylistic peculiarities as well as the explicit mention of the name Zebedee, otherwise suppressed in John 1–20, speak against the view that chapter 21 was directly written or dictated by the evangelist.

This literary-critical evidence tips the scales slightly in favor of the following hypothesis: *While John 1:1–20:31 was written or dictated by the evangelist himself, in John 21:1–23 one of his disciples has subsequently added further Easter stories of his teacher, possibly from memory.* The evangelist was therefore probably the author of the wording of John 1:1–20:31 and the author of most of the wording of John 21:1–23.

4. Epilogues and Appendices in Ancient Literature

In Greco-Roman and Early Jewish literature, appendices were not uncommon. Sometimes they were added without the slightest comment (a). In other cases, authors indicated that they themselves had added appendices to their own works (b). Particularly interesting are appendices which indirectly indicate that they were secondary additions (c).⁸²

4.1 Appendices without Explicit Indications by Their Authors

Appendices which are not identified as such by explicit statements of their authors can in many cases be identified on the basis of other pieces of evidence. Sometimes the style of the presumably appended section is remarkably different from the style of the rest of the book. In other cases, the textual tradition of a book reveals that it exists in two different versions, a shorter and an expanded one. In other cases still, the author of a work explains elsewhere that he published both a short and an expanded version of the same text. As a matter of course, these different pieces of evidence sometimes support each other.

⁸² Cf. the still very useful overview given by H. Emonds, *Zweite Auflage im Altertum: Kulturgeschichtliche Studien zur Überlieferung der antiken Literatur* (KPS 14; Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1941), and more recently M. Mülke, *Der Autor und sein Text: Die Verfälschung des Originals im Urteil antiker Autoren* (UALG 93; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).

(1) *Cicero, Academica*. Cicero, the author of the *Academica*, reported to his friend Atticus about the composition of his *Academici Libri*:

Stirred by what you wrote to me in your letter about Varro I have taken the whole *Academy* from highly aristocratic personage and transferred it to our friend; and from two books I have put it into four. They are bigger than the old ones, yet I have removed a good deal.⁸³

According to this explanation, Cicero published his *Academica* in two different editions. The first edition consisted of two books, namely *Catulus* (which is no longer extant) and *Lucullus*. The second edition contained four books (of which only part of the first book has survived).⁸⁴ During the rewriting process, Cicero himself added some new material.

(b) *Optatus, Adversus Donatistas*. A discrepancy between his preface and the textual tradition of his book against the Donatists reveals that Optatus' work *Adversus Donatistas* contains a secondary appendix. Whereas in his preface Optatus mentions the respective content of only six books,⁸⁵ the medieval manuscripts contain seven books. And while Jerome knew of only six books,⁸⁶ at the beginning of the sixth century Optatus' work was said to contain seven volumes. Its content suggests that book 7 consists of material written by Optatus but not intended to become an additional book of his work. It is probable that others added it after the death of Optatus.⁸⁷

The more interesting appendices in our context are those that are demarcated or even introduced by explicit statements of an author.

4.2 Primary Appendices with Direct Indications by their Authors

(1) *Josephus, Antiquitates and Vita*. Josephus' *Antiquitates* has two conclusions. The first conclusion reads:

Here will be the end of my *Antiquities*, following which begins my account of the war. The present work contains the recorded history ... For I think that I have drawn up the whole story in full and accurate detail. I have also endeavored to preserve the record of the line of high priests ... For this was what I promised to do at the beginning of my history ... I have also labored strenuously to partake of the realm of Greek prose and poetry ... Perhaps it will not seem to the public invidious or awkward for me to recount briefly

⁸³ Cicero, *Epistulae ad Atticum* 13.13.1 (V, 202–203 Shackleton Bailey); cf. 13.16.1; 13.19.3, 5.

⁸⁴ Cf. M. Griffin, "The Composition of the *Academica*: Motives and Versions," in *Assent and Argument: Studies in Cicero's "Academic Books"* (ed. B. Inwood; PhAnt 76; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1–27 (14–16); T. J. Hunt, *A Textual History of Cicero's Academici libri* (Mn.S 181; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 10–13.

⁸⁵ Optatus, *Adversus donatistas* 1.1.7.

⁸⁶ Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 110.

⁸⁷ Cf. Emonds, *Zweite Auflage im Altertum*, 72–82.

my lineage and the events of my life while there are still persons living who can either disprove or corroborate my statements.⁸⁸

Immediately after this first conclusion follows a second, shorter one:

With this I shall conclude my *Antiquities*, contained in twenty books with sixty thousand lines. God willing, I shall at some future time compose a running account of the war of the later events of our history up to the present day, which belongs to the thirteenth year of the reign of Domitian Caesar and to the fifty-sixth of my life (i.e. A.D. 93/94). It is also my intention to compose a work in four books on the opinions that the Jews hold concerning God and His essence, as well as concerning the law, that is, why according to them, we are permitted to do some things while we are forbidden to do others.⁸⁹

In the first conclusion of his *Antiquities*, Josephus announced that he was going to attach an account of the events of his life. In the conclusion of his *Life*, he declared that he had actually done so:

Such are the events of my whole life; from them let others judge as they will of my character. Having now, most excellent Epaphroditus, rendered you a complete account of our antiquities, I shall here for the present conclude my narrative.⁹⁰

From these related conclusions it may be inferred that the *Antiquities* were published in two different editions, one with and one without the appended *Life* of Josephus. Since in his second conclusion (20.267–268) Josephus declared that he published the *Antiquities* in 93/94 A.D. and since he wrote his *Life* only after 100 A.D., this second ending must have concluded the first edition of his *Antiquities* without an appendix. The first ending (20.259–266) therefore belongs to the second edition of the *Antiquities*, which was published after 100 A.D. and included Josephus' apologetic autobiography. The chronologically second conclusion found its place between the end of the historical narrative of the *Antiquities* and the original conclusion.

Two explanations are possible. Either Josephus himself was responsible for this order or an early copyist combined the two different endings from the two slightly different editions of the work.⁹¹ In both cases, one and the same author, namely Josephus, concluded a first edition of his work with an epilogue (*Ant.* 20.267–268) and also concluded a second enlarged edition of his work with an epilogue (*Vita* 430).

⁸⁸ *Antiquitates* 20.259–266 (Thackeray, LCL).

⁸⁹ *Antiquitates* 20.267–268 (Thackeray, LCL).

⁹⁰ *Life* 430 (Thackeray, LCL).

⁹¹ Cf. R. Laqueur, *Der jüdische Historiker Josephus* (1920; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970), 1–6.

