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This investigation studied the use of the Greek term παροιμία in the Gospel of John. In chapter 1 modern and ancient writers who wrote about the παροιμία are reviewed as a background study. The discussions are mostly limited to the area of popular proverbs. The list of παροιμία in the period before the Fourth Gospel revealed that not only proverbial sayings but also idioms and maxims were included in the category of παροιμία. The use of the term in the Septuagint translation and in Philo's writings shifted from the earlier use of the term because the former, in several places, translated the Hebrew words בְּשָׁם and נַחַת by παροιμία and the latter replaced three words σωτηρία, παραβολή, and
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διηγήμα by παρομία. This use provided an intermediate step toward the drastic shift in the term's meaning in the Fourth Gospel.

In chapter 2 the use of the term in 16:4b-33 and the problem of ἐν παρομίαις are probed. By investigating the use of τάφα it is shown that Jesus referred to the passage of vss. 5-24 by τάφα in 16:25. The crucial sayings of vss. 25, 29 are conditioned by the questions of the disciples. The questions were caused by the difficult sayings of Jesus, which can be identified with παρομία. The difficult sayings are found in vss. 5 (10b), 16. They are not parables, proverbs, illustrations, or figures of speech. They are riddles. Features of the Johannine riddles which occur in chap. 16 were observed: short; expanded by the use of a parable; cause questions; Jesus centered; Jesus' sayings; and use of ambiguous words.

In chapter 3 the παρομία of 10:1-5 was investigated to determine its literary form. Several possibilities were considered: parable, allegory, and riddle. 'Riddle' is the most appropriate English equivalent for παρομία. Additional features of the Johannine riddles were observed: lengthy; cause of misunderstanding; and expansion by the use of proverbs.

In chapter 4 further Johannine riddles were located in light of the features observed in the previous chapters. These riddles culminate in the death of Jesus. Jesus is portrayed as a teacher of riddles in the Gospel.

The Johannine use of the term παρομία shows a
dramatic shift from its use in the classical and Hellenistic literature before the Gospel.
To my wife Myungssoon
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INTRODUCTION

Stephen S. Smalley epitomized the riches of the Gospel of John in these words:

The Gospel of John is a source of endless fascination for the student of the New Testament. Its problems deserve and receive constant investigation, and yet its secrets show no sign of being fully discovered. This is not surprising, since—in Luther’s phrase—its incomparably ‘simple words’ are at the same time ‘inexpressible words.’

His statement summarizes the impressions of those who read the Fourth Gospel (FG), whether trained in the New Testament discipline or not.

Even though the FG possesses several peculiar characteristics, it has been widely accepted that it does not include parables. In recent scholarship, however, a


2A. M. Hunter, According to John (London: SCM Press, 1968), 78, notes that in 1863 Renan asked why the FG does not contain a parable. This question is accepted by many critics as valid. When Walter Schmithals wrote an introduction to the translation of Bultmann’s commentary on John, he stated (contrary to what Bultmann believed): “Parables are altogether absent. Even the characteristically Johannine I-words, which often announce the theme of a great parabolic discourse (ch. 10, the Good Shepherd; ch. 15, the Vine), are not parables, but must be understood as direct statement.” Rudolf Bultmann, The Gospel of John: A Commentary (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 4.
number of exegetes have come to see the presence of parables in the FG.

**Problem**

It is a well-known fact among New Testament scholars that the Synoptics use the Greek term παραβολή for the parables of Jesus and the FG does not use it. It uses the term παρομία. Since the Greek term παρομία is the only term John uses to designate any form of literary device, it has long been understood to be a synonym for the Synoptic counterpart, that is, παραβολή. In addition, the Hebrew term ה'פנ has been translated by these two Greek terms. Therefore it has been commonly accepted that both terms designate the same kind of literary form. Nevertheless, this assumption is simpler than the facts warrant.

In spite of the majority scholarly opinion that the Johannine term παρομία and the Synoptic term παραβολή are based on the same Hebrew term ה'פנ, they do not seem to have the same meaning. Furthermore, the Johannine term παρομία does not seem to be in accord with the classical and Hellenistic use of the term.

What is a παρομία in the FG? This question in turn raises a number of other questions:

1. To what does it refer in the FG?

'See chapters 2-4.
2. What is the genre of the items referred to by the term?

3. Are there any other portions in the FG which can be properly designated with the same term?

4. What is its function?

5. How does it compare to the meaning and function of παραβολή in the Synoptics? What are the similarities and differences between the Synoptic παραβολή and the Johannine παρομία?

Concerning points 1 and 2, there are diverse opinions among scholars. The other issues have not been adequately discussed.

Thus far, there have been many studies of the Synoptic παραβολή, but the study of the Johannine παρομία has been minimal, as the topic has not been taken seriously. It is handled only as a subsidiary topic under the discussions of παραβολή or ἔσο. A number of scholars have devoted several pages to the meaning of ἔσο, παραβολή, and παρομία in their introductions to parable studies.¹ They have not, __________

however, made a serious investigation of the meaning and function of the Johannine term παρομοία as a primary topic.

What they have done for this problem is at best to state a probable difference between the two Greek terms, but they could not make it clear because they did not study the relevant texts systematically. At least they admitted the presence of the difference, but did not give enough attention to its nature. Therefore we assume that the nature of παρομοία in John still remains a problem worth

---

1 Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989), 504: "It is difficult to put a real difference of meaning between them, and both probably reflect something of the Hebrew מִשְׁמַר... This is not to say that there is no difference between the parables so characteristic of the Synoptic Gospels and such a passage as the present one. The differences are plain. All that I am saying is that it is difficult to make a hard and fast distinction between the meanings of the two words."

Also, John Drury, The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory (New York: Crossroad, 1985), 159, observed: "It [παραβολή] contains what we can only consider to be parables, but he [John] prefers the label παρομοία usually translated 'figure'. The significance of this is hard to assess because the difference is not clear."

---
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investigating. So one may still ask and investigate the problem: What is the Johannine παρομία?

**Purpose and Scope of the Study**

It was the purpose of this study to (1) clarify what the biblical category of Johannine παρομία indicates, (2) make a list of the Johannine παρομία, and (3) see how they function in the FG.

**Review of Literature**

There is a relative lack of relevant literature dealing with this problem. For the Johannine use of the Greek term παρομία, only a few dissertations and articles are relevant--most of them very indirectly--apart from the commentaries and periodical articles that deal with the particular texts (10:6; 16:25, 29) in which the term occurs.

Edwin Hatch contributed a valuable piece of research on the relationship between παραβολή and παρομία as they occur in the LXX and other Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible and in the New Testament. Based on a few observations, he concluded that παραβολή and παρομία are interchangeable--there is no sharp distinction between them. His conclusion might be applicable for the translations of the Hebrew Bible, but not for the difference between the Synoptics and the FG.

---

Karl Rupprecht has contributed two related articles: "Παρομία"¹ and "Paroimiographoi."² In the first article he discussed the etymology of παρομία and the origin of proverbs. He arranged Greek proverbs according to inner forms and external forms. The worldview in the proverbs was described and the world of proverbs was portrayed. He arranged proverbs according to their contents: historical proverbs and proverbs based on the characteristics of animals, plants, and inorganic material. He also mentioned four elements which symbolize important feelings and ideas of the ancient Greek people--namely, earth, fire, wind, and water. In the discussion he presented a great number of Greek proverbs as illustrations. This article remains a thesaurus of Greek proverbs.

The second article deals with the collectors of proverbs and their collections. Rupprecht did not mention the Book of Proverbs in the Old Testament because he dealt only with Greek and Roman proverbs.

James Kelso contributed a survey article.³ He described the chief characteristics of proverbial sayings, and he posed two possible origins: popular proverbial sayings and literary proverb or gnome. He also discussed

---

¹PRECA, s.v. "Παρομία," by Karl Rupprecht.
²PRECA, s.v. "Paroimiographoi," by Karl Rupprecht.
metrical forms and the occurrences of proverbs in Greek society.

Herman L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck's commentaries on the gospels contain about 150 rabbinic proverbs,¹ but they do not seem to be directly related to the παρομία of the FG.

Friedrich Hauck contributed an article entitled "Παρομία"² in which he has two sections: (1) The Word outside the New Testament, and (2) The New Testament. He summarized the understanding of παρομία by the Greeks, discussed the Hebrew term בַשָר, and observed that Philo often used παρομία for "proverb." He observed that the use of the term in 2 Pet 2:22 is for a proverb. However, He also noticed a proverb in Luke labeled as παραβολή.

For the Johannine παρομία Hauck said that it "occurs 3 times at 10:6 and 16:25, 29."³ Actually it occurs twice in 16:25, thus making four times altogether. He considered it to mean "hidden, obscure speech" which stands in need of interpretation. He understood "all Jesus' words up to the Parting Discourses as obscure speech which can only

¹Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Oskar Beck, 1922); see under "Sprichwörter" in the index of volume 4.


³Ibid., 856.
imperfectly indicate supraterrestrial truth in human words."¹ This article can give us a good starting point, but Hauck did not analyze the Johannine παρομία sufficiently to show its characteristics. He did not directly compare the use of παρομία in the Greek literature with the Johannine παρομία.

Herbert Leroy finished his Inauguraldissertation in 1967.² This work is closely related to my topic, but it does not deal with the Johannine παρομία per se; instead it investigates the misunderstandings. His study has three parts: the form of riddle, the Johannine misunderstandings, and the hidden riddle. He listed eleven Johannine misunderstandings.³ Raymond Brown summarized the conclusions of this study:

After a study of the riddle in varied cultures and literatures, Leroy decides that from the viewpoint of form criticism Johannine misunderstanding is a type of riddle concealed in a dialogue. It is based on a twofold meaning whereby the words employed have a general meaning for outsiders, quite distinct from the special meaning they have for those on the inside, "in the know."⁴

¹Ibid.
³They are dealt with in the following order: (1) 7:33-36; 8:21f; (2) 8:31-33; (3) 8:51-53; (4) 8:56-58; (5) 4:10-15; (6) 6:32-35, 41f; (7) 6:51-53; (8) 3:3-5; (9) 2:19-22; (10) 4:31-34.
Due to his assumptions Leroy did not deal with all the scenes of Johannine misunderstanding in his study.\textsuperscript{1} His aim seems to lie in his expectation to see the Sitz im Leben of the church when the FG was composed. He believed that from an analysis of these misunderstandings he could draw the picture of a gnosticizing Johannine community.

Carl Heinz Peisker in his article "\textit{Paroimia}" traced the occurrences of this term in the Greek literature briefly, and then he considered \textit{paroimia} in the LXX.\textsuperscript{2} He also mentioned Philo and the popularity of proverbs among the rabbis. He thought it striking that many sayings of Jesus that can be classified as proverbs are not designated as such. He believed that it is only in the FG that \textit{paroimia} occurs in the sense of dark saying, or riddle.

Kim E. Dewey has written an article closely related to my topic.\textsuperscript{3} He discussed the Johannine use of \textit{paroimia} and made a list of thirty-four \textit{paroimiai}. He followed Bultmann and Brown in accepting that the use of \textit{paroimia} in 16:25, 29 was "to be a reference not merely to the immediately

\textsuperscript{1}All his misunderstandings are isolated from chapters 2-8, while we see two scenes of misunderstanding or failed understanding in 10:6 and 16:17-20. Since in both places the cause of failure seems to be the \textit{paroimia} (apparently so in 10:6), the study of the Johannine concept of misunderstanding is a crucial part of this search.


preceding verses, but to all the words of Jesus in the Gospel."¹ He also believed that John's use of the term παρομία "embraces a range of literary forms, devices, and concepts, including riddle, proverb, parable, metaphor, allegory, irony, paradox, enigma, aporia, and so on."² By this statement he has presented παρομία as one of the most important words in the Gospel. He included almost every verse in the Gospel in this category of παρομία. Dewey believed that the use of the proverb is "with little risk of being misunderstood." His definition of proverb defies its inclusion in John's use of the term,³ because wherever παρομία is used, there is misunderstanding. His article is useful in indicating the probable existence of a list of Johannine παρομία. Also it focussed attention on the significant role of παρομία in the FG.

D. A. Carson has written an article on the Johannine misunderstandings.⁴ He suggested sixty-four misunderstandings in the FG. R. Alan Culpepper discussed the Johannine misunderstandings in the sixth chapter of his

¹Ibid., 82.
²Ibid.
³She says (91), "The proverb is a sanctioned vehicle for expressing one's thoughts and intentions, without fear of public censure and with little risk of being misunderstood."
book,¹ providing a short survey of literature on the topic. He suggested that there are eighteen Johannine misunderstandings² and a number of variations of misunderstanding.³ Then he described how they function in the Gospel. It is not clear how he related the Johannine misunderstandings to παρομία. He did not discuss the παρομία explicitly, but some misunderstandings were caused by them.

Linda Bridges⁴ studied the aphorisms in the FG. Aphorisms are closely related to proverbs, but they are not equivalent. She observed that "the aphorism was a highly polished rhetorical skill and literary technique developed by every good young Greek pupil."⁵ She followed Leo Perdue in asserting that "the aphorism tends to shock and disorient; the proverb, however, attempts to sustain the traditional world view."⁶ She added, "Although the external forms may appear similar, the proverb and the

² Ibid., 161, 162. He provides a list of them.
³ Ibid., 160, 161.
⁵ Ibid., 21.
⁶ Ibid., 25.
aphorism evoke different responses in readers."¹ The list of twenty-six Johannine aphorisms is given.

Methodology

The method of defining the meaning of the term and its function in the gospel must be a complex one. It entails philological and exegetical operations. Therefore it seems proper to explain the methodology by way of describing the chapters about to be presented.

In chapter 1 I first discuss the definition of the term as it was used before the FG, reviewing lexica, dictionary articles, and monographs. Definitions given by the Greek authors or rhetoricians are then discussed. Since they do not give a unified view, it is necessary to embark on a philological investigation of παρομία in the Greek literature, utilizing a search for occurrences of the word by means of the TLG on CDROM to compile a collection of παρομία before the FG. Based on the analysis of this collection, I attempt to define the term.

Greek writers after the second century A.D. have been excluded because we are neither interested to see how John's use of παρομία affected the subsequent writers in Greek in the way they used the term nor are we focusing on the way it was interpreted by later expositors, but how it came to be used in the FG. Jewish and Christian writers in

¹Ibid.
the first and second centuries A.D. are examined to see how near-contemporaries understood the term.

Then I discuss the παρομία found in Hellenistic Judaism and also discuss Hebrew terms הלחם and הלחם, which the term translates. The purpose of this section is to see whether the term suffered any semantic shift by the use of translators and writers. This chapter is a philological background study for the Johannine παρομία.

Chapters 2 and 3 discuss two passages of the FG, namely, 16:4b-33 and 10:1-5, which include all four occurrences of the term in the FG. This attempt requires a careful exegesis of the passages. My goal in this effort is to pick up what are referred to by παρομία in each passage and to categorize them by literary or oral form. The results need to be compared among themselves to find any common characteristics between them; these characteristics may then help to locate any other Johannine παρομία in the Gospel.

In chapter 4 the result of the above investigation is applied to the whole Gospel to see whether it is possible

---

1 In the LXX παραβολή frequently translates the Hebrew noun הלחם. The LXX translates הלחם by αἰνημα four times, but by προβλημα in Judg 14:12-20; Pss 49:5; 78:2; Dan 8:23 and Hab 2:6. In Ezek 17:2 it is represented by διηθμα. Παρομία translates הלחם in Sir 8:8; it translates הלחם in 6:35 and 47:17. For Sir 18:29 and 39:3 we do not have Hebrew text.

2 There is a reason behind the order of these two passages. The passage of 16:4b-33 has three occurrences out of four. It has more to say about παρομία. Its importance commands priority.
to find any other παρομία, which are not explicitly so labeled. I collect παρομία using the identifying marks indicated by the previous chapters. A brief discussion of the function of the Johannine παρομία follows. The result, it is hoped, will be that our knowledge of the Johannine παρομία will be brought into clear focus. Some suggestions follow to answer the question of relationship between the Synoptic παραβολή and Johannine παρομία.
CHAPTER I

ΠΑΡΟΙΜΙΑ IN GREEK LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter is a philological study of the background of the Johannine term παροιμία. I studied both ancient Greek literature and secondary sources to discover how παροιμία is employed and understood by various writers. One asks a question: What does the term παροιμία mean in the classical and the Hellenistic Greek literature and in Hellenistic Judaism? This question can be paraphrased thus: To what literary form(s) does the literary phenomenon of the Greek παροιμία belong?

I first investigate various definitions of παροιμία in lexica, the secondary literature, and those given by the Greek authors themselves to see the meaning of the term and to determine the usage.

In the second main section I investigate how the term παροιμία was actually employed in the Classical and the Hellenistic literature. Παροιμία may often be translated as proverb,¹ for many proverbial sayings, along with others,

¹There are other Greek words which designate proverbs: for example, ὁ λόγος, τὸ λεγόμενον, ὁ αἰνος, ὁ ἔπος. Herbert Pierrepont Houghton, Moral Significance of Animals as Indicated in Greek Proverbs (Amherst: Carpenter &
were labeled as παρομία. However, many other proverbial sayings in the same literature are not so labeled. Since the problem of the Johannine παρομία arose with the particular use of the term, I focus only on the materials which are so labeled in Greek literature. Paul Martin suggested a wider scope of collection, in which old sayings were collected. The common denominator among them is 'old'. His scope is narrower than what is widely accepted among scholars. Nevertheless, his scope is not helpful for this study because he collected proverbs, not παρομία. Our interest is not in the Greek proverbs as such, but in what is actually called παρομία. I collected the παρομία, then analyzed them in order to discover what literary form(s) they should be assigned to.

Morehouse, 1915), 3-4, comments on the terms of αίνος, λόγος, μύθος, and παρομία. According to Richard Volkmann, Die Rhetoric der Griechen und Römer in systematischer Übersicht (Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1885), 417, παρομία is the last of 38 τροπι mentioned by Trypho.

1 One problem that needs to be dealt with is that the Johannine παρομία were misunderstood or not understood by the audience, while other παρομία before the FG were well understood.

2 This is the method mentioned in Erich von Prittwitz-Gaffron, Das Sprichwort im griechischen Epigramm (Munich: Giessen, 1911), 3, who employed it to collect genuine proverbs.

3 Paul Martin, Studien auf dem Gebiete des griechischen Sprichwortes (Ostern: F. E. Neupert, 1889), 4. He observed as the marks of genuine proverbs the following designations in the writings of Plato: παλαι, την ἀρχαῖαν παρομίαν, παλαιά παρομία, την παλαιάν παρομίαν, την παρομίαν την παλαιάν. Actually he distinguished between the old and new proverbs.
In the third main section, I examine how the Jews adopted the Greek terms for their translation of the Hebrew words 𐤋𐤀𐤌 and 𐤀𐤋𐤌 in the LXX. The Jewish writers who wrote in Greek are investigated to see how they employed the Greek term παρομια in their writings.

Christian patristic writers do not constitute a helpful resource for this study. Barnabas used only παραβολη, as did Hermas. Justin, who wrote in the middle of the second century A.D., provides not a single case of the use of παρομια. A number of Greek Church Fathers used the term παρομια, but employed both παρομια and παραβολη without attempting to distinguish one from the other. Furthermore they do not explain why and how John came to use this term in the Gospel. Their use of the term was definitely influenced by the Johannine παρομια; further investigation of the usage in their writings can be another subject, which may be developed apart from this dissertation.

Various Approaches to Παρομια

In this section I survey different views of the παρομια. First, I look at the lexica to see what possible meanings are listed under the term παρομια and investigate the secondary literature to see how modern scholars have

---

1 L. Bieler, "Die Namen des Sprichworts in den klassischen Sprachen," Rheinisches Museum 85 (1936), 241. He said: "It is significant that the Church Fathers took John and the Book of Proverbs as the starting point when they explained about proverbs, and also Byzantine lexica occasionally refer to them."
understood it. Then, a review of the ancient Greek writers' own definitions of the term follows. This investigation is particularly interested in the definitions of παρομία made before the FG.

Lexica

The etymology of the Greek word παρομία is not clear semantically, whether it is an abstraction of πάρομος or παρ' οίμον (way, road), οίμην (song, saying). It probably came from the notion that it is said along the way. In this context it means by-word. For this study an etymological search is not profitable.

We turn to three lexica: those of Henrico Stephano, Henry G. Liddell and Robert Scott, and G. W. H. Lampe. Stephano listed Proverbium, Adagium, and Vulgare dictum as meanings for the term. The references he made to the definitions of different authors are considered in the last part of this section. He explained that αίνος represents story, fable, and saying; and παρομία represents proverb, riddle, decree, and resolution.


2See Henrico Stephano, Thesaurus Graecae Linguae (Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), 7:533. He tends to depend upon the writers who came after the period of present study.
Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott have listed several meanings in three lines:

1. proverb, maxim, saw;
2. figure, comparison based on John 10:6; and
3. digression, incidental remark.

Although Lampe is limited to the literature after the FG, it is well to note how he dealt with the term. He understood that παρομία meant proverb or saying and then described its etymology. He listed five different aspects of proverb:

1. straightforward moral observation;
2. popular saying in cryptic form;
3. idiom;
4. parable, or dark saying, with emphasis on its obscurity, a meaning based on the Johannine παρομία; and

The first usage is scarcely found in classical and Hellenistic literature, rather having a more Christian background. The fourth usage definitely reflects Johannine influence. The fifth is apparently derived from the

---

3. Examples were given: "For this same παρομία is remembered saying 'from iniquities sprang out the trespass'; "about the παρομία that it is necessary for the friends to share with the least."
4. According to the so-called παρομία, ὅν τοῦ σκαλιτί, Marcellus called pagan proverbs thus.
5. The formula "λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν" often signals an idiom.
Septuagint. The second and third usages seem to remain valid for our discussion.

Articles on Παρομία

There are many articles about the proverbs, but articles on the word Παρομία are rare. The scholars who attempted to define Παρομία always began their study with the idea of proverbs in mind. Karl Rupprecht devoted his whole article of Παρομία to proverbs. He talked about the world of proverbs: history, animals, plants, and inorganic nature.

Friedrich Hauck described Παρομία outside the New Testament in these words:

The word Παρομία expresses by construction an essential aspect of the "proverb." It is not used independently, but is a sentence accompanying (παρά), amplifying or summing up what is said (cf. Lat. adagio, Eng. "by-word"). Of the essence of the proverb, too, is that it should be of popular derivation, ancient and widespread. It states an experienced truth of popular wisdom in short and pointed form. Since it embodies a generally recognized truth, it serves as a cogent argument or provides easy popular orientation in dubious cases.

Geoffrey W. Bromiley's translation of the subject of the second sentence quoted above is not precise. The normal

---

1Rupprecht, "Παρομία," 36.3:1729-34.

2Ibid., 1730. He believed that historical proverbs are characterized as political conditions of a particular time and are related to unique historical facts, military expeditions, battles, wars, the siege of a castle, or the names of particular men and nations.

3Hauck, 845. In the German edition it is in 5:852.
English use of "It" refers to the subject of the preceding sentence, but German construction indicates that "It" should refer to "proverb [Sprichwort]" instead. Hauck did not deal with the broad semantic range of the term in Greek literature. He apparently began with the definition of the German or Greek proverbs. In German literature there is a distinct genre of Sprichwort, while in Greek literature παρομία does not seem to be limited to proverbs.

In Hauck's second sentence he speaks only of "a sentence," while the Greek παρομία can be a sentence, a phrase, or even a single word. So his failure to relate to these Greek phenomena indirectly reveals that he tried to impose the general concept of the proverb on the Greek παρομία.

Contrary to his views, a παρομία might not present an experienced truth of popular wisdom and may simply be an incidental reference to certain incidents or accidents. In short, his approach was not been established upon close investigation of Greek literature, but rather on secondary literature on the Greek proverb.

James A. Kelso's article is not specifically limited to Greek proverbs, but he gave useful information about them. He listed four chief characteristics of proverbial

---

1 It is not Es but Dasselbe.
2 Hauck, 845.
sayings: brevity or conciseness, sense, piquancy or salt, and popularity.\textsuperscript{1} Kelso observed:

Proverbs abound in certain figures of speech which add to their impressiveness. The two most characteristic of these figures are hyperbole and paradox. . . . More than this, proverbs and gnomic literature were two of the seed-plots of Greek philosophy.\textsuperscript{2}

He suggested two origins of proverbs: popular proverbial saying and literary proverb, or gnome, which is the product of reflection such as the ones in the Book of Proverbs. Apart from these articles, four other authors are worthy of mention: Richard C. Trench, Wilhelm von Christ, Richard Volkmann, and William A. Beardslee.

Trench observed:

The infinite multitude of slight and fine allusions to the legends of their gods and heroes, to the earlier incidents of their own history, the Homeric narrative, the delicate side glances at all these which the Greek proverbs constantly embody, assume an acquaintance, indeed a familiarity, with all this on their part among whom they passed current, which almost exceeds belief.\textsuperscript{3}

Von Christ sees the affinity between the proverb and riddle in that both are used to epitomize the wisdom of life in short and elegant forms,\textsuperscript{4} but it is clear that παρομία is not used for riddles. Riddle has its own terms: παίγνια, αἰνημα, and γρίφος.

\textsuperscript{1}Kelso, "Proverb," ERE, 10:412-415.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., 413-4.

\textsuperscript{3}Trench, 55.

Volkmann observed that in spite of their outdatedness, proverbs had great authority. In the time of the latter Sophists, the previous collections of proverbs were frequently used for rhetorical purposes.¹

Beardslee asserted that Plutarch's maxims and proverbs are, in the first place, rhetorical and decorative, enlivening the presentation of an essay or narrative.² A large number of them bring to expression an ironic awareness of the precariousness of existence.³ He quoted Aristotle to prove what Plutarch tried to accomplish. Aristotle placed proverbs and maxims under the heading of persuasive speech. He urged the insertion of popular maxims into argument, even if they did not possess strict logic because they would be easily believed.⁴ Popular proverbial wisdom is scattered and incidental in his writings.⁵ For him the popular proverb belonged to a less sophisticated level of literary achievement.⁶ Most of Plutarch's proverbs are simple statements.⁷ The discussions of παρομία by these

¹Volkmann, 238-9.
³Ibid.
⁵Beardslee, 105.
⁶Ibid., 106.
⁷Ibid.
article writers do not give a direction to the definition of παρομία.

Monographs on the Greek Proverbs

Martin believed that we do not have a perfect definition of παρομία in the Classical period of ancient Greece.¹ He noticed the intention of secrecy on the part of the speaker when he used a proverb.²

He observed that Aristotle defined παρομία as old philosophy and also noted that Aristotle used the term to designate the saying "Ἀττικὸς παροικος," which did not belong to the old philosophy, but to the recent past. Therefore, as a solution, he suggested that the particular group of παρομία which was attributed to the former times should be identified as the genuine proverb.³

He warned that if one based the rule of determining a proverb on the time element, one would face another problem, for then what was a proverb to Plutarch may not have been a proverb to Plato or Aristotle.⁴ He also

¹Martin, Studien, 1.
²Ibid. This idea appears to be foreign to the characteristics of the παρομία before the FG. Still it is understandable because he did not limit his search to the literature before the FG. Also Kim Dewey's definition of proverb eliminates cryptic or hidden elements; see above p. 10, n. 3.
³Ibid., 4.
⁴Ibid., 5.
mentioned, in this vein, that Apostolius\(^1\) and Arsenius\(^2\) included about eighty Homeric sentences in the list of \(\text{παρομια} \).\(^3\) He aptly noted that as proverbs grow old they tend to become shorter.\(^4\) He rightly showed that ‘proverb’ can translate \(\text{παρομια} \), but not always. He classified proverbs as (1) historical, geographical, (2) animal and plant, (3) mythological, in which gods or demigods are mentioned.\(^5\) All this discussion, however, was based more or less on the definition of the German term \textit{Sprichwort}.

P. Raphael Sollert introduces the proverbs of Synesius,\(^6\) who lived between the fourth and fifth century A.D. He classified the collection of Synesius' proverbs as:\(^7\) (1) proverbs from mythology, (2) proverbs from mythology, (3) proverbs introduced with \(\text{παλαιος λογος} \), (4) proverbs introduced with \(\text{λεγομενον} \), (5) proverbs introduced with \(\text{φασιν} \), and others (including \(\text{φασιν} \)) are not genuine proverbs, but quotations or maxims. Sollert, 10-12.

\(^1\)Paroimiographer, who lived in the 15th century A.D. He is the father of Arsenius.

\(^2\)Paroimiographer, who lived in the 15th and 16th centuries A.D.

\(^3\)Ibid.

\(^4\)Ibid., 7.

\(^5\)Ibid., 9.


\(^7\)Actually Synesius included the following in the category of proverbs: (1) those referred to by \(\text{παρομια} \); (2) those introduced with \(\text{φασιν} \); and (3) those introduced by \(\text{λεγομενον} \), \(\text{παλαιος λογος} \), \(\text{κοινη λεγεται} \), \(\text{παλαιος λογος} \). Sollert thought that from the Synesius' collection of proverbs those introduced by \(\text{παλαιος λογος} \), \(\text{λεγομενον} \), and others (including \(\text{φασιν} \)) are not genuine proverbs, but quotations or maxims. Sollert, 10-12.
(2) historical-geographical proverbs, (3) proverbs from the realm of nature, (4) proverbs of general content, (5) proverbial formulas, and (6) maxims and idioms. These classifications are almost identical to Martin's, except that points 5 and 6 are added.

Erich von Prittwitz-Graffron, in his Inaugural-Dissertation, contradicted Martin and Sollett, deeming it inadvisable to classify παρομικα according to mythology, history, geography, human life, organic or inorganic nature. He recognized the fact that in the Greek proverb-collection much non-proverbial material had been included. He pointed out that Apostolius and Arsenius included (1) metaphorical expressions, (2) word-play, (3) satire, (4) idiomatic expressions, and (5) quotations in the circle of proverbs. These five are additional to the genuine proverbs. He rejected an attempt by C. Prantl, who included as genuine proverbs only those labeled expressly as παρομικα by the ancient writers and the commentators.

Herbert P. Houghton believed that παρομικα should be distinct from the folklore forms such as αινος, λογος, μυθος, and yet it is often a product or an offshoot of some or all of these genres. This testifies to the fact that παρομικα is a loose term that can include various kinds of literary genres. The ancients defined the meaning of παρομικα quite loosely.

1von Prittwitz-Gaffron, 2.
2This testifies to the fact that παρομικα is a loose term that can include various kinds of literary genres. The ancients defined the meaning of παρομικα quite loosely.
3Ibid., 3.
4Ibid.
of them.¹ He observed that it is the generic term for proverb, maxim, or adage.²

All these scholars agreed that παρομία represents a proverb. They also noticed that not only proverbs, but also maxims and idiomatic expressions and others are included in the term παρομία. We need to give attention to the witness of the Greek authors themselves to see how they viewed it.

Some Definitions by Greek Authors

A number of different definitions of παρομία are given in Greek literature. I quote from Stephano five authors:³

1. Caesarius: Proverbs are profitable sayings in life; they conceal much usefulness in them.⁴

2. Eustathius (twelfth century A.D.): A story and a proverb are different. The fable is a story drawn from animals or plants for the purpose of admonishing human beings. Eustathius defines a fable as an unfolded proverb.⁵ Therefore, a proverb should more naturally be defined as a compressed fable, in like manner as a metaphor is an implied or compressed simile. If the fable is the

---

¹Houghton, 4.
²Ibid.
³Stephano, 7:533.
⁴Caesarius Homilia in Proverbs of Solomon 454.
seedbed of the proverb, then as the simile exists before the metaphor, so the fable is older than the proverb.

3. The rhetorician Demetrius (first century B.C. to first century A.D.) commented that "If graceful things are taken from a proverb for practical use, it is because proverbs, by nature, are beautiful things."¹

4. Basil (fifth century A.D.), when he commented on the proverbs of Solomon, defined παρομια to be:

The name imposed upon the most popular sayings from outside and upon the things said on the way by many, for the way is called οδύς, whence it limits the proverb, wayside saying reared up in the use of many and it is possible to be received likewise by a few with more than a meaning.²

5. The lexicographer Hesychius (fifth century A.D.), referring to the proverbs of Solomon, commented: "Proverb is a profitable word, said on the way, which is byroad, for the road is οδύς."  