Table 5: *Josephus, Antiquities and Life*

	<i>First Edition</i>	<i>Second Edition</i>
Prologue (author)	<i>Ant.</i> pr. 1–26	<i>Ant.</i> pr. 1–26
Narrative (author)	<i>Ant.</i> 1.1–20.258	<i>Ant.</i> 1.1–20.258
Epilogue (author)		<i>Ant.</i> 20.259–266
Epilogue (author)	<i>Ant.</i> 20.267–268	<i>Ant.</i> 20.267–268
Narrative (author)		<i>Vita</i> 1–429
Epilogue (author)		<i>Vita</i> 430

Since the *Antiquities* and the *Life* belonged to different literary genres, history and biography respectively, Josephus did not append his *Life* without a statement about the link between these two works. This authorial comment in 20.259–268 fulfilled the function of a bridge that not only concluded the *Antiquities* but also introduced the autobiography.

(2) *Cornelius Nepos, De viris illustribus*. Cornelius Nepos dedicated his work on the lives of eminent commanders to Cicero's best friend Atticus whose life he treated in the final section of his work. In the middle of this final section on Atticus, we find the following remark:

Here ends what I wrote during the lifetime of Atticus. Now, since it was Fortune's decree that I should survive him, I will finish the account, and so far as I can, will show my readers by examples that as a rule – as I indicated above – it is the character of every man that determines his fortune.⁹²

This remark suggests that Cornelius had published a first edition of his work while Atticus was still alive (before 32 B.C.). This first edition contained only the first 18 sections of his life of Atticus. A few years later, after Atticus had died (after 32 B.C.), Cornelius added sections 19–22 in which he reported about Atticus' last days and his death. These he published in a second, enlarged edition.⁹³

As far as we can tell, Cornelius Nepos did not conclude the first edition of his work with an epilogue, but he opened his appendix with a prologue. The reason why he did not place his remark on the origin of the book at the

⁹² Cornelius Nepos, *De viris illustribus* 25.19.1 (Rolfe, LCL).

⁹³ On alternative interpretations of the quoted passage and the different opinions concerning further revisions of the first version see S. Anselm, *Struktur und Transparenz: Eine literaturwissenschaftliche Analyse der Feldherrnviten des Cornelius Nepos* (Alturumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium 11; Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004), 43–46: "Die erste und zweite Auflage des Feldherrnbuches."

end of its enlarged edition was that he wanted to indicate which paragraphs he had written before and after Atticus' death:

Table 6: Cornelius Nepos, De viris illustribus

	<i>First Edition</i>	<i>Second Edition</i>
Text (author)	1.1–25.18	1.1–25.18
Prologue (author)		25.19.1
Appendix (author)		25.19.2–22.4

(3) *Eusebius, Historia ecclesiastica*. The *Church History* of Eusebius consists of ten books. A clear indication that it had not always been that long can be found in the opening section of book 10. After a short prayer in 10.1, Eusebius goes on to explain:

And having now added, while we pray, the tenth tome also of the *Ecclesiastical History* to those which preceded it, we shall dedicate this tome to thee, my most holy Paulinus, invoking thee as the seal of the whole work.⁹⁴

According to this statement of the author himself, his *Church History* was published in at least two different versions. An earlier edition consisted of nine books while the final edition included a supplementary tenth book.

Beyond this, Eduard Schwartz deduced from textual and logical indications that the *Church History* was ultimately published in four different editions. The first edition consisted of books 1 to 8, in a second edition book 9 was added, the third edition contained 10 books, and in a fourth edition Eusebius removed a number of passages on Licinius.⁹⁵ Be that as it may, it is clear that Eusebius himself appended book 10 to an earlier edition of his work and indicated this in a prologue:

⁹⁴ Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 10.2 (Oulton, LCL).

⁹⁵ Cf. Emonds, *Zweite Auflage im Altertum*, 37–38.

Table 7: Eusebius, *Church History*

	<i>First Edition</i>	<i>Second Edition</i>	<i>Third Edition</i>	<i>Fourth Edition</i>
Narrative (author)	Book 1–8	Book 1–8	Book 1–8	(revision)
Narrative (author)		Book 9	Book 9	
Prologue (author)			10.2	
Narrative (author)			Book 10	

We don't know whether Eusebius – assuming that the above reconstruction of the successive origin of his *Church History* is correct – had closed earlier editions of his work with epilogues (after book 8 or 9) which he later removed. But if Schwartz and others who have developed similar theories are right, in his final edition Eusebius did not explicitly mention that his book had passed through more than two stages.

4.3 Secondary Appendices with Indirect Indications by Their Authors

(1) *Second Maccabees*. The anonymous book *Second Maccabees* has a prologue (2:19–32) and ends with an epilogue (15:37–39) – but it begins with two letters in 2 Macc 1:1–9 and 1:10–2:18. Since prologues were usually placed at the very beginning of ancient books, the two prefixed letters are most likely secondary. They were probably added some time after the work of the epitomizer who created *Second Maccabees* was finished.⁹⁶ In this case, the prefixed material was not the work of the book's author, and the author's prologue clearly separated the letters from the original book. On the other hand, the prefixed letters were not introduced by a prologue or concluded by an epilogue of their composer or editor.

⁹⁶ Cf. V. Parker, "The Letters in II Maccabees: Reflexion on the Book's Composition," *ZNW* 119 (2007): 386–402 (386–390); B. Herr, "Der Standpunkt des Epitomators: Perspektivwechsel in der Forschung am zweiten Makkabäerbuch," *Bib* 90 (2009): 1–31.

Table 8: *Second Maccabees*

	<i>First Edition</i>	<i>Second Edition</i>
Prefixed Letters (editor)		2 Macc 1:10–2:18
Prologue (author)	2 Macc 2:19–32	2 Macc 2:19–32
Narrative (author)	2 Macc 3:1–15:36	2 Macc 3:1–15:36
Epilogue (author)	2 Macc 15:37–39	2 Macc 15:37–39

At the same time, the author of the second, supplemented edition of Second Maccabees did not disturb the integrity of the book by introducing the letters at some point within the text, but rather attached them in front of the book so that their character as secondary additions remained apparent. The editor thereby indirectly indicated the secondary character of the letters.

(2) *Wisdom of Sirach*. A second example comes from the Wisdom of Sirach. Since the book has an epilogue in 50:27–29, chapter 51 may be an appendix. Whereas the Hebrew version of the epilogue ascribes the book in the third person to “Jesus son of Eleazar son of Sirach,” the majority of the Greek and Latin manuscripts have the epilogue in the first person singular:

Instruction in understanding and knowledge I have written in this book, Jesus son of Eleazar son of Sirach of Jerusalem, whose mind poured forth wisdom. Happy are those who concern themselves with these things, and those who lay them to heart will become wise. For if they put them into practice, they will be equal to anything, for the fear of the Lord is their path.⁹⁷

After this epilogue, the book does not end but continues with an additional chapter that contains a prayer that in its title (“Prayer of Jesus, Son of Sirach”) is explicitly ascribed to Ben Sira, the author of the whole book. The appended chapter also contains an autobiographical poem on wisdom. A subscription that ascribes the whole book to Ben Sira forms the final conclusion of the book. The Hebrew text reads:

Blessed be Yahweh forever, and praised be his name from generation to generation. Thus far the words of Simeon, the son of Yeshua, who is called Ben Sira. The Wisdom of Simeon, the son of Yeshua, the son of Eleazar, the son of Sira. May the name of Yahweh be blessed from now to eternity.⁹⁸

⁹⁷ Sir 50:27–29.