Except for Demetrius, all are later than John. Demetrius' definition does not give any direction, and Basil's comment is not relevant because he deals with the proverbs of Solomon. The common denominator of these definitions is that proverbs are useful.

¹De elocutione 156.
²Basil Homilia in principium proverbiorum 31.388.24-25.
We may note some other comments. On a number of occasions, Aristotle commented on παρομοία: "The παρομοία are the remnants of old philosophy"; "proverbs, again, are metaphors from one species to another"; "some proverbs are also maxims." 

The grammarian Tryphon gave a precise description of a proverb:

Proverb is a saying said in the beginning about something else, now being said by us according to a circumlocution about something of similarity, as with Sappho, "It is not honey to me, nor honey-bee." 

1George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), 289, says, "Aristotle uses the word of style (στυλον) in a general sense. Without calling them figures or tropes or anything else, he discusses similes, proverbs, and hyperbole (1412a 34ff.) as subdivisions of metaphor, and what were later called Gorgianic figure he touches upon in discussing the period (1410a 24ff.)."

2Aristotle Fragmenta 1474b.5. "Proverbs are the fragments of the old philosophy of the dead magistrates, that have managed to escape destruction because of their brevity and cleverness."

3Aristotle Rhetorica 1413a.14. Here their drawing of the special out of the common is implied. A short and proper explanation by J. G. Herder has been quoted in Eugen Geissler, Beiträge zur Geschichte des griechischen Sprichwortes (Breslau: Druck von R. Nischkowsky, 1908), 3, 4: "Jede Anwendung eines Sprichwortes will einen neuen Fall: dieser muss übersehen und in allen Umständen erkannt werden. Eben die genaue Anwendung auf den gegebenen Fall, die Verknüpfung des Allgemeinen und des Besondern, sie macht die Kunst des Sprechenden aus."

4Rhetorica II.xxi.13. The proverb "An Attic neighbor" is given for an example.

5Tryphon Παράστασις 206. Tryphon lived in the first century B.C.
Accordingly certain παρομία mean different things from situation to situation.

Suidas defined: "The παρομία is a hidden saying which attempts to deliver a message by way of other manifest things."¹ Apostolius defined: "Παρομία is a brief tale (διηγμα), a saying honed by the use of many people."² He pointed out shortness, popularity, and refinement as the characteristics of proverbs. Again Apostolius commented:

Proverbs are profitable sayings in life, they conceal much usefulness in them, the hortatory sayings which are used for all the paths in life.³

Age, metaphorical element, beauty, and development of significance are the characteristics given as definitions in the literature prior to the FG. Characteristics of popular sayings, hidden sayings, compressed fables, brief tales, profitable sayings, hortatory sayings are mentioned by the writers after the FG. Because the suggestions given by the Classical scholars and the Greek writers do not give a consistent definition, we need to seek the definition by making a collection of παρομίαι and analyzing them.

¹Suidas lived in the 10th century A.D. Hauck, 854, footnote 4, believed that probably Suidas had been influenced by the Johannine usage. Hauck made a mistake by stating that Hesychius, who lived in the fifth century A.D., might have been dependent on Suidas.

²Apostolius Συνογωγή Παρομίων κατ Συνθηκη Praef.4. (CPG, II, 234 f.).

³Ibid.
In the first section it was seen that many varied definitions were given by modern scholars and ancient Greek writers. The most common definition among them is παρομία as proverb. Every study of παρομία was done only to investigate Greek proverbs. Accordingly justice was not done to the use of the term παρομία. In addition, studies were done without giving due attention to the role of Johannine use of the term, which may have rendered a significant shift in the semantics of the term. This requires a study of the use of the term before the FG. No attempt to grasp παρομία in the literature before the Gospel of John had yet been made. Therefore it is necessary to collect and analyze παρομία before the FG.

The Collection of Greek Παρομία

Collections of Greek παρομία were published by E. L. Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewin in 1839.¹ These collections

¹E. L. Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewin, Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1839, (CPG) presents several collections of Greek παρομία. In the first volume we find: (1) Zenobius' 552 proverbs, which were compiled in the second century A.D.; (2) Diogenianus' 784 proverbs, which were compiled in the second century A.D.; (3) Plutarch's 183 proverbs used by the Alexandrians, which were collected between the first and second centuries A.D.; (4) Gregory of Cyprus' 307 proverbs, which were compiled in the thirteenth century A.D. And in the second volume we find: (5) Diogenianus' 300 proverbs, which were compiled in the second A.D.; (6) Gregory Cyprus' other edition of 243 proverbs; (7) Macarius' 796 proverbs, which were collected in the fourteenth century A.D.; (8) Aesop's 17 proverbs; (9) About 1800 proverbs of a collection by Apostolius and Arsenius, which were compiled in the
by several paroemiographers share a great number of παρομία with each other. Each παρομία in the collections is presented along with two kinds of comments: application and provenance. This pattern is not found consistently in the collections—sometimes only the application is included; other times only the provenance is found. Still other times there is no comment. The collections serve as commentaries on the sayings.

The παρομία in these collections are not helpful for our purpose because they do not show us how they work in the original context. It is not clear if they were labeled as παρομία in the original literature. The principles of fifteenth and sixteenth centuries A.D.; (10) and 251 proverbs of Mantissa, whose date is uncertain. Each of them arranges the παρομία in alphabetical order. The question remains whether all of them were designated as παρομία in the text from which they were taken. I have made an interesting observation in the first volume: many proverbs lack a verb. Among 552 of Zenobius' proverbs only 224 have a verb; 328 do not have one. Among 784 of Diogenianus' proverbs only 318 have a verb, but 466 do not have one. Among 183 of Plutarch's proverbs only 90 have a verb, and 93 do not have one. Among 307 of Gregorius' proverbs only 181 have a verb, but 126 do not have one.

All of these collections were made after the first century A.D. There are other collections of proverbs prior to these—for example, collections by Aristotle, the Peripatetic Clearchus of Soli, the Stoic Chrysippus, and Theophrastus. These collections were made for the purposes of philosophy. In the Alexandrian age collections for literary purposes began to be made by such writers as the antiquarian Demon, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Didymus, and Lucillus of Tarrha. The later sophistic movement led to a great demand for the proverb as an ornament of style, as may be seen, for example, in the works of Lucian and Libanius. Cf. Walter Manoel Edwards, "Paroemiographers," in The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 784, for the origin of Corpus Paroemiographorum.
inclusion for these collections are not given. Furthermore, they are too numerous to deal with. Many of them do not reveal the dates of origins. Therefore, it is necessary to make lists of παρομία under various Greek authors who employed them in their writings.

The reason for presenting all the παρομία in the Greek literature before the beginning of the second century A.D. is to see how the term was used. When it is decided what is referred to by it, then its form(s) can be identified or defined. Also, the purpose of the use of them can be known—whether to illuminate the point of discussion or to obscure it.¹ We could simply adduce a few examples to make the point that the authors consistently used παρομία to illuminate and persuade, but in order to show that there is no exception to this rule I present here all the sayings referred to by the term. The authors are arranged by century.

Using TLG² 199 Greek παρομία have been collected (with some repetitions). The scope of the search has been limited to the time before the beginning of the second century A.D. TLG catalogues nearly all the extant Greek

¹This particular question is based on the use of the term by John because it appears that the παρομία obscured the meaning in the FG.

writings before A.D. 600.\textsuperscript{1} It appears that the task of searching for Greek \textit{παρομία} using this device gives a substantial number of \textit{παρομία}, which constitute a reliable basis for the sound analysis of the Greek \textit{παρομία}. Detailed analyses of forms and contents have been set aside because they are not relevant to the objectives. Comments on the contents of \textit{παρομία} are occasional. The English translations are listed in the text, and the Greek originals in the footnotes.

\textbf{Iccus Philosophus}

1. The supper of \textit{\textenquote{Iccus}}.\textsuperscript{2}

This is a two-word \textit{παρομία}. It does not constitute a sentence, but is an idiomatic expression.

\textbf{Aesop}

2. \textit{\"Without brass Phoebus does not prophesy the strength,\" he means this of good qualities}.\textsuperscript{3}

\textsuperscript{1}Luci Berkowitz and Karl A. Squitier, \textit{Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works} (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), x.

\textsuperscript{2}Iccus Testimonia 2.10. \textit{τὸ δεῖπνον Ἰκκοῦ}. In Testimonia 3.1 we find \textit{Ἰκκοῦ δεῖπνον}. This proverb is about the poverty of Iccus. It is applied to his simple dinners. Iccus lived in the sixth century B.C. Translation mine.

\textsuperscript{3}Ἀνέν χαλκοῦ Φοῖβος οὐ μαντεύεται τὴν ἵσχυν τούτο σημαίνει τῶν ὀπισθών. Aesop lived in the sixth century B.C. All these proverbs are found in \textit{Paroemiae}. No further references will be given for them. All the translations in this section are mine. Houghton, 5, comments on this list of 17 that they \"are styled proverbs of Aesop; they are listed by the editors without comment; they were probably derived from some paraphrase of the fables made in the early Middle Ages.\"
3. Whence thence woes, by which evil surrounds him.¹

4. The lame will be running, the unseen will be seen.²

5. Seeking to carve Hermes he carved Cercops.³

6. Either Zeus or Charon, either happy life or end.⁴

7. I hate a long delayed hope.⁵

8. He who is near the god (Zeus) is near the thunderbolt.⁶

9. Anyone who endures time did not step out curved.⁷

10. Is there any place where Artemis does not dance?⁸

11. To weave a rope of sands.⁹

12. Say well-rounded, so that it might be much talked of.¹⁰

13. Even a sheep bites the unfortunate.¹¹

---

¹Ἐνθὲν ἐκείθεν οὐκαὶ, οἷς περιστοιχίζεται κακά.
²Εσται καὶ χαλῶν δρόμος τὸ ἄδηλον δηλοὶ.
³Ζητῶν Ἑρμῆν γλύφα Κέρκοπα ἐγλυφά.
⁴Ἡ Ζεὺς ἢ Χάρων ἢ εὐδαίμονος βίος ἢ τέλος.
⁵Μακρὰς ἐλπίδας μισῶ.
⁶Ὁ ἐγγος Διὸς, ἐγγὺς κεραυνοῦ.
⁷Οὐδεὶς καταράκας ἐξέβη κυρτός.
⁸Ποῦ γὰρ ἢ Ἀρτεμίς οὐκ ἔχορευσεν;
⁹Εξ ἐμοῦ σχοινίων πλέκειν.
¹⁰Στρογγύλα λέγε, ίνα καὶ κυλίτηται.
¹¹Τὸν ἀτυχή καὶ πρόβατον δάκνει.
14. Whom the Fortune abuses, she finds whips for all cases.¹

15. What are left behind are conquered.²

16. Let a lion eat me up, not a fox.³

17. Let it fail and revile me.⁴

18. Because of this Histiaeus indeed stitched together the sandal, but Aristagoras escaped.⁵

We find a three-word παρομια, two four-word, four five-word, three six-word, a seven-word, two nine-word, a ten-word, and an eleven-word παρομια. Because all of them are found without context, I have not analyzed their purposes, origins, and functions. They are short indeed. Eleven out of eighteen have no more than seven words. A number of them do not have a proper verb.⁶ Five proverbs are found with personal names,⁷ which might hint of their origins, but without the knowledge of these personalities it is impossible to understand the proverbs. They were given to illuminate and to help the audience to understand better. Proverb number 6 gives an explanatory phrase to provide

¹Ον ἡ τύχη προσηλακίζει, καὶ πάνων πραγμάτων μάστιγας εὑρίσκει.
²Τὰ προλήματα νικήματα.
³Φαγέτω με λέων καὶ μῆ ἀλώπηξ.
⁴Δυστυχεῖτο καὶ λοιπορεῖτο με.
⁵Παρὰ τούτῳ τὸ ὑπόθημα ἐράσε τὸν Ἰστιαῖος, ὑπεδύσατο δ’ Ἄρισταγόρας.
⁶Numbers 6, 8, 11, 15.
⁷Numbers 2, 5, 6, 10, 18.
understanding, as does proverb number 2. The proverbs 13 and 14 seem to express the same idea. The meanings of 10 and 15 are quite obvious.

Epimenides Philosophus

19. The skin of Epimenides.\(^1\)

This idiomatic expression about stored things has no verb.

Empedocles Poeta et Philosophus

20. [We ought to repeat] twice and even three times that which is good.\(^2\)

The meaning of this maxim is obvious. It is advice to promote good things. It is also short--only five words. No intention to obscure is found.

Euripides

21. For without Fortune, a single effort does not distress mortal men.\(^3\)

\(^1\)Epimenides Testimonia 2.12. Τὸ Ἐπιμενίδειον δέρμα. Epimenides lived in the sixth century B.C. Translation mine.

\(^2\)Empedocles Fragmenta 25.3 (apud Plato Gorgias 498 E). In Hermann Diels and Walther Kranz, Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker, 3 vols. 6th ed. (Berlin: Weidmann, 1951; repr., Dublin: 1966), 1:276-307. See number 44, also found in Plato Philèbus 59. δίς καὶ τρὶς τὸ καλὸν. ἐπος is another Greek word he used to designate proverbs. Empedocles lived in the fifth century B.C. Translation mine.

\(^3\)Euripides Fragmenta 668 (apud Stobaeus Florilegium 29.36). In August Nauck, Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta (Leipzig: Teubner, 1889; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1964), 570. ἄνευ τυχῆς γὰρ πόνος μονοκλῆς σώκετ' ὁλίγυς βροτοῦς. We find only one use of παρομία in his 19 Tragedies and fragments. He lived in the fifth century B.C. Translation mine.
Sophocles

22. A foe's gifts are no gifts and profit not.¹
23. Indeed from little known, let man know.²

Both of these are very short—one with four words, the other with seven words. They were used to prove certain situations to be true in the light of the proverbs. No obscurity is created for the audience.

Plato

24. Any pig would know.³
25. Get a toss of the donkey.⁴
26. Well begun is half done.⁵
27. The knowledge of the beautiful things is difficult.⁶

¹ Sophocles Ajax 665. ἔχθρων ὄδωρα ὀδώρα κούκ ὁ-ήσιμα. His experience proves this proverb true. Sophocles lived in the fifth century B.C. Translation mine.


³ Plato Laches 196.d.9. ἀν πᾶσα ύς γνώι. All the translations of Plato are from the Loeb Classical Library (LCL). He lived in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.

⁴ Leges 701.c.7. ἀπὸ πνος ὁνο πεσείν.

⁵ Leges 753.e.6. ἀρχή ἡμείς παντός ἐργο.

⁶ Cratylus 384.a.8. χαλεπά τα καλά ἐστιν ὅπη ἐχα παθείν.
28. Beautiful things are difficult.¹
29. Like to like.²
30. It would be a long time before such a man would even take a city.³
31. Like their mistresses [they] become.⁴
32. Goods of friends that are common.⁵
33. Nothing too much.⁶
34. Fools get their lesson from the deed done.⁷
35. Human affairs are not what a man wishes but what he can.⁸
36. None that is evil shall know, but only he that has become experienced and practiced in virtuous habits.⁹

¹Hippias Major 304.e.8, Republica 435. χαλέπα τα καλά. It is introduced with a formula "old ἀριστομία." The attempt to find the use of this proverb before Plato using TLG fails. This is a shorter form of number 27.

²Republica 329.a.4. ἡμῖς ἀλλικα σέρπει. For number 64 I put "Mate delights mate," simply following the translator of that volume. But the Greek original is the same.

³Sophista 261.c.1. δι γε τοιούτος ἂν ποτε ἔλοι πάλιν.

⁴Republica 563.c.6. οἰσίπερ αἱ δέσποιναι γνωρίζουσι.

⁵Republica 424.a.1. κοινά τα φίλαν.

⁶Philebus 45.e.1. μηδὲν ἂγαν. Rhetorica II.xxi.13, Aristotle believes it to be the most popular saying, along with the saying "Know thyself."

⁷Symposium 222.b.7. νήπιον παθόντα γνώναι.

⁸Hippias Major 301.c.5. Οὐχ οία βουλεύεται τις, ἀλλ' οία δύναται.

⁹Leges 741.d.6. οὐδεὶς εἴσεται ποτὲ κακός ὡν, ἀλλ' ἐμπειρὸς τε καὶ ἐπεκτικὴς ἔθεσι γενόμενος.
37. Bards speak many lies.¹

38. If that pleases you, it does not displease me.²

39. Starting pottery on a wine-jar.³

40. Not even God will ever be seen fighting against Necessity.⁴

41. Beautiful is friendly.⁵

42. It is not easy to escape all the wrestler’s grips.⁶

43. We ought to repeat twice and even three times that which is good.⁷

44. And every man always commends a good beginning.⁸

Plato provides twenty-one examples of παρομία. They are very short. There is a two-word παρομία, five three-word παρομίαι, and four four-word παρομίαι. Eighteen proverbs

¹Jus 374.a.8. πολλὰ ψεύδονται ἄνδοι. See number 92. I do not find a precedential use of this saying in TLG.

²Theaetetus 162.c.1. σοι φίλον, οὐδ’ ἐμοὶ ἔχθρον.

³Laches 187.b.3. συμβαίνῃ ἐν πίθῳ ἢ καταμεία γιγνομένη.

⁴Leges 818.b.1. τὸ δὲ ἀναγκαῖον αὐτῶν σχὸν οἷον τε ἀποβάλλειν ἄλλ’ ἔουεν ὁ τὸν θεόν.

⁵Lysis 216.c.6. τὸ καλὸν φίλον εἶναι. We find an ἐπος in Theognis, Elegiae 1: ὅτι καλὸν, φίλον ἐστί, τὸ δ’ οὐ καλὸν οὐ φίλον ἔστι. He lived in the sixth century B.C. We find also in Euripides, Bacchae 881, 901: οὐ καλὸν φίλον ἂν.

⁶Sophista 231.c.5. τὸ τὰς ἀπάσας μὴ ῥάδιον εἶναι διωφεύγειν.

⁷Philebus 59.e.10. τὸ καὶ δις καὶ τρις τὸ γε καλῶς ἔχων ἔτανασσολεῖν. The shorter form is found in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. Cf. number 19 above. Plato lived in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., and he has a longer form.

⁸Leges 753.e.6. τὸ γε καλῶς ἀρξασθαι πάντες ἐγκαμιᾶζομεν.
out of twenty-one have no more than seven words. This shows that a παρομία is usually short.

The παρομία of numbers 25, 30, 34, 41, 42, 43, have only an infinitive. Copulas need to be supplied to understand 26, 28, 32. Only number 33 has no verb. We see therefore that παρομία can be in any form, either verbal or non-verbal.

Many παρομία epitomize what occurs often in life, reflecting certain regularities of existence. No personal and geographical names are found in this section. They were used for advice, description, orientation, and warning. They do not seem to deliver a clear message unless they were given in their contexts. Sometimes they make only allusions to longer fables or stories. One thing must be clear--they were not given to hinder the understanding of the audience, but were used to persuade the audience.

1Houghton, 4, comments that "the tendency to omit the copula is characteristic of pregnant sayings in Greek; when the definite article appears it usually has deictic force."

2Numbers 26, 35, 39, 42, and 43.

3Numbers 30 and 36.

4Numbers 29, 31, and 33.

5Numbers 34 and 37.

6Numbers 25 and 28.
Aristophanes Comicus

45. A scorpion lurks under every stone.¹

This is a four-word proverb. A copula needs to be supplied. It is a simple warning from desert life, which can be applied to any hidden danger.

Plato Comicus

46. The retail-dealer uses his wits.²

This is also a short, five-word proverb.

Demosthenes Orator

47. Do not see what you see, do not hear what you hear.³

48. Over the shadow of a donkey.⁴

The first one is a seven-word proverb. It is advice for Athenians, who inhabit the city naturally and generously, not to see what they see and not to hear what they hear when

¹Aristophanes Thesmophoriazusae 529. ὑπὸ παντὶ λίθῳ σκορπιῶ. It is used as a warning against Sophists. The poisonous nature of their teachings seems to be in focus. Aristophanes lived in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Translation mine.


³Demosthenes Orationes 25.89.4. ὅτανας μὴ ὅραν καὶ ἀκούοντας μὴ ἀκούειν. Demosthenes is of the fourth century B.C. The translations in this section are mine.

they face unfortunate things. The second one is a three-word idiom, sarcastically used for those ambitious about something that is not useful. It is apparent that they were not given to obscure the audience’s understanding.

**Antiphanes Comicus**

Antiphanes wrote an entire play called Παρωμία, a fragment of which can be found:

If I ate any of your order’s meat.
I should feel just as if I had to eat
Raw Mushrooms, or sour apples, or other types
Of provender that give a man the gripes.¹

It is not obvious whether the title Παρωμία indicates the presence of any proverb in the play.

**Aristotle**

49. Lybia is always producing something new.²

50. Shame remains long.³

51. Another Hercules, a second self.⁴


Antiphanes lived in the fourth century.

²Aristotle De generatione animalium 746b.7. ὁτι τῆς Λυβῆς τρεφούσης καινὸν. A similar form we find in Historia animalium 606b.19: ὁτι Λυβή φέρει τι καινὸν. "Always something fresh in Libya." Aristotle lived in the fourth century B.C. All the translations of this section are from LCL unless indicated otherwise.

³Rhetorica 1363a.6. αἰσχρὸν ταὶ δηρὸν τε μένειν. Translation mine.

⁴Ethica Eudemia 1245a.30. ἄλλος Ἡρακλῆς, ἄλλος αὐτος.
52. When the south wind begins.¹
53. Laserwort of lisper.²
54. The bull of Pythia conquered.³
55. A bull wanders about.⁴
56. Slave before slave, master before master.⁵
57. Friends will have all things common.⁶
58. Beast knows beast.⁷
59. In justice is every virtue comprehended.⁸

¹Problemata 943a.25. ἀρχομένου τε νότου. We find longer forms in Problemata 942b.1.: ἀρχομένου γε νότου καὶ λήγοντος βορέαο. "[Sail] when the South wind begins and when Boreas ceases his blowing," and in Problemata 945a.24: εὖ πλεῖν ἀρχομένου τε νότου καὶ λήγοντος βορέαο.


³Fragmenta varia 616 (apud Herodian π. μον. λέξ). In Rose, 388. Βοῦθος Πῦθα νικήσας. Translation mine.

⁴Fragmenta varia 616 (apud Hesychius lexicon), in Rose, 388. Βοῦθος περφοιτα. A proverb about the good and stupid people. Translation mine.

⁵Politica 1255b.29. δοῦλος πρὸ δοῦλου, δεσπότης πρὸ δεσπότου.


⁷Rhetorica 1371b.15. ἐγνω δὲ θὴρ θήρα.

⁸Ethica Nicomachea 1129b.29. ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνη συλλήβδην πᾶσι ἀρετῇ ἐν.
60. Men cannot know each other till they have 'eaten salt together.'

61. Glaucus, a helper is a friend so long as he fights.

62. Charity begins at home.

63. On account of Syloson's open space.

64. Mate delights mate.

65. Bringing it on himself as Caecias does clouds.

66. Nail knocks out nail.

67. The bushel of salt.

68. We have once more the man of Carpathus and his hare.

---

1 *Ethica Nicomachea* 1156b.25. γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰδήσαι ἀλλήλοις πρὶν τοὺς λεφτὸν τούς άλλας αὐτες καταλάβαι.

2 *Ethica Eudemia* 1236a.35. Γλαύκ' ἐπίκουρος ὁ πάρ τον σοφὸν φίλον ἐστὶν μάχης.

3 *Ethica Nicomachea* 1168b.8. γόνυ κνήμης ἔγγον. Literally, "The greave is near the knee."

4 *De divinatione per somnum* 44.574.2, 8, 45.611.188. ἑκατὸν Συλουσώντος εὐπνεοντος. Translation mine. See Strabo *Geographica* 14.638.

5 *Rhetorica* 1371b.15. ὑλῆς ἡλικία τέρπει. See number 29.


7 *Politica* 1314a.5 ὑλω γὰρ ὁ ὑλος.

8 *Ethica Eudemia* 1238a.2. ὁ μέδιμνος τῶν ἀλών.

9 *Rhetorica* 1413a.19. ὡς ὁ Καρπαθίως τῶν λαγώ.
69. As Philamon struggles with Corycus.¹
70. As always the same.²
71. A place where the stag sheds his horns.³
72. For the Callicrates.⁴
73. Friendship is equality.⁵
74. According to the glory for Priam.⁶
75. Jackdaw to jackdaw.⁷
76. They know more about the good masters.⁸
77. Corcyrean scourge.⁹
78. Insolence to wanton violence.¹⁰

¹Rhetorica 1413a.14. Ὄσπερ Φιλάμμων ζυγομαχῶν τῷ Κορύκῳ. Translation mine. Corycus is a promontory of Cilicia.
²Rhetorica 1371b.15. ὡς ἄει τὸν ὁμοϊόν. Translation mine.
³Historia animalium 611a.27. οὐ δὲ ἐλαφοὶ τὰ κέρατα ἀποβάλλονσιν.
⁴Fragmenta varia 462 (from Historica apud Zenobius 6.69), in Rose, 299. ὑπὲρ τὰ Καλλικράτων. Translation mine. It is a hyperbole for increase of wages.
⁵Ethica Nicomachea 1168b.8. ἰσότης φιλότης.
⁶Rhetorica 1363a.6. καὶ δὲ κεν εὐχαλὴν Πριάμῳ. Translation mine.
⁷Rhetorica 1371b.15. καὶ γὰρ κολοιῶς παρὰ κολοιῶν.
⁸De divinatione per somnum 44.586.10. καλλικουρίων πλείους. Translation mine. See Zenobius 4.54.
⁹Fragmenta varia 513 (from Historica apud Zenobius Παρασισίν 4.49), in Rose, 323. Κερκυραία μάστις.
¹⁰Fragmenta varia 57 (from Dialogi apud Stobaeus Florilegium 3.54), in Rose, 67. κόρος μὲν ὅβριν. Translation mine.
79. Misfortunes of destruction.¹

80. Never show an old man kindness.²

81. After the Lesbian song.³

82. A single soul.⁴

83. Mysian prey (easy prey).⁵

84. Fool, who slayeth the father and leaveth his sons to avenge him.⁶

85. When water chokes, what is one to wash it down with?⁷

86. There is no leisure for slaves.⁸

87. No one else has yet sacrificed the bull for the benefactor but Puria.⁹

¹Fragmenta varia 523 (from Historica apud Zenobius Παρομία 4.83), in Rose, 326. κυθωμαίας συμφοραί. Translation mine. A proverb of utter ruin. It is from the extirpation of the Cythians by Amphitryon.

²Rhetorica 1376a.2. μῆκτος εὐ ἐρδεῖν γέροντα.

³Fragmenta varia 545 (from Historica apud Hesychius; apud Zenobius Παρομία 5.9), in Rose, 336. μετὰ Λέσβιον φόδον. Translation mine.

⁴Ethica Nicomachea 1168b.7. μία ψυχή.

⁵Rhetorica 1372b.32. Μυσών λειαν.

⁶Rhetorica 1376a.2. νύμπας δὲ πατέρα κατάνα πατίδας καταλείπει.

⁷Ethica Nicomachea 1146a.34. ὅταν τὸ ύδωρ πνίγῃ, τι δεὶ ἐπτίπνειν.

⁸Politica 1334a.20. οὐ σχολὴ δούλοις.

⁹Fragmenta varia 505; 611.355 (from Historica apud Heraclias), in Rose, 318. οὐδείς [πάπυρος] ἐνεργεῖτα βοῦν ἔθουσαν ἀλλ' ἢ Πυρίας. Translation mine.
88. The Athenians no longer know the Megarians.¹
89. Ancient Milesians were brave.²
90. The maiden of Ancaeus.³
91. There is many a slip twixt cup and lip.⁴
92. Bards tell many a lie.⁵
93. Wickedness needs but a pretext.⁶
94. A sharp-tongued advocate.⁷
95. To misuse such by the misfortunes.⁸

¹Ethica Eudemia 1236a.37. οὐκέτα γνωσκούσιν Ἀθηναίοι Μεγαρῆς.
²Fragmenta varia 557 (from Historica apud Athenaeus 86.12), in Rose, 342-343. πάλαι ποτέ ἦσαν ἄλλοι Μιλήσιοι. Translation mine. It means that times are changed.
³Fragmenta varia 571 (from Historica apud Scholia in Apollon. Rh.1.188), in Rose, 353. Παρθένης Ἀγκαίος.
Translation mine.
⁴Fragmenta varia 571 (from Historica apud Heraclas; Scholia ad Odysseus 10.9), in Rose, 354. πολλά μεταξὺ πέλει κύλικος καὶ γειλος ἀκρου. Translation mine. A proverb for those who hesitate in doing something. At least five different versions of the story of a Samian king have been put together. A short story about the incident which originated this proverb can be found in "Ancaeus," The Oxford Classical Dictionary, 62. Compare this proverb with number 148.
⁵Metaphysica 983a.3. πολλά ψεύδοντα ψεῦδοι. See number 37.
⁶Rhetorica 1373a.351. προφάσεως δεῖται μόνον ἡ πονηρία.
⁸Fragmenta 82 (from Dialogi apud Demetrius peri ōmptneías §.28), in Rose, 87. τὸ ταύτα ἐν τοῖς πάθοι κακοσχεδεῖν. Translation mine.
96. What is in the heart of the sober is on the tongue of the drunken.¹

97. He would pick a corpse's pocket.²

98. Breaking the pitcher at the door.³

99. Shame dwells in the eyes.⁴

100. An Attic neighbor.⁵

Aristotle used more παρομια than any other Greek writer. Fifty-two are listed above. There is a one-word παρομια. There are nine two-word, ten three-word, eight four-word, nine five-word, six six-word, and three seven-word παρομια. Only six out of the fifty-two παρομια have more than seven words. This shows that they are short. Several examples reveal that παρομια become shorter.⁶

Only eighteen out of the fifty-two have a proper verb or verbs.⁷ This means that about two-thirds of them do not have a proper verb.

¹Fragmenta varia 102 (from Dialogi apud Plutarch de garrulitate 4), in Rose, 101. το γαρ εν τη καρδια του νησοντος επι της γλωττης έστι του μεθυντος. Translation mine. See number 192.

²Rhetorica 1383b.24. το απο νεκροι φερειν.

³Rhetorica 1363a.7. το έπι θώραις την ύδριαν.

⁴Rhetorica 1384a.34. το εν όφθαλμοις είναι αίδο.

⁵Rhetorica 1395a.19. Ἀττικὸς παρομια. Aristotle believes that it is also a maxim.

⁶Numbers 52, 94.

⁷Numbers 49, 52, 59, 62, 64, 71, 79, 84, 85, 91, 92, 93, 95, and 96.
We find a number of proverbs which contain geo-historical allusions or names.¹ When these names are not known to the audience, it is impossible to understand the proverbs, but they are always dependent on what is said. A few of them can be used as idiomatic expressions.² It can be noted that almost every one of them belongs to a popular proverb. Usually the contexts, not the contents of the proverbs, give an explanation with regard to the provenance and application.

The most significant fact found in reading the context is that the audience never failed to understand what the speaker said, and the speaker or author never intended to obscure his speech by using παρομία. It helped the audience to understand more clearly or vividly what the speaker tried to say.

Aristotle used παρομία to persuade the audience, because they had authority as did time-honored philosophy. By their use communication was made easy. Their purposes included advice, warning, and emphasis. They were not given to make it difficult to understand, but rather to enhance understanding.

¹Numbers 49, 51, 54, 61, 65, 68, 69, 72, 74, 77, 81, 83, 87, 88, 89, 95, and 100.
²Numbers 54, 68, 83, and 84.
Archytas Philosophus

101. Archytas's rattle.¹

Hyperides Orator

102. The better things of the thieves.²

103. Never move anything evil that lies in the right place.³

104. The works of the young.⁴

105. He lets go the brace to catch at the sheet.⁵

¹Archytas Testimonia 2.7. Ἀρχύταος πλαταγή. See Aristotle Politica 1340b.26: "One must think Archytas's rattle a good invention, which people give to children in order that while occupied with this they may not break any of the furniture; for young things cannot keep still. Whereas then a rattle is a suitable occupation for infant children, education serves as a rattle for young people when older." Archytas lived in the fourth century B.C. Translation mine.