⁹⁸ Translation by P. W. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 579–580.

While both the originality and the authenticity of chapter 51 are disputed,⁹⁹ it is probable that Ben Sira concluded his book with the epilogue in 50:27–29 and someone else added chapter 51.¹⁰⁰ The language, form, and content of the secondary appendix are not so different from the preceding text as to unquestionably preclude its authenticity.¹⁰¹ But had Ben Sira himself added chapter 51 he would probably have moved the epilogue (50:27–29) from the end of chapter 50 to the end of the appendix to conclude the enlarged book. *A later reviser, however, who added another chapter may have found it appropriate to leave the original text of the author (including his epilogue) untouched and may have preferred to add his supplementary material after the author's original conclusion:*

Table 9: *The Wisdom of Sirach*

	<i>Original Edition</i>	<i>Hebrew Edition</i>	<i>Greek Edition</i>
Prologue (translator)			Prologue
Text (author)	Sir 1:1–50:26	Sir 1:1–50:26	Sir 1:1–50:26
Epilogue (author)	Sir 50:27–29	Sir 50:27–29	Sir 50:27–29
			Title
Appendix (editor)		Sir 51:1–30	Sir 51:1–29
Subscription		Subscription	Subscription

4.4 *The Position of the First Epilogue (20:30–31) in the Fourth Gospel*

These observations lead to a few conclusions concerning the Fourth Gospel.

(1) *The Perspective of the Evangelist.* From the perspective of the evangelist, there was little reason to leave his own epilogue (20:30–31) in its original place when he added a final chapter to his book. In contrast to the appended *Life* of Josephus, John 21 does not belong to a different literary genre. And in contrast to the appendix in Cornelius Nepos' *De viris illustribus*, the Gospel author did not have to indicate the transition from an earlier section of his book that had been written before the death of its hero to a later section that had been added after the hero's death. *If the evangelist*

⁹⁹ J. Marböck, "Structure and Redaction History of the Book of Ben Sira: Review and Prospects," *The Book of Ben Sira in Recent Research* (ed. P. C. Beentjes; BZNW 255; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 61–79 (77–79).

¹⁰⁰ G. Sauer, *Jesus Sirach* (ATD Apokryphen 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 2000), 346–347.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Skehan/Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 563.

*himself had added chapter 21, he probably would not have left his epilogue (John 20:30–31) at its current position.*¹⁰²

Further, John 20:30–31 does not look like a bridge that was also intended to open the final section of the book; rather, the epilogue suffices itself with concluding chapters 1–20. In this respect, Augustine's assertion that John 20:30–31 serves as "a kind of preface to the narrative that was to follow"¹⁰³ goes beyond what the original epilogue actually expresses. By contrast, when Josephus and Cornelius Nepos added new material to their works and decided to insert an authorial comment, they explained to their readers that the story was not yet finished. *If the evangelist had added chapter 21, he would probably have announced in 20:30–31 that more Easter stories were to follow.*

(2) The Perspective of the Editor. More plausible is the assumption that *a later person who had great respect for the work of the evangelist shied away from removing the original author's purpose statement or from inserting his additional material before the author's original epilogue.* For this person it would have appeared completely natural to attach chapter 21 to the concluding epilogue of the evangelist (20:30–31) as a clearly identifiable appendix. Further, such a procedure appears to have close analogies in the secondary additions to Second Maccabees and particularly to the Wisdom of Sirach. Finally, in this case it comes as no surprise that John 20:30–31 does not serve as a bridge but merely concludes chapters 1–20.

5. The Editorial Epilogue of the Fourth Gospel (John 21:24–25)

After the "we" of the author in the theological prologue (John 1:14 and 16), an authorial "we" (21:24) and an authorial "I" (21:25) do not appear until the last two verses of the Gospel:

- | | |
|------------|--|
| John 21:24 | "This is the disciple
who is testifying to these things
and has written them,
and we know
that his testimony is true." |
| John 21:25 | "But there are also many other things that Jesus did;
if every one of them were written down,
I suppose that the world itself
could not contain the books that would be written." |

¹⁰² Cf. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 1079–1080; Schnackenburg, *Das Johannesevangelium*, III, 415–417.

¹⁰³ Augustinus, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 122.1 (CCL 36, 668 Willems).

The content of the second conclusion in John 21:24 as well as its language are reminiscent of 19:35 (“His testimony is true, and he knows that he tells the truth”). John 21:24 contains several favorite terms of the Fourth Evangelist: ἀληθής (Matt 1/Mark 1/Luke 0/John 14), μαρτυρέω (1/0/1/33) and μαρτυρία (0/3/1/14).

The second conclusion in John 21:25 sounds similar to 20:30 in terms of content (“Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book”). The words of John 21:25, however, are not particularly close to the typical vocabulary of the rest of the Gospel. Since the interpretation of the two concluding verses is complex, it can best be accomplished by addressing a number of subquestions in sequence.

5.1 *The Anonymity of John 21:24–25*

The question has been raised whether an anonymous statement in John 21:24 about the trustworthiness of the evangelist could ever fulfill its purpose.¹⁰⁴ But if the editors were disciples of the evangelist or elders of the church in Ephesus whose identity the readers knew, an anonymous statement could be just as effective as a statement under someone’s name. The anonymity of the concluding remark did not undercut its utility.

The reason the editors decided not to mention their names was probably because it was their intention to imitate the anonymity of the evangelist – just as they imitated the wording of 19:35. To provide their own names at the end of a work whose author did not mention his name would have appeared to them rather inappropriate.

5.2 *The Authors of John 21:24*

Who is the author of the “we know” statement in John 21:24? Five different answers have been given. The first three interpretations (a–c) assume that in this second conclusion the author of the whole Gospel (1:1–21:23) is speaking. The remaining two interpretations (d–e) ascribe the second conclusion to someone else:

¹⁰⁴ J. Chapman, ““We Know that his Testimony is True,”” *JTS* 31 (1930): 379–387 (381).

Table 10: Interpretations of John 21:24

“This is the disciple who is testifying ... and we know that his testimony is true”

- a. “(I, the evangelist, and you, my readers) we know that his (i.e. my) testimony is true”
 - b. “(I, the evangelist, and my coworkers) we know that his (i.e. my) testimony is true”
 - c. “I, the evangelist, know that his (i.e. my) testimony is true”
 - d. “We (the disciples or fellow elders of the evangelist) know that his testimony is true”
 - e. “We (the writers of John 21) know that his (= the evangelist’s) testimony is true”
-

(1) *The Evangelist*. The assumption that the author of the whole Gospel is speaking in John 21:24¹⁰⁵ is defended in three different forms:

(a) In John 21:24, the author of John 1:1–21:23 uses the *Pluralis sociativus*.¹⁰⁶ The first person plural “we” includes the readers as an “associative collective”:¹⁰⁷ “(I, the evangelist, and you, my readers) we know ...”