³Hyperides Fragmenta 30 (apud Scholia Plato), in Jensen, 119. το μη κινειν κακον ει κειμενον. The equivalent English expression is "Let sleeping dogs lie."

⁴Hyperides Fragmenta 57 (Apud Aristophanes Gramm Paroemiae 4), in Jensen, 123. ἔργα νέων. The longer form is: ἔργα νέων, βουλαί δὲ μέσαι, εὐχαί δὲ γερόντων. "The works of the young, the wills of the middle-aged, the wishes of the old." See number 126.

⁵Hyperides Fragmenta 181 (apud Harpocratio), in Jensen, 145. ἀφεῖς την ὑπέραν τὸν πόδα διώκει. Liddell and Scott translation. A proverb of those who drop the substance to grasp a shadow.
In *Historia Alexandri Magni*

106. Be careful of evil when you are near good.²

107. He who does evil to others does evil to himself.³

As for the numbers 101 to 107 we can observe that the παρομία was used to illuminate and illustrate the point the authors were trying to convey.

Theophrastus

108. A tailor among kings.⁴

109. It is the year which bears and not the field.⁵

110. Like is attracted to like.⁶

111. As the northeast wind drew a cloud to

---

¹After the fourth century B.C.

²Recensio A.1.13.72. It is not labeled παρομία but ὁ παρομιακὸς λόγος. ἐγγύς ἄγαθῳ παραπέφυκε κακόν. The translated texts in this section are mine.


⁴Theophrastus *Historia Plantarum* 7.7.2.7. κόρχος ἐν λαχάνοις. The translations in this section are mine except number 108, which is Liddell and Scott translation. A bitter leaf, which looks like a basil leaf, found among basil leaves. Similar Hebrew proverb: "Is Saul among the prophets?" Theophrastus lived in the fourth and third centuries B.C.

⁵*Historia Plantarum* 8.7.6, *De Causis Plantarum* 3.23.4. ἐτος φέρει σοίχ ἑροῦρα.

⁶*Characters* 29.6. τὸ ὁμοιὸν πρὸς τὸ ὁμοιὸν πορεύεσθαι.
himself.\textsuperscript{1}

112. The nightly north wind not yet supplicates the light the third time.\textsuperscript{2}

113. But south wind loves after hoar-frost.\textsuperscript{3}

114. When the swift southwest wind makes white clouds, then all the clouds follow after the white wind.\textsuperscript{4}

We find a three-word παρομία, two four-word παρομίαι, three six-word παρομίαι, a seven-word παρομία, and a fifteen-word παρομία. They are usually short. All of Theophrastus' παρομίαι are related to elements of farming except number 110. He explained the climate by employing παρομία.

Alexis Comicus

115. Always, man is very well a skin and also very well a meal-sack.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{1}De Ventis 37, in F. Wimmer, Theopharstii Eresii opera, quae supersunt, omnia (Paris: Didot, 1866), 384.
\textsuperscript{2}De Ventis 49. οὕτως νυκτερινὸς βορέας τρίτον ἰκετο φέγγοι.
\textsuperscript{3}De Ventis 50. φιλεί δὲ νότος μετὰ πάχυντι.
\textsuperscript{4}De Ventis 51. λίγω ἄνεμος ταχύ μὲν νεφέλας ταχὺ δ' αἰθρὰ ποιεῖ, ἀργεστὶ δ' ἄνεμῳ πᾶσ' ἐπεται νεφέλη.
\textsuperscript{5}Alexis Comica Fragmenta Hesione 1, in T. Kock, 2:85. ἅπι ποτ' εὔ μὲν ἀσκός εὔ δὲ θύλακος ἀνθρωπός ἔστι. Alexis lived in the fourth century B.C. Translation mine.
Menander Comicus

Menander has a παρομία, but lacunae make it unusable. We cannot use it. He collected many maxims,¹ but because they were not labeled as παρομία they will not be discussed.

Dinarchus Orator

116. Follow the trade of goldsmith.²

Antigonus Paradoxographus

117. The darts of strong muscles.³

Numbers 115 to 117 are short proverbs, which were not used to hinder understanding, but to enhance it.

¹They are listed in Sententiae ex codicibus Byzantinis, Sententiae (758 maxims), Sententiae ex papyris (877 maxims including a number of titles). They are notably very short sentences. Menander lived in the fourth and third centuries B.C.

²Dinarchus Fragmenta 6, in Nicos C. Conomis, Dinarchi orationes cum fragmentis (Leipzig: Teubner, 1975), 83. A proverb concerning those who fall into any speculation, as the Athenians in their attempt to extract gold from their silver-ores. χρυσόχορειν. Liddell and Scott translation. See Leutsch and Schneidewin, 1:464 where the form is: ἐγὼ δὲ ὅμων χρυσοχορείν. Dinarchus live in the fourth and third centuries B.C.

Aristophanes Grammaticus

118. The red breakfast pouch of the yearling lamb Aigos.¹

119. The wage of the prostitute is near the ankle.²

120. Of women at home and a matter in the household.³

Though they are not easy for us to understand they were not given to obscure or hide certain things, but to help the audience to grasp the contents of the speaker.

Only fragments exist of Aristophanes' work Paroemiae. It is a collection of proverbs in two sections: metrical proverbs and non-metrical proverbs. No context is given for them. Therefore we cannot judge what they intended to express, but there is no indication of obscuring the point for the audience. Aristophanes listed five metrical proverbs:⁴

121. Right to sandal, left to foot-pan.⁵

¹Aristophanes Fragmenta 4.9 (apud Eustathius Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam 1625.33), in A. Nauck, Aristophanis Byzantii grammatici Alexandrini fragmenta, 2d ed. (Halle: Lippert & Schmid, 1848; repr., Hildesheim: Olms, 1963), 104. Ἀγός ἐπιπήδου ἐρωθροῦ πόης ἀριστ. Aristophanes lived in the third and second centuries B.C. The translations in this section are mine.

²Fragmenta 18 (apud Scholia Aristophanes Aves 1620), in Nauck, Aristophanis, 169. Περὶ σφυρόν παχεία μίσης γυνῆ.

³Fragmenta 18 (apud Eustathius 566.12), in Nauck, Aristophanis, 196. ἔνδον γυναικών καὶ παρ' σικέτας λόγος.

⁴Paroemiae 1-5.

⁵Δεξιῶν εἰς ύπόθημα, ἀριστερὸν εἰς ποδονίστηραν.
122. Since Kalchas thought well and divined.¹
123. The pole deceived the vine.²
124. The works of the young.³
125. Not the boat of every man sails for Corinth.⁴

Seven non-metrical proverbs are as follows:⁵

126. A doctor heals.⁶
127. Listen to the one who has four ears.⁷
128. I will soothe in a hollow seat.⁸
129. Corcyraean scourge.⁹
130. Deliverance of Dionysus is complete.¹⁰
131. The sword of Peleus.¹¹

¹Ετερ τι Κάλχας ἔνθο προνών μυναύεται.
²Χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον. The longer form is: Εξηματησεγ ή χάραξ τὴν ἄμπελον. The omission of the verb and the article of the subject is seen in the process of contraction.
³Έργα νέων. The longer form is: Έργα νέων, Βουλαι δὲ μέσων, εὐχαι δὲ γερόντων. In the shorter form only the first phrase of the longer form remains, representing the whole idea.
⁴Ὅυ παντὸς ἄνδρος δίς ὁρίνων ἐσθ' ὁ πλοῦς.
⁵Paroemiae 6-13.
⁶Ἀκεσίας ἱάσατο. The longer form is: Ἀκεσίας τὸν πρωτότον ἱάσατο. A doctor heals the anus. The object is omitted in the shorter form.
⁷Ἀκουὲ τοῦ τὰ τέσσαρα ὅτα ἔχοντος. It is against those who disobey or those who see and hear many things.
⁸Εν ὀ λιμῷ εὐνάσῳ.
⁹Κερκυραῖα μάστιξ.
¹⁰Λύσοι τελεταί, αἱ Διόνυσου.
¹¹Πηλέως μάχαιρα. An idiom for unexpected aid.
132. The leg of partridge.¹

Polybius

133. Let the risk be for the Carian.²

134. Justice has an eye.³

135. The natives of a place do not only know best the direction of the wind, but the character of their compatriots.⁴

136. Had we not perished so soon we would never have been saved.⁵

137. More desert than Libya.⁶

138. A brave man meets another braver yet.⁷

139. It is possible for a human being to be fortunate, but impossible for him to be constantly so.⁸

140. Vain heads make vain plans.⁹

141. The Locrians and the pact.¹⁰

¹Πέρδικος σκέλος.

²Historiae 10.32.11.2. δεῖ γὰρ ἐν Καρί τὴν πείραν. Polybius lived in the second century B.C. All the translations are from LCL. All the quotations are from Historiae.

³23.10.3.1. Δίκης ὀφθαλμός.

⁴9.25.4.1. ἐγχώριοι γὰρ οὐ μόνον τὰς τῶν ἄνεμων στάσεις ἄλλα καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐγχώριων ἄνθρώπων ήθη κάλλιστα γινώσκουσιν.

⁵38.18.12.1. Εἶ μὴ ταχέως ἀπαλύμηθα, οὐκ ὡς ἐσώθημεν.

⁶12.26a.2.2. ἔρημόσερα τῆς Λιβύης.

⁷15.16.6.3. ἐσθλὸς ἐὼν ἄλλου κρείττονος ἀντέτιχεν.

⁸23.12.5. εὐτυχήσατο μὲν ἄνθρωπον ὅντα δυνατόν, διευτυχήσατο γε μὴν ἀδύνατον.

⁹33.5.4.1, 38.16.11.2. κενοὶ κενὰ λογιζόνται.

¹⁰12.12a.1.2. Λοκροὶ τὰς συνθήκας.
142. The glorious record of our sires.¹

143. What the Romans gave with their right hand they took with their left.²

144. After singing the dying swan's song.³

145. The justest of his iniquities.⁴

146. They took the wolf by the ears.⁵

We find a two-word παρομία, four three-word, two four-word, two five-word, one six-word, and one seven word παρομία. We have one each of a nine-word,⁶ ten-word,⁷ and a seventeen-word παρομία, which is extraordinarily long.⁸

Eleven out of fourteen have no more than seven words. This shows that they are usually short. Some of them do not have a proper verb.⁹ There are four proverbs which have geographical or personal names in them.¹⁰ Also two idiomatic expressions are found.¹¹ Numbers 134, 136, and 139.

¹15.4.11.3. πατέρων εὕ καίμενα ἔργα.

²38.10.9.1. τὰ διδόμενα τῇ δεξιᾷ παρὰ Ῥωμαίων ἐδέχοντο τῇ λαϊκῇ χείρι.

³30.4.7.1. τὸ κύκνειον ἔξηχοσαντες.

⁴15.26a.1.3. τῶν ἄδικων ἔργων δικαιοτατον.

⁵30.20.9.1. τὸν λύκον τῶν ὀτων ἔλαβον.

⁶Number 139.

⁷Number 143.

⁸Number 135.

⁹Numbers 134, 137, 139, 142, 144, and 145.

¹⁰Numbers 133, 137, 141, and 143.

¹¹Numbers 144 and 146.
140 are adages embodying common experience or observation. All of them listed above were given to help understanding. Not one of them obscured what the speakers said.

Charondas Nomographus

147. We are the cause of all these, the meal of god.¹

Dionysius Thrax

148. There is many a slip betwixt cup and lip.²

Dionysius Halicarnassensis

149. Neither rejoice nor grieve too much.³

We cannot find any obscuring intention in the contexts of numbers 147 to 149. They were not given to hinder the audience's understanding but to help.

¹Charondas Fragmenta 60.11 (apud Stobaeus 4.2.24), in H. Thesleff, The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1965), 60. τὸ γὰρ ἄριστον τὸν θεὸν ἴμεν αἵπτον πάνων τούτων. This work is placed in the fourth and second centuries B.C. Translation mine.

²Dionysius Thrax Fragmenta 36 (apud Σ Hom. χ 9), in K. Linke, Die Fragmente des Grammatikers Dionysios Thrax Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, 3 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1977), 3:13-33. πολλὰ μεταξὺ πέλει κυλικος καὶ χείλεος ἀκρον. A shorter form of the proverb is also introduced: πολλὰ μεταξὺ κυλικος. The verb is omitted; the last part is also omitted in this shorter form. Cf. number 91. Dionysius Thrax lived in the second century B.C. Translation mine.

³Dionysius Halicarnassensis De Demosthenis dictione 30. οὕτω γὰρ χαίρων οὕτω λυπομένος ἄγαν. It is an axiom as a rule of conduct. Dionysius lived in the first century B.C. Translation mine.
Strabo

150. Spools of good things.¹

151. Truer than the result at Sagra.²

152. Apart are the boundaries of the Mysians and Phrygians.³

153. A Datum of good things.⁴

154. Neither go to Scolus thyself nor follow another thither.⁵

155. To Phasis, where for ships is the farthest run.⁶

156. Corcyra is free, dung where thou wilt.⁷

157. Merchant, sail in, unload your ship, everything has been sold.⁸

158. It produces even birds' milk.⁹

159. The scourge of the Corcyraeans.¹⁰

¹Strabo Geographica 7a.1.33.19, 36.5. ἀγαθῶν ἀγαθίδας. Strabo lived in the first century B.C. and the first century A.D. All the quotations are from Geographica. The translations are from LCL.

²6.1.10.5. ἀληθεστέρα τῶν ἐπὶ Σάγρα.

³12.4.4.5. χωρίς τά Μυσών καὶ Φρυγών ὀρίσματα.

⁴7a.1.33.19, 36.5. Δάτον ἀγαθῶν.

⁵9.2.23.3. εἰς Σκῶλον μῆτ' αὐτός Ἰναί, μῆτ' ἄλλω ἔπεσθαι.

⁶11.2.16.4. εἰς Φάσιν ἐνθα ναυσίν ἐσχατός δρόμος.

⁷7a.1.8. ἔλευθερα Κόρκυρα, χεῖ' ὧπον θέλεις. 7a.1.7, "Corcyra is proverbially derided as joke because it was humbled by its many wars."

⁸14.5.2.19. ἑμπορε, καταπλευσον, ἐξελοῦ, πάντα πέπραται.

⁹14.1.15.18. φέρει καὶ ὄρνιθων γάλα.

¹⁰7a.1.3. ἡ Κερκυραίων μάστις.
160. By the will of Syloson there is plenty of room.¹

161. The Cretan does not know the sea.²

162. When the lightning flashes [through] Harma.³

163. Whoever had no work to do walled Armene.⁴

164. More healthful than Croton.⁵

165. Corinth is both beetle-browed and full of hollows.⁶

166. The last of the Crotoniates was the first among all other Greeks.⁷

167. A Lerne of ills.⁸

168. But when you trouble Maleae, forget your home.⁹

169. The tithe of the Syracusans would not be sufficient for them.¹⁰

170. Not for everyone is the voyage to Corinth.¹¹

¹ 14.1.17.6. έκπτεν Συλοσώντος οὐρωφωρίαν. See number 63.
² 10.4.17.16. ὁ Κρής ἀγνοεῖ τὴν θάλατταν.
³ 9.2.11.7. ὁπόταν δὲ Αρματος ἀστράτη.
⁴ 12.3.10.27. ὅστις ἔργον οὐδὲν ἔχειν Ἀρμένην ἔτειχισεν.
⁵ 6.1.12. ὑγείεστέρον Κρότωνος.
⁶ 8.6.23.54. Κόρινθος ὀφρυᾷ τε καὶ κοιλαίνεται. "Beetle-browed" may mean to have ridges or hills.
⁷ 6.1.12.32. Καρτονιατῶν ὁ ἔσχατος πρῶτος ἢ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων.
⁸ 8.6.8.15. Λέρνη κακῶν.
⁹ 8.6.20.9. Μαλέας δὲ κάμνας ἐπιλάθου τῶν οἰκαδε.
¹⁰ 5.2.4.13. οὐκ ἂν ἐξισκεσθήτο αὐτοῖς ἢ Συρακουσίων δεκάτῃ.
¹¹ 12.3.36.14; 8.6.20.34. οὐ παντός ἄνδρός εἰς ὀρνθῶν ἔσθε, ὁ πλοῦς.
171. All beneath Myconos alone.¹
172. Thracian pretense.²
173. The copper vessel in Dodona.³
174. Beset by the hero of Temesa.⁴
175. He put Colophon to it.⁵
176. Well then, the Corycaean was listening to this.⁶

We have five two-word,⁷ three three-word,⁸ five four-word,⁹ four five-word,¹⁰ six six-word,¹¹ one seven-word,¹² and three eight-word παρομίαι.¹³ None of them has more than eight words. Only about 10 percent has more than seven words. This shows that παρομίαι are usually short.

---

¹10.5.9.3. πάνθ᾽ ὑπὸ μίαν Μύκονον.
²9.2.4.7. Θρακικά παρεύρεσις.
³7a.1.3.1. τὸ ἐν Δοδόνῃ χαλκίον.
⁴6.1.5.9. τὸν Ἱρων τὸν ἐν Τεμέσῃ ἐπικείσθαι αὐτοῖς.
⁵14.1.28.5. τὸν Κολοφῶνα ἐπείθηκεν.
⁶14.1.32.24. τοῦ δ’ ἄρ’ ὁ Κορυκαῖος ἡκροάζετο.
⁷Numbers 150, 153, 164, 167, and 172.
⁸Numbers 159, 160, and 175.
⁹Numbers 151, 158, 162, 171, and 173.
¹⁰Numbers 156, 157, 163, 168, 174, and 176.
¹¹Numbers 152, 155, 163, 168, 174, and 176.
¹²Number 169.
¹³Numbers 154, 166, and 170.
Only four do not have geographical or personal names in them.¹ Still they are originated from certain incidents. The twenty-three ἀρνομία which contain geographical or personal names can be called historical proverbs.² Strabo reminded the readers of the stories from which the ἀρνομία were derived. Unless the readers were aware of the stories behind them, they could not understand the ἀρνομία. This does not mean that ἀρνομία were used as cryptic statements because orators and authors used them to illuminate the point and persuade the audience. Apparently they were popular sayings which people were using without knowing their origins. Strabo did not coin any of them. The stories behind the ἀρνομία reveal their origins and provenances.

¹Numbers 150, 153, 157, and 158.

²Archer Taylor, The Proverb (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931), 82-3, observes significant points that "proverbs which turn on historical allusions are necessarily rare and short-lived. Since all proverbs make a general application of a particular incident, it is clear that the meaning and implications of the incident must be obvious to speaker and hearer... As a rule, the meaning of an historical allusion cannot long remain generally intelligible. Consequently the life of an historical proverb must be very brief, or the allusion must be rendered so general that it no longer has an identifiable connection with the historical fact, unless it has personal names or geographical names." Emphasis supplied.
Plutarch

177. Not without Theseus.¹

178. One who is dangerously sick needs only parsley.²

179. Serious business for the morrow.³

180. This is not to be believed even though Cato says it.⁴

181. Who will praise a father, except happy sons?⁵

182. If you dwell with a lame man, you will learn to limp.⁶

183. Good things are hard.⁷

184. To expel and dispel wine with wine, and headache with headache.⁸

¹Plutarch Theseus 29. οὐκ ἄνευ Θησέως. Plutarch lived in the first and second centuries A.D. All the translations are from LCL.

²Timoleon 26. τὸν ἐπισφαλῆς νοσοῦντα δεῖ σθαι τοῦ σελίνου.

³Pelopidas 10. σύκον ἐς αὐρίνον τὰ σπουδαῖα.

⁴Cato Minor 19.7. ὅτι τούτο μὲν σῶδε ἀτανός λέγοντος πιθανὸν ἐστὶ.

⁵Aratus 1.1. τίς πατέρ' αἰνήσαι, εἴ μὴ ευδαιμονές νίοι; This is the proverb of Chrysippus in the third century B.C. Now Dionysodorus of Troezen corrected the last part into κακοδαιμονές νίοι. Plutarch accepted this correction to be accurate.

⁶De liberis educandis 4.a. ἀν χαλά παροικήσῃς, ὑποσκάζειν μαθήσῃ. It is advice not to have the wrong kind of servants for young masters. An axiom of a general truth.

⁷De liberis educandis 6.c. χαλεπὰ τὰ καλὰ. An axiom of a general truth.

⁸De tuaude sanitate praeccepta 127.F. οίνῳ δὲ τὸν οἶνον κρατάλη δὲ τὴν κραταλῆν ἐξελάωντας καὶ διαφορήσοντας.
185. Who does not own himself would Samos own.¹

186. Yer ain (your own) hand use when Fortune ye would call.²

187. No one but Pyrrhias has slain an ox for his benefactor.³

188. To suffer more terribly than Sambicus.⁴

189. The one who can make a good guess is the best prophet.⁵

190. For what is in man's heart when he is sober is on his tongue when he is drunk.⁶

191. They asked for buckets, but tubs were refused.⁷

192. Remembrancer.⁸

---

¹*Apophthegmata Laconica* 233.D. ὃς σύντον σύντον σώκ ἔχει, Σάμον θέλει. It is a satire given by Spartans to the Athenians who wanted to have Samos when they themselves had no power to survive.

²*Apophthegmata Laconica* 239.A. τὰν χείρα ποτιφέροντα τὰν τῦχαν καλὰν. The translator seems to attempt to give a feeling of quaintness by using Scottish dialect.

³*Aetia Romana et Graeca* 298.F. σύνεις εὐεργέτη βοῶν ἔθουσαν ἀλλ' Ἡ Πυρρίας. Pyrrhias was saved by an old man, who gave him wealth. Later he showed his gratitude by offering an ox.

⁴*Aetia Romana et Graeca* 302.C. δεινότερα Σαμβίκου παθεῖν. Sambicus has been tortured for a year. This saying emphasizes the severity of suffering.

⁵*De Pythiae oraculis* 399.A. ὁ μὲν εἰκάζων καλὰς, ὁν ἄριστον μάντιν.

⁶*De garrulitate* 503.F. τὸ γὰρ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ νηφόντος ἐπὶ τῆς γλώττῃς ἐστὶ τοῦ μεθύοντος. An adage embodying common experience.

⁷Ibid., 512.E. ἄμας ἀπήτουν, οἱ δ' ἀπηγοννύτο σκάφας.

⁸*Quaestiones convivales* 612.C. μνάμονα. Dorians and Sicilians called a master of ceremonies thus. This idiomatic expression arose from the custom in which the
193. Salt and bean friends.¹
194. Fish in reserve.²
195. I can't carry the goat; put the ox on me.³
196. Just wait, crab, and I'll let you go free.⁴
197. To mix fire with water.⁵
198. The fox knows many tricks, but the hedgehog one big one.⁶
199. Don't give a child a knife.⁷

All of the 23 παρομιάια are related to particular historical incidents. Their meanings are clearly given by way of explanation. We find a satirical proverb,⁸ two idioms,⁹ master should remember what was said during the party when all were drunk.

¹Ibid., 684.E. ὁ περὶ ἄλα καὶ κύαμον.
²Ibid., 703.E. ἀποκαίμενον ἱχθύν.
³De vitando aere alieno 830.A. οὐ δύναμαι τὴν αἴγα φέρειν, ἐπὶ μοι θέτε τὸν βοῦν.
⁴De Herodoti malignitate 862.F. μένε, καρκίνε, καὶ σὲ μεθήσοι.
⁵Aqua an ignis utilior 950.F. ποὺ ὄδας μιγνύναι. As an example of the impossible. An idiomatic expression.
⁶De sollertia animalium 971.F. πόλλ' οἶδ' ἀλώπεκε, ἀλλ' ἔχινος ἐν μέγα. The way in which hedgehogs defend and guard themselves has occasioned the proverb.
⁷Fragmenta 131 (apud Stobaeus 4.1.140; 4.31.46), in F. H. Sandbach, Plutarchi Moralia, 15 vols., Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), 7:79. Μὴ παῖδι μάγαραι. He quoted this proverb to develop one of his own, "Don't give a child wealth, nor an uneducated man political power."
⁸Number 185.
⁹Numbers 192 and 197.
and many popular proverbs. Plutarch informed his readers of the historical backgrounds of these παρομία. Apart from these he lists 183 παρομία in his collection. His collection will not be added to the list above because a great number of them coincide with the listed ones, and because Plutarch's principle of inclusion is not known, though he thought they were παρομία. As a result, for many of them we are not sure whether they were labeled by παρομία in the texts from which he collected them.

Conclusion

We have seen so far that not only proverbs but also maxims and idioms are referred to by the term παρομία. Never have we seen that its presence in the context hindered the audience's understanding, even though they may be difficult for modern readers to understand. The users of παρομία had no intention to obscure meaning for the readers or the audience. They were always elucidating and illuminating, never obscuring the meaning.

1Plutarch's collection of παρομία has 131 items. At least 74 of them have information indicating when to use them. These comments begin with ἄντι τῶν. So to speak, "this is about those who do certain things." These παρομία are idiomatic expressions, rather than genuine proverbs. Among the rest of the 57 there are some proverbs, quotations, a curse, and others. He also has a list of 31 idioms for impossible things. They begin with "you are doing such and such," for example, "you are sowing on the rock", "you are trying to measure the sand in the sea with basket", "you are pursuing the wind" and so forth. He adds 15 similar sayings about impossible things. Some of them are redundant. He also has 6 idioms about soft things.
Now we can test the definitions of the scholars mentioned in the previous section. We can affirm that Lampe's definitions do not squarely match with features observed so far in the classical and the Hellenistic literature except popular sayings, and idiom. I do not say that he is wrong. Since he covered the period later than John, only some parts of his definition are valid for my study. From Liddell and Scott we could see only proverb and maxim fit with the result of my investigation.

Most modern scholars tend to impose modern conceptions about proverbs on παρομια. Not only an experienced truth of popular wisdom, but also incidental references to certain historical events were referred to as παρομια.

Reading antecedents of the Johannine παρομια in the old Greek literature, we find that the παρομια were clearly understood by the audience. There was no intention on the part of the speaker to conceal secrets in them. They could be old, or be of the recent past. It seems that they were not coined by the authors who were using them in their addresses, but rather, they were from the popular usage, from history, and from literature.

Παρομια in Hellenistic Judaism

In this section I discuss how παρομια was used in Hellenistic Jewish literature. The purpose is to see whether the Jewish translators' works rendered any change of
meaning to the term παρομία. I consider four different Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible, namely, the Septuagint, Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus, and the writings of Philo. Josephus did not use the particular term παρομία.

The Septuagint

The Greek term παρομία occurs in the LXX three times in the Book of Proverbs (1:1; 25:1; 26:7) and five times in Sirach (6:35; 8:8; 18:29; 39:3; 47:17). The Hebrew word בַּקֵּשׁ is used in the plural form for the superscription of the Book of Proverbs. The Old Testament Book of Proverbs

1I do not discuss the exact dates for these translations. Still we need to know the approximate dates for them. In H. A. Redpath, "Greek Versions," A Dictionary of the Bible, 4 vols., ed. James Hastings, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908-11), 4:864-866, the following dates are given: Aquila, c. A.D. 130 under Hadrian; Theodotion, c. A.D. 185; Symmachus, latter half of the second century A.D. They are certainly later than John; and it is notable to see that they were not influenced by the Johannine παρομία.

2There are a number of studies of the Hebrew word בַּקֵּשׁ. Since we are not specifically dealing with this term the reader is referred to some of these. Allen Howard Godbey, "Hebrew בַּקֵּשׁ," AJSL 39 (1922-23): 89-108; G. M. Landes, "Jonah: A לְשׁוֹנָה?" in Israelite Wisdom, ed. J. G. Gammie et al. (Missoula, MO: Scholars Press, 1978), 137-58; Timothy Polk, "Paradigms, Parables, and בַּקֵּשׁ: On Reading the בַּקֵּשׁ in Scripture," CBQ 45 (1983): 564-81, agrees, in 565, with Landes that the בַּקֵּשׁ "was not characterized by fixed literary form" but was rather "applied to a variety of literary types." For a concise overview of the history of understanding this term, see Lawrence Boadt, "Understanding the בַּקֵּשׁ and Its Value for the Jewish-Christian Dialogue in a Narrative Theology," in Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity, ed. Clemens Thoma and Michael Wyschogrod (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 172-6.
contains various species of sayings in different forms. Its contents tell us the wide range of meanings the Hebrew word \( בְּשָׂר \) has. Actually in the Old Testament \( בְּשָׂר \) covers a number of different forms of speech: proverb, byword, satire, taunt, riddle, story or allegory, and story parable. We may ask a question: Does this also support the idea that the Greek word \( παρομία \) has the same range of meanings, because it translates the particular Hebrew term \( בְּשָׂר \)? The book does not contain proverbs exclusively. The sayings in the Book of Proverbs do not resemble the Greek \( παρομία \). They are in poetic forms, while Greek proverbs are not usually in verse, but in short prose. The former are rather longer than the Greek ones. They tend more to be about religion and morality. They do not accompany or amplify what is being said. The term was adopted not because it has the same range of meanings, but because it has some commonality with the Hebrew word--as the Hebrew word \( בְּשָׂר \) can mean proverb so can the Greek term \( παρομία \). Furthermore, it is also not uncommon in Greek literature to thus title a collection of various sayings. Various quotations of old sayings are included in the Greek collections, \( παρομία \), and it is


2It seems more proper to have "\( παραβολαι \) of Solomon" to translate "\( מַשְׂרַה \)." So did Aquila, because it included some parables and a lot of sayings which give comparisons to life. Nevertheless, the LXX followed the convention of the Greek writers to name it thus.
natural to designate a saying in the collection as \( \text{παρομία} \), regardless of its literary classification and content.

The Hebrew word \( מָשֶׁל \) in the title of the Book of Proverbs was translated by \( \text{παρομία} \). It was not translated by the same Greek term in 1:6, but by another term: "παραβολή". This might suggest interchangeability between the two terms. The word in the title, however, indicates comprehensiveness of collection, while the word in 1:6 indicates a certain form of speech which is only a subset because we find "παραβολή" (\
\( \text{μασ} \)) along with \( σκοραφέων \) (\
\( \text{λόγον} \)), "ῥήτορος σοφόν" (\
\( \text{δόξα} \)), and "κάνειμα" (\
\( \text{χρήσι} \)). All four of them designate different things. If we consider parallelism, it is more likely to see the parallelisms between the first and the third, and between the second and the last, but not between the first and the last, though parallelisms are possible between the first and the second, and between the third and the fourth. Furthermore, we need to note that even words in synonymous parallelism are not always entirely synonymous. Therefore, the title "Παρομία" rather indicates that it is a collection of various sayings. It does not support that it is a collection of Greek \( \text{παρομία} \)-type sayings. Based on this observation it is difficult to accept that two Hebrew words, "מָשֶׁל" and "רְחֵי", are synonymous. In Ps 48:4 (MT: 49:5) we find a parallelism between "מָשֶׁל" ("παραβολή") and "רְחֵי" ("προβλημα"), but the translator uses two different Greek words for two Hebrew words.
Hauck believed that παροιμία and παραβολή are synonymous because παροιμία was used both in Sir 6:35; 47:17 (translates "טָשֹׁם") and 8:8 (translates "רָצֶל") and because παραβολή is used for both in Prov 1:6 ("עָיִן-פָּרָאָבָוָלֶה") and Ps 48:4. But we find that Sir 47:17 lists song, παροιμία ("טָשֹׁם"), riddle (παραβολή-רָצֶל), and interpretation (ἐρμηνεία). Can we think that these four are the same things? It is apparent that they designate different kinds of sayings or literary forms.

Therefore, I conclude that the impression that the two Greek words παραβολή and παροιμία are synonymously used in the LXX is created by the inconsistent use of the Greek terms by the translators. The consistent translation of the Hebrew word רָצֶל would be using such Greek words as αἰνήγμα or πρόβλημα.