(b) In John 21:24, the author of the whole book speaks together with other eyewitnesses¹⁰⁸ or his coworkers.¹⁰⁹ “(I, the evangelist, and my fellow witnesses or coworkers) we know ...”

(c) The “we” should be considered to be a *Pluralis majestatis* of the author of John 1:1–21:23: “I, the evangelist, know ...”¹¹⁰ Some interpret this plural more specifically as a plural of authority (a “‘we’ of authoritative testimony”), a typically Johannine idiom. According to this view, the plural “we,” in contrast to the singular “I,” constitutes a stronger claim to authority on the part of the author.¹¹¹ Thus, in John 21:24 the evangelist used the authoritative “we” in order to underscore the authority of his testimo-

¹⁰⁵ Thus e.g. already Theophylact, *Enarratio in Evangelium Joannis* on John 21:24 (PG 124, 316C–317C).

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 280.

¹⁰⁷ Jackson, “Ancient Self-Referential Conventions,” 17–24; cf. Köstenberger, “‘I Suppose (οἶμαι),’” 73–74; Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 794–795.

¹⁰⁸ Rese, “Das Selbstzeugnis des Johannesevangeliums,” 85–90; C. S. Keener, *The Gospel of John*, II, 1240–1241.

¹⁰⁹ Schlatter, *Evangelist Johannes*, 376.

¹¹⁰ Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 684.

¹¹¹ Cf. 3:11; 1 John 1:1–5; 4:14; 3 John 9–10, 12.

ny. In 21:25, he returned to the first person singular in order to make a non-authoritative statement.¹¹²

This third option (c), however, is called into question by the observation that several Johannine testimonies that make authoritative claims are formulated in the first person singular (1:15; 1:19–27; 1:32: “And John testified, *I* saw the Spirit ...” etc.). The only possible testimony of Jesus that is formulated in the first person plural is John 3:11 (“*we* speak of what *we* know and testify to what *we* have seen”), but its interpretation is strongly debated.¹¹³ Moreover, even the other passages that have been adduced as evidence for an authoritative plural (1:14–16; 1 John 1:1–5; 4:11–16; 3 John 9–12) can easily be interpreted as genuine plurals.

A second question concerns all three interpretations of John 21:24 that have so far been mentioned (a–c): Can the author of the Fourth Gospel have referred to himself both in the first person plural (“*we* know”) and in the third person singular (“the disciple”) in one and the same sentence? Thus far, no convincing analogies for such a mode of expression have been presented. Martin Rese claims that several analogies existed but mentions only one.¹¹⁴ And even this one is far from compelling.

In his *Bellum Judaicum*, Josephus was able to report autobiographically about his own experiences in the Galilean city Jotapata. At one point of his report he tells how the people of Jotapata asked him to stay:

They embraced and held *him* by his feet, they implored *him* with sobs to stay and share their fortune. All this they did, *I cannot but think* (ἐμοιγε δοκεῖν), not because they grudged *him* his chance of safety, but because they thought of their own; for, with *Josephus* on the spot, they were convinced that no disaster could befall them.¹¹⁵

As soon as this combination of self-references in the first and third person are interpreted against the background of ancient literary practice and the rules observed by Josephus in the rest of his work, however, the difference to John 21:24 becomes obvious. Like many other Greek historians,¹¹⁶ Josephus used the first person singular when he spoke as an author or historian reflecting on his work.¹¹⁷ In contrast, he referred to himself in the third person singular in the autobiographical sections of his book. Only once in his *Bellum*, in the above quoted sentence from 3.202, does a self-reference

¹¹² Chapman, ““We Know that his Testimony is True,”” 383–386; Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses*, 369–381.

¹¹³ Cf. Brown, *The Gospel According to John*, 132.

¹¹⁴ Rese, “Das Selbstzeugnis des Johannesevangeliums über seinen Verfasser,” 89.

¹¹⁵ Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 3.202 (LCL, Thackeray).

¹¹⁶ Cf. A. D. Baum, “Autobiografische Wir- und Er-Stellen in den neutestamentlichen Geschichtsbüchern im Kontext der antiken Literaturgeschichte,” *Bib* 88 (2007): 473–495 (476–478).

¹¹⁷ Cf. Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* 2.151; 2.479; 4.312; 6.4 etc.

in the third person coincide with a self-reference in the first person. This exceptional concurrence of self-references in the first and third person in one sentence sounds a bit peculiar but nevertheless follows the common pattern: The *author* Josephus reflects in the first person (“I think”) about the experiences of the *historical figure* Josephus during the war that are related in the third person (“Josephus”). The readers could be in no doubt about the meaning of the self-references in this sentence.

In contrast, according to the three interpretations (a–c) mentioned above, in John 21:24 the evangelist referred to himself as *author* not only in the first person (“we know”) but also in the third person (“this is the disciple who is testifying to these things”; “his testimony is true”). Such a way of speaking about oneself appears to be without any parallel in ancient narrative literature. Recipients of John’s Gospel would probably have been unable to understand John 21:24 as a self-reference of the evangelist.

(2) *The Disciples of the Evangelist*. The possibility should therefore be considered that those who use the first person (plural) in John 21:24 (“we know”) have to be distinguished from “the disciple who is testifying” who is referred to in the third person. John 21:24 can be interpreted most naturally as an analogy to 3 John 12 (“*you* know that *our* testimony is true”) and similar passages (John 5:32; Mark 12:14). Several persons confirm the truth of someone else’s testimony:

(d) In John 21:24, either the friends or disciples of the evangelist¹¹⁸ or the elders of the community where the Gospel was published are speaking:¹¹⁹ “We (the disciples, or friends, or fellow elders of the author of 1:1–21:23) know” Grammatically, this interpretation is entirely possible. However, if someone other than the author of chapter 21 wrote John 21:24, the author would have ended his narrative in 21:23 without a formal conclusion. The end of his texts would be formed by a question in direct speech: “Yet Jesus did not say to him that he would not die, but, ‘If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you?’” It is more reasonable to assume that the author of John 21:24 was also responsible for John 21:1–23.

(e) Hugo Grotius, in his judgment concerning the apostolic author of the book, was of the opinion that in John 21:24 the author of the concluding chapter included the whole church of Ephesus in his use of the plural.¹²⁰ Today, it is frequently assumed that in John 21:24 the writer of chapter 21

¹¹⁸ Lightfoot, “Internal Evidence for the Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John’s Gospel,” 196–197; Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 706–707.

¹¹⁹ Westcott, *The Gospel According to St. John*, 306; Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean*, 534.

¹²⁰ Schmithals, *Johannesevangelium und Johannesbriefe*, 46–48.

and his co-editors are speaking:¹²¹ “We (the writers of John 21) know” This reading coincides with the above interpretation of chapter 21 as a secondary appendix.¹²²

According to David Trobisch, the final redactors of the Fourth Gospel who wrote John 21:24, also published the Four Gospel canon and a canonical edition of the whole New Testament (in the form of a codex with a fixed number and sequence of writings and traditional book titles) in the second century.¹²³ However, there is no external evidence that the Fourth Gospel ever existed without 21:24 between the time of its composition and the hypothetical canonical edition. Against the interpretation that John 21:24 (“this is the disciple, who has written these things”) and the Gospel heading (“Gospel according to John”) stem from one hand can further be argued that the name of the author is concealed in John 21:24 but mentioned in the heading.