The LXX Sirach has παραβολή and παροιμία, but they are not accompanied by any kind of examples. Even if Sirach gives no example of παροιμία, what he says about them gives some clue to its meaning. Παροιμία is used in Sir 6:35 for

---

1The Hebrew term רָצֶל means riddle. Hans-Peter Müller, "Der Begriff 'Rätsel' im Alten Testament," Vetus Testamentum 20 (1970): 465, lists four meanings of the Hebrew word רָצֶל in the Old Testament: (1) das volkstümliche Rätsel, (2) den symbolischen Traum und das anigmatische Orakel, (3) das Rätsel als Mittel des Wettkampfes unter Königsten und (4) eine Gattung der hofisch-schulischen Weisheit. It is used 17 times in the Hebrew Bible; the LXX used αἰνήγμα, πρόβλημα, διηγήμα, and παροιμία to translate them.

2Hauck, 855, 748.
and in 18:29 (no Hebrew text). It seems to refer to wise sayings or aphorisms.

Three particular Hebrew words (מלשנ', חרות, מָשָׁל) in Sir 47:17 can be found in Prov 1:6. Sir 47:12-22 is a poem devoted to Solomon. These two points clearly show that Sirach referred to Proverbs.

Παρομια used for מָשָׁל in Sir 8:8 is significant because the Hebrew word מָשָׁל means a riddle. It is not clear why the translator chose Παρομια to translate this word. Probably the translator understood by the context that it refers to proverbs. What is crucial for this study is that the Hebrew word מָשָׁל is associated with the Greek word Παρομια. At least there is a connection established between the meaning of riddle and Παρομια. This may provide a basis for translating the Greek term Παρομια as riddle.

The expression "the hidden things of proverbs" (ἀπόκρυφα παρομιῶν) in Sir 39:3 is of particular importance because this is probably the first place where the word Παρομια is connected directly and apparently to the meaning of secrecy or obscurity. This connotation is reinforced by the parallel expression of "the enigmas found in parables" (ἐν αἰνίγμασι παραβολῶν). Unfortunately the Hebrew text of Sir 39:3 has not been found. At least we can know that the word

1Sir 8:8 flows like this: "Despise not the discourse of the wise, but acquaint thyself with their proverbs: for of them thou shalt learn instruction, and how to serve great men with ease."
παρομία in Sir 39:3 refers to dark or obscure sayings. This shift of meaning resulting from the use of the Greek term παρομία when translating certain Hebrew words may be seen as a rudimentary transition to the meaning which we will encounter in the FG.

Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus¹

Edwin Hatch presented two arguments by which he concluded that παραβολή and παρομία are interchangeable for translating בֹּשָׁהוּ: (1) παραβολή and παρομία are both used in the LXX to translate בֹּשָׁהוּ; and (2) other translators and revisers frequently substitute the one for the other.² Both observations are correct, but they do not necessarily support his conclusion. There are four cases where παρομία replaced the LXX παραβολή for the Hebrew word בֹּשָׁהוּ. In each case it appears that the use of παρομία stands in close relationship to the classical and the Hellenistic use because the content referred to by the term constitutes a popular proverb, and there is no affinity between the two Greek words παρομία and παραβολή in the Greek literature before the LXX.³ The selection of that term does not seem

¹Variant readings of these three versions are found in Origenis Hexapla (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1964).
²Hatch, 66.
³TLG search shows that they are not related at all.
to be based on the interchangeability, but for the restoration of original meaning.\(^1\)

The first instance is found in the LXX of 1 Sam 10:12, where παραβολή was used for the proverb and other translators rendered it as παρομία.\(^2\) It is closer to its sense in Greek because it is a popular proverb, even in the Greek sense.\(^3\)

The second example is 1 Sam 24:14.\(^4\) The LXX translates it as παραβολή. Symmachus replaced it with παρομία, which is proper with what is so designated there.

The third example is found in Ezek 12:22 where the LXX, Aquila, and Theodotion agree, using παραβολή. Symmachus, however, rendered it παρομία. Probably Aquila and Theodotion were not sure whether the popular saying "The days grow long, and every vision comes to nought" was a proverb in a Greek sense.

\(^1\)Smith, 13, convincingly observes, "[παρομία] is frequently substituted for παραβολή by the Hexapla revisers of the LXX. It was natural rendering of ἄνω used of a proverb . . . and as soon as it had been recognized as a substitute for παραβολή in this sense, the way was prepared for it to take over the other meanings of ἄνω. It is not surprising, then, to find it employed in the Fourth Gospel in the sense of 'allegory' (x. 6, xvi.25,29), although we have no earlier instance of this use." Except for his mention of doubtful "allegory," Smith's observation is correct.

\(^2\)"Is Saul also among the prophets?"

\(^3\)It is short, it has a personal name, the context says it is widely used, it speaks of certain truths about Saul's person.

\(^4\)"Wickedness proceedeth from the wicked."
The last example occurs also in Ezek 18:3, where a proverb is quoted: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." It is labeled as παραβολή by the LXX translators, but Aquila called it παρομία. Aquila considered it a proverb.

Ezek 16:44 could have been a classical example for this case, but no variant is found for this. Παραβολή is used in the verse of the LXX. It is probable that in the process of replacing παραβολή with παρομία, the translators passed this case unnoticed.

The trend seen in these Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible indicates that the translators tried to find a more suitable Greek word for the Hebrew term, at least in the places where παρομία was used. Whatever was the translation, tradition, or custom, they tried to go back to

"As is the mother, so is her daughter."

A note on translating skills seems appropriate at this point. Some translators use different words to translate a foreign word. Sometimes they believe that they are interchangeable. But other times they think certain words they use are improper in other places where they have the same foreign word to translate. They choose a certain word above others because they believe this particular one is proper. If it is the case we should not say that they are interchangeable. They might be so in the eyes of the other translators and of the readers, and still influence the later writers to depend upon the translation, but they are not interchangeable.
the normal use of the term. This may be explained by the
renaissance of Hellenism.¹

Apparently the close contact between the two Greek
terms παραβολὴ and παρομία began with the LXX because of the
translator's inconsistent use of them. Just because they
translated the same Hebrew word, the idea evolved that they
were closely related. No instance of their affinity,
however, is found in the Classical and the Hellenistic
literature apart from Judaism. Only in the LXX do the two
terms begin to appear together with any close relationship.
Still the use of παρομία in the translation of the Hebrew
word opened a possibility of semantic shift in the term.
The Hebrew word בִּיטִי can mean riddle, and it might have
influenced the use of παρομία in other places. Though
παρομία did not translate the meaning of riddle in בִּיטִי, and
did translate the meaning of proverb, by this it received
the potential of translating other meanings of the Hebrew
word בִּיטִי, including the meaning of riddle because the Hebrew
word can mean different forms of speech. It is an
irresistible phenomenon.

¹It is called Atticism, which was developed against
Asianism. See Helmut Koester, History, Culture, and
Religion of the Hellenistic Age (Philadelphia: Fortress
Press, 1982), 103-4. He provides a case which may explain
the accurate use of the Greek term παρομία: "Aelius
Dionysius of Halicarnassus and a certain Pausanias from
Syria (ca. 100 CE) composed dictionaries designed to ensure
that literary vocabulary was identical to that of the
classical Attic authors."
Although Philo Judaeus (30 B.C.- A.D. 45) employed many allegorical interpretations of the Jewish tradition, he never employed the term παρομία for those interpretations. The term παρομία is found seven times in his writings. He quoted Prov 3:4 and employed two Greek παρομία: "The belongings of friends are held in common"; and "the horse to the meadow." The former he used to explain the relationship between God and Abraham, and between God and Moses. The latter he employed to describe the capability of learning. Two idioms were quoted: adding fire to fire; Philadelphian—meaning great. They do not deviate from the normal Greek usage.

There is a remaining problem in Philo's use of the term. He used the word παρομία in place of the three words αίνιγμα, παραβολή, and διηγήμα in the LXX Deut 28:37. Does this mean that Philo equated these three with παρομία? The

1De ebrietate 84.1; De Abrahamo 235.9; De vita Mosis 1.22.7; De vita Mosis 1.156.4; De vita Mosis 2.29.6; De praemiis et poeris 150.2; Legatio ad Gaium 126.1.

2De ebrietate 84.1

3κοινά τὰ φίλων.

4τίπος εἰς πεδίον.

5πῦρ ἐπιφέρων πορί.

6Φιλαδελφείους.

7Proverbial sayings about the doomed history of the Israelites can be labeled as παρομία in its original sense.
attempt at finding other versions than the LXX for support proved futile.\textsuperscript{1} All these three terms may find their commonality in παρομία. Παρομία may be the word comprising all three. In this sense Philo's use is akin to its use in the title of the Book of Proverbs. The referent is definitely the derision the children of Israel should endure. In the old Greek literature some παρομία are derisive. Since Philo replaced αἶνημα (along with other two terms) with παρομία, a semantic shift toward 'riddle' was made possible.

Summary and Conclusion

I have thus discussed what constitutes a παρομία in Greek literature, investigated lexica, and listed all the possible meanings. The examination of existing dictionary articles and other modern authorities, including monographs on the topic of proverbs, produced the conclusion that they did not give us reliable results to begin this study. As a foundational study for the Johannine παρομία I extracted 199 παρομία from the Greek literature to see how the term was actually used.

It was revealed that they not only referred to proverbs or popular sayings, but also maxims and idiomatic expressions. The Greek authors themselves in the period of this study gave a number of definitions which later were

\begin{itemize}
  \item For αἶνημα, Aquila: εἰς ὁφονισμόν; Symmachus: εἰς ἀπορίαν.
  \item And for καὶ διηγηματι, Aquila: (καὶ εἰς) δευτεροσιν.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1}For αἶνημα, Aquila: εἰς ὁφονισμόν; Symmachus: εἰς ἀπορίαν. And for καὶ διηγηματι, Aquila: (καὶ εἰς) δευτεροσιν.
developed fully to be more inclusive. The authors of later literature annexed additional meanings, and forms to the term. It was made clear by the investigation that παρομία were given to help the audience to understand, not to obscure.

Turning to Hellenistic Judaism, although the LXX seems to indicate that translating the Hebrew words בֵּית and וְיוֹסֶף by παρομία rendered a change to the meaning of the latter, it is difficult to assess the data fully due to the absence of the designated παρομία. Nevertheless, the use of παρομία to translate יְהוָה provides a basis for translating παρομία as riddle. In addition, the expression "the hidden things of proverbs" in Sir 39:3 gives an impression that the word παρομία has taken the meaning of obscurity or secrecy in the LXX. The trend, in which other Greek translations of the Hebrew Bible try to find a more suitable word for the translation, seems to give the impression of resistance to possible changes in the meaning of the term. Still, the use of the term by the LXX broadened the meaning of the Greek term παρομία.

We have also seen that Philo leaves a hint as to a possible semantic shift of the term by replacing αίνιγμα with παρομία. Therefore, we can conclude that the semantics of the term suffered a slight change before the time of John's Gospel, which provided a foundation for John to use the term in his own peculiar way.
CHAPTER II

ΠΑΡΟΙΜΙΑΙ IN JOHN 16:4b-33

Introduction

The basic task of this and the next chapter is to seek the definition of the Greek word παροιμία in the Gospel of John, thus to understand its nature. It requires a close investigation of the four usages of this word in the Gospel. The word occurs in two passages: 10:1-6; 16:4b-33.

We begin with the passage of 16:4b-33. Two good reasons for doing this are: (1) it has three of the occurrences of παροιμία in John, and (2) this passage contains some clues to the reason for using παροιμία and to its nature.

Therefore, this chapter examines 16:4b-33. The next chapter deals with 10:1-6. The exegesis is limited only to

1Vs. 33 is not only the end of a passage but also the end of a large block because the prayer of Jesus begins at 17:1. The beginning of the passage can be debated. Raymond Brown, The Gospel According to John: XIII-XXI, Anchor Bible, vol. 29a (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1970), 709, treats 16:4b-15 as a unit for convenience. He comments, 727, that "in distinguishing between 4b-15 and 16-33, we are distinguishing between two parts within a whole rather than between two really independent subdivisions." D. A. Carson, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1991), 532, 542, follows this fashion of division. All the biblical quotations are from the RSV unless noted otherwise.
seeking the definition and the nature of the \textit{paromía} in the FG.


A full discussion of this section of biblical material is not necessary.

\textbf{The Reading of 16:4b-33}

An examination of 16:4b-33 is required to see in what context the phrase \textit{en paromíac} is used. In reading this passage we are only interested in the reason why the saying of 16:25 was necessary at that particular point of the narrative.

Jesus expected that the disciples would ask him a question about where he was going (16:5). It implies that the saying about his going away is difficult for them to understand. In fact, Peter and Thomas have asked Jesus where he was going (13:36; 14:5), but "they have not really
asked thoughtful questions about where Jesus is going and what it means for them.¹ As Jesus spoke about his departure and the coming persecution, they were full of sorrow.

Jesus did not offer a full explanation about his going away, but rather spoke of the expediency of his going away. He informed them of the works of the ἐκκλησία, who will come and "convince the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment." (16:8). Jesus had many things to say to the disciples but refrained from doing so, because they could not bear them at that point. When the Spirit of truth came he would guide them into all the truth. The Spirit was to announce to them the things which Jesus refrained from telling them, including the things that were to come. The Spirit will reveal what Jesus could not. Therefore, the content of what Jesus abstained from revealing was exactly what the Spirit of truth was to announce to them. Because Jesus did not speak about the things to come, they were not spoken ἐν παρομίασι. Furthermore, they are not referred to by the phrase ἐν παρομίασι.

In vs. 16 comes a saying which the disciples were not able to understand, a difficult saying, causing questions in the minds of some disciples, which are recorded in vss. 17, 18. Probably they were afraid to ask Jesus

¹Carson, John, 533. Emphasis original.
openly.1 When they were about to ask him concerning the sayings, Jesus articulated their question in vs. 19. He did not answer the question, but comforted them in vss. 20-22, which contained a parabolic word in vs. 21.2 Then he gave them a promise which informed them about their relationship with the Father in Jesus' name. The parable described, in a more vivid manner, the situation following his leaving. So this difficult saying of vs. 16 remained unexplained.

The parable word of a woman in travail is a fitting illustration of the abrupt change from sorrow to joy. It emphasizes the greatness of joy which can thwart all the memory of past sorrow. Vs. 22 reiterates vss. 20, 21. The joy they would have was not from man but from God, because it arises from the event of seeing Jesus again. Therefore, no man takes it from them.

Jesus promised several things (vss. 23, 24). He promised that they will ask nothing of him, but they will receive all things if they ask Him in Jesus' name, thus promising the use of his name and the fullness of joy. All these things are not separated from the comfort given in the

---

1 We find a possible parallel of this in the Synoptics. When Jesus predicted his passion the similar response was recorded there. See, for example, Mark 8:31 (Matt 16:21; Luke 9:22); Mark 10:33-34; Matt 17:23. Especially the following three underlined verses are significant: Luke 18:32-34; 9:45; Mark 9:31-32.

preceding verses. Vss. 20-24 make a unit of thought in that vss. 20-22 introduce the joy, and vss. 23-24 amplify the nature of that joy.

The saying of 16:25 seems, at first glance, to be independent from the context of 16:4b-33. Explanations given by many exegetes tend to offer an impression that this particular saying is independent from the flow of the narrative: Jesus suddenly spoke about the manner of his revelation. Why is the saying of 16:25 located at this juncture of narrative? If it describes the mode of revelation, it is intrusive, because it breaks the flow of dialogue. Then we ask: Why is it there? That question leads one to look at the use of the verb ἐπανειλημμένω in the passage, which occurs five times. This verb has two meanings: to question and to request. Here we put together the sayings which include the particular verb:

Jesus knew that they wanted to ask him; so he said to them, "Is this what you are asking yourselves, . . . ." (19) "In that day you will ask nothing of me." (23) ["I have said this to you in figures; the hour is coming when I shall no longer speak to you in figures but tell you plainly of the Father." (25)] "... and I do not say to you that I shall pray the Father for you" (26) "Ah, now you are speaking plainly, not in any figure! Now we know that you know all things and need none to question you." (29, 30)

1Brown, John: XIII-XXI, 734.


3Emphasis mine.
We can eliminate vs. 26 from our discussion because the verb in context is a rough synonym of αἰτεῖ (to ask for something). The meaning of the verb in 23b is debatable. D. A. Carson understood it as a synonym of αἰτεῖ with the support of other instances in the Gospel, while at the same time he aptly did not ignore the possibility that 23a "may address a more immediate concern, viz. disciples' repeated requests for information."¹ The saying of 16:25 sprang from the situation of questioning. Hence it is not out of place to combine 23a with 25b to make the connection clear: "In that day you will ask [question] nothing of me, [for] I shall no longer speak to you in figures but tell you plainly." This attempt is strongly supported by vss. 29, 30. Therefore, the saying of 16:25, particularly the phrase ἐν παρωμία, is related to some specific sayings which caused them to question. Raymond Brown would not disagree with the above, "for both 23a and 25 concern a deeper understanding of Jesus (through Paraclete)."²

Παρωμία in John 16:25, 29

Vss. 25 and 29 are examined to see how the expression "ἐν παρωμία" can be understood and to what it

¹Carson, John, 545. Emphasis original.

²Brown, John:III-XXI, 734: "The promise of deeper understanding in 23a was in terms of the disciples' not needing to put more questions to Jesus; now the promise is in terms of Jesus speaking more clearly." Brown fails to see the connection of vs. 25 to the questioning of vss. 17-19 by the disciples.
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refers. A discussion of the expression ἐν παρουσίᾳ is undertaken in the next section.

Verse 25

In order to find clues to unlock the problem of ἐν παρουσίᾳ, it is necessary to investigate the following in vs. 25: τὰῦτα, ὥρα, παρουσίᾳ, περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς. Ταῦτα is discussed last, for to know what it refers to is to know what is meant by ἐν παρουσίᾳ. Hence the discussion is in the following order: παρουσίᾳ; περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς; ὥρα; ταῦτα.

Παρουσία

The Greek word παρουσία means outspokenness, frankness, freedom of speech, and was claimed by the Athenians as their privilege. It can also mean license of tongue, freedom of action, liberality, and lavishness. In private relations it means candor. Παρουσία was not used to mean the opposite of παρουσία before the FG; no such case was found in the TLG. No contrast between ἐν κρυπτῷ and ἐν παρουσίᾳ is found before the FG.

1For further discussion on the use of παρουσία, see Heinrich Schlier, "Παρουσία," in TDNT, 4:871-886. It is used to mean a right to say anything, the actuality of things, the courage of openness in the political sense. He stated, 875, "The LXX goes beyond the Hellenistic senses in passages where it is stated that God gives the people παρουσία and that divine σοφία has παρουσία. The influence of the Old Testament faith is especially to be seen, however, when there is reference to παρουσία towards God or to the παρουσία of God Himself." In the Epistles of John man's openness to God was highlighted. In Acts it is used to mean only boldness, candor towards man.
There are nine occurrences of \textit{παρρησία} in the FG. All of them appear in dative form. Two of them are used with a preposition \textit{ἐν} (7:4; 16:29). The presence of the preposition does not offer a different meaning. All of the occurrences can be divided into two groups: (1) as opposed to \textit{ἐν κρύπτω};\textsuperscript{1} (2) as opposed to \textit{ἐν παραμικας}. To the former belong 7:4, 13, 26; 11:53; 18:20,\textsuperscript{2} which indicate the public nature of Jesus' teachings. Here it means "boldly" or "openly." To the latter belong 10:24; 11:14; 16:25, 29. It means "plainly." We are chiefly concerned with the second group.

\textit{Παρρησία} as opposed to \textit{ἐν παραμικας} is used in four cases, each case by different individuals or groups: the Jews (10:24), the Evangelist (11:14), Jesus (16:25), and the disciples (16:29).

At the feast of the Dedication, the Jews asked Jesus to tell them plainly about himself (10:24). He had given some indications that he was the Messiah, but they were not satisfied with them. They wanted to hear a plain statement,

\textsuperscript{1}Rudolf Schnackenburg, \textit{The Gospel According to St. John}, 3 vols. (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 3:162, commented: "In most of the other places where it occurs (apart from 11:14), \textit{παρρησία} has reference to the 'public', in other words, it suggests that Jesus' revelatory discourse is not a secret doctrine, but is something that takes place in the presence of the 'world'."

\textsuperscript{2}In the light of the uses of this term in 1John we might develop an idea that \textit{παρρησία} not only indicates openness, but by its dative form the manner of speaking with boldness as well.
not an obscure statement. The use of παρησία in 10:24 has a close connection with the παρομία in 10:6, because all this misunderstanding was caused by the παρομία and the Jews were asking him to speak openly (παρησία), and Jesus told them that he had expressed it plainly (10:25). This might indicate that vss. 7-18 are given in παρησία. Still the Jews did not think so. Not only what Jesus said by the use of παρομία, but what he said ἐν παρησίᾳ, was not understood and accepted. Παρομία in 10:6 and παρησία in 10:24 constitute a dialectic chain which is fully developed in 16:25.

Concerning the death of Lazarus Jesus told his disciples that he was asleep, meaning his death. They understood literally, but Jesus said 'plainly' (παρησία) that he was dead (11:14). In contrast to what did the Evangelist use this term? One cannot find any other term than παρομία used in the Gospel to refer to a saying which contrasts with παρησία. Based on the fact that the παρομία of 10:1-5 and its expansion were met by the request of the audience to speak plainly (παρησία), and ἐν παρομίαις was contrasted with παρησία in 16:25, there is no other feasible term except the term παρομία. The use of παρησία in 11:14 is the Evangelist's comment just as the use of the term παρομία in 10:6 is from him. It is reasonable to propose that παρομία is implied by the Evangelist's use of the term παρησία in 11:14.
Jesus compared Lazarus' death with a sleep in view of raising him up. It is very much a metaphor. It is specifically a metonymy, in which death was represented as sleep and sleep described death only partly. They did not understand this figure of speech. The Evangelist commented that Jesus told his disciples about the death of Lazarus plainly. Therefore, παρρησία refers to a manner of saying something without using an obscuring figure.

When we turn our attention to how the disciples used the term, its use in 16:29 calls for careful attention. In vs. 29 they commented on the saying of Jesus, "Ah, now, you are speaking plainly, not in any figure!" On what basis did they make these comments? Since the saying of vs. 16 was not explained, we cannot say that speaking παρρησία is giving an explanation of παρομία. It is simply speaking without παρομία. This use corresponds to the one in 11:14.

When Jesus talked about the 'death' of Lazarus he used a παρομία of sleep. Somehow the 'death' was not a word to be spoken openly. The same was true of Jesus' death. He did not speak openly about his 'death,' but he alluded to it by speaking of his going away. We find only one use of παρρησία in the Synoptics. Mark reports that Jesus "began to teach them that the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and the chief priests and the scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again. And he said this [τὸν λόγον] plainly [παρρησία]" (Mark 8:31, 32). This unique use seems to reveal the fact that the word about passion is hidden. When it is spoken, the manner of its revealing is παρρησία. Therefore παρρησία carries an overtone in the Synoptics of revealing the death and resurrection of Jesus. This is in line with the Johannine use of the term.
Returning to the verse under investigation, we find no difficulty in stating that παρομοια means the absence of παρομοια. This implies that παρομοια and παρομοια do not directly oppose each other, but παρομοια has an aspect which is contrasted to the meaning of παρομοια. Παρομοια, thus, seems to refer to an obscure and difficult saying.

Περί τοῦ πατρός

We may ask three questions: (1) Did Jesus reveal the things about the Father before? (2) When did Jesus speak about the Father plainly? and (3) Can ραπτνα identify with περί τοῦ πατρός.

To answer the first question, it is necessary to study the occurrences of the word πατηρ in the FG. The Greek word πατηρ occurs 135 times in this Gospel—fifteen of them do not refer to God, and 120 occurrences do. The fifteen exceptional cases include Abraham, Jacob, the devil, and so forth. An examination of the 120 occurrences shows that Jesus revealed to both Jews and disciples much about the Father. The Evangelist expressly stated in 8:27 that Jesus "spoke to them of the Father."

God is revealed to be a lover (15:8; 17:24), a sender (5:36; 20:21), a giver (18:11), a seeker (4:23), a worker (5:19; 10:37), a judge (5:45), a glorifier (12:38; 17:1, 4), a commander (15:10), a farmer (15:1), one with Jesus (5:18), etc. He also appears as objects of certain verbs. He is seen (6:46), he is respected (5:23; 8:49), he
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is known (8:38), he is the topic (8:27; 16:25), he is the
destination of Jesus (13:1; 14:6, 28; 16:10, 17, 28; 20:17),
he is asked (14:12; 16:23), he is loved (14:12), he is hated
(15:23, 24), and so on. The Father is in Jesus, and Jesus
in the Father (17:21). He is the righteous Father (17:25),
and the holy Father (17:11).

Based on these observations one can say that much
was already revealed by Jesus about the Father.1 Jesus was
to reveal the Father (1:18). It is clear that Jesus told
them about the Father in the past, but whether he used
παρομια to speak about the Father is another question. To
this we shall return later because we do not know yet what
παρομια is.

To answer the second question a suggestion can be
made: the prayer of Jesus in chap. 17 is a foretaste of what
speaking about the Father plainly refers to. It is not
explicitly said so, but it is hinted. A few observations
can be made for the idea that chap. 17 is a foretaste of the
hour when Jesus will speak plainly about the Father.

1Cf. Bultmann, 587, who observed "Not that he will
say anything new; not even that the meaning of what has
already been said will gradually become comprehensible to
the mind; for Jesus had never imparted theoretical
knowledge. Rather, what was once said will become clear in
the eschatological existence, for which it was spoken from
the beginning. All that can be said as simple communication
had been said long ago; and with the words περι του πατρος
απαγγελω υμιν we are not embarking on any new theme; for that
the Father loves him, that he has given him ζωοσια, that he
has sent him etc., has been said frequently, nor can
anything else be said of the Father than how he works in his
Son."
First, much information about the Father was given, while two other prayers in the Gospel are very short and do not reveal much of the Father.\(^1\) Second, the prayer of Jesus in this place "affords the plainest language possible about union with God."\(^2\) Third, Jesus' attitude to God was παρησία. He addressed God as Father six times: "Father" (17:1, 5, 21, 24), "Holy Father" (17:11), and "O righteous Father" (17:25). His boldness in this prayer became an example for the disciples and those who believe through them. It may be that Jesus' way of speaking to the disciples is ἐν παρομίας and that of praying to the Father is παρησία. By the extension of the meaning of παρησία we can say that Jesus went before God with παρησία through the prayer. Through the prayer to God he let them know plainly the things about the Father and his relationship with Him.\(^3\)

Fourth, 16:25 is situated between vss. 23-24 and 26, which are the sayings about asking God with boldness, as described in 1 John 3:21-22, which says,

11:42: "Father, I thank thee that thou hast heard me. I knew that thou hearest me always, but I have said this on account of the people standing by, that they may believe that thou didst send me": 12:27b, 28a: "Father, save me from this hour? No, for this purpose I have come to this hour. Father, glorify thy name."


Interplay of the two meanings of a word is interesting to note. In its dative form παρησία can mean "boldly" and "plainly." When it is used in contrast with παρομία, it means "plainly." When it is used with αἰτώ, it means "boldly."

---


\(^2\) Interplay of the two meanings of a word is interesting to note. In its dative form παρησία can mean "boldly" and "plainly." When it is used in contrast with παρομία, it means "plainly." When it is used with αἰτώ, it means "boldly."
Beloved, if our hearts do not condemn us, we have confidence (παρθενία) before God; and we receive from him whatever we ask, because we keep his commandments and do what pleases him.

1 John 5:14 seems to support this idea, since παρθενία is connected to the prayer of asking.

Fifth, "when the hour comes" in 16:25 corresponds to "the hour has come" in 17:1. Surely the time mentioned in 16:25 has arrived when he prayed to the Father about the glory in this climactic moment. Jesus was entering glory through the prayer. This prayer is the overture to the glory spoken of so far.

To answer the third question, we need to see three possible ways to look at 25b in view of the phrase "περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς."

First, it is to understand that the contents of 25a and 25b are the same but only the manner is different. Carson notes that "Jesus himself, after the resurrection, will speak words that will lose their enigmatic character, words about his Father." He equates ταῦτα with περὶ τοῦ πατρὸς, that is, 'these' refers to [the things] concerning

---

1 We may add another dimension. Based on the Johannine theology of Jesus' oneness with the Father, whatever is said about Jesus is also about the Father. This idea is clearly delineated in 14:7, 9b: "If you had known me, you would have known my Father also; henceforth you know him and have seen him." "He who has seen me has seen the Father; how can you say, 'Show us the Father'?" Therefore, if something is spoken concerning the Son ἐν παρθενίας, then something concerning the Father is also spoken in this manner.

2 Carson, John, 547. If Carson identifies Jesus with the Father his explanation may stand, but he does not indicate this.
the Father. So Jesus spoke about the Father ἐν παρουσίας so far, but when the hour comes he will speak no more in this manner, but ἐν παρουσίᾳ.¹ This, however, is difficult to establish, because the Father was not revealed in any enigmatic speech and τὰ ὑπάρχοντα seems to refer to what is preceding and its content is about Jesus' destiny.

The second way understands that the one who will speak plainly is the Spirit-Paraclete.² In support of this, the reading of ἀναγγέλω is preferred over the reading of ἀναφέρεσθαι because it is said in 16:15 that the Spirit of truth will announce [ἀναγγέλει]. The resurrected Christ will teach them through the Spirit, but this does not explain the interconnections between all the significant words in vs. 25.

Third, one may attempt to understand that different topics are in view. We may paraphrase as follows: I have spoken these things [topic one] to you in παρουσίας, and when the time comes I will announce to you concerning the Father [topic two] plainly. It can be known that the first topic is Jesus, because in the passage Jesus spoke about his going away and the second topic is the Father. They converge in the relationship between the Father and the Son. There was

¹R. C. H. Lenski, The Interpretation of St. John's Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), 1102, "Yet Jesus himself defines 'these things' in the phrase 'concerning the Father,' and more fully in v. 28."

²Beasley-Murray, 287.
no question when Jesus spoke concerning the Father, but whenever he connected himself to the Father, the people raised questions. Any announcement about Jesus' relationship to the Father caused the audience to question and misunderstand. In Johannine context his relationship with the Father is firmly rooted in the statements about his origin and destiny. His origin and destiny define his identity. Announcement concerning the Father was made plainly. They will be made more plain when the relationship between the Father and Jesus is made plain in the absence of παρομία. Therefore, topic one deals with his going away, and topic two deals with his destination: the Father. Both are closely related to each other. Although they are dealing with two different topics they converge in the relationship between the Father and the Son.

In sum, Jesus spoke plainly about the Father. The origin and destiny of Jesus was in riddles. Therefore, the phrase περί τοῦ πατρός does give a clue to the problem of ἐν παρομίας. What Jesus spoke about himself in παρομία will be manifest by his speaking plainly about his relationship with the Father. Παρομία is about Jesus' origin and destiny, but it is made plain only when his relationship with the Father becomes plain.
The word Ωρα occurs twenty-six times in John. Ωρα means an appointed time, the time set for something. Four times it is used to indicate the hour of the day. We can find at least three different qualities of time. First, it is a time called now: (1) the hour of true worship, and (2) the time when the dead will hear the voice of the son of God. Second, it means the event-hour: (1) the hour of glory; (2) the hour to go to the Father; (3) the hour not to speak in παροιμίας; and (4) the hour they will be scattered. Each of the four is considered as one event.

The Johannine Ωρα also is the eschatological hour in 5:26. This can be equated with the hour of persecution in 16:2, 4. There is an ambiguity in this. This might be included in point number 4 above.

Exegetes have two views in regard to Ωρα in vs. 25: (1) the time comes after Christ's resurrection; and (2) the time comes before His death. For the first view, C. K. Barrett, among others, held that "the 'hour' is not that of the immediately following sentences, but of the period after

---

2The sixth hour, 4:6; 19:14; the seventh Hour, 4:52; the tenth hour, 3:39.
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the resurrection, when the Spirit is given."¹ He, along with others, did not accept the response of the disciples as truthful.

For the second view, C. H. Dodd seems to disagree with the exegetes mentioned above. He believed that 16:28 is:

the explicit statement to which the metaphors of 16:19-23, drawn from current eschatological thoughts, correspond. This 'plain statement' is clearly meant to be the close of the exposition, which passes from παραστήσις to παραστήσις.²

J. Ramsey Michaels agrees with Dodd and says:

Their observation that Jesus already speaks plainly is quite accurate, and their acknowledgement that he comes from God (vs. 30) confirms what he had said they believed in verse 27.³

It appears that the majority of scholars interpret the time of παραστήσις as the time after the resurrection. When the Spirit of the Truth comes, he will enlighten the minds to understand the deep things of God.⁴ The second view, however, is not out of place, because the disciples

---


⁴Some exegetes interpreted existentially following Bultmann.
enjoyed the foretaste of the time in 16:26-28 and in chap. 17. Therefore, it is plausible to accept the comment in vs. 29 literally and to interpret that experience as the foretaste of the hour they will have after the resurrection. Still, the foretaste is not comparable to the fullness, which is yet to come. But this does not yet point to a conclusive answer to the question of the meaning of ἐν παρομίας.

Ταύτα

What does ταύτα refer to in John 16:25? If we can determine the referent of this ταύτα, we can define the nature of παρομία by examining the forms and contents of the material, but the views are so diverse that it is not easy to arrange them under a few categories. Grouping them into a few major views is somewhat forced, but in order to make the diversity and complexity manageable it is helpful to present them in this way. Before surveying the various views, it is necessary to note that all the scholars agree that it includes what is immediately preceding. The difference lies in what additions they make.

We can roughly group them into four major views. The first view suggests that it should refer to only what is immediately preceding. This trend is recently in vogue, but the tendency to extend its referents is seen even among its
advocates. Scholars who hold to this view also differ in their details.¹

The second view suggests that it should refer to the whole Farewell Discourse. Exegetes in this group do not agree in all points.²

¹John Peter Lange, The Gospel According to John (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 499, believes that "the proximate reference is to the saying of a little while, and, in particular, to the parabolic word concerning the woman in travail." He observes that "Jesus characterizes the entire method which he has hitherto pursued amongst the disciples, as a speaking εν παρομοιας." Still he thinks it wrong to include the word about the vine. He is not clear where to begin the section which is referred to by ταινα, but he believes that it should refer to more than just vss. 17, 21. Dodd, Interpretation, 392, 416, observes that it refers to 16:19-22. He thinks, 416, that the imagery of 16:19-22 is properly described by way of speaking in παρομοια. J. H. Bernard, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. John, ed. A. H. McNeile (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1972), 519, affirms that the primary reference here is to vss. 15-18. Schnackenburg, John, 3:161, believes that it refers to 16:16, 17c, 21. He notes that the use of plural implies a generalization, and adds that, "this is confirmed by the fact that the same word is used in the singular ('not in any figure') in vs. 29." Beasley-Murray, 286, concurs with Schnackenburg in what is referred to, except that he includes vs. 20, but he realizes the uncertainty involved, so he suggests three stages: immediately preceding; 4b-33; 13:31-16:32. Michaels, 273, restricts its reference to the riddle of vs. 16, the parable about the woman in labor in vs. 21, and perhaps to the metaphor of the vine in 15:1-17. He believes that to characterize the whole discourse as figures of speech is an exaggeration, to about the same degree as the statement in Mark 4:34 that Jesus would not speak to the people "without using parables."

The third view asserts that it should refer to all the teaching of Christ in the Gospel. All those who principally referred to, and at others, the obscurity resulting from that character. The former reference seems to prevail in 10:6, and the latter in the passage before us . . . but it is here applied to figurative expressions as obscure, and is fairly represented by dark sayings." G. H. C. MacGregor, The Gospel of John, Moffatt New Testament Commentary (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1928), 302, tries to add "to the immediately foregoing much of the discourse with reserve." The expression "the discourse" is taken to refer to the Farewell Discourse. Barrett, 495, believes, based on the contrast with μαρτυρία, that veiled speech is meant. He observes that it is "unlikely that the reference is simply to the analogy of the woman in childbirth in v. 21." For him "it is rather to the last discourses as a whole, or to all the teaching of Jesus, which John certainly represents as not having been understood." Morris, 709, holds to the pure form of this view. He includes consistently the whole Farewell Discourse. He finds it as referring to the discourse as a whole rather than to the immediately preceding figure of the woman in childbirth.

1George Hutcheson, The Gospel of John (London: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1972; first published 1657), 347, extends the referent to the most part of Jesus' doctrine hitherto. He observes that μαρτυρία should not "be restricted to the immediately preceding purpose in this chapter, but should be more generally extended to the most part of his doctrine hitherto, particularly in this last sermon." A. Plummer, The Gospel According to John, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (Cambridge: The University Press, 1923), 303, understands that it refers to all Christ taught. He observes that the certainty of how much is included is not decisive. At least he knows two opinions: one adheres to vss. 9-24; and the other to 15:1-16:24. But he suggests that the latter is too narrow. Bultmann, 587, argues against the idea of B. Weiss that μαρτυρία ought to be limited to vss. 23f, because its opposite is the future μαρτυρία-discourse. So he extends its reference to all that had been said previously. He thinks all to be enigmatic talk, and adds that "all discourses are both overt and enigmatic." He does not think it possible to distinguish one from the other. Whether it is overt or enigmatic the teaching of Jesus is not understood without the existentialization. Lenski, 1102, understands that μαρτυρία refers to "all that pertains to the Father, his [Jesus] mission, his return to the Father, all that Jesus and the Father will then do."
accept this view appear to presume that the presence of perfect and future tenses of the verbs in vs. 25 seems to indicate the demarcation of time. They tend to extend the scope of its referent.

The fourth view suggests that it should refer to what is immediately preceding and to the element of the mysterious that characterizes all the words of Jesus, to all of parabolic nature, and the characteristic of obscurity.¹

Josef Blank, The Gospel According to John, ed. John L. McKenzie, 2 vols. (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 2:162-163, believes that everything that Jesus had said during his earthly life is described as having been obscure and enigmatic in 16:25. He adds that the Gospel is largely a collection of parabolic discourses which are deciphered by means of misunderstandings and Jesus' replies to them. He comments on the differences between the Synoptic parables and Johannine discourses.

¹Frédéric Godet, Commentary on the Gospel of John, with Historical and Critical Introduction, translated from the 3d French edition by Timothy Dwight, 2 vols. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1886), 2:318, begins with ἐν παραμικη. He believes that it means similitude. He comments that Jesus meant "to characterize in general the manner of speaking of divine things in figurative language." He includes in the figurative language such as follows: Father's house, way, to come, to see again, to manifest oneself, to make one's abode, etc. Edwyn Clement Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel (London: Faber and Faber, 1947), 489-490, observes that "the Lord's teaching was characterized by this obscurity throughout; not merely the so-called parables but the sayings of the ministry in general." He understands that the distinction between the original teaching of Jesus and the teaching of the Church is justified and explained in this verse. Marcus Dods, The Gospel of St. John, The Expositor's Greek Testament, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll, 2 vols. (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1956), 2:838, includes all the sayings with reserved character of all the sayings of that and all the previous teachings. William Hendriksen, New Testament Commentary: The Gospel According to John, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1975), 336-337, believes that ἔτι refers to all the words which Jesus spoke that memorable night and
probably even to all his previous teaching. He thinks dark utterances to be the very heart of Christ's teaching. The discourse often centers in the veiled saying, but he does not believe that all the sayings of Jesus are dark utterances. He adds that "in the body of such a discourse there are many statements of sufficient clarity to remove every excuse for rejecting Jesus as the Son of God." He has a long list of dark utterances: "Jesus had spoken about raising up the temple in three days, getting born again, living water which quenches thirst once and for all, rivers of this water flowing from within believers, people who would never see death; also about himself, as the One whose flesh the believer must eat and whose blood he must drink, as having preceded Abraham in time, as the good shepherd who lays down his own life; about a mysterious betrayer (whose identity remained undisclosed for a considerable period of time); and about an enigmatic "little while," which was to be followed by another equally puzzling "little while" (see on 2:19; 3:3, 5: 4:10, 14; 6:35, 50, 51, 53-58; 7:37, 38; 8:51, 56, 58; chapter 10; 13:18, 21; 16:16-19)." Emphasis original.

Brown, John: XIII-XXI, 734, believes that the disciples have not understood the figure of the woman in labor that Jesus uses to illustrate his departure, but it cannot be sustained by the text. There is not a slight hint about this in the text. What they did not understand is not the parabolic word of a woman in travail, but the word of departure. So Jesus promised that the time will come when such figures will no longer be necessary. Brown goes on and extends it to include "the element of the mysterious that characterized all the words of Jesus in the Gospel." It is not clear whether he intends to include all the words of Jesus in παροιμίαι. Barclay M. Newman and Eugene A. Nida, A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of John (New York: United Bible Societies, 1980), 516, 517, include a saying about the woman; washing of the disciples' feet; the vine and the branches; the good shepherd; and more. They extend the scope of its referent to all the Gospel; still they limit it only to the sayings of parabolic nature. Peter F. Ellis, The Genius of John: A Composition-Critical Commentary on the Fourth Gospel (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1984), 237, observes the referents of παροιμία in two contexts. First, the immediate context, in which the reference is to the mysterious saying of "little while" in vss. 16-19 and to the parabolic similitude of the travail and joy of the woman who gives birth in vss. 21-22. Second, he has a list of "allegories": the wind in 3:8; the shepherd and the gate; the saying about Lazarus' death; the saying about seeing the Father in 14:7; and the vine and the branches, and "all of which presented difficulties to the hearers (cf. 3:9; 10:24;
It is difficult to put the views in good sequence because there is no apparent development. A reason for presenting these views is not to see a development, but to show disagreement. The nineteenth century authorities are quoted to show that there is almost no advancement in defining τῶν. The recent tendency is to limit it to the immediately preceding passage, but the whole Gospel tends to attract the attention of the exegetes. Since the views are so diverse, we recognize the difficulty of the problem.

One common tendency among all the exegetes is this: They made decisions about what ἐν παρομίας means before they investigated what τῶν refers to. Once the meaning of ἐν παρομίας is settled, there is no need to investigate what this τῶν refers to. My contention is: Unless we are sure about what τῶν refers to, we are not in a position to decide the meaning of ἐν παρομίας. We need to investigate first what τῶν refers to, then we can analyze the referent and decide what ἐν παρομίας means. So the sequence of the investigation must be τῶν--ἐν παρομίας not ἐν παρομίας--τῶν. A survey of how τῶν is used in this Gospel will help us in the process of determining the referent of τῶν in 16:25.

11:14; 14:8-9)." David J. Ellis, The International Bible Commentary with the New International Version, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1986), 1257, combines two ideas. He wants it to refer to the immediately preceding material in the discourses and to "the parabolic method which Jesus employed as a whole."
Taûta in John

Many sayings are referred to as taûta in this Gospel. Since taûta is a neuter plural form of oûtoç, it is necessary to investigate the use of toûto all through the Gospel in order to see how taûta is employed, and this in turn will assist us to know what taûta in 16:25 refers to. We limit our investigation to taûta and toûto only as they refer to certain sayings, regardless of the speaker. In order to see the consistency with which the word is used we will deal with μετά taûta and μετά toûto as well.

We have two questions to ask: what does taûta refer to in the various contexts of John? Of what size are the referents of taûta? In many cases what taûta refers to is obvious, and there are some cases in which the referent is not obvious. We call the former obvious.taûta.

Obvious Taûta. We have twenty-two examples of obvious taûta. Taûta in 6:53 refers to the discourse on the bread of life. Taûta in 13:21 refers to the block of sayings in 13:12b-20. Taûta in 15:11 refers to the discourse on the vine in 15:1-11. Taûta in 16:1 refers to 15:18-27. This is apparent because they were worried about the persecutions he had spoken of. This is referred to as taûta again in vss. 4 and 6. Actually taûta in vss. 16:1, 4 (2), 6 refers to the same, which is 15:18-27. Taûta in 17:12 refers to 17:1-11. Taûta in 18:1 refers to the prayer in chap. 17. All these eight instances refer to rather extensive portions.

We have other instances of ταῦτα which refer to short sayings. Ταῦτα in 9:40 refers to one sentence in 9:39. Ταῦτα in 11:28 refers to 11:27, which is one sentence. Ταῦτα in 12:16 refers to one sentence quotation from Isaiah in vs. 15. Ταῦτα in 20:14 refers to 20:13, one sentence of Mary. All these cases have one sentence.

These are obvious ταῦτα. The plural form does not necessarily indicate many sentences. Even a sentence can be referred to as ταῦτα (e.g., 11:27; 12:16), and also a long block of sayings can be called ταῦτα (e.g., 13:12b-20; 15:1-11). Ταῦτα seems to refer to a sentence or sentences of any size. Therefore we can conclude that ταῦτα may refer to any length of sayings, but it is certain that each of them refers to what is immediately preceding.

Τοῦτο. A neuter singular form of οὗτος, τοῦτο is used consistently in the Gospel to refer to a single saying. We
have fifteen instances of this usage.\textsuperscript{1} All these refer to one sentence immediately preceding. Compared to the use of τῶν, it is more consistent and literal, due to the fact that τότε always refers to one sentence or verse (remembering that versification is arbitrary). It also refers to what is immediately preceding. From the above investigation, τότε, when it refers to a saying, is used consistently to refer to a short saying or question. There is no exception to this rule. In order to see the consistent use of τῶν, let us look at μετὰ τῶν.

\textbf{Μετὰ τῶν}. Μετὰ τῶν in 3:22 may refer to a time after at least two incidents: the first one in Jerusalem; the second, an interview with Nicodemus. Therefore, the function of τῶν comports with its plural form. Μετὰ τῶν in 5:1 may refer to a time after Jesus' visit to Galilee and the visit to Cana, or after all the things that happened in Cana. Therefore, τῶν in its plural form functions literally. Μετὰ τῶν in 5:14 may refer to a time after the question in 9c-13 and Jesus' withdrawal. Μετὰ τῶν in 6:1 refers to a time after the dialogues in 5:14-47.

Μετὰ τῶν in 7:1 refers to a time after all the things happened in chap. 6. Μετὰ τῶν in 19:38 refers to a time after all the things which took place in the passion of Jesus. Μετὰ τῶν in 20:21 refers to a time after two post-resurrection appearances of Jesus. That all these seven


**ταύτα** refer to a plurality of incidents is clear. There is no exception to this rule. They consistently refer to more than one incident of life.

**Μετά τούτο.** There are three instances of **μετά τούτο.** Each of them refers to a single incident. The one in 11:7 refers to the fact that Jesus stayed two more days after he heard the news that his dear friend was ill. The other in 11:11 refers to the preceding incident in which he spoke. The third one in 19:28 refers to the moment Jesus spoke to his beloved disciple about his mother. All these refer to single things. Therefore, we conclude that **τούτο** with **μετά** consistently refers to a single thing.

**These Words.** Τοὺς λόγους τούτους in 10:19 and ταύτα τὰ ρήματα in 10:21 refer to the same speech in 10:7-18. The expression τῶν λόγων τούτων in 7:40 refers to 7:37-39. Ταύτα τὰ ρήματα in 8:20 refers to 8:12-19. Τούτων τὸν λόγον in 19:8 refers to 19:7 where the Jews said, "we have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." In Greek the sentence has fourteen words, but the plural form of "τῶν λόγων τούτων" in 19:13 refers to a single sentence in 19:12, which has sixteen words. Therefore, we might conclude that the expression "these words" is consistently used to refer to a singular saying, though the sizes of the sayings vary. All of them refer to what is immediately preceding.
Less Obvious Ταύτα. There are five Ταύτα which call for attention, because they do not obviously show their referent. Before we enter the discussion it is important to pay attention to the fact that we must give preferential consideration to the immediately preceding portion as the referent of Ταύτα, because obvious Ταύτα has shown this regularity.

The saying in 5:34 has a present tense verb of λέγω, which might be translated as 'I am saying.' It seems to refer to what is preceding, but because of the present tense, the possibility that the following section can be included in Ταύτα is high. Jesus reveals that the purpose of saying certain things is to impart the saving knowledge. Both the following and the preceding portions seem equally to fit into the purpose, and the verb indicates on-going conversation. Therefore, it may refer to both what is preceding and what is following, all that Jesus says in 5:19-47.

When one enters the Farewell Discourse, the question of what Ταύτα refers to becomes more complicated because at least seven Ταύτα are used. All of them are related to each other in some degree or another. Ταύτα in 16:33 refers to what precedes. When we analyze the verse we see two stated purposes: that "in me you may have peace"; that "you may be of good cheer in spite of the tribulation." Their hearts were troubled because he told them of his going away. They were in sorrow when he told them of the coming persecution.
Jesus said τῷα to remedy these two conditions. Up until 16:6 he told them of the gloomy future, but suddenly the tone changes in 16:7, where comforting words begin. Since 16:33 reveals that τῷα was given to comfort them, it is natural to see it refer to the comforting words. Therefore, 16:7 can be a good starting point of this τῷα. Carson thinks that it refers to chaps. 14-16.¹ Bernard believes that it refers to the immediately preceding of vs. 32,² but I believe it to be more likely the passage of 16:7-32, with some interruptions, that is referred to.

Τῷα in 17:1 refers to the preceding words of consolation, but since this verse does not have any specifications it is possible to extend the scope of its referent. It is after the end of the Farewell Discourse and is found in the narrator’s comment and also before the beginning of the prayer. We can extend it to the whole discourse, and scholars usually agree to the extent that it refers to the whole Farewell Discourse.³ In spite of the

²Bernard, 523.
fact that ἵνα always refers to what immediately precedes, it is plausible to accept the view that this ἵνα refers not only to what immediately precedes, but the whole discourse as well.¹ Still it does not contradict the pattern we have seen so far, except the size of the referent is enormously large at this time.

Ταῦτα in 14:25 presents a rather difficult problem. Due to the perfect tense of the verb, it certainly refers to what is preceding, but what is the real beginning of the section referred to is not certain. Bernard wanted to put chap. 14 at the end of the Farewell Discourse and he commented:

This is the seventh time that this solemn refrain appears in the Last Discourse. Here ἵνα embrace all that has been said throughout the evening, and not only the sentences immediately preceding.²

There is little to substantiate Bernard's rearrangement. If this rearrangement is implausible, then where do we find the beginning point of the section this ἵνα refers to? Several verses can be suggested: 14:23; 14:18; 14:9; 13:33 [31]; and 14:1. The portion beginning with 13:33 indicates the longest of them, the portion of 13:33-14:24. The portion beginning with 14:23 indicates the shortest of them, that is, 14:23-24. There is one good reason we should think

¹Barrett, 467, thought that the reference was to the words of consolation which Jesus has spoken. Bultmann, 625, believed that ἵνα referred to all the sayings of Jesus thus far.

²Bernard, 552.
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Inclusively. In 14:25 Jesus emphasized his presence among the disciples. From 13:33 to 14:24 we have at least five instances of mentioning his presence among them, and there is no ἐννοούμενον at all used in this section. It seems to show that ἐννοούμενον in 14:25 refers to 13:33-14:24. This portion of sayings was interrupted by the questions from Peter (13:36-38), Thomas (14:5-7), Philip (14:8-11) and Judas (not Iscariot, 14:22). The saying was interrupted at 13:35, but in 14:1, Jesus resumed the topic. At this time he comforted them with the promise of his return. Again it was interrupted by the question Thomas raised, again by Philip. Jesus resumed it at vs. 12. This time the promise of greater works which the believers are able to do was given. Then followed a commandment of love. The promise of his return was repeated, and all was summarized. Judas raised a question, but Jesus answered and continued his discourse. Therefore, we conclude that it refers to the section of 13:33-14:24, a rather long portion.

There are a few cases in which ἐννοούμενον is used to refer to what is written (e.g., 20:31; 21:24), but since the problem of ἐννοούμενον we are dealing with concerns the sayings of Jesus, being conditioned by a verb λαλέω, I do not discuss this in detail.

1It is not clear whether only signs are referred to, or both signs and sayings are referred to by these ἐννοούμενον. It probably refers to the Gospel as a whole.
Summary. We may summarize the characteristics of the use of τάουα in regard to the sayings material:

1. Τάουα refers to what is immediately preceding (with one possible exception in 5:34, where the following can be included).

2. Τάουα may refer to a large block of sayings or to a small block of sayings of any size.

3. Τάουα may refer to a simple saying.

4. Τάουα may refer to a few verses.

5. Τάουα may refer to a block of sayings interrupted by interlocutions.

Τάουα in 16:25

There is no doubt from the prevailing patterns we have seen so far that τάουα in John normally refers to what is immediately preceding. Chap. 16:20 [19]-24, therefore, seems to be what is referred to by the τάουα in vs. 25, according to the first and second of the above characteristics. Vs. 19 repeats the saying in vs. 16. It responds to the questions caused by the saying in vs. 16. Therefore, it is difficult to separate vs. 16 from what follows. We have seen a fifth characteristic which allows some interruptions in the discourse material referred to by τάουα. This phenomenon was seen in the portion referred to by τάουα in 14:25. It appears that even without the

1Τάουα in μετά τάουα and τότε in μετά τότε refer to the preceding incidents and the preceding single incident respectively.
interruptions by the questions of the disciples, the Discourse might have followed the same route. By tentatively bracketing ἐν παρομίας we have no objection as to the idea that τὰῦτα refers to vss. 16, 20-24. The inclusion of vs. 16 gives rise to the question whether the preceding section should be included, but if we attempt to find everything in vss. 16, 20-24 that was spoken ἐν παρομίας we will be misled.

There are two objections to the assumption that τὰῦτα refers only to vss. 16, 20-24. First, the words preceding vs. 16 are not separated from it, although that deals with the way the Spirit of the Truth works. Second, in vs. 17 not only the saying of μικρὸν, but also the saying of his going away to the Father was questioned, which is found in vs. 5a [10b]. It might be more proper to include the words preceding vs. 16, where his going away was mentioned.

We see τὰῦτα in vs. 4. This τὰῦτα refers to what Jesus said about the coming persecution primarily, and in vs. 5 it appears that a turn of topic occurs. He resumes the topic of his return, and this topic continues all the way to vs. 16. It appears most likely that 16:5-24 is what is referred to by τὰῦτα in 16:25. We, therefore, conclude that τὰῦτα refers to not only 16:16, 20-24, but 16:5-15 as well. Analysis of 16:5-15 is not necessary because to know what is referred to by τὰῦτα gives adequate ground to continue the discussion of what is παρομία in this context.
In 16:25 Jesus made it clear that he will no longer speak to them ἐν παρομίας. It is obvious from the text that there is no παρομία in 26-28. When they heard him speak vss. 26-28 they responded that he was not speaking a παρομία. This is a comment on the manner of Jesus' speech, while vs. 30 is a comment and confession arising from what Jesus has said. It is absurd to assert that they did not know what Jesus meant by ἐν παρομίας. They understood the shift between the two, but they did not understand the contents of παρομία. They did not say that they now understood what he said, they simply said "you are speaking plainly, not a παρομία." They did not seem to understand what Jesus meant in vs. 16 even after he spoke vss. 26-28.

Thus far, we have discussed at length 16:25, 29. The examination of significant elements in the verses revealed that ἐν παρομία means the absence of παρομία, which seems to refer to an obscure and difficult saying. Speaking plainly is not only contrasted with speaking ἐν παρομίας but is related closely to the boldness of prayer to the Father, which emphasizes Jesus' relationship with the Father. Ἡμα is understood to refer to the time after resurrection as well as the moment of speaking as a foretaste of that coming hour. Ταῦτα in 16:25 is understood to refer to the immediately preceding passage of 16:5-24.

It is natural to think of 16:16 as the παρομία which triggered the question. In 23a Jesus said that "in that day
you will ask [question] nothing of me," because the παρομοία will be solved by the resurrection. If resurrection gives them the answer, then the question is on death. It suggests that the referent of the παρομοία can well be the death of Jesus. It is significant to see Jesus' statement in 20:17-18 after the resurrection that he will go up to the Father. When Jesus told them about his going away to the Father before his death, he was speaking to them about the return to God through his death and resurrection.

In light of the discussion we may draw three important points toward the conclusion: (1) the saying of 16:25 was given in the context of questioning conditioned by the ambiguous words of Jesus; (2) the phrase ἐν παρομοιαῖς is contrasted with παρρησία; and (3) ταύτα refers to what is preceding. Based on this we can conclude that the sayings of 16:5a (10b), 16 are παρομοίαι.

Ἐν Παρομοίαις

We have identified that the sayings of μικρὸν in vs. 16 and of υπάγω in vs. 5a [10b] as παρομοία in the passage. Now we have to ask: What does ἐν παρομοίαις mean in 16:25? This is the main question and the reason for the preceding discussion. A basis for solving the problem is laid. It is necessary to review various views to test them against the results of our preceding study. We find at least five different views regarding the phrase ἐν παρομοίαις, reflected in various Bible translations and commentaries: proverb,
parable, illustration, figure[s] of speech, and riddle [dark saying].

Proverb

The KJV translates it "in proverbs." It is based on a literal translation of a Greek word παροιμία. Kim Dewey believed that John's use of the term παροιμία "embraces a range of literary forms, devices, and concepts, including riddle, proverb, parable, metaphor, allegory, irony, paradox, enigma, aporia, and so on." To say that John uses a range of all these listed above is one thing, but to say that each use of the term embraces a range of all the listed above is another. This seems like a case of "illegitimate totality transfer," to use a phrase of James Barr. Dewey discussed the Johannine use of proverbs and makes a list of thirty-four proverbs, and followed Bultmann and Brown accepting the use of παροιμία in 16:25, 29 "to be a reference not merely to the immediately preceding verses, but to all the words of Jesus in the Gospel." He focused on the proverbial-parablic material, and believed that the use of the proverb is "with little risk of

---

1 Dewey, 82.


3 Dewey, 82.
being misunderstood." His definition of proverb\textsuperscript{1} eliminates 'proverb' from John's use of \textit{παρομία}. He saw two proverbs in 10:1-5, but they were not understood! We find 16:21 in his list of thirty-four, but this verse is not identified as a \textit{παρομία} above.

Also, he thought that by \textit{ἐν παρομίαις} the incomprehensible things were communicated, and by \textit{ἐν παρομίαις} the things comprehensible were communicated, but misunderstanding was not caused by the forms and literary devices! Rather, it is caused by mysterious content. When he used Bultmann he did not look at his reason for saying this--not because of the literary devices, but the difficulty arose because of the lack of commitment.\textsuperscript{2} The misunderstanding was not caused by proverbs. Therefore, proverbs must be deemed out of the range of this term in the FG. In the general sense of \textit{παρομία} Dewey is not wrong, but his view deviates from the Johannine sense of \textit{παρομία}.

It is strange that H. R. Reynolds used the translation of "in proverbs" and amplified it with "in concentrated and to some extent enigmatical utterances, 'in dark sayings upon a harp'." What definition did he accept for "proverbs"? If he followed the modern definition he

\textsuperscript{1}He says on p. 91, "The proverb is a sanctioned vehicle for expressing one's thoughts and intentions, without fear of public censure and with little risk of being misunderstood."

\textsuperscript{2}Bultmann, 587.
should not accept this translation because proverbs belong to the public. He put all the similitudes in chaps. 9-12, 16 in this category.¹ There are proverbs in John but none of them was called παρομιά, though in the Synoptic Gospels proverbs were called παραβολή (Luke 4:23; 6:39; Mark 3:23, 24). In the FG, particularly in our text, something else is called παρομιά. Therefore, "in proverbs" is not proper for the translation of this phrase.

Parable

Literary critics define parable in various ways. Bernard Brandon Scott defined a parable: "A parable is a mashal that employs a short narrative fiction to reference a symbol."² This will be our working definition for the discussion. He mentioned four components of a parable. The second component is significant for our discussion: "A parable is a short, narrative fiction. This initially differentiates parables from other meshalim like proverbs, riddles, sentences of the wise, and so forth."³ According to Scott's definition, the sayings of 5a [10b], 16 are not


³Ibid.
parables, and 16:21 might be a parable. Nevertheless, it is not fictitious.

The Amplified Bible translates it "in parables (veiled language, allegories, dark sayings)" in both 16:25 and 29. The editors gave room for options in the parenthesis. It appears that they chose "parable" in view of the fact that παρομια is another word for παραβολή. Many scholars hold this view. Newman and Nida thought that there seemed to be no "perceptible difference between Johannine παρομια and Synoptic παραβολή."¹ The context of John 16:25, however, reveals that παρομια is different from the Synoptic παραβολή. Therefore, 'parable' is an improbable meaning.

Illustration

Floyd V. Filson believed that παρομια is an illustration.² It is not a hindrance, but rather a help. He agreed with Brown that the παρομια is a parable and is given to help their understanding. This ignores the contrast between παρησια and ἐν παρομιας. If we follow their view it is not a dark saying, but a figure of speech employed to help their understanding the sayings which caused misunderstanding. If it did, the purpose of

¹Newman and Nida, 325. It is possible to propose this theory based on Mark 4. Nevertheless Johannine data do not seem to support it.

illustration is not achieved. In fact, Filson did not seem to accept the presence of a dark saying. He stated:

He does not mean that he has deliberately tried to keep them from understanding him. He means that to help them at their stage of spiritual growth he had to use such illustrations. Even then they have not fully understood him.¹

He understood that the παρομία were employed to assist understanding. Therefore, he thought they were illustrations.

Brown submitted:

The disciples have not understood the figure of the woman in labor that Jesus uses to illustrate his departure, and so Jesus promises that the time will come when such figures will no longer be necessary.²

It is extremely difficult to support this interpretation, because we cannot find any indication from the text that they did not understand 16:21, and actually it is an illustration for vs. 20, and the sayings of vss. 5a [10b], 16 are not illustrations. We have observed so far that παρομία impeded rather than illuminiated. "Illustration" therefore appears to be an inappropriate translation of παρομία in the FG.

Figures of Speech

The Good News Bible rendered the word παρομία "figures of speech." The NIV chose "figuratively" (16:25), "figures of speech" (16:29). The NKJV chose "figurative

¹Ibid.  
²Brown, John:XIII-XXI. 734.
language" (16:25), "figure of speech" (16:29). The NEB selected "figures of speech," "figure of speech." The NASB opted for "figurative language," "figure of speech." The RSV rendered "in figures, in figure." Schnackenburg supports this proposal. He believes that 16:16, 17c, 21 belong to this figure. It is an attempt to go back to the Hebrew word ἐν, which seems to include a wide range of literary genres. Based on the use of the plural form of παρωμία, it is asserted that the word is intended not to point to a specific literary form or Dominical saying, but to the whole method of figurative language permeating the Gospel—that is, a generic plural. If we accept this, our understanding of the expression ἐν παρωμολογίας in the Synoptics should be modified considerably (Matt 13:3, 13; Mark 4:2). Furthermore, because we have two specific παρωμία of 16:5 (10b); 16, we need to see the term technically, not generically.

Since we are not looking for the general idea of παρωμία but for the specific idea from the context, we are obliged to look for something narrower. This approach of Schnackenburg, 3:161.

2Gail R. O'Day, Revelation in the Fourth Gospel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 106, understood it to refer to the mode of revelation. She asserted: "The change from plural to singular indicates that the disciples do not understand that Jesus is referring to his mode of speaking, but instead interpret his words as if Jesus were referring to individual teaching units." She also viewed that "16:25 is not a straightforward statement to be taken at face value but is itself ironic."
using "figure" is safe but not specific enough for our investigation. We must look beyond it.

Riddle

The Hebrew word for riddle is נטש. Samson's riddle is the only example of נטש as meaning riddle. Usually riddles are difficult questions (1 Kgs 10:1; 2 Chr 9:1).

The method of God's revelation to the prophets, except Moses, was described by the use of this term (Num 12:8: in dark speech). "With him I speak mouth to mouth, clearly (טו יד), and not in dark speech; and he beholds the form of the Lord." Somehow this provides a background for John 16:25. When we try to understand John 16:25 in the light of Num 12:8 we can arrive at an insightful interpretation--the disciples do not remain as ordinary prophets, but they will be like Moses. God's dealings with the people, its history, and its hidden meaning were labeled as riddles (Ps 78:2).