The statement about the composition of the Gospel by the Beloved Disciple in the first person plural in John 21:24 (“we know”) probably goes back to a group to which the evangelist did not belong. Those who confirmed the trustworthiness of the evangelist’s report may have been his disciples who had appended chapter 21.

5.3 The Author of John 21:25

The origin of John 21:25 is as controversial as that of 21:24. The third concluding statement is also either attributed to the evangelist (1) or to an editor (2).

Table 11: Interpretations of John 21:25

	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 2</i>
John 1:1–21:23		evangelist
John 21:24	evangelist	editor
John 21:25		editor

(1) Several exegetes interpret the concluding statement of the Gospel in John 21:25, which is formulated in the first person singular, as a statement of the evangelist.¹²⁴ Origen wrote on 21:25, without further explanation:

¹²¹ Brown, *Gospel According to John*, 1124–1125; Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, III, 444–447; Hengel, *Die johanneische Frage*, 271–273 (*The Johannine Question*, 106–108).

¹²² See section 3 above.

¹²³ Trobisch, *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments*.

¹²⁴ Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 685–86; Rese, “Das Selbstzeugnis des Johannesevangeliums,” 88–90; Thyen, *Johannesevangelium*, 796.

Why need I speak of him who leaned back on Jesus' breast, John, who has left behind one Gospel, confessing that he could write so many that even the world itself could not contain them (John 21:25).¹²⁵

A recent argument in favor of this interpretation is the fact that the formulation "I suppose (οἶμαι)" has thus far not been found in editorial statements.¹²⁶ However, in light of the variety of secondary technical statements in ancient books, this observation cannot be deemed to carry much weight.

(2) Several observations speak against a composition of John 21:25 by the evangelist and for its composition by one of the editors: Why should the author of the Gospel raise his voice again after the concluding statement of the editors in John 21:24? Such a procedure is likely without analogy in the rest of ancient literature.

A variation of this interpretation says that initially with John 21:25 the evangelist had only concluded a shorter version of the Gospel (1:1–20:31). When John 21:1–24 was appended, John 21:25 was transferred to the end of the enlarged book. Therefore, in spite of its awkward position, the concluding remark comes from the pen of the evangelist.¹²⁷ It must be asked, however, why an editor of the Gospel would append a concluding statement of the Gospel author to his own concluding statement in 21:24?

Further, the use of the first person singular by the evangelist would be unique in the whole Gospel. Otherwise, he only says "we" (1:14–16).

Beyond that, the style of John 21:25 differs from the rest of the Gospel. The complex sentence structure, which consists of a relative clause interlocked with a conditional sentence, belongs to a more literary style¹²⁸ and does not quite fit with the simple syntax of the rest of the book.

According to Trobisch, John 21:25 (like 21:24 and the whole chapter 21) was added in the second century by the author of a canonical edition of the New Testament.¹²⁹ However, since, as we have seen, John 21:24 can hardly have been an editorial of a canonical edition, Trobisch's thesis should be limited to 21:25. According to Trobisch, John 21:25 makes better sense as an editorial of a Four Gospel collection in terms of its content ("but there are also many other things that Jesus did"). Yet, this remains conjectural since we have no evidence for a version of the Fourth Gospel without 21:25.

¹²⁵ According to Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.25.9 (GCS Eusebius II/2, 578, 3–6 Schw./W.; trans. by Oulton, LCL); cf. Augustinus, *In Iohannis evangelium tractatus* 124.8 on John 21:25: "as the evangelist here terminates his Gospel (*euangelista terminante euangelium suum*)" (CCL 36, 688 Willems; trans. by NPNF III, 452).

¹²⁶ Köstenberger, "I Suppose (οἶμαι)," 82–87.

¹²⁷ Westcott, *Gospel According to St. John*, xxviii.

¹²⁸ Blass/Debrunner/Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, § 294.5.

¹²⁹ Trobisch, *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments*, 147–154.

Thus, *John 21:25 should be understood as an editorial statement, going back either to the same editor who already wrote John 21:24*¹³⁰ *or to another member of the editorial group of John 21:24.*¹³¹ This interpretation can be traced back to Theodore of Mopsuestia who, according to an old Catena on the Gospel of John, said on 21:25: "These words do not come from the evangelist but were inserted by a diligent person."¹³²

5.4 The Point of Reference of John 21:24–25

A common interpretation assumes that the statement in John 21:24 refers to the whole Gospel. Considered separately, the words "these things" in 21:24 could be related to chapter 21 alone.¹³³ However, this reading is in conflict with both the immediate context (21:25) and the conventions of ancient conclusions.

Conclusions of ancient books usually referred not only to the concluding section of a book but to its whole text. This is true for the book of Esther (subscription), the book of Sirach (50:27–29), as well as Second Maccabees (15:37–39), and thus probably applies to the Gospel of John as well. There is no reason to suppose that the statement in John 21:24 does not follow the general rules and did not conclude the book as a whole.

Further, in the context of John 21:25 ("the world itself could not contain the *books* that would be written") it is probable that John 21:24 also refers to the entire writing.¹³⁴ Therefore, *John 21:24 and 25 probably refer back to the whole Gospel of John.*

5.5 The Genre of John 21:24–25

Four different suggestions have been made concerning the literary genre of John 21:24–25. The conclusion of the Fourth Gospel has been called an *incipit* (1), a *sphragis* (2), a subscription (3), and an editorial epilogue (4).

(1) *John 21:24a as an Incipit.* R. Alan Culpepper has suggested interpreting the identification of the author in John 21:24a as an *incipit* of the editor.¹³⁵ Against this has to be said that *incipit* is the name for the first words of a book (cf. the Hebrew designations of the biblical books and the names of the papal bulls) and therefore stands at the beginning of a book.

¹³⁰ Thus Zahn, Lagrange, and Brown in their commentaries and Hengel in *Die johanneische Frage*, 224–225 (*The Johannine Question*, 83–84).

¹³¹ Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, III, 448.

¹³² The Greek text is quoted by J. N. Birdsall, "The Source of Catena Comments on John 21:25," *NovT* 36 (1994): 271–279 (274–275).

¹³³ C. H. Dodd, "Note on John 21,24," *JTS* 4 (1953): 212–13; C. Roberts, "John 20:30–31 and 21:24–25," *JTS* 38 (1987): 409–410.

¹³⁴ Schnackenburg, *Johannesevangelium*, III, 445–447.

¹³⁵ Culpepper, "John 21:24–25: The Johannine *Sphragis*," 353–354, 359.

Nearly all the passages which Culpepper has adduced as examples have their position at the end of the respective books.¹³⁶ Beyond that, an *incipit* is the work of a book's author, not of its editor.