The king who understands riddles will arise (Dan 8:23). A taunt saying is referred to by the term (Hab 2:6). In size Old Testament and Judaic riddles are usually short.

1 H. Torczyner, "The Riddle in the Bible," HUCA 1 (1924): 125-49, lists several Old Testament riddles: Ps 19:5, 3-4; Judg 13:18; 6:23; Amos 7:8; Jer 1:11; Ezek 17:3-10; Cant 8:8-10; Eccl 12:2-6; but they are not labeled as נטש.

2 Emphasis supplied.

3 Samson's riddle in Judg 14:14: "Out of the eater came something to eat. Out of the strong came something sweet." Only six words in Hebrew. We find a riddle in
Riddles in the Greco-Roman world have their own peculiarities.1 Clearchus of Soli gave a definition: "A riddle is a problem put in jest, requiring, by searching the mind, the answer to the problem to be given for a prize or forfeit."2 Some Greek riddles are: (1) based on a letter; (2) based on a syllable; and (3) based on a whole noun. As for the riddle's lengths we find some riddles are short, but others are extremely long.3

Lamentations Rabbah I.1.11: "What are the following: nine go out but eight come in, two pour out but one drinks, and twenty-four serve?" We also find several riddles in Yebamoth 97b: "My paternal, but not my maternal brother, and he is the husband of my mother and I am the daughter of his wife'!" "He whom I carry on my shoulder is my brother and my son and I am his sister'!" "Greetings to you my son; I am the daughter of your sister'!

1 Walter Manoel Edwards and Frederick Adam Wright, "Riddles," in The Oxford Classical Dictionary, ed. N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 924: "A riddle (γρίφος) in its proper sense may be described as a species of δινήμα or 'dark saying', ('story'). It is essentially designed to baffle or challenge the intelligence of the hearer; its subject-matter may be derived from a variety of sources, e.g. natural phenomena, social custom, or myth."

2 Athenaeus Deipnosophistae 10.448c.

3 All the riddles in this section are found in Athenaeus Deipnosophistae (1) Short riddles: the sweat from the Bromiad spring: wine; the dewy stream of the nymphs: water; the redolent breath of cassia coursing through the air: myrrh (10.449c); "What is the strongest thing in the world?" (10.451b); "A creature footless, spineless, boneless, shellbacked, its elongated eyes popping out and popping in': snail (10.455e); (2) Longer riddles: "There is a feminine being which keeps its babes safe beneath its bosom; they, though voiceless, raise a cry sonorous over the waves of the sea and across all the dry land, reaching what mortals they desire, and they may hear even when they are not there; but their sense of hearing is dull" (10.450f); "The hollow-bodied vessel formed by the while of the wheel,
We may list Pythagoras' enigmas:1 "Do not taste of black-tails"; "Do not step over the beam of a balance"; "Do not sit on a peck measure"; "Do not give your hand to everybody"; "Do not wear a tight ring"; "Do not poke a fire with steel"; "Do not eat your heart"; "Abstain from beans"; "Do not put food into a slop-pail"; "Do not turn back on reaching the boundaries." These enigmas are listed also in Plutarch De Iside et Osiride 534e, where they are labeled as Πυθαγορικών παραγγελμάτων (Pythagorean precepts). These are precepts couched in enigmas. When the intentions of these sayings are in view, they are precepts, but when difficulties are in view they are enigmas.

Whenever individuals gave a riddle they asked what it meant. Hence, riddles are followed by a question. In the Judaic world if one understood the riddle one won a garment(s) as the reward, and if he failed he lost his garment(s).2 In the Greco-Roman world when one failed to

fashioned of clay, baked in another house of Mother Earth, and bearing in its womb the tender-fleshed forms, milk-nursed and stewing, of the new-born flock: pot (10.449b); "The creamy flood that flows from bleating shegoats, mingled with fountains from the tawny bee, and nested in a flat covering of the maiden daughter of chaste Demeter, luxuriating in countless delicately-compounded wrappings: a flat-cake" (10.440c); "It is not mortal nor yet immortal; rather, it has a nature so mixed that its life is neither in man's estate not in a god's, but its substance ever grows fresh and then dies again; it may not be seen by the eye, yet it is known of all": sleep (10.449d).


2Samson's case, and see Lamentations Rabbah I.1.11.
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resolve the riddle, he should drink an extra cup of wine mixed with brine.¹

Greek words for 'riddle' are γρίφος, αίνιγμα, and πρόβλημα,² but the term used here is παρομία, which hinders literal translation in the context. Several translators of this term understood it in context and in contrast with παρρησία. The JB used "veiled language" in vss. 25, 29. Leon Morris understood it as "dark sayings or parables," which he believed to refer to the whole discourse.³ Barnabas Lindars rendered it "obscurely."⁴ Carson thought that "figuratively" does not mean 'with figures of speech' but 'with veiled speech' in contrast to the 'plainly'.⁵

¹Athenaeus Deipnosophistae 10.458f: "we must tell also what penalty was suffered by those who failed to solve the riddle put to them. They drank brine mixed in their wine, and were obliged to take the cup without stopping to breathe, as Antiphanes shows."

²Τρίφος and αίνιγμα are πρόβλημα, which is, they are difficult problems. The former is in question format. One gives a riddle and asks the audience what it is. One requires the audience to solve the problem. The latter has common features with the former, but not always. It sometimes leaves the audience in darkness. Therefore the audience should ponder and find out the meaning or the answer. The Johannine riddles are closer to the latter than to the former. Jesus is portrayed as stimulating the audience to ask questions about what he said. His way of giving riddles was different from those of Samson and Greek Sophists.

³Morris, 709.

⁴Lindars, 511.

⁵Carson, 163.
Ernst Haenchen put it "in enigmatic words, veiled sayings."\(^1\) Marcus Dods regarded it as "dark sayings" or "riddles." He thought that it referred to the reserved character of the whole evening's conversation and of all the previous teaching.\(^2\)

A few scholars prefer "riddles." Bultmann used "enigmatic talk."\(^3\) J. N. Sanders thought that \(\epsilon\nu\ \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\iota\mu\iota\alpha\varsigma\) referred to enigmatic sayings. He believed that much that Jesus said to the disciples was enigmatic.\(^4\) W. H. Cadman believed that \(\pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\iota\alpha\varsigma\) is used in "the sense of dark sayings, utterances which have had in them meanings hidden so far from the disciples." He thought that "their relationship to Him will remain a dark riddle until they come through the gift of the Spirit to experience the reality of union with Him and the Father."\(^5\) B. F. Westcott commented on 10:6 and 16:25 that it showed "the notion of a mysterious saying full of compressed thought, rather than that of a simple comparison."\(^6\) George R. Beasley-Murray believed that it is

\(^{1}\)Haenchen, 145.

\(^{2}\)Dods, 838.

\(^{3}\)Bultmann, 587, Rätselrede.


\(^{6}\)Westcott, 233.
"in the obscure speech of metaphor," and "obscure language."¹ R. C. H. Lenski believed that παρομια are veiled utterances or forms of speech over against complete plainness and direct language."²

The sayings of 16:5 (10b), 16 are difficult sayings. Therefore, "riddle," in the sense of a difficult saying, fits best for them and is well supported by the context. Now, we need to return to the question of above: Did Jesus reveal the Father through riddles? The answer is no. God was revealed as explicitly as possible, but it was the relationship between the Son and the Father that was described in παρομια. Although Jesus did not give them riddles as such, we read that his riddles caused the audience ask him about their meaning. In this sense his riddles are slightly different from the ones then current.

We examined 'proverb,' 'parable,' 'illustration,' 'figures of speech,' and 'riddle' to find which of these are most appropriate for the translation of παρομια in the expression "ἐν παρομιας." Since vss. 16:5 (10b), 16 are identified as παρομια, it is clear that they do not belong to the categories of proverb, parable, or illustration. We saw that 'proverb' did not fit because of the failed understanding. 'Parable' does not fit because vs. 16:15 is apparently not a parable. The notion that it is an

¹Beasley-Murray, 267.
²Lenski, 1102.
'illustration' is misleading because it should help with understanding, not hinder. 'Figures of speech' is not specific enough; it is too broad for John. 'Riddle' represents the best translation because it explains why the disciples failed to understand, and questioned. Furthermore, vss. 5a [10b], 16 are good examples of riddles. Therefore, we accept "in riddles" as the more appropriate translation of the phrase ἐν παρομίαις.

Analysis of Riddles

The situation in 17-24 ensued from the obscure saying in vs. 16, and this saying pertained to the event of Jesus' going away. Most specific παρομίαι are mentioned in vs. 17: the riddle of a little while and the riddle of his going away. Therefore, it is evident that παρομία is a riddle about the departure of Jesus. There were a few references to his going to the Father after the first mention in 14:12 in his own words.1 We find mention of this in 16:5, 7, 10 in this passage.

The question in vs. 17 is about the meaning of vs. 16, but vs. 17 includes "because I go to the Father" at the end. We heard of his going away in the previous sections in the Gospel,2 but not in 16:16. However, his departure was

14:19, 23, 28. The Evangelist himself mentioned the departure in 13:1, 3.

13:33, 36; 14:12, 19, 28; 16:5, 10b. Especially 16:10b is quoted verbatim in 16:17.
brought up when they questioned him about 16:16. In vss. 16-19 this saying of μικρόν is mentioned four times. This repetition suggests the significance of the saying. The whole section seems to revolve around it. It is apparent that they have not understood the departure sayings in the previous section. Now when they faced another difficult saying of μικρόν, they brought up these two sayings together (16:5a [10b], 16). They were not able to correlate them very well. The saying of his going away became more obscure with the saying of μικρόν. The intensification of the difficulty made them question.

In 16:5 Jesus expected his disciples to ask questions about ύπάγω. It appears that Jesus thought the word of his departure was a difficult saying. Nevertheless, they did not ask about it in the way Jesus expected. Later in 16:17b they included this by quoting 16:10b. The saying of ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ύπάγω καὶ οὐκ ἔπειτα θεωρεῖτε με combined two riddles of going away and seeing no more (16:10).

The verb ύπάγω is used thirty-two times in the FG. When Jesus used this word to tell the people about his going away, it was not understood properly (7:33; 8:14, 21, 22; 13:33; 14:4, 28). Although John mixes πορεύομαι with ύπάγω, the latter is used more ambiguously. It is supported by the fact that when Jesus used πορεύομαι instead of ύπάγω they said that he was not saying a riddle (16:28, 29). The riddle includes the ambiguous word ύπάγω. They did not understand the saying about his going to the Father.
The riddle of μικρόν of 16:16 shows a repetitive structure: "A little while, and you will see me no more; again a little while, and you will see me." The disciples were puzzled by μικρόν. By the repetitive use of an ambiguous word (μικρόν) the saying became obscure. They did not understand μικρόν. Not only ὑπάγω but μικρόν also is an ambiguous word. The riddles reveal the mystery of Jesus' going away in ambiguous words. Therefore, I propose that the use of an ambiguous word is one of the characteristics of the Johannean riddle.

Since his return to the Father is only through the death on the cross and the resurrection from the dead they were not able to understand his saying. It was probably not based on the lack of faith or the lack of proper commitment to the person of Jesus, as Bultmann proposes, but was prompted because of their conception of Messiah. It is evident that the Jews believed that the Messiah should remain forever. The disciples appear to have shared the

---

1 We see that the English translation has better verbal parallelism than the Greek original: "Μικρόν καὶ οὐκέτι θεορεῖτέ με. καὶ πάλιν μικρόν καὶ δύνεσθε με." We can find a similar parallelism in Samson's riddle in Judg 14:14; the Greek term for this riddle is πρόβλημα. and Samson said: "Out of the eater came something to eat. Out of the strong came something sweet."

2 Bultmann, 586-7.

3 Cf. 12:34. It is not clear which Old Testament text is in the background of this belief. Brian McNeil, "The Quotation at John xii 34," NovT 19 (1977): 22-33, sees the Targum to Isa 9:5 (6) provides the key to understanding the allusion. Gillian Bampfylde, "More Light on John xii
popular belief. Although they have accepted him as the Messiah, they could not accept his return to the Father, even through death.

The major theme of this discourse, which we might call the major ἀποστία, appears to be his going away. Everything in chaps. 13-17 ensued from the situation of his going away. What they were not able to understand was his going away through death. The sending of the Holy Spirit and the asking of the Father "in my name" were two main pillars which sustained the disciples when they were told of his going away. These two promises were the core of this Farewell Discourse.

It is apparent that vs. 16 is a riddle. Vs. 21 is an illustration for vs. 20, not for vs. 16. It is included in the expansion of the riddle of vs. 16. Vss. 20, 22 describe the result of their not seeing him and seeing him

34," JSNT 17 (1983): 87-89, considers the source of the quotation in John 12:34 to be Ps 61:6-7. Psalms of Solomon 17 dealt with the suffering of the people of Israel. The author applied the words of the prophets to the Gentiles who were wicked rulers. In reality, the words were given to the people and the leaders of the Israel when they were sinning against the will of God. We find their yearning hope for a new leader who is strong and holy and can expel the Gentiles from their land, and who will last forever. We sample a few verses: 1, 21, 38, 51. "O Lord, Thou art our King for ever and ever, For in Thee, O God, doth our soul glory. . . . Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David, At the time in the which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over Israel Thy servant. . . . The Lord Himself is his king, the hope of him that is mighty through (his) hope in God. . . . The Lord Himself is our king for ever and ever." Translation from R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 2: 647-651.
again. A closer look at vss. 16 and 20 shows that they are saying the same things, the one in light of the cause, the other in light of the effect. Vs. 21 seems to illustrate, indirectly, the result of the events in vs. 16. Obscure sayings need illustrations or explanations, but the reason for illustration by vs. 21 is not because of the difficulty vss. 20, 22 have but to emphasize the abruptness and the intensiveness of the change of situations they will experience. Vss. 20-24 expand the riddle of μικρόν and ἔπαιργο, in which a proverial-parabolic saying, to use Dewey's term, was employed. If his departure is a riddle, then his coming (origin) should be a riddle as well. These two ideas (origin and destiny) should give direction to the understanding of his identity and his relationship with the Father.

Conclusion

In order to see what is referred to by ἐν παρομίας in 16:25, we have traced why the saying of 16:25 was necessary at the present juncture of the narrative and discussed fully what τὰῦτα refers to. The saying of 16:25 was necessary because the disciples had difficulty understanding some Dominical sayings, and the situation resulted in their wanting to ask him questions. In this connection the saying of 16:25 arose. Therefore, it has to do with specific sayings which are difficult to grasp.
A key to the meaning is the presence of the contrast between παρομία and ἐν παρομία. This strongly suggests that παρομία is a difficult saying. We have concluded that the referent of ταῦτα cannot refer to all that Jesus said. Neither can it refer to the whole of the Last Discourse because the use of ταῦτα in John deters this application. 

So we have limited the reference of ταῦτα to 16:5-24. The analysis of the contents of the section referred to by ταῦτα does not show that all the sayings belong to παρομία, but only some parts. Therefore, we did not accept the idea that the whole section of 16:5-24 is ἐν παρομία, rather we argued that some παρομία were employed in the section. Based on these points we found two παρομία, that is, 16:5a [10b], 16.

The proper translation of the word παρομία in our context was determined to be "riddle" with the support of many scholars and the content which the section carries. They cannot be proverb, parable, or illustration; figure of speech is too broad. Therefore, we called these difficult sayings riddles.

Riddles were employed by the Jesus of the FG to bring out questions from the audience. He used riddles to obscure his meaning and to induce questions from them. This brought home their inability to grasp the revelation. In turn it would direct them to the fullness of understanding which was yet to come.
Riddles were never explained in this chapter of the FG. Rather they were expanded. The response of the disciples in 16:29 declared that Jesus did use a παρομία, but not that he explained it for them.

We may summarize the characteristics of these riddles as follows: (1) they are short; (2) they include ambiguous words; (3) they are spoken by Jesus; (4) they are about the destiny of Jesus, especially the death of Jesus; (5) they are expanded, and the expansion employs a proverbial-parabola expression; and (6) they cause questions to arise in the mind of the audience and provoke them to ask questions.

In light of chapter 1 it is clear that the use of παρομία in Greek literature before its use in the LXX has no parallel to the Johannine use of it in 16:25, 29. The classical and the Hellenistic use of παρομία points to popular sayings, maxims, and idiomatic expressions, and it never employed the meaning of 'riddle.' We found that the Johannine παρομία in this section was not founded on the Classical παρομία. Nevertheless, we saw a possibility open in the LXX that παρομία can translate נמשל and emulation, which can mean riddle (especially Sir 39:3). Still it was not very clear and developed as in this place. Therefore, we propose that the addition of the meaning of "riddle" to the Greek word παρομία was completed by its use in the FG and it is a contribution of the Johannine παρομία.
CHAPTER III

ΠΑΡΟΙΜΙΑ OF JOHN 10:1-5

Introduction

It was stated in the beginning of chapter 2 that the task of this chapter is to arrive at the definition of the Greek word παροιμία in 10:6, and thus to understand its nature. We concluded in chapter 2 that riddle, in the sense of a difficult saying, best translates παροιμία in 16:25, 29. In the present effort we have fewer difficulties than previously because we do not need to discuss what parts of Jesus' teaching are referred to by παροιμία in this context.

One might ask how such a lengthy text as 10:1-5 (84 words) can be a single παροιμία, while the examples in chapter 1 are extremely short (the longest was seventeen words). Nevertheless, it is a single παροιμία based on the following reasons:

1. Ἄμην ὑμῖν in 10:1 clearly demarcates a break from the previous saying, and a beginning of a new saying. When we do not take vs. 1 as a beginning, but take some other verse in chap. 9 as the beginning, the size of the παροιμία will grow grotesquely large. Furthermore, it is difficult to find a good break within the text itself because these verses are so closely connected to each other.
2. The text as it stands is labeled as a παρομία, a singular noun.

3. Many exegetes do not raise a question as to the number of παρομία involved in this text.¹

4. Vs. 6 seems to be independent of 10:1-5. The παρομία of 10:1-5 is ascribed to Jesus, while the comment in vs. 6 is added by the Evangelist. Vs. 6 is a link between 10:1-5 and 10:7-18. It describes the reaction of the audience, which did not understand what Jesus said in 10:1-5. The Evangelist labels this as παρομία. It is clear that 10:1-5 is called a παρομία.

Based on the idea that this is a single παρομία, we may establish that a παρομία can be extremely long in the FG. It is a unique contribution of the FG to this Greek term. Nevertheless, the question remains whether this Johannine παρομία belongs to the forms of Greek παρομία before the FG.

At least three different translations have been employed for this term: parable;² figure of speech;³ and

¹There are a few exceptions. J. A. T. Robinson, "The Parable of John x. 1-5," Zeitschrift für die neuestamentliche Wissenschaft 46 (1955): 233-40, first raised the question that two parables of vss. 1-3a and vss. 3b-5 were merged into one parable. Others followed him that it is a composite parable.

²JB, NEB, KJV, AB (1962), GNB, and the Modern Reader's Bible.

³NASB, NIV, and RSV (figure).
The present investigation should determine the literary form of this text and the characteristics of this παρομοία. This requires an investigation of relevant parts in John 10. The discussion is limited to the material which is essential to understanding the term παρομοία.

Before we begin our investigation we need to discuss the relationship of chap. 10 with the preceding passage in chap. 9.

The Relationship Between John 9 and 10:1-5

The idea that John 10 can be understood properly only in the light of John 9 has been accepted widely. Before this trend came to be in vogue, the opinion that the shepherd speech was loosely inserted into its present context was influential.² Some efforts were made by the form and redaction critics to explain the seemingly dislocated texts.³ Ulrich Busse summarized two possible solutions to this problem: (1) a tradition-historical

¹NKJV, and LB.

²Ulrich Busse, "Open Questions on John 10," in The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 6-17. See the endnotes of 3-9 for the references to the various opinions on the dislocation and development of this text. This article was first published in NTS 33 (1987): 516-31 in German with the title: "Offene Fragen zu Joh 10."

³For example, Bultmann, 360, 363, reconstructed the order as 22-26, 11-13, 1-10, 14-18, 27-39. Schnackenburg, 2:276-8, accepted the present sequence and said "it was recognized that the pastoral discourses were levelled in polemic way at the Jewish leaders, whom, Jesus, after he had healed the blind man, reproached with their sins."
'growth' model, and (2) a 'rearrangement' hypothesis. He
argues that "10:1ff. cannot be separated from chapter 9, and
notably 9:39-41, without difficulty."¹ He saw "a coherent
composition and flow of argument in so far as the main
interest of the author is christological-soteriological."²

Current scholarship tends to read the text using new
literary approaches. Jan A. Du Rand ably demonstrated the
cohesion of chaps. 9 and 10.³ He concluded:

From a syntactical point of view chapters 9-10
should be taken as the co-text of John 10 and from a
narratological perspective, chapters 5-10. This means
that chapter 10 cannot be interpreted as an isolated
island in the Johannine gospel sea.⁴

Since there is no difficulty in accepting this conclusion,⁵
we need not hesitate seeking the point of cohesion between
the two chapters.

Jesus declared (9:39): "For judgment I came into
this world, that those who do not see may see, and that
those who see may become blind." There are two roles of
Jesus, seen in this pronouncement: to give sight and to

¹Busse, 8.
²Ibid., 16.
³Jan A. Du Rand, "A Syntactical and Narratological
Reading of John 10 in Coherence with Chapter 9," in The
Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and Its Context (Cambridge:
⁴Ibid., 94.
⁵For example, Charles H. Giblin, "The Tripartite
455, saw 9:1-10:21 as a unit. See also Carson, John, 379-
380.
blind. Jesus did the former by healing the man born blind, and he did the latter by giving a παρομία to the audience (probably Pharisees), and this blinding παρομία was given as an answer to the question raised by some of the Pharisees near him: "Are we also blind?" Jesus answered in such a way that if they denied that they were not blind, they should remain guilty, and by giving the riddle, Jesus proved that they were not only blind but also guilty. This contrast of opening (chap. 9) and blinding (chap. 10) tells the cohesiveness of these two chapters. It is necessary to see this παρομία in view of Jesus' intention to blind the unbelievers.

Form of 10:1-5

The form of this passage (10:1-5) has not been taken seriously into consideration by many because traditionally it was believed that there is no difference between παρομία and the Synoptic παραβολή in translating the Hebrew word בְּשָׁם.¹

Kim Dewey assigned it to the literary form of proverb. Among his list of thirty-four proverbs, 10:1-3a (the shepherd and the thief); 10:3b-5 (the shepherd and the stranger); and 10:11b-13 (the shepherd and the hireling) are

listed. Though his classification appears to be true to the normal meaning of the Greek term ἁρμωνία, the context does not support it because the ἁρμωνία (two proverbs of 10:1-3a and 10:3b-5 according to Dewey) caused misunderstanding. Therefore, his form of proverbial-parable for 10:1-5 is difficult to support. Its inclusion is legitimate only when it is isolated from the Gospel, without considering how it functions in context.

There is another approach, such as proposed by Carson. He attempted to encompass the wide meaning of the Hebrew word פָּרָשָׁה for ἁρμωνία. He translated the term 'figure of speech,' asserting that 10:7-18 is an expansion of it. "Figure of speech" is too inclusive to be helpful, and we cannot use this translation readily because it is not known which word (עֵנָב or הָרֵצָה) ἁρμωνία translates.

There are two major opinions as to the genre of this passage: parable and allegory. They each are advocated by two large groups of scholars.

---

1Dewey, 94.

2In chapter 1 we found that ἁρμωνία was employed to refer to popular proverbs, maxims, and idioms. We can accept his designation only if the two proverbs of 10:1-3a, 3b-5 are popular proverbs.

3Carson, John, 380.
It is often regarded as parable. It appears to be

1 Gustav Adolf Jülicher, "Parables," in *Encyclopaedia Biblica* 3:3564, believed that παροιμία in 10:6 is a similitude as well as what is indicated in 16:25-29. They "are regarded by the fourth evangelist as identical in nature with the parables of synoptists." "The parable is of the nature of a riddle spoken so that it may not be too easily understood, it is intended to hinder conversion--in fact, to harden (Mk. 4:11f.)." David Flusser, *Die rabbini­schen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler I. Teil Das Wesen der Gleichnisse* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1981), 251, noted that John "called the parables of Jesus as proverbs. (10:6; 16:25, 29)." Hutcheson, 201, labeled it as parable, and in 203, he called 7ff. an explication of the parable. R. H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel: A Commentary* (Oxford: Claren­don Press, 1956), 210, said that 1-5 is "the only approach in John to the familiar parable (παραβολή) in the earlier gospels." Hoskyns, 370, 371, believed that 10:1-5 is a parable and 7-18 the interpretation of the parable. He sees, 369-370, no distinction between the Synoptic παραβολή and Johannine παροιμία. McQuilkin, 12, listed 10:1-6 along with the Synoptic parables. Robinson, 233-40, saw two parables; Bultmann, 371, thought it is a parable rather than an allegory, so did Beasley-Murray, 168. Augustin George, "Je suis la Porte de brebis," *Bible et vie Chrétienne* 51 (1963): 18, believed that there are three small parables in 10:1-21: (1) The legitimate shepherd and the thief (1-3a); the shepherd knows the sheep and the stranger (3b-5); the good shepherd who gives his life for the sheep and the hireling who cares only himself (11b-13). Joannes J. O'Rourke, "Jo 10, 1-18: Series Parabolatarum?" *Verbum Domini* 42 (1964): 22, believed that 10:1-5 is a parable and 6-18 is explication. Brown, *John: I-XII*, 390, believed that "10:1-5 consists of several parables, while 10:7ff. consists of allegorical explanations." Lindars, 355, labeled this as parable, and in 357, he called 7-18 as allegory. Sydney Temple, *The Core of the Fourth Gospel* (London: Mowbrays, 1975), 178, thought that 1-5 is a parable and 7-18 has two parables. George Allen Turner and Julius R. Mantey, *The Gospel according to John*, The Evangelical Commentary on the Bible, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), 212 and 215, labeled vss. 1-5 as parable, and 7-18 as explanation of the parable. Michaels, 162, thought it is a parable. Peter F. Ellis, 168, thought that it is a parable, and 10:7ff is an allegorical explanation. Xavier Léon-Dufour, "Jesus, Le Bon Pasteur," in *Les Paraboles les Évangéligues*, 362, believed it to be a parable given to the Jews, and he sees, 365, 10:7-10 to be the first
a parable because Jesus tried to convey certain truths by means of the affairs of daily life. It is clear that Jesus did not say this just to describe the life situation of a farmhouse. Also, it is not uncommon in the Old Testament parables and in the Synoptic parables to use sheep and shepherd as images of spiritual realities. Nevertheless, this does not support or deny that it is a parable.

The term παροιμία also has some relation to parable because it has been generally understood to translate the Hebrew word לְשׁוֹן, which includes all kinds of forms of trope, especially parable. Therefore, it is not surprising to see so many scholars follow this opinion, but caution is necessary, because their use of the term 'parable' is often not precise, since there are so many different understandings of the term 'parable'. We have adopted a working definition of parable in chapter 2: "A Parable is a mashal that employs a short narrative fiction to reference a symbol."1 We will apply it to this text. It is not fiction. Therefore, it is difficult to establish that this παροιμία is a parable.

1 See above p. 120, n. 1.
Is the narrative of chap. 9 being illustrated in 10:1-5? Though chap. 9 is closely related to chap. 10, the content of 10:1-5 does not seem to illustrate the situation in chap. 9; rather it is developed from the situation. 1 Although they are related, the παροιμία cannot be a parable. Rather it is an epitomization of chap. 9. It appears that Jesus made a riddle from the experience of chap. 9, just as Samson made a riddle out of his experience.

We do not find any substantial number of points of contact with Synoptic parables. The Synoptic parables mostly have introductory formulae, while this παροιμία has no such parabolic introductory formula, 2 and does not refer to an incident, but to routine. There is no tertium comparationis known in 10:1-5, whereas in the parables of Synoptics the kingdom is compared to many other things in life. Therefore, it is hardly a parable in the Synoptic sense. 3

---

1 Recognition of the voice of the shepherd by the sheep may illustrate the once blind man's recognition. His excommunication can be compared to the leading of his sheep out of the fold by the shepherd. Nevertheless if we pursue this line of interpretation the picture will be distorted, because the details conflict with each other.

2 Schnackenburg, 284.

3 Ibid.
The opinion that the distinctive characteristics of this παρομία make it an allegory is widespread.¹

¹Godet, 140, said that it has the nature of "allegory rather than that of parable." He labeled 7-10 as a new allegory; 11-18 as the third allegory. Paul Piebig, Alttjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1904), 164, saw many allegories in the FG which find their parallels only in the apocalyptic literature, such as the allegories found in Ezekiel, but not in the Synoptics. He referred to 10; 15:1ff. He labeled, 165, 10:1-5 as allegorical riddle. A. Plummer, "Parable," Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908), 3:663. G. H. C. MacGregor, 234, also accepted it as "the allegory of the Shepherd, the Sheep, and the Door." Bernard, 351, believed that it is the description of the allegory of the Shepherd and the sheep. J. Alexander Findlay, Jesus and His Parables (London: Epworth Press, 1950), 3, thought that "the allegory of the Good Shepherd is a παρομία, a provisional description, true and illuminating for the time being," because proverbs are proverbially half-truths. He assumed that the effort "to invent a new meaning for παρομία is merely due to its confusion with παραβολή, which appears to have the meaning of 'dark saying' in such passages as Matthew 13:35 and perhaps in Mark 4:11." Leon Morris, 501, believed that "it is basically an allegory, but with distinctive features of its own." Robert Kysar, The Fourth Evangelist and His Gospel (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1986), 158, believed that this and the word of vine are allegories. "The genre is unique to John within the New Testament, even though there are traces of allegory in the narrative parables of the Synoptic Gospels." In 159 he commented, "John is the master of allegorical speech, and he saw four distinct allegories in 10:1-16: 1-3a; 3b-5; 7-10; 11-18." Hendriksen, 97, 99, thought it an allegory. Graham N. Stanton, The Gospels and Jesus (London: Oxford University Press, 1989), 105, commented that "In John, although there are a few parabolic sayings, there are no parables comparable with the synoptic tradition. The extended allegories of the sheep-fold and the door in 10:1-18 and of the vine in 15:1-11 are hardly even partial exceptions." He reiterated this position in 208.
Definition of Allegory

Before we discuss whether this παρομία is an allegory, we need to define allegory. Since allegory and parable both sometimes receive the designation of παραβολή, a distinct line between the two entities is often blurred. Often it is understood wrongly that when a parable is explained in detail, it becomes an allegory. Sometimes


2 In the Greek literature, παραβολή and ὑπόνοια, the latter of which has been employed for allegorical interpretation, are not closely related. This means that παραβολή did not need explanation or interpretation in the Greek literature, and it was not explained. It appears that ὑπόνοια, which is usually translated as allegory, was used more often for interpretive method than for a way of speech. It seeks the deeper meaning—non-literal meaning—from the text, whether myth or history, but not parable. ὑπόνοια, which is a hermeneutical term, is the Greek word used to designate deeper meaning. It is the word used for allegorical interpretation. The Greek term αλληγορία, which is a rhetorical term, has basically two meanings: (1) an allegory, that is, description of one thing under the image of another; (2) an allegorical exposition. I have searched through the Greek literature to see any relationship between the two words (παραβολή and ὑπόνοια) and failed to find a close connection between the two. For more information on the relationship between ὑπόνοια and
the detailed explanations of all the parts of a parable are unfortunately believed to constitute an allegory. Nevertheless, a parable does not become an allegory when the parabler himself explains the meaning of the parable in detail. In the same fashion, the detailed explanations of a parable do not constitute an allegory.1 The interpretation, though it may be allegorical, does not make itself an allegory. Allegory is something different from parable in its nature.

To make the discussion short, I list five characteristics of allegory in order to see whether this παρομοια can be appropriately called an allegory:

1. Allegory is an extended metaphor.2

1 Klauck, 354: "Die Auslegung eines allegorischen Textes ist selbst nicht allegorisch, solange sie streng nach der intentionalen Textur des exegetischen Objekts fragt, d. h. nach sprachlicher Struktur, Intention des Autors und Erwartungshorizont der Hörer."