(2) *John 21:24–25 as a Sphragis*. Culpepper interprets the conclusion of the Fourth Gospel not only as an *incipit* but also as a *sphragis* which he defines as “a validating paratext” that “typically identifies the author and certifies the authenticity of the document or its contents.” According to Culpepper, the *sphragis* of the Fourth Gospel has been added by an editor, possibly when the book was circulated to readers outside the Johannine communities.¹³⁷ This interpretation is problematic for two reasons. In the first place, *sphragis* is the name of a validating seal used by poets. It therefore does not suggest itself as the appropriate term to be applied to narrative prose texts or history books.

In the second place, a *sphragis* was formulated by the author himself as a self-reference. A *sphragis* is “a motif in which an author names or otherwise identifies himself or herself, especially at the beginning or end of a poem or collection of poems.”¹³⁸ A *sphragis* was not added by an editor. Two examples can illustrate that. In the opening section of his elegies, the Greek poet Theognis of Megara (6th century B.C.) wrote the following verses:

For me, a skilled and wise poet, let a seal, Cynos, be placed on these verses. There theft will never pass unnoticed, nor will anyone take something worse in exchange when that which is good is at hand, but everyone will say, ‘They are the verses of Theognis of Megara, and he is famous among all men.’¹³⁹

The exact interpretation of the word σφράγις in this context is contested, but the most probable sense is that by mentioning his name Theognis wanted to protect his verses against plagiarism.¹⁴⁰ Other poets, such as Hesiod, Sappho, Timotheos etc., used a similar device both to protect their books by identifying themselves and to thereby lay claim to their intellectual and literary property. The main motivation will have been their longing for honor and fame.¹⁴¹ A Roman poet who made use of a *sphragis* was Virgil:

¹³⁶ *Sybilline Oracles* 3:827–829; *Apocalypse of Adam* 8:17; *Testament of Job* 53:1; *Testament of Solomon* 26:8; *I Enoch* 108:4, 10, 15.

¹³⁷ Culpepper, “John 21:24–25: The Johannine *Sphragis*,” 357–364.

¹³⁸ D. H. Roberts, “*Sphragis*,” *OCD* 1435; cf. H. A. Gärtner, “*Sphragis*,” *DNP* 11:819–820.

¹³⁹ Theognis 19–23 (Gerber, LCL).

¹⁴⁰ H. Selle, *Theognis und die Theognidea* (UALG 95; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 289–311: “Das Siegelgedicht.”

¹⁴¹ Selle, *Theognis und die Theognidea*, 364–370: “Geistiges Eigentum.”

Thus I sang of the care of fields, of cattle, and of trees, while great Caesar thundered in war by deep Euphrates and gave a victor's law unto willing nations and essayed the path to Heaven. In those days I, Virgil, was nursed of sweet Parthenope, and rejoiced in the arts of inglorious ease – I who dallied with shepherds' songs, and, in youth's boldness, sang, Tityrus, of thee under thy spreading beech's covert.¹⁴²

The first Greek historian who mentioned his name in his prologue was Hecataeus of Miletus, whose practice was followed by Herodotus, Thucydides and many others. In all these cases as well, the identification of the author comes from himself. Against the background of these observations, it does not come as a surprise that nearly all the sphragides (or *sphragis*-like passages) quoted by Culpepper are self-identifications of primary authors.

For two reasons, therefore, the identification of the author in John 21:24–25 should not be classified as a sphragis: It does not identify a poet and it is not a self-identification of the evangelist.

(3) *John 21:24–25 as a Subscription.* Howard M. Jackson classified John 21:24 as a formal and solemn “documentary subscription” and John 21:25 as an informal “epistolary postscript.” According to Jackson, the subscription of the Fourth Gospel parallels the postscript by the sender in letter-writing that included a resumptive summary and a first-person address to the recipients in order “to verify the sender as the source of the letter and to confirm him as the agent and authority of its content.”¹⁴³ From a literary-historical perspective, the two concluding verses of the Fourth Gospel (21:24–25) would then be reminiscent of “colophons” (“endings”) or “subscriptions” (“subscriptions”) which already Ancient Near Eastern copyists had appended to their texts.

Colophons were used in Greco-Roman antiquity from the third century B.C. onwards and in Hellenistic times.¹⁴⁴ They were also prevalent in Byzantine literature.¹⁴⁵ They can already be found in Old Testament writings, e. g. in the Book of Job, in the Psalms, and in the prophetic books.¹⁴⁶

(a) John 21:24–25 has much in common with these ancient colophons or subscriptions. Like a colophon, John 21:24–25 has its place at the end of the Gospel. In contrast to the “seals” which were woven into the text, John

¹⁴² Virgil, *Georgica* 4.559–566 (Rushton Fairclough, LCL).

¹⁴³ “Ancient Self-Referential Conventions,” 3–8.

¹⁴⁴ Wendel, *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung*, 3–4.

¹⁴⁵ H. Hunger, *Schreiben und Lesen in Byzanz: Die byzantinische Buchkultur* (München: Beck, 1989), 95–99.

¹⁴⁶ H. M. I. Gevaryahu, “Biblical Colophons: A Source for the ‘Biography’ of Authors, Texts and Books,” *Congress Volume, Edinburgh 1974* (VTS 28; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 42–59; J. R. Lundbom, “Baruch, Seraiah, and Expanded Colophons in the Book of Jeremiah,” *JSOT* 36 (1986): 89–114; B. K. Waltke, “Superscripts, Postscripts, or Both,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 583–596.

21:24–25 is detached from the text and forms a comment on the text, just as a subscription.¹⁴⁷

Also the content of John 21:24–25 is in many respects similar to the content of ancient colophons. Ancient colophons referred to the book and its related persons, but within this framework their content was quite diverse. The colophons on the clay tablets of the Ancient Near East included a random number of elements from the following three categories: (1) bibliographical remarks (catch-line, number of the tablet, title of the work, line number, etc.), (2) specifications about persons (writer, owner, client, examiner), and (3) other information (purpose of writing, wishes of the writer, curses, prayers and invocations, date).¹⁴⁸

In Mesopotamian colophons, the *name of the author* was almost never mentioned.¹⁴⁹ It is found more often in Hittite colophons.¹⁵⁰ In many biblical colophons, the name of the author is also identified (Job 31:40; Psalm 72:18–20; Jer 51:64). The identification of authors in Ancient Near Eastern colophons was probably related to the different literary genres. While historiographical works were traditionally transmitted anonymously, prophetic and wisdom literature carried the name of the author as a rule. John 21:24–25 does not mention the name of a copyist or translator of the Gospel, but does identify its author.

(b) Although the conclusion of the Fourth Gospel has much in common with subscriptions or colophons it also distinguishes itself from this genre in one critical respect: John 21:24–25 cannot be attributed to a copyist of the Gospel but probably comes, as we have seen, from the disciples of the author and was added before the publication of the book. *A colophon, in contrast, was a note at the end of a tablet,¹⁵¹ a scroll or a codex that came per definition from a copyist and therefore not from a secretary of the author, a co-author, or an editor (as John 21:24–25).*

(4) *John 21:24–25 as an Editorial Epilogue.* In light of the above observations, John 21:24–25 has to be considered to be an editorial epilogue to the Fourth Gospel in which the editors referred to the author (21:24) and to his book (21:25). This editorial epilogue has much in common with an ancient colophon but does not belong to the same genre.

¹⁴⁷ M. D. Reeve, "Subscriptions," *OCD* 1450–1451; E. Gamillscheg, "Subscriptio II.A–B," *DNP* 11:1068–1089; cf. E. Caldelli, "Subscriptio II.C," *DNP* 11:1069–1071.

¹⁴⁸ Wendel, *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung*, 2–3; H. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone* (AOAT 2; Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker, 1968), 1.

¹⁴⁹ Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*, 9, 22.

¹⁵⁰ Wendel, *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung*, 7–8.

¹⁵¹ Cf. Hunger, *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*, 1.

Table 12: The genre of John 21:24–25

	<i>Position</i>	<i>Origin</i>
<i>Incipit</i>	beginning	author
<i>Sphragis</i>	beginning or end	author
John 21:24–25	end	editor
Subscription	end	copyist, corrector, translator

6. Conclusion

As the interpretation of John 20:30–21:25 against the background of ancient epilogues and appendices has demonstrated, Martin Hengel (who followed Raymond Brown and Rudolf Schnackenburg) was probably right when he interpreted John 20:30–31 as the original epilogue of the evangelist, chapter 21 as an editorial appendix, and John 21:24–25 as the epilogue of the editors.

Table 13: The components of the Fourth Gospel and their origins

John 1:1–18	theological prologue	evangelist
John 1:19–20:29	original narrative	evangelist
John 20:30–31	original technical epilogue	evangelist
John 21:1–23	secondary appendix	evangelist/editors
John 21:24	secondary technical epilogue	editors
John 21:25	secondary technical epilogue	editors

In order to express his authorial intention the author of the Fourth Gospel adopted a literary device from Greco-Roman historiography with its characteristic fondness for purpose statements. Formally, the evangelist's decision to make his purpose statement not in a prologue but rather in a solitary epilogue at the very end of his book was reminiscent of the Old Testament preference for solitary technical comments at the end of literary works. Yet, his main reason for choosing this unusual place for his technical purpose statements will have been that he wanted to open his Gospel with a weighty theological introduction (John 1:1–18) whose immediate impact he did not want to lessen by a preceding technical prologue. In addition, it was in line with his general understanding of authorship that the

evangelist made his own voice heard only at a rather unobtrusive place of his work, in its final lines.

Since all kinds of epilogues (whether solitary or with a preceding prologue) signaled the end of a literary work, John 20:30–31 indicates that the evangelist originally intended to finish his book with chapter 20. Chapter 21 has therefore to be regarded as an appendix, whether it was added by the evangelist himself or by some later writer.

Since content, syntax, and vocabulary of John 21 are very similar to the content and style of chapters 1–20, the appended chapter 21 probably comes from the same source as the rest of the book. Several minor semantic peculiarities, however, and the reference to the “Sons of Zebedee” in John 21:2 suggest that John 21 was not in the same direct way the work of the evangelist as the rest of the book. One possibility among others is that chapter 21 was written down from memory by one of the evangelist’s disciples.

The supposition that the evangelist was not the immediate author of John 21 is supported by the observation that, on the one hand, ancient authors who supplemented their own books moved earlier written epilogues to the end of the appended versions of their texts. On the other hand, later writers, who added material to the books of others could, out of respect for the integrity of the original author’s work, leave the author’s epilogue in its original place and add the supplementary material after it (or even before a prologue).

The second conclusion in John 21:24 contains a statement in the first person plural (“we know”) about a person who is mentioned in the third person singular (“this is ...”). As a self-reference this expression is without precedent. A more natural interpretation takes this verse as a concluding statement of an unidentified group about the author of the book. Since John 21:23 does not form an appropriate conclusion and since John 21:24 is closely connected with the content of chapter 21, the most probable assumption is that the comment about the evangelist in 21:24 stems from the author of chapter 21.

In contrast to a *sphragis*, John 21:24–25 is neither part of a poetical text nor does it go back to the book’s author; and in contrast to a subscription or colophon, John 21:24–25 cannot be ascribed to a scribe, corrector, or translator of the Gospel. Since John 21:24–25 comes from the editors of the book who added chapter 21 and forms a concluding remark about some technical aspects of the book’s origin and quality, the most appropriate designation for this text is editorial epilogue.

Finally, whereas the paratexts in John 20:30–31 and 21:24–25 help to classify chapter 21 as an editorial appendix, which had been difficult to do on purely literary-critical grounds, it is hardly possible to identify further

interpolations that were added by the editors who appended John 21. In light of the highly unified content and style of the Fourth Gospel, any hypotheses that go beyond what can be deduced from the epilogues remain highly speculative.

Bibliography

- Abbott, Edwin A. *Johannine Vocabulary: A Comparison of the Words of the Four Gospels with those of the Three*. London: Black, 1905.
- Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. *Der Text des Neuen Testaments*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1982.
- Anselm, Sabine. *Struktur und Transparenz: Eine literaturwissenschaftliche Analyse der Feldherrnviten des Cornelius Nepos*. Altertumswissenschaftliches Kolloquium 11. Stuttgart: Steiner, 2004.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Bauer, Walter. *Das Johannesevangelium*. HNT 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, ³1933.
- Baum, Armin D. "Autobiografische Wir- und Er-Stellen in den neutestamentlichen Geschichtsbüchern im Kontext der antiken Literaturgeschichte." *Bib* 88 (2007): 473–495.
- . "Anonymity in the New Testament History Books: A Stylistic Device in the Context of Greco-Roman and Ancient Near Eastern Literature." *NovT* 50 (2008): 120–142.
- . "Lk 1,1–4 zwischen antiker Historiografie und Fachprosa: Zum literaturgeschichtlichen Kontext des lukanischen Prologs." *ZNW* 101 (2010): 33–54.
- Birdsall, James N. "The Source of Catena Comments on John 21:25." *NovT* 36 (1994): 271–279.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner and Friedrich Rehkopf. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1984.
- Boismard, Marie-Émile. "Le chapitre XXI de Saint Jean. Essai de critique littéraire." *RB* 54 (1947): 473–501.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Gospel According to John*. AB 29. New York: Doubleday, 1966/70.
- . *An Introduction to the Gospel of John*. Edited by Francis J. Moloney. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 2003.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Gospel of John: Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. KEK 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, ¹⁸1964.
- Caldelli, Elisabetta. "Subscriptio II.C." *DNP* 11:1069–1071.
- Carson, Donald A. *The Gospel According to John*. Leicester: IVP, 1991.
- Chapman, John. "'We Know that his Testimony is True.'" *JTS* 31 (1930): 379–387.
- Culpepper, Richard Alan. "John 21:24–25: The Johannine *Sphragis*." Pages 349–364 in *John, Jesus, and History*. Vol. 2. Edited by Paul N. Anderson. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Dodd, Charles H. "Note on John 21,24." *JTS* 4 (1953): 212–13.
- Earl, Donald C. "Prologue-Form in Ancient Greek Historiography." Pages 842–56 in *ANRW* I.2. Edited by Hildegard Temporini. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972.