2. Allegory is reducible to a nonfigurative level.¹

3. In pure allegory no direct reference is made to the principal object.²

4. Allegory does not cause misunderstanding.³

5. Allegory is commonly fictitious.⁴

For the first characteristic we do not see any metaphor or simile in 10:1-5. It is rather a straightforward factual statement. It is only when we come to vss. 7-18 that we have metaphors. Second, 10:1-5 is not reducible to a nonfigurative level because we have no clue to reduce it. The reduction of 10:1-5 cannot be made, and there is no need to reduce it to nonfigurative level. The third characteristic seems to fit the text of 10:1-5. No direct reference is made to the principal object in this. Strangely enough, however, no scholar uses this criterion to label this as allegory. According to the fourth characteristic, the audience is expected not to fail to perceive the meaning, but it (10:1-5) was not understood. Fifth, John 10:1-5 is not fictitious, rather it describes the life situation of a farmhouse. Therefore, we can safely assert


²Smith, "Similitude," BTEC 9:752. He did not include John 10:1-5 under allegory, and what is more likely an allegory (15:1-6), he regarded as a metaphor.

³Ibid.

that it does not follow the definitions given above, except point 3. So it is extremely difficult to establish that it is an allegory.

In the following section we shall analyze the text to see some features of non-allegorical nature. This will strengthen the thesis that it is not an allegory.

Non-allegorical Elements in 10:1-18

One may have a false impression that the παραμια is an allegory from the following five features:

1. Vss. 1 and 8 are parallel: both describe the man who is a thief and a robber.

2. Ο μη εσερχόμενος in vs. 1 is interpreted as πάντες ὅσοι πρό ἐμοῦ in vs. 8.

3. Vss. 1-5 has two pieces—the door and the shepherd; vss. 7-13 has two pieces—the door and the shepherd.

4. An explanation of the sheep is supplied in vs. 26.

5. Vss. 1-5 describe in the third person what can be applied to anyone; it describes a general pattern of a farmhouse. We find the same nature of sayings in vss. 7-18 (vss. 10a, 11b-13), but other sayings are made so specifically related to Jesus. So we have a mixture of the parabolic and the metaphoric. If we call vss. 1-5 allegory, then we have to call 10a, 11b-13 by the same name.

We find fourteen reasons to deny that it is an allegory:

1. There is no indication that the section of vss. 7-18 is an explanation of vss. 1-5, in spite of ὅν (v. 7); still it is not clear.

2. Both sections begin with ἄμην ἄμην. It shows that both proclaim solemn truth. Just as the former is a proclamation, so is the latter.

3. In vs. 1 "who climbs in by another way" seems to be in focus, while in vs. 7 the door is in focus. It is somewhat unexpected.

4. In vs. 2 "who enters by the door" seems to be in focus, but in vs. 9 the door is in focus.

5. Vss. 2 and 9 are parallels: in vs. 2 the shepherd enters through the door; in vs. 9 the sheep enter through the door. Therefore, the shepherd and the sheep are paralleled.

6. Vss. 5 and 12 parallel. In the former, the sheep flee away from the strangers (because they are wolves). In the latter, the hirelings flee away from the sheep because of the wolves. They are intrinsically strangers. Even when they were entrusted with the sheep, they could not keep them.

7. We find πήν ψυχήν τίθησαν repeated four times: vs. 11 (his life), vs. 15 (my life), vs. 17 (my life), vs. 18 (my life). The significant motif of his death seems to be the thrust of vss. 7-18. After all, what he tried to tell about was his death, but the word θάνατος is not used.

8. From vss. 1-5 only two words, the door (vss. 7, 9) and the shepherd were highlighted (vss. 11, 14). Jesus did not begin with an explanation. He proclaimed the truth about himself.

9. In the Synoptic 'allegories' the pattern of explanation is: A-A', B-B', C-C'; but here it is: X-A; X-B. The referring system of the latter is in the opposite direction, and it focuses on one subject.

10. The παραμια caused misunderstanding (vs. 6), the expansion of it caused schism (vs. 19). People wanted to know whether he was the Messiah, but his introduction of himself confused them because (a) he presented himself as

---

'Schism as it is involved in misunderstanding is in view. Schism is a more developed form of misunderstanding. When they could not understand the Proper meaning, there was a schism.'
the door, (b) as the shepherd, even a shepherd to die; finally, they rejected him because he made himself equal with God. Long after the discourse, they still did not understand. The misunderstanding lasted for some time.

11. In vs. 12 μισθωτός seems to have converted to λύκος.

12. In vss. 7-18, 25-30, the progression was made in the relationship between the shepherd and the sheep, 'I' and the Father, and the Father and the sheep, not only to a shepherd, but to the Messiah, and to God.

13. In vss. 7-18, several other things such as hireling and wolves, Father and laying down of life, were added which are not intrinsic to the παρομοία of vss. 1-5. It is rather an expansion than explanation.

14. He told them this (10:1-5) as an introduction to his proclamation in vss. 7-18. Even without 10:1-5 the latter makes sense.

An overwhelming number of points thus stand against the idea that the παρομοία of 10:1-5 is an allegory.

There are a number of scholars who tried to merge these two genres of parable and allegory. Sometimes they labeled 10:1-5 as parabolic allegory; at other times, allegorical parable. Bernard Lefrois listed five of..."
Johannine "parable-allegories": the Invisible Wind, the Light of the World, the Good Shepherd, the Grain of Wheat, the Vine and the Branches. However, since it is neither a parable nor an allegory as I have shown above, the merging of two genres to produce a hybrid does not stand.

**Παροιμία as Riddle**

A few researchers take the problem of the genre of John 10:1-5 more seriously. For example, R. Schnackenburg discussed it specifically and pointed to a number of elements which militate against the genre as parable or allegory. He observed:

> But there is no sign of any formula introducing and signalling a parable; nor are we able to specify any actual tertium comparationis. . . . One can neither reduce the supposed parable's 'teaching' to a common denominator nor sum it up in a single sentence. Likewise untenable is the possibility at the other extreme--that it is an allegory, in which each narrative element has its own figurative meaning. . . . Easiest of all, then, one could think of it as being a figurative device of a mixed kind, a parable with symbolic features.

> It is a real riddle--and, in fact, is the only figurative discourse to be characterized as such. . . . In a veiled manner it seeks to prepare the way for, and lead up to, the Christological self-revelation in 10:7-18. . . . Accordingly the paroimia holds its own special place among the Johannine figurative words and discourses: it constitutes a way of speaking that is sui generis.²

---


² Schnackenburg, John, 2:284-5. Bold original.
Still, he could not leave the realm of parable. So he tested the possibility of its being "a parable with symbolic features," and rejected it.

Then he proceeded one more step and asserted that the μαρωνία is "a real riddle [Rätselrede]." Formerly Bultmann gave a hint in this direction. Though he labeled this as a parable, in one place he hinted that it is a 'riddle' [Rätselrede]. Schnackenburg developed this and rightly asserted John 10:1-5 to be a riddle. Since this usage, along with other examples in chap. 16, is different


2Bultmann, 360.

3Bultmann, 375.

4He emphasized the uniqueness of this genre. Accordingly he did not relate this to the riddles in chap. 16, which he could not recognize as such.
from the Classical and Hellenistic usage of \( \pi \alpha \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \), when
one intends to connect these cases together, 10:1-5 can be
called a proverbial riddle. This is to honor the original
usage, but not to promote that the \( \pi \alpha \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \) in the FG are
proverbs. This artificial designation embraces the tension
between what should be understood and the misunderstanding
which happened, because a proverb is something everybody
knows and a riddle is not understood by all.

In the Greek literature before the FG, \( \pi \alpha \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \) should
mean something everybody knew, understood, and used, but
here it (10:1-5) was not understood, though its content was
unmistakably clear. This supports the idea of blinding the
audience. Also, its content leads to nowhere unless the
audience reads the speaker's mind.

In both chaps. 10 and 16, the tension was created
because they did not understand what they should have
understood. It seems that the tension is well preserved by
the use of the term \( \pi \alpha \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \).

In sum, we could not accept proverb, parable,
allegory, as the form of \( \pi \alpha \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \); rather we came to accept
riddle as the appropriate meaning of \( \pi \alpha \rho \omicron \mu \alpha \).'

---

1 Alan P. Winton, *The Proverbs of Jesus: Issues of
History and Rhetoric*, JSNT Supplement 35 (Sheffield: JSOT
Press, 1990), 35, gives an interesting remark on the
relationship between riddle and proverb. He says: "The
proverb may be distinguished from the riddle on account of
the lack of clarity in the sense of the riddle. . . .
However, it may be disputed whether the distinction between
riddle and proverb can be made so easily; or alternatively
the question may be raised as to whether some of Jesus'
As a result of the above investigation, we came to see that the παρομία is expanded in vss. 7-18. The seven significant observations which support this view are:

1. The style of 10a, 11b-13 has the features of vss. 1-5. It seems as if the riddle continues in vss. 7-18.

2. There is no indication that this section is an explanation of vss. 1-5. Several things such as hireling and wolves, Father and laying down of life were added which are not intrinsic to the riddle of vss. 1-5. It is rather an expansion than explanation.

3. Both sections begin with ἀμήν ἀμήν indicating that they are solemn proclamations.

4. We find τὴν ψυχὴν τίθεναι repeated four times. This idea is not explicit in the riddle of vss. 1-5, but it is the main thrust of the second section, which is the expansion of vss. 1-5.

5. The riddle was misunderstood in vs. 6, and the expansion caused schism as a result of misunderstanding.

6. The audience could not understand either section, therefore they asked Jesus to speak plainly (παρρησία) in vs. 24.

Regarding vss. 7-18, L. William Countryman noted that "the language is deliberately mysterious. There is no intention to clarify matters." Hence we call the section sayings would be better discerned as riddles."

'Countryman, 72.
of vss. 7-18 an expansion of the riddle.¹ This expansion is closely related to the riddle in 16:16, which somehow obscured the death of Jesus in the use of μυκρόν, and this riddle (10:1-5) was expanded by the idea of the death of the shepherd.

It is significant to see a pattern in Johannine dialogues in relation to the use of riddles. In both places (chaps. 10 and 16) Jesus gave a riddle, the audience was puzzled, and Jesus expanded the riddle. In the expansion, Jesus used figures of speech. We can find a number of examples of this pattern.² The Evangelist portrayed Jesus as a teacher of riddles.

Misunderstanding of the Παροιμία

In this section the reason of misunderstanding, the Jewish messianic expectations in the FG, will be discussed. At what level of meaning they misunderstood is not quite clear, because what Jesus said in 10:1-5 is a routine scene in a farmhouse. It is extremely improbable that the urban Jerusalemites could not understand the imagery of shepherding in view of their Old Testament background (if

¹Carson, John, 300, thinks 7-18 as an expansion of 1-5.

²For example, in chap. 3 a riddle was given (3:3). The response reveals the puzzlement (3:4). The expansion followed (3:5-8): (1) repetition of the riddle with a little explication; (2) a proverbial saying of flesh and spirit; (3) repetition of the riddle; and (4) analogy of wind.
If the scene of shepherding is not foreign to their life, virtually nothing could cause the failure of understanding of the παροιμία. Therefore, we ask: What level of meaning could they not understand? They were not able to fathom what Jesus was about to say by referring to this normal life of a shepherd and his herd. This indicates that the saying of vss. 1-5 was given only as a way of crude introduction. Hence, they could not imagine what was about to follow. In this sense, it is a riddle.

Why Did the Jews Fail to Understand?

The first reason the Jews failed to understand can be found in the saying of Jesus (9:39):  

“For judgment I came into this world, that those who do not see may see, and that those who see may become blind.” Jesus is portrayed as having intended to blind the audience. They were made blind not only in the narrative of chap. 9, but also by the riddle of 10:1-5. Here we see clearly the intention of obscuring the audience by the riddle.

---

1 Genuyt, 384, believed that the components of the parable were well known to the audience.

2 We can find a similar statement in Mark 4:12. This seems to imply that some Synoptic parables are riddles.

3 Cf. Matt 13; Mark 4. In these chapters Jesus taught by parables. As we read carefully we do not find any clue that the audience did not understand what Jesus said, rather the disciples could not understand and they asked him to explain them for them, though Jesus said that for the outsiders everything was in parables.
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The second reason can be found in the content of the saying. As we analyze the content, we find the core of the content is Messianic. The whole discussion or debate looms large in the question: Are you the Christ? (10:24) This question was developed from John 9, where the blind man recognized Jesus as a prophet. He did not stop there. He went on and believed the Son of man and worshipped him. A crescendo is seen: a prophet--the Son of man--the Christ. The focus of chap. 9 is on the identity of Jesus, and 10:1-5 stands in the same line of development, which is only expanded in vss. 7-18, albeit the Jews did not understand and accept. Nothing else stands out so conspicuously as the question of who Jesus is in the context of chaps. 9-10. The misunderstanding seems to be based on the understanding of the Messiahship they cherished.

How is their misunderstanding described in the narrative? Is the misunderstanding caused by lack of faith? They were portrayed as having misunderstood because they could not abandon their cherished interpretation of Messiahship, which is discussed below. It is strong faith in the wrong belief that caused them to misunderstand. When the Spirit will enlighten the heart and correct their understanding of Messiahship they will see the death and resurrection of the Messiah as the core of true Messiahship, which they failed to understand before the actual event (14:26; 20:22; 20:28). It appears proper to investigate at
this juncture the people's messianic expectations hinted at in the FG.

The Messianic Expectations

We find Χριστός nineteen times in John.1 The transliteration μεσσιάς occurs twice and only in John (1:41; 4:25). This might testify to the significance of Messianic debate for John's community. The writer tried to answer the question: Is Jesus the Messiah? He could not avoid using the Hebrew word מֶשֶׁךְ because of the intensity of the debate.

Our investigation aims to see what the characters thought of the Messiah. A number of texts reveal that the people as a whole expected Messiah to appear (1:20, 25, 41; 10:24). The Gospel itself does not introduce Jesus as the Messiah, but a number of witnesses were introduced: Andrew (1:41); Philip (1:45); the Samaritan woman (4:29); many people (7:31); the man born blind (9:22, 34). They gave testimonies for Jesus as the Messiah.

M. de Jonge noted the Jewish expectations about the Messiah2 and listed four traditions recorded in the Gospel:

1 Cf. M. de Jonge, "Jewish Expectations About the 'Messiah' According to the Fourth Gospel," NTS 19 (1972-73): 246-270. On 247, he states his starting point: "We cannot use the Johannine material without taking into account that the Jews whose opinion is expressed in the Gospel appear on a scene set by a Christian evangelist. They are portrayed as 'representative Jews' and are obviously introduced in the Gospel because it was important to compare John's views on
1. When Christ comes nobody knows his origin. This belief was held by some of the Jerusalemites (7:26, 27). They thought they knew the origin of Jesus, but Jesus retorted that He came from his Father.

2. When Christ comes will he perform more miracles than Jesus did? In the light of this question we can presume that the Messiah to come will perform miracles. Jesus did many miracles. Therefore Jesus satisfied this expectation.

3. "The Christ is descended from David, and comes from Bethlehem." In this we have two traditions merged. Since they knew that Jesus was from Galilee and that there was no tradition about a prophet from Galilee (or so they thought), there was a division among them.

4. The Christ remains forever (12:34). By this Jesus the Christ with Jewish expectations concerning the Messiah." On 248, he comments: "Representative people (disciples, ordinary people: the crowd, Jewish leaders, Samaritans) express representative beliefs and raise representative objections."

1 John 7:42. Matthew and Luke recorded the Davidic origin of Jesus and also Bethlehem as his birthplace. In John, it was not known to the Jews. Probably Matthew and Luke were written partly to answer this question, probably still current in time when the FG was written.

2W. C. van Unnik, "The Question in John 12:34," NT 3 (1959): 179, observed, "Though an explicit text in which Ps. 88 (89):37 is found with the reading 'the Anointed One' in stead of 'His seed' is not yet found (besides John xii 34), it is quite in line with rabbinic exegesis to interpret to σπέρμα αὐτοῦ by ὁ χριστός. At any rate this text is far more suitable as the source for John xii 34 and could more easily be adopted than any of the others adduced so far." "It [this psalm] has been given a messianic interpretation, as
tradition they rejected the death of the Christ. De Jonge is confident that "John wants to make clear that the Jewish-Messiah-concept is fixed--it is connected with the expectation of the Davidic King."¹ Jesus did not fit their expectations. Therefore, they rejected Jesus as the Messiah, who hinted at his coming death.

Schnackenburg emphasized that the objections were not just literary 'inventions' used solely to carry the debate a step further, but they also took into account existing differences of opinion in the Jewish-Christian debate at the time.²

De Jonge concluded:

The Jewish statements about the Messiah either point to a complete misunderstanding (vii. 27, 41b-42; xii. 34) and are therefore ignored (vii. 42b, 42; xii. 34) or reinterpreted fundamentally (vii. 27); or they represent an inadequate formulation of belief in Jesus (vii. 31) which is subsequently implicitly corrected. Christian believers may use and do use 'the Christ' as designation for Jesus (i. 41, cd. vii. 41) - it is the central point in the debate between Jews and Christians - but this title needs to be interpreted. The Gospel interprets it by the title Son of God, pointing to the unity between Jesus and the Father who sent him.³

may be seen from the famous Psalm of Solomon 17 (see before), the New Testament (Act 2:30; Luke 1:51; Act 13:22; Rev 1:5; 3:14) and rabbinic sources," 178.

¹De Jonge, 261.


³Ibid., 252. Emphasis original.
What were the messianic expectations of those who believed Jesus? The disciples reported from the beginning that they had met the Messiah. They believed the Messiah, but from their responses and behaviors we can tell that they accepted a Messiah who betrayed their expectations. They believed, but they did not understand the way of the Messiah. Even those who accepted Jesus as Messiah had their private expectations and interpretations. They could not accept fully the way of the Messiah.

Concerning their misunderstanding of Messianic expectation, John Painter helpfully noted:

The misunderstanding motif in John should be compared with the Messianic secret in Mark. In Mark, Jesus silences those who would confess his Messiahship openly. It was suggested that this was a device to cover the fact that Jesus did not claim to be Messiah. But it is more likely that this is an indication of Jesus' rejection of the Messianic role as it was then understood in Judaism.¹

Jesus, in the FG, seems to be the Christ for Galileans and Samaritans, not for the people of Jerusalem, though he worked earnestly for them. Galilean disciples did not fully understand his destiny either (16:17-33). Those who believed, believed on the basis of the witness of John, and of the miracles or the signs of Jesus.

The purpose of the Gospel is explicitly given in 20:31: "but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ [Messiah], the Son of God, and that

believing you may have the life in his name."¹ Though the ultimate goal of John is to lead the readers to accept Jesus as the Son of God, the first step is to lead them to accept him as the Messiah who suffered death and rose from the dead, contrary to their messianic expectation.

What Jesus said in 10:18 is related to the accounts of the death and resurrection of Lazarus in John 11. The significance of Messiahship—the death and the resurrection—was illustrated by the death and the resurrection of Lazarus, but they did not catch the implications of the event of Lazarus' death and resurrection. The event of the death and resurrection of Jesus was needed to correct the people's expectations and the understanding of Messiahship. Therefore, the FG was given as a corrective to the wrong concept of Messiahship.

In the riddle and its expansion, the door is identified with Jesus and the shepherd as well. The failure to understand the expansion of the riddle was not due to the difficulty of the imageries used, but due to the fact that the intention of Jesus in speaking this riddle was not known. Jesus hid the meaning of the sayings from their

¹Emphasis supplied. J. Louis Martyn, History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel, rev. ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1979), 91, commented: "It is clear that the issue of Jesus Messiahship stands at the center of the synagogue-church discussion." He proposed, 102-151, that "the transition is from a confession of Jesus as the Prophet-Messiah like Moses to the confession of Jesus as the Son of man."
sight. Therefore, they could not understand what Jesus meant. The proclamations in vss. 7-18 astounded the audience because they were directly opposed to their view of the door and the shepherd.\(^1\) Furthermore, since the shepherd imagery is closely related to the Messianic figure, Jesus' statement relating the death of the shepherd led them to reject Jesus. They expected a different Messiah—a messiah fit to their understanding and expectations.

Johannine riddles were already proverbial for the Christians, but they remain as riddles in the context of the Gospel. The use of the term in 10:6 appears to be based on 16:25. The Evangelist employed the same term to designate the riddles of Jesus which they failed to understand. He highlighted the aspect of a riddle by using the particular term. Here is seen the intention of the Evangelist. Based on the use of \(\text{παρωμία}\) in 10:24 he could use the term \(\text{παρωμία}\) in 10:6. Both chapters are related by the use of the term. Since its use of 16:25 is extended to chap. 10, there is justification for finding riddles in other chapters of the Gospel. Although their understanding of the term \(\text{παρωμία}\) and the starting point are far from the one used here, other

\(^1\) We find a strikingly similar parable about Moses, attributed to R. Nehemiah, in Ruth Rabbah proem 5: "To whom can Moses be compared? To a faithful shepherd whose fence fell down in the twilight. He arose and repaired it from three sides, but a breach remained on the fourth side, and having no time to erect the fence, he stood in the breach himself. A lion came, he boldly withstood it; a wolf came and still he withstood against it."
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scholars have attempted to find additional παρομοία in the FG.¹ Παρομοία which are not explicitly labeled as such are distributed throughout the Gospel.²

The Characteristics of the Riddles

We have arrived at a point where we need to enumerate the characteristics of the riddle in John 10:1-5.

1. People did not understand the riddle. It is the misunderstanding or non-understanding as a response that can signal the presence of a riddle.

2. This riddle is about Jesus, specifically the messianic role of Jesus. So it is Jesus-centered (i.e., the Johannine riddles are the riddles of Jesus about himself). Hence we may call them Christological riddles.

3. The riddle is expanded upon, but it is not resolved until the event of the death and resurrection of Jesus.

4. In the expansion of the riddle, the death of the shepherd is highlighted, and Jesus' relationship with his people and the Father is emphasized.

5. We find ἀμην ἀμὴν in 10:1. This signals the beginning of the riddle of 10:1-5.

¹Kim E. Dewey believed it as proverb and tried to collect the proverbs from the FG. Scholars who understood παρομοία as parable tried to collect parables from the FG. Those who believed as allegory did likewise.

²These other riddles are noted in chapter 4.
Summary and Conclusion

We have seen that chap. 10 is so closely related to the episode of chap. 9 that the former is better understood in the light of the latter. The proclamation of 10:1-5 was given as a blinding riddle for the Jews who did not wish to accept the miracle, the healed, and the healer.

Major attention was given to the form of 10:1-5. We rejected proverb, 'figure of speech,' parable, as its genre. We discussed at length the possibility of allegory, but allegory did not fit contextually and in many other aspects. Some attempts of merging the genres of parable and allegory into a hybrid proved futile. We have accepted the form of riddle for 10:1-5. It follows that 10:7-18 is an expansion of the riddle. Therefore, we see that Johannine παροιμία deviate much from the non-Johannine παροιμία in the literature before the FG in their contents, functions, and lengths. Johannine παροιμία can be extremely lengthy and they always cause misunderstanding, while other παροιμία are short and do not cause misunderstanding.

We investigated the reason of misunderstanding. We came to see that not only Jesus' mode of discourse blinded them, but also the current messianic expectations hindered the audience from understanding what Jesus said.

Using the conclusions of chapters 2 and 3 we may propose a few identifying marks for the non-designated riddles in the FG:
1. They include ambiguous words, or figures.
2. They cause questions to arise in the mind of the audience or produce misunderstanding.
3. These sayings of Jesus emphasize the origin and destiny of Jesus, and especially Jesus' relationship with the Father.
4. The term παρρησία indicates the presence of a riddle.
5. The riddles are not resolved until after the resurrection.
6. The sayings can be expanded by means of a proverb or a parable.
7. The sayings can be introduced by the ὄμην ὄμην formula.

In chapter 4, I identify other riddles in the FG by applying these identifying marks.
CHAPTER IV

NON-DESIGNATED RIDDLES IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

Introduction

In chapters 2 and 3 we outlined the genre of the Johannine παρομικά--it is riddle. We have found and discussed three designated riddles. In this chapter we are about to read the Gospel to find non-designated riddles; in other words, riddles which are not explicitly labeled as such. I attempt to locate the Johannine riddles, which are discussed in turn, based on several identifying marks. A discussion of their narrative functions in the FG follows.

To be classified as a Johannine παρομικά-riddle, a saying should satisfy most of these conditions, according to the last chapter: (1) they include ambiguous words; (2) the sayings cause the audience to ask questions, or fail to understand;¹ (3) these sayings about Jesus emphasize his

¹For more information on the Johannine misunderstandings, see Leroy, 49-155; Charles H. Giblin, "Suggestion, Negative Response, and Positive Action in St John's Portrayal of Jesus (John 2:1-11; 4:46-54; 7:2-14; 11:1-44)," NTS 26 (1979/80): 197-211; Culpepper, 152-164; D. A. Carson, "Understanding Misunderstandings," Tyndale Bulletin 33 (1982): 91. The criterion of misunderstanding makes the list an assured minimum because there are other Christological sayings such as 1:51 and 12:24 which can be included in this list if without this criterion. We employ it because we deal with non-designated παρομικά.
origin and destiny, and especially his relationship with the 
Father;¹ (4) the term παρομοία indicates the presence of a 
riddle; (5) the riddles are not resolved until after the 
resurrection; (6) the sayings can be expanded by means of a 
proverb or a parable;² (7) the sayings can be introduced by 
the ὁμή ὁμή formula, but the formula itself is not 
necessarily included.³

I first need to make three things clear:

1. There can be many riddles in the Gospel, but the 
three clear examples were all spoken by Jesus. Therefore, 
only the riddles spoken by Jesus are counted toward the 
number of Johannine παρομοία.

¹The sayings about Jesus include Jesus as the topic of the sayings. So we may call them Jesus-centered sayings. They should include all the sayings Jesus said about himself, about the relationship between him and the Father, and him and the believers, and him and the non-believers, and him and the world, and his mission, identity, and destiny, therefore Christological.


³Victor Hasler, Amen: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Einführungsformel der Herrenworte "Wahrlich ich sage euch" (Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1969), 146, listed 25 of the Johannine double ὁμή formula: 1:51; 3:3, 5, 11; 5:19, 24, 25; 6:26, 32, 47, 53; 8:34, 51, 58; 10:1, 7; 12:24; 13:16, 20, 21, 38; 14:12; 16:20, 23; and 21:18. It is highly possible to see the intimate relationship between these and the misunderstandings. We can easily see that many sayings beginning with this formula were misunderstood. Although we do not see it as an absolute element, but only a frequent one, we cannot avoid considering this formula in our effort to locate the Johannine riddles.
2. The word παρομία is always accompanied by the verbs which denote "speech"; it represents sayings or utterances. Therefore, we exclude all action-riddles from the list, but include only speech-riddles. Jesus' making of wine, and washing the feet of the disciples could well be included in the list, but they are not counted, because they are not denotable by the Greek term παρομία. Παραβολή can well refer to actions, because the word does not dictate the exclusion of actions.

3. The riddles can be long or short.

The list of Johannine riddles, the Christological sayings of Jesus which apparently caused the audience to question or to misunderstand is as follows: 1 2:19; 3:3; 4:32; 6:32-33, 35, 51, 53; 7:33-34; 7:37b-38; 8:21, 31-32, 51, 56, 58; 11:11; 12:32; 13:8, 10, 21c, 27b; 13:33, 36b; 14:19; 21:18. This list is an assured minimum. There might be others.

Non-Designated Johannine Riddles

The discussion of this part must involve some subjectivity, though I have laid out the principles. It is extremely difficult sometimes to distinguish between riddles and non-riddles. Therefore, the list is vulnerable to objections.

---

1 George Johnston, *The Spirit-Paraclete in the Gospel of John* (Cambridge: University Press, 1970), 162, 152, found the sayings of 14:7, 12-14 to be riddles, but they do not have the marks we summarized.
John 2:19

Jesus answered: "'Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.'"¹ The Jews understood this saying literally according to the context, but not Christologically. Thus, John judged that they had misunderstood. For them, 'temple' was the material temple in Jerusalem. The disciples failed to understand, too. Only after the resurrection did they remember and understand the riddle in the light of Jesus' death (2:22). Jesus said one thing, but he meant another. Jesus did not say 'I am the real temple,' which would have offended the Jews more. The literal understanding of it caused the audience to stumble. When the riddle was not understood Christologically, it was misunderstood in the FG. It is the riddle of the death of Jesus, which was resolved only after the death and resurrection of Jesus. Several elements indicate that 2:19 is a legitimate Johannine riddle:² (1) the use of "this temple" is ambiguous; (2) it causes them to misunderstand; (3) it is about Jesus, and his death; and (4) the riddle is not solved until after the resurrection.

¹In John, the temple imagery is significant. Jesus identified himself not only with the temple, but with the light and the bread [of presence]. Also ἵππος in John 1:14 (Cf. Exod 25:8).

²Schnackenburg, 1:349, thinks this as an enigmatic saying. He connects it to a cryptic "mashal."
John 3:3

Jesus replied to Nicodemus: "'Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God.'" Nicodemus misunderstood the dual meaning. There are three ways of interpreting ἀλλ'οτριώς: from above, from the beginning, and from above.¹ He understood in his own way, that is, the literal meaning of 'again', and questioned Jesus about the meaning. According to Kelso this riddle belongs to the genre of logogriph,² which is based on the double meaning. Probably Jewish understanding of spiritual life was based on blood and flesh, that is, to be born from Jewish parents. Jesus gave a correction and expanded the riddle (3:5-8):

"Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Do not marvel that I said to you, 'You must be born anew.' The wind blows where it wills, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know whence it comes or whither it goes; so it is with every one who is born of the Spirit."

Here Jesus not only interpreted the word ἀλλ'οτριώς by "of water and the Spirit," but expanded the idea of being born of the Spirit. Still Nicodemus failed to understand (3:9). Now

¹Schnackenburg, 1:367.

²James A. Kelso, "Riddle," in ERE 10:765-770, believed that there are six types of riddles: (1) logogriph (the double meaning of a word); (2) enigma (obscure intimation); (3) rebus (a picture of things in words or syllables); (4) charade (syllable-riddle); (5) epigram; and (6) arithmetical riddle (gematria and נון). The first two are relevant for the Johannine riddles.
Jesus scolded him for his failure and gave him the reason for the failure (3:11-12). Jesus said:

"Truly, truly, I say to you, we speak of what we know, and bear witness to what we have seen; but you do not receive our testimony. If I have told you earthly things and you do not believe, how can you believe if I tell you heavenly things?"

Jesus expanded on the theme of heaven, which culminated in the idea of the lifting up of the Son of man, that is, the death of Jesus. Jesus continued (3:13-15):

"No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man. And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whoever believes in him may have eternal life."

Therefore, we see the sayings of 3:3, 5-8 caused misunderstanding on the part of Nicodemus. Vs. 3 does not seem to speak about Jesus, but the event of being born again is equated with believing in Jesus. Though the riddle did not directly talk about Jesus, it eventually ended with the Son of man, even his death. To believe Jesus is equated with being born again. The parable of wind is employed to illustrate the nature of the rebirth in the expansion.

1Comparing 3:3; 3:5; and 3:15 we may see that rebirth is closely related to believing Jesus. He who is born again enters the kingdom, and he who believes receives eternal life. Therefore rebirth and believing Jesus is equated in this chapter, when entering the kingdom and receiving eternal life mean the same thing.

2David Rensberger, Overcoming the World: Politics and Community in the Gospel of John (Cambridge: The University Press, 1989), 55: "To be 'born from above,' then, or from God, means believing in Jesus, in the full Johannine sense, and this, as we have seen, is what Nicodemus lacks."
There is no misunderstanding recorded after vs. 15. New birth begins by believing in Jesus who is lifted up. Therefore, these sayings are related to the death of Jesus. The double ἄνευ formula is found three times (3:3, 5, 11).

Jesus gave a riddle to Nicodemus (3:3). He misunderstood. Jesus expanded the riddle (3:5-8). Nicodemus failed to understand. He was scolded and was given the reason why he could not understand (3:11-12). Then, Jesus again expanded the riddle and faded out (3:13-15). The riddle and its expansion are chained together.¹

We find these identifying marks: (1) it includes an ambiguous word of double meaning; (2) it causes Nicodemus to ask questions and to misunderstand; (3) the sayings orient toward the relationship of a person to Jesus, based on the death of Jesus; (4) the riddle is expanded by the use of figures of speech; (5) it begins with the ἄνευ ἄνευ formula; and (6) the riddle is not solved until after the resurrection.

John 4:32

When the disciples asked Jesus to eat, he answered (4:32): "I have food to eat of which you do not know."² This saying is a riddle when abstracted from the context.

¹Kelso, "Riddle," 10:766, sees the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus to be an example of an enigmatic discourse, which is a type of riddle.

²Schnackenburg, 1:445, views that "to have food to eat" is a metaphor.
He teased the disciples' imagination to guess. They were puzzled. They thought someone brought food for him. Now Jesus expanded it (4:34-38):

"My food is to do the will of him who sent me, and to accomplish his work. Do you not say, 'There are yet four months, then comes the harvest'? I tell you, lift up your eyes, and see how the fields are already white for harvest. He who reaps receives wages, and gathers fruit for eternal life, so that sower and reaper may rejoice together. For here the saying holds true, 'One sows and another reaps.' I sent you to reap that for which you did not labor; others have labored, and you have entered into their labor."

Here the riddle of food was explained as doing the will of God. This riddle brings up the Christological mission and compares it with food. This work is compared to the harvesting and gathering of food. For a physical harvest they had to wait four months, but the spiritual harvest was now.

The coming of the Samaritans was described as the time of harvest. Chap. 4:37 seems to be a popular proverb, that is, a genuine παρομοια in the Greek sense: "One sows and another reaps." There was a misunderstanding, and the riddle was expanded. The coming of the Samaritans explained the expansion of the riddle. A proverb was employed for a contrast in the expansion.

The following marks are found: (1) it includes an ambiguous word; (2) it causes the disciples to question; (3) the riddle is about Jesus' mission; (4) it is expanded by

'Interestingly, the food motif is connected to the death motif of the Messiah in 6:55.'
the use of a proverb; and (5) the riddle is resolved by the coming of the Samaritans, but the deeper meaning is not known until after the resurrection.

John 6:32-33, 35, 51, 53

Jesus said to the crowd (6:32-33):

"Truly, truly, I say to you, it was not Moses who gave you the bread from heaven; my Father gives you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is that which comes down from heaven, and gives life to the world."¹

Not knowing what Jesus meant by the bread of God, they asked Jesus to give this bread always. Jesus identified himself with this bread and amplified the meaning of having the bread (6:35-40):

"I am the bread of life; he who comes to me shall not hunger, and he who believes in me shall never thirst. But I said to you that you have seen me and yet do not believe. All that the Father gives me will come to me; and him who comes to me I will not cast out. For I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me; and this is the will of him who sent me, that I should lose nothing of all that he has given me, but raise it up at the last day. For this is the will of my Father, that every one who sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."²

In the light of vs. 41 it is clear that the cause of misunderstanding, which led them to their murmuring, was the bold-faced parts in the above quotation. Vs. 41 picked it up in this way: "'I am the bread which came down from heaven.'" Therefore, the difficulty is based on the

¹Emphasis supplied.
²Emphasis supplied.
combination of vss. 33 and 35. Vs. 33 should be understood

together with vs. 32. Their misunderstanding was about the

origin of Jesus. They were right when they said that Jesus
came from Nazareth, but Jesus seemed to deny it. The

statement Jesus made of his own origin became a riddle. A

long string of sayings is given in 6:43-51. Vs. 51 needs

attention:

"I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if

any one eats of this bread, he will live for ever; and

the bread which I shall give for the life of the world

is my flesh."

In the response the Jews picked up vs. 51 by the question

(6:52): "'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?'" Now

Jesus expanded the riddle, and he said (6:53-58):

"Truly, truly, I say to you, unless you eat the flesh of

the Son of man and drink his blood, you have no life in

you; he who eats my flesh and drinks my blood has

eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.

For my flesh is food indeed, and my blood is drink

indeed. He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides

in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and

I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will

live because of me. This is the bread which came down

from heaven, not such as the fathers ate and died; he

who eats this bread will live for ever."

The riddle was taken up again, and he indicated that eternal

life means resurrection life. The eternal life was also

described as abiding in him. A distinction was then made

between the food the fathers had eaten and that the

believers were to eat. The disciples could not understand

again. They labeled it a "hard saying (Σκληρός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος

οὕτως)" (6:60b). Many disciples drew back and no longer went
about with Jesus. For them it remained as a riddle. This riddle was intended by Jesus.

We see at least four riddles (6:32-33, 35, 51, 53). All of them are closely chained showing how the Johannine riddles develop.

We find the following marks: (1) the riddles include ambiguous words; (2) they cause the audience to ask questions, or fail to understand; (3) these sayings about Jesus are related to Jesus' death; (4) the sayings are expanded by the use of an example of the fathers; (5) the sayings are introduced by the ἐμὴ ἐμὴ formula; (6) the riddles are not resolved until after the resurrection.

John 7:33-34

Jesus told the temple police (7:33-34): "'I shall be with you a little longer, and then I go to him who sent me; you will seek me and you will not find me; where I am you cannot come.'" This saying puzzled them. Suddenly the temple police faded out and the Jewish leaders faded in and they murmured. They were totally lost to the saying of Jesus. It remained a riddle for ever for them. It has an echo of 16:16, and belongs to the departure riddle and conceals the death of Jesus. It is clearly a Johannine riddle.

Following marks are found: (1) it includes an ambiguous word; (2) it causes the audience to ask questions and fail to understand; (3) the riddle is about Jesus' death; (4) the riddle is not resolved until after the resurrection.

John 7:37b-38

Jesus proclaimed on the last day of the feast of Tabernacles: "'If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink. He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, "Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water."'" The aside reveals that it was not understood. It was about the Spirit who will be given on the basis of the death of Jesus. The narrator connects this to Jesus' glory. It is also a Johannine riddle.

These are the marks we find for this saying: (1) it includes an ambiguous word; (2) it causes the audience to fail to understand; (3) this saying about Jesus is related to the death of Jesus; (4) the riddle is not solved until after the resurrection.

John 8:21

Jesus told the Pharisees (8:21): "'I go away, and you will seek me and die in your sin; where I am going, you cannot come.'" This saying echoes 7:33, 34. On this occasion they drew close to the truth. They thought of his

'Nicholson, 35, saw this to be a departure riddle.
death, even his suicide. It also belongs to the departure riddle with a variation. Jesus gave the reason why he said this (8:23-24):

"You are from below, I am from above; you are of this world, I am not of this world. I told you that you would die in your sins, for you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he."

The departure riddle is closely related to the secret of Jesus' origin. When they asked Jesus who he was, he answered (8:25-26):

"Even what I have told you from the beginning. I have much to say about you and much to judge; but he who sent me is true, and I declare to the world what I have heard from him."

Jesus mentioned the origin of his teaching, but they could not connect his origin with the Father. This saying clusters to the riddle of Jesus' origin.

Jesus described his going away in different language (8:28):

"When you have lifted up the Son of man, then you will know that I am he, and that I do nothing on my own authority but speak thus as the Father taught me. And he who sent me is with me; he has not left me alone, for I always do what is pleasing to him."

When Jesus said this, many believed him (8:30). When we carefully examine the following conversation, we are surprised to see that they did not really believe him.

The fact that they will know that "I am he" after the lifting up of Jesus, indicates that the real identification of Jesus will be possible only after the
death and resurrection of Jesus. That is to say, the death is the clue to unlock all the riddles they were facing.

These marks were found: (1) it includes an ambiguous word of going away; (2) it causes the audience to ask questions and to misunderstand; (3) the riddle is about Jesus' death; and (4) the riddle is not solved until after the resurrection.

John 8:31-32, 51, 56, 58

Jesus told the people who believed in him (8:31-32):
"'If you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free.'" They were offended and could not understand that they were not free because they knew they were not slaves to anyone. Jesus' words clashed with their perception. Jesus explained the meaning of being slaves and expanded the riddle (8:34-38):

"Truly, truly, I say to you, every one who commits sin is a slave to sin. The slave does not continue in the house for ever; the son continues for ever. So if the Son makes you free, you will be free indeed. I know that you are descendants of Abraham; yet you seek to kill me, because my word finds no place in you. I speak of what I have seen with my Father, and you do what you have heard from your father."

The listeners tried to affirm their Abrahamic origin, but Jesus denied it. Now they asserted that they had one father, God. Jesus denied it, telling them their father is the Devil (8:44). They accused Jesus of demon-possession. Jesus answered (8:51): "'Truly, truly, I say to you, if any
one keeps my word, he will never see death.'" Again in his reply Jesus said (8:56): "'Your father Abraham rejoiced that he was to see my day; he saw it and was glad.'" They objected again. Jesus said (8:58): "'Truly, truly, I say to you, before Abraham was, I am.'" They could not understand him so they tried to stone him. The intention of Jesus is seen here. He drove the minds of these people away from him. The riddles are 8:31-32, 51, 56, 58. Though they do not speak about death, they caused an attempt on his life. Therefore, it is indirectly connected to the death of Jesus.

These marks were found: (1) they include ambiguous words; (2) they caused the audience to ask questions and fail to understand; (3) the sayings caused the people to attempt to kill Jesus; (4) the riddle of 31-32 is expanded in 34-38 by the use of a proverb in vs. 35; (5) the riddles of 51, 56, 58 are introduced by the ἀμὴν ἀμὴν formula; and (6) the riddles are not solved until after the resurrection.

John 11:11

Jesus commented on the illness of Lazarus: "'This illness is not unto death; it is for the glory of God, so that the Son of God may be glorified by means of it.'" This only can be understood fully in the light of the two resurrections, Lazarus' and Jesus'. Jesus' tarrying for two days also suggests some intention to conceal.

Jesus said (11:11): "'Our friend Lazarus has fallen asleep, but I go to awake him out of sleep.'" The disciples
misunderstood this. Jesus explicitly said (11:14):
"'Lazarus is dead.'" When Jesus said that they were going
to him, Thomas said (11:16): "'Let us also go, that we may
die with him.'" Apparently the riddle of sleep was
resolved; nevertheless, why Jesus compared death to sleep
remained unknown. Therefore, it is a riddle. The use of
the word παρρησία in 11:14 echoes 16:25 and 10:24. It is
difficult to exclude this from the Johannine riddle, due to
this echo. This proleptically alluded to the death and
resurrection of Jesus, and the intention of Jesus to use an
euphemism for the word 'death' reveals the nature of riddle.

The following marks were found: (1) the riddle
includes an ambiguous word; (2) it causes the disciples to
ask questions and to misunderstand; (3) the term παρρησία is
present; (4) the saying is indirectly related to the death
of Jesus; (5) the riddle is resolved by Lazarus' resurrection but its deeper significance was not known until
after the resurrection; and (6) the riddle is put in
opposition to the term παρρησία.

John 12:32

Jesus said to the Greeks and his disciples (12:23-
26):

"The hour has come for the Son of man to be glorified.
Truly, truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat
falls into the earth and dies, it remains alone; but if
it dies, it bears much fruit. He who loves his life
loses it and he who hates his life in this world will
keep it for eternal life. If any man serves me, he must
follow me; and where I am, there shall my servant be also; if any one serves me, the Father will honor him."

One might think that four separate sayings are put together in vss. 23-26. Since they, however, are subtly connected together it is best not to look at them separately. The main idea is that the Son of man was to be glorified. Vs. 24 gives a proverbial saying in order to indicate the way to glory. The glory is related to much fruit. Vs. 25 takes up the death of the grain and connects it with the death of a man. Vs. 26 admonishes the followers to do likewise. Therefore, we accept this saying as self-contained.

This saying contains references to Jesus' death in various expressions: glory, the death of a grain of wheat, and losing one's life. Jesus again answered (12:31-32):

"This voice has come for your sake, not for mine. Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the ruler of this world be cast out; and I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself."

The audience noticed that he meant death, but they could not correlate the death with the Messiah. By the aside in 12:33 the readers could know that this indicated Jesus' death. Suddenly the crowd appeared in the scene and they answered him (12:34): "'We have heard from the law that the Christ remains for ever. How can you say that the Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?'" They understood in their own way, so they failed to understand Jesus and the death of the Messiah. Vs. 32 as a riddle has the following marks: (1) it includes an ambiguous word; (2) it caused the
audience to fail to understand; (3) it is about Jesus' death; and (4) it is not resolved until after the resurrection.

John 13:8, 10, 21c, 27b

When Jesus said (13:8): "'If I do not wash you, you have no part in me.'" Peter did not understand Jesus, and asked him to wash his head and hands. Peter did not catch the meaning of this washing. We may know that this washing was symbolic by the following saying (13:10): "'He who has bathed does not need to wash, except for his feet, but he is clean all over; and you are clean, but not every one of you.'" The aside in vs. 11 reveals what this washing symbolizes and also that the washing is closely related to the betrayal of Judas.

Jesus said (13:21c): "'Truly, truly, I say to you, one of you will betray me.'" 'One of you' is hidden. The death of Jesus was not expected by the disciples. They did not know that Judas was the one who would betray him. Even after Jesus gave the choice morsel, they did not understand it. They did not suspect Judas.1 This remained a riddle until the arrest of Jesus, when Judas appeared with the police. Jesus said to Judas (13:27b): "'What you are going

1'Probably the reason the narrator kept telling of Judas' identity throughout the narrative is because the disciples were perfectly deceived by Judas. But the narrator informs the readers that Jesus knew it from the beginning.
to do, do quickly.'" The "what" is hidden. No one at the meal understood the meaning. This also remained as a riddle until the arrest of Jesus. Both of these words have to do with the death of Jesus.

These verses share the following marks as riddles: (1) they are ambiguous; (2) they caused the disciples to ask questions and fail to discern what was going on; (3) the sayings are about Jesus and his death; (4) the riddle of 13:21c is introduced by the ἀμὴν ἀμὴν formula; and (5) the riddles are not resolved until after the arrest and resurrection.

John 13:33, 36b

Jesus said to his disciples (13:33-35):

"Little children, yet a little while I am with you. You will seek me; and as I said to the Jews so now I say to you, 'Where I am going you cannot come.' A new commandment I give to you, that you love one another; even as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another."³

Peter picked up the head of this saying, which is the recurring departure riddle, and he asked (13:36): "'Lord, where are you going?"' Jesus answered: "'Where I am going you cannot follow me now; but you shall follow afterward.'" This is a personal application of the riddle to Peter.

¹Nicholson, 35, saw this to be a departure riddle.
²George Johnston, 162, saw this to be a riddle.
³Emphasis supplied.
Peter asked him again, "'Lord, why cannot I follow you now? I will lay down my life for you.'" Jesus answered: "'Will you lay down your life for me? Truly, truly, I say to you, the cock will not crow, till you have denied me three times.'"

Vs. 13:33 is a departure riddle, developed in 36b as such for Peter, triggering Peter's questions. The prediction of Peter's denial was resolved when Peter denied Jesus. The riddle of 13:36b is echoed again in 21:18. In the light of the fact that 16:16 is a riddle, this riddle of vs. 33 is a variation of it. Although we cannot find other features of a riddle, we can safely include this in the list.

These are the marks we found: (1) the riddles are ambiguous; (2) the riddle of vs. 33 caused Peter to ask questions, fail to understand; (3) the sayings are about Jesus' death; and (4) the riddle of 36b is introduced by the ἄμην ἄμην formula.

John 14:19

Jesus said (14:19): "'Yet a little while, and the world will see me no more, but you will see me; because I live; you will live also.'" This is another departure riddle. This saying is picked up by the other Judas (14:22): "'Lord, how is it that you will manifest yourself to us, and not to the world?'" We do not need to enumerate the features since it is a variation of 16:16.
John 21:18

Jesus said to Peter (21:18):

"Truly, truly, I say to you, when you were young, you girded yourself and walked where you would; but when you are old, you will stretch out your hands, and another will gird you and carry you where you do not wish to go."

The aside in 21:19 reveals that it is a riddle, it was not understood, and here the death is explicitly connected to the notion of glorifying God. Though it does not speak about Jesus, since Peter's death is based on the glory of Christ--his death, it is connected indirectly to Jesus' death. Therefore, though it is not a riddle about Jesus, since it alludes to the Christological riddle of death, it can be part of the list: (1) the riddle includes ambiguous words; (2) it caused the audience to ask questions or fail to understand; (3) the saying is about following the footsteps of Jesus--that is, to follow his death; (4) the saying is introduced by the ἀμην ἀμην formula; and (5) the riddle was not resolved until long after the resurrection.

We need to summarize the observations thus far made. The riddles were not explained, rather they were expanded. When they were expanded they were misunderstood again. Jesus did not intend to explain the riddles. They remained as riddles until the time of death and resurrection. All of them remained as such because unless the core of the riddles, that is, the death and the resurrection of Jesus was made manifest, all other subsidiaries could not be made
clear. The lengths of the riddles are varying. Some are very short; others are quite long. Some short riddles were based on certain Greek words: \( \text{μικρόν, ὑψόω, ἀνωθεν} \). Some are apparent riddles without considering the context. Most of these riddles cluster around the grand riddle of the death of Jesus. Thus, the death of Messiah was hidden from the eyes of the characters in the FG.

**The Functions of the Johannine Riddles**

We have seen thus far that the Johannine riddles caused failure to understand due to the difficulty of certain sayings, and they caused the audience to ask questions, or caused them to misunderstand. Unfortunately, the distinction between the riddles and misunderstandings is not made clear in recent scholarship.\(^2\)

---


\(^2\) Carson, "Understanding Misunderstandings," 65, comments: "But against Leroy, Brown insists that these misunderstandings are the Johannine equivalent of parabolic language in the synoptic gospels, reflecting the world's inability to perceive the truth. They are therefore not a Johannine peculiarity; and it is quite unhelpful to consider them as 'riddles'." Both Leroy and Brown seem to deviate from the Johannine data, in the fact that Leroy thinks that misunderstandings are riddles, and in the fact that Brown believes that parabolic language of the Synoptics is equivalent to the Johannine misunderstandings. Because there are a number of parabolic speeches in John, which are not closely related to the misunderstandings, we should view the Johannine riddles and Johannine parables discriminately. Carson, 78-79, registers three qualifications to Brown's idea: (1) Although many synoptic parables are suitably
The combination of riddle and misunderstanding offers a vantage point for the readers of the Gospel. Therefore, the Johannine riddles function effectively as a literary device in the narrative context.

Painter saw the root of the misunderstanding motif in the situation of the earthly Jesus, believing that it was dramatically developed. He thus regarded the misunderstandings as a very important feature in the FG. If they are so, then the riddles which caused the misunderstandings must also be given special emphasis. The significance of the presence of the riddles in the FG should not be minimized. Though the Johannine misunderstanding is a recurring motif, the real focus is on the riddles because only riddles received such labels. The significance of riddles is emphasized above the misunderstandings. The messages about the Messiah reside in the riddles, not in the misunderstandings.

Jesus is portrayed as having employed riddles not only for the unbelievers, but for the believers as well. The misunderstandings caused by the riddles show that people analogous to Johannine misunderstandings insofar as the theme of misunderstanding itself is concerned, they are formally rather unlike most instances of misunderstandings in John. (2) There are synoptic analogues to Johannine misunderstandings beyond the parables suggested by Brown. (3) We should not overlook the fact that John records so many misunderstandings, and such diverse forms of them, and should ask what this might signify.

'Painter, 82.
did not understand Jesus and his mission until after the resurrection. All these riddles remained mysteries, or are kept unsolved, until a certain time, mostly the time of Jesus' death and resurrection.¹ Therefore, it is clear that Johannine riddles are particularly related to the Jo

tanna sōφα (glory), that is, the death and resurrection of Jesus, the Messiah, and the Son of God. The riddles not only repelled those who could not believe him but also those who tried to believe and understand him based on their traditional expectations.²

As R. Alan Culpepper has indicated, 'implicit commentary' is valid only for the readers of the Gospel, but not for the characters in it.³ Even the belief in and the confession of Jesus on the part of the characters did not make everything known and understood (11:27, 39).

The riddles also reveal another aspect. By words and signs (with a few exceptions), Jesus could not make himself known to the Jews and the disciples as the Son of God, but only by his death and resurrection. The riddles are Christological not only because they speak about Jesus,

¹Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, 48: "In the course of his narrative, therefore, the writer is constantly impressing on his reader that those who have seen all these events have grasped their true meaning only after Jesus' death and resurrection."

²For a condemnation of inadequate belief, see John 2:23-25.

³Culpepper, 164.
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but also because they are spoken by him. At the same time, they are eschatological due to the fact that they culminate in the death and resurrection of Jesus.

The relationship between this Johannine term and its features and the Synoptic παραβολή calls for attention. Since the Johannine παρομία is definitely defined as riddle, its detachment from the Synoptic παραβολή is clearly laid bare. Nevertheless, a question can be raised: Does the Greek term παραβολή used in the Synoptics connote anything of riddle?

A number of scholars have noticed the mysterious nature of Synoptic parables because the parables sometimes were not properly understood and, as a result, required interpretation. Since παραβολή translates the Hebrew word בְשׁוֹן, which has a broad range of meanings comprising even 'riddle,' we cannot completely exclude the meaning of riddle from it. Therefore, we answer positively to the first question.

We have another question to deal with: What is the Hebrew word for the Johannine παρομία? I have delayed raising this question until now. Some suggestions can be made toward the answer. It has been a scholarly consensus that παρομία translates בְשׁוֹן in the FG. I believe, however,

1 Cf. Mark 4:12, 13 and its parallels.

2 Cf. Schnackenburg, John, 3:161: בְשׁוֹן is the underlying Hebrew word.
it is not \( \text{הרי} \) but \( \text{נהריה} \) which is behind \( \text{פרשניא} \) in the FG, for the following reasons, which combine with the reasons why the term \( \text{פרשניא} \) was chosen:

1. John seems to have purposely avoided using \( \text{פרשתה} \) because it was used in the Synoptics in a different sense, and John's use of \( \text{פרשניא} \) is limited to the meaning of riddle.

2. Since the Synoptics employed only \( \text{פרשתה} \) John tried to revive the use of the other term \( \text{פרשניא} \) by the use of \( \text{פרשניא} \). He wanted to emphasize another important feature of Jesus' teaching, so to have balance between the two. He had to emphasize Jesus' teaching in riddles. He taught his identity, mission, death, and his relationship with the Father in riddles.

3. John probably developed the idea of riddle dormant in the Synoptic \( \text{פרשתה} \) and made it a distinct category for his Gospel.

---

'John probably knew the Synoptic use of \( \text{פרשתה} \). Ps 78:2 (MT) reads: "I will open my mouth in a parable (\( \text{נשב} \)); I will utter dark sayings (\( \text{נדה} \)) from of old." Matthew quoted it thus: "I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter what has been hidden since the foundation of the world." His quotation does not follow Masoretic text. We find in LXX Ps 77:2 thus: "\( \text{Ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, διδαχὴς προβλήματα ἀπὸ αἰῶνα.} \)" We read in Matt 13:35b: "\( \text{Ἀνοίξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὸ στόμα μου, ἡ διδαχὴ κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς} \) κόσμον." The second half of the Matthean quotation does not follow the LXX. The LXX seems to reflect more of the Masoretic \( \text{נדה} \). It is awkward to see \( \text{נדה} \) deprived of its connotation of wisdom forms, because the hidden things no more indicate the forms, but rather the contents.
4. Because there is a case in the LXX where נַחַל is translated by παρομία (Sir 8:8) it is plausible to conclude the Synoptics reflected נַחַל, while the Johannine Gospel has in the background נַחַל. Jesus taught concerning the kingdom ἐν παραβολαῖς, but his origin, destiny, and mission were announced ἐν παρομίαῖς. The Synoptic parables give insights to the what and how of the Kingdom of God, while the Johannine riddles focus more on who Jesus is and what his mission was.

We may ask still another question: Why did John use παρομία instead of πρόβλημα or αἰνημα? Παρομία has no affinity with them, except a few cases in the LXX, where it is used together with them in genitive construction. Nevertheless, its meaning there is not so clear because examples were not given, as they are in the FG. It is significant to observe the fact that what the characters of the FG failed to understood (riddle) was what everybody should have known (proverb). Therefore, it is likely that John wanted to maintain the tension between what should be known and their failure to know it, by using the term παρομία instead of πρόβλημα or αἰνημα.

1 I exclude by no means some riddle-like parables from the Synoptics, but the narrowing has developed in the FG.
Summary and Conclusion

We extracted from the FG an assured minimum of Jesus' riddles: 2:19; 3:3; 4:32; 6:32-33, 35, 51, 53; 7:33-34; 7:37b-38; 8:21, 31-32, 51, 56, 58; 11:11; 12:32; 13:8, 10, 21c, 27b; 13:33, 36b; 14:19; 21:18. In the discussions, identifying marks for riddles are listed. We came to realize that these riddles culminate in the riddle of the death of Jesus.

In the discussion concerning the function of Johannine riddles, we have noticed that they are closely related to the misunderstandings, but more weight is on the riddles, rather than the misunderstandings.

Jesus was misunderstood theologically by the characters of John. No explanation, no hint, no illustration could help the people who were in contact with Jesus to understand. Therefore, his origin, his identity, his mission, his death and other aspects of his life and mission were not understood. The people did not understand the revelation from God in the form of a riddle. Jesus was a riddle to them. It also shows that they were not able to be enlightened by the words and signs of Jesus. Only by his death and resurrection did they come to the correct understanding of the mission and identity of Jesus Christ.

The Johannine term παρομία seems to have been used to avoid the confusion which might be caused by the use of the Synoptic term παραβολή because the Johannine term designates...
some sayings quite different from the sayings labeled by παραβολή in the Synoptics.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This dissertation dealt with the question of the Johannine παρομία. The term is found in two passages of the FG: 10:1-6 and 16:4b-33. The purpose was to see what is referred to by this term, to identify the form of παρομία, and what function it performs.

In chapter 1, the usage of the Greek term παρομία in the literature before the FG was investigated. The examination of existing dictionary articles and other modern authorities, including monographs on the topic of proverbs, produced a conclusion that they do not provide reliable results to begin our study. The definitions by the Greek authors or rhetoricians were discussed. Since they did not give a unified view, it was necessary to embark on a philological investigation of παρομία in the Greek literature, which demanded a searching for the word using TLG on CDROM for a complete collection of παρομίαι before the time of the FG. As a foundational study for the Johannine παρομία, I extracted 199 παρομίαι from the Greek literature to see how the term was really used.

It was discovered that they not only refer to proverbs and popular sayings, but also to maxims and idiomatic expressions. The Greek authors gave a number of
definitions which later were fully developed to be more inclusive. The authors of later literature annexed additional meanings and other literary features to the term. It is clear that the notion of riddle was not included in the meaning of παρομία before the LXX. Παρομία are nearly always short and never more than 17 words. Only seven out of 199 have more than ten words.

The use of παρομία found in Hellenistic Judaism was also examined. The notion that παραβολή and παρομία are interchangeable for the translation of the Hebrew term ḥesem proved wrong. Παρομία translates ἡρίθ in Sir 8:8. Based on this case we could see a connecting link between these two words, which denote two different things. As a result the definition "riddle" could be added to the Greek term παρομία.

Philo did not deviate from the normal use of the Greek term, except once when he replaced αίνημα (along with others) with παρομία. We could conclude that the shift in semantics of the term is minimal before the time of John's Gospel. Παρομία in the Classical literature before John remained in the area of proverb, maxim, and idiom. Nevertheless, the LXX extended its meaning toward the riddle in Sir 8:8.

Chapter 2 discussed John 16:4b-33. Reading the passage we noticed that the saying of 16:25 was occasioned
by questions from the disciples. These questions were raised due to difficult sayings of Jesus.

The complexity and ambiguity of τοῦτα and ἐν παρομίας in 16:25 was emphasized, and they were discussed in detail to define what was referred to by the former and what was the meaning of the latter. Τοῦτα played an important role for defining the content of what was spoken ἐν παρομίας. It was concluded that τοῦτα could not refer to all that Jesus said, neither could it refer to the whole of the Last Discourse because the use of τοῦτα in John deters this application. So we limited its reference to John 16:5-24.

The analysis of the contents of the section referred to by τοῦτα does not show that all the sayings are παρομία, but only some parts are παρομία. We found two short παρομία which were difficult to understand: 16:5a [10b], 16. The legitimate translation of the word παρομία in our context was determined to be "riddle" in the sense of a difficult saying, with the support of many scholars and the content and context which the section carries. We thus concluded that παρομία are riddles.

Riddles were never explained in John 16; rather they were expanded. The response of the disciples in 16:29 showed that Jesus did not explain the riddle, but he did not use a παρομία (riddle) anymore.

In light of chapter 1 it is clear that the use of παρομία in the Greek literature has no parallel to the Johannine use of it in 16:4b-33 because the Classical and
the Hellenistic use of παρομία was made to refer to popular sayings, maxims, and idiomatic expressions. Furthermore, it never employed παρομία in the sense of "riddle." The semantic development which started in the LXX of Sirach was completed in John 16:25.

In chapter 3, we saw that John 10 is so closely related to the episode of chap. 9, that the former is better understood in the light of the latter. The παρομία of 10:1-5 was given as a proclamation of Jesus to the Jews who did not wish to accept the miracle, the healed, and the healer--the miracle-worker, and as a result the proclamation was a blinding riddle.

Primary attention was given to the genre of 10:1-5. We rejected proverb, 'figure of speech,' and parable as its genre, and discussed at length the possibility of allegory. Allegory did not fit contextually and in many other aspects. Some attempts at merging the genres of parable and allegory into a hybrid proved futile. We have accepted the genre of riddle for 10:1-5. Since this was not explained in the following verses, but rather expanded, it remained as a riddle. The riddle found in chap. 10 is long. This is a wide deviation because the longest παρομία in the first chapter is seventeen words. The Johannine παρομία is different from other παρομία before the FG.

We investigated the point of misunderstanding, the contents of it, and the reasons behind it. We came to see
that the current messianic expectations hindered the audience from understanding what Jesus said. The death of the Messiah was something unthinkable for the people in the FG.

The Johannine riddles were employed by Jesus to obscure his meaning and to induce questions from them. This was intended to bring home their inability to grasp the revelation and would lead them to the fullness of understanding which was yet to come.

In chapter 4, the above characteristics were applied to the whole FG in order to find other Johannine riddles which are not explicitly so labeled. The following is the list of the Johannine riddles we made from the reading of the Gospel: 2:19; 3:3; 4:32; 6:32-33, 35, 51, 53; 7:33-34; 7:37b-38; 8:21, 31-32, 51, 56, 58; 11:11; 12:32; 13:8, 10, 21c, 27b; 13:33, 36b; 14:19; 21:18. We came to realize that these riddles culminate in the riddle of the death of Jesus.

The Johannine riddles were intended to show that the people did not understand the revelation from God. Jesus was a riddle to them. The riddles also indicate that Jesus was not able to enlighten their minds, except by his death and resurrection. The riddles are Christological not only because they speak about Jesus, but also because they are spoken by him. They are eschatological due to the fact that their core is the death of Jesus and they are only resolved by his resurrection.
In short, the use of παρομία in the FG deviates from its use in other Greek literature. The Johannine use can find its legitimacy only in Sir 8:8, 39:3, and Philo. The term παρομία in 16:25 refer to the two riddles of 16:5a [10b], 16, which are expanded in 16:20-24. The παρομία of 10:1-5 is a riddle as well, and it is expanded in 10:7-18. These three riddles are Christological. They are especially focused on the death of Jesus. By applying some characteristics common among these riddles, we could locate a number of riddles in the FG. The role of the riddles in the narrative are so important that they might supercede the functions of the misunderstandings.

The Johannine παρομία is definitely defined as riddle, its detachment from the Synoptic παραβολή is clearly laid bare. It is not ἅπα but ἡ τεχνή which is behind παρομία in the FG. Concerning the question why did John use παρομία instead of πρόβλημα or αίνιγμα, we may answer: it is likely that John wanted to maintain the tension between what should be known and the failure to know it, by using the term παρομία instead of πρόβλημα or αίνιγμα.
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