- Emonds, Hilarius. *Zweite Auflage im Altertum: Kulturgeschichtliche Studien zur Überlieferung der antiken Literatur*. Klassisch-philologische Studien 14. Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1941.
- Gamillscheg, Ernst. "Subscriptio II.A–B." *DNP* 11:1068–1089.
- Gärtner, Hans Armin. "*Sphragis*." *DNP* 11:819–820.
- Genette, Gérard. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge: University Press, 1997.
- Gevaryahu, Haim I. M. "Biblical Colophons: A Source for the 'Biography' of Authors, Texts and Books." Pages 42–59 in *Congress Volume, Edinburgh 1974*. SVT 28. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Griffin, Miriam. "The Composition of the *Academica*: Motives and Versions." Pages 1–27 in *Assent and Argument: Studies in Cicero's "Academic Books"*. Edited by Brad Inwood. PhAnt 76. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Heckel, Theo K. *Vom Evangelium des Markus zum viergestaltigen Evangelium*. WUNT 120. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Johannine Question*. London: SCM, 1989.
- . *Die johanneische Frage: Ein Lösungsversuch*. WUNT 67. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.
- Herkommer, Elmar. "Die Topoi in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke." Ph.D. diss. Tübingen University, 1968.
- Herr, Bertram. "Der Standpunkt des Epitomators: Perspektivwechsel in der Forschung am zweiten Makkabäerbuch." *Bib* 90 (2009): 1–31.
- Hunger, Herbert. *Babylonische und assyrische Kolophone*. AOAT 2. Kevelaer: Butzon and Bercker, 1968.
- . *Schreiben und Lesen in Byzanz: Die byzantinische Buchkultur*. München: Beck, 1989.
- Hunt, Terence J. *A Textual History of Cicero's Academici libri*. Mn.S 181. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Jackson, Howard M. "Ancient Self-Referential Conventions and their Implications for the Authorship and Integrity of the Gospel of John." *JTS* 50 (1999): 1–34.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Köstenberger, Andreas J. *John*. BECNT 4. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004.
- . "'I Suppose (οἶμαι)': The Conclusion of John's Gospel in its Literary and Historical Context." Pages 72–88 in *The New Testament in its First Century Setting*. FS Bruce W. Winter. Edited by Peter J. Williams et al. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. *Évangile selon Saint Jean*. Études bibliques. Paris: Lecoffre, 1948.
- Laqueur, Richard. *Der jüdische Historiker Josephus*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970 (1920).
- Lattke, Michael. "Joh 20,30f. als Buchschluß." *ZNW* 78 (1987): 288–292.
- Lightfoot, John B. "Internal Evidence for the Authenticity and Genuineness of St. John's Gospel." Pages 123–96 in idem, *Biblical Essays*. London: Macmillan, 1893.
- Lundbom, Jack R. "Baruch, Seraiah, and Expanded Colophons in the Book of Jeremiah." *JSOT* 36 (1986): 89–114.
- Marböck, Johannes. "Structure and Redaction History of the Book of Ben Sira: Review and Prospects." Pages 61–79 in *The Book of Ben Sira in Recent Research*. Edited by Pancratius C. Beentjes. BZNW 255. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997.
- Markl, Dominik. "Spielen Joh 1,1; 20,30f; 21,24f auf den Rahmen des Pentateuch an?" Pages 107–219 in *Führe mein Volk heraus. Zur innerbiblischen Rezeption der Exodusthematik*. FS G. Fischer. Edited by Simone Paganini. Frankfurt: Lang, 2004.

- Mülke, Markus. *Der Autor und sein Text: Die Verfälschung des Originals im Urteil antiker Autoren*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 93. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Overbeck, Franz. *Das Johannesevangelium: Studien zur Kritik seiner Erforschung*. Edited by Carl A. Bernoulli. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1911.
- Parker, Victor. "The Letters in II Maccabees: Reflexion on the Book's Composition." *ZNW* 119 (2007): 386–402.
- Petersen, Silke. "Die Evangelienüberschriften und die Entstehung des neutestamentlichen Kanons." *ZNW* 97 (2006): 250–267.
- Porter, Stanley E. "The Ending of John's Gospel." Pages 55–73 in *From Biblical Criticism to Biblical Faith*. FS Lee M. McDonald. Edited by William H. Brackney and Craig A. Evans. Macon: Mercer, 2007.
- Reeve, Michael D. "Subscriptions." *OCD* 1450–1451.
- Rese, Martin. "Das Selbstzeugnis des Johannesevangeliums über seinen Verfasser." *ETL* 72 (1996): 75–111.
- Roberts, Colin. "John 20:30–31 and 21:24–25." *JTS* 38 (1987): 409–410.
- Roberts, Deborah H. "*Sphragis*." *OCD* 1435.
- Ruckstuhl, Eugen. *Die literarische Einheit des Johannesevangeliums: Der gegenwärtige Stand der einschlägigen Forschung*. NTOA 5. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1988.
- Ruckstuhl, Evgen, and Peter Dschulnigg. *Stilkritik und Verfasserfrage im Johannesevangelium: Die johanneischen Sprachmerkmale auf dem Hintergrund des Neuen Testaments und des zeitgenössischen hellenistischen Schrifttums*. NTOA 17. Freiburg: Herder, 1991.
- Sauer, Georg. *Jesus Sirach*. ATD Apokryphen 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 2000.
- Schlatter, Adolf. *Der Evangelist Johannes: Wie er spricht, denkt und glaubt*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1975.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Johannesevangelium und Johannesbriefe: Ein Forschungsbericht*. BZNW 64. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. *Das Johannesevangelium*. HThK IV/1–4. Freiburg: Herder, 1965–84.
- Schubart, Wilhelm. *Das Buch bei den Griechen und Römern*. Handbücher der staatlichen Museen zu Berlin. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1921.
- Selle, Hendrik. *Theognis und die Theognidea*. Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 95. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Thyen, Hartwig. *Das Johannesevangelium*. HNT 6. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Trobisch, David. *Die Endredaktion des Neuen Testaments: Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der christlichen Bibel*. NTOA 31. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1996.
- Van Seters, John. *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the 'Editor' in Biblical Criticism*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "Superscripts, Postscripts, or Both." *JBL* 110 (1991): 583–596.
- Wendel, Carl. *Die griechisch-römische Buchbeschreibung verglichen mit der des vor-deren Orients*. Hallische Monographien 3. Halle: Niemeyer, 1949.
- Westcott, Brooke F. *The Gospel According to St. John*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975 (1881).
- Zahn, Theodor. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. Leipzig: Erlangen, 1921.