ERIC JOHN WYCKOFF

John 4:1–42 among the Biblical Well Encounters

Mohr Siebeck

Eric John Wyckoff

John 4:1–42 among the Biblical Well Encounters

Pentateuchal and Johannine Narrative Reconsidered

Mohr Siebeck

Eric John Wyckoff, born 1963; 1990 M.A. and 1992 M.Div. Pontifical College Josephinum; 2004 D.Min. Barry University; 2010 S.S.L. Pontifical Biblical Institute; 2020 S.S.D. Studium Biblicum Franciscanum; 1999–2003 Lecturer and 2009–2012 Assistant Professor at the Instituto Teológico Salesiano, Tlaquepaque, México; since 2012 Assistant Professor of Biblical Studies at the Salesian Pontifical University, Jerusalem Campus.
orcid.org/0000-0003-3074-8119

For
Margaret J. Wyckoff
(1929–2005)

Preface

The following monograph presents my doctoral dissertation at the Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (SBF) in Jerusalem, successfully defended on March 9, 2020. Apart from some minor alterations, the study appears here as it was originally submitted. The responsibility for its shortcomings falls on me alone, but those who contributed to its growth from an idea to a dissertation to a published volume are many.

The administration and professors at the SBF were unfailing in their support of my desire to explore this topic, wherever it might lead me. My advisor, Alessandro Cavicchia, and my reader, Alessandro Coniglio, constantly challenged me to let the course of my research be determined by the verifiable results at each stage. If there is methodological rigor in my work, I attribute it to the high standards set by these two specialists in inner-biblical exegesis.

The SBF also invited two eminent scholars to participate in my doctoral process, whom I thank for graciously accepting. Francis J. Moloney contributed his wealth of experience in Johannine studies to the initial formulation and approval of my research proposal, and he provided timely guidance throughout the project. Edward L. Greenstein brought the perspective of a scholar in Hebrew Bible and ancient Near Eastern literature to my dissertation committee, offering detailed feedback on successive drafts, including insights from his own recent research on recurring narrative patterns.

I am also thankful to other exegetes cited in this study who kindly contributed to its development. Maurizio Marcheselli made a number of key suggestions at the outset of the writing stage. Piet Van Veldhuizen donated a copy of his superb monograph. Through the kindness of my colleague Marcie Lenk, I was privileged to exchange ideas with the members of the 2017 Colloquium Ioanneum in Jerusalem. Among them, I am especially grateful to R. Alan Culpepper and Catrin Williams, who shared preliminary manuscripts of their essays, and to Jean Zumstein, who responded to my questions on method with thorough precision.

The Tantur Notre Dame Residential Doctoral Fellowship offered the opportunity for a hiatus from teaching in order to bring my SBF dissertation to completion. Jerusalem's Tantur Ecumenical Center, located on a verdant hill overlooking Bethlehem, provided an ideal environment for scholarly research, dialogue, and writing. I sincerely thank Russell K. McDougall and his staff in

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AnBib	Analecta Biblica
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BA	*Bibical Archaeologist*
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000
BDB	Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Suttgartensia*
Bib	*Biblica*
BibInt	*Biblical Interpretation*
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BN	*Biblische Notizen*
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries
BSac	*Bibliotheca sacra*
BTB	*Biblical Theology Bulletin*
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Manuscript Series
CHJ	*Cambridge History of Judaism*. Edited by W. D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984–2006
CNT	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament
ConBNT	Coniectanea neotestamentica or Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series
CurBS	*Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*

DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DRev	*Downside Review*
EBib	*Études bibliques*
ECC	Eerdmans Critical Commentary
ECL	Early Christianity and Its Literature
EstBib	*Estudios bíblicos*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
EWE	*Erwägen Wissen Ethik*
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FB	Forschung zur Bibel
FOTL	Forms of the Old Testament Literature
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
Greg	*Gregorianum*
HALOT	*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Köhler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. Translated by Mervyn E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999
HBT	*Horizons in Biblical Theology*
HeyJ	*Heythrop Journal*
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
IBC	Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IKaZ	*Internationale katholische Zeitschrift*
Int	*Interpretation*
ITC	International Theological Commentary
ITQ	*Irish Theological Quarterly*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBQ	*Jewish Bible Quarterly*
JFSR	*Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament
LASBF	*Liber Annuus Studii Biblici Franciscani*
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LD	Lectio Divina
LEH	Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003
LNTS	The Library of New Testament Studies
LSJ	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon with a Revised Supplement*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996
LXX	Septuagint (Old Greek)
MdB	*Le Monde de la Bible*
MT	Masoretic Text

NA[28]	*Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland, 28th ed.
Neot	*Neotestamentica*
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NT	New Testament
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OT	Old Testament
OTL	Old Testament Library
OtSt	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
PG	Patrologia Graeca
PL	Patrologia Latina
PRSt	*Perspectives in Religious Studies*
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RBS	Resources for Biblical Study
RevExp	*Review and Expositor*
RevistB	*Revista bíblica*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
SBB	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge
SBFA	Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
SemeiaSup	Semeia Supplements
SJ	Studia Judaica
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and Its World
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SRB	Studies in the Reception History of the Bible
StBibLit	Studies in Biblical Literature
SubBi	Subsidia Biblica
SymS	Symposium Series
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TBT	*The Bible Today*
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
TGST	Tesi Gregoriana, Serie Teologia
TP	*Theologie und Philosophie*
VC	*Vigiliae christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary

WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WUNT II	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

Introduction: Posing the Question

Readers of the Bible grow accustomed to repetitions.[1] In the Pentateuch, we find two accounts of creation (Gen 1:1–2:4a; 2:4b–25), three of the patriarchs feigning to be siblings rather than spouses (Gen 12:10–20; 20:1–18; 26:1–11), two of Hagar discovering a miraculous well in the desert (Gen 16:7–14; 21:17–21), and two of Moses drawing water from the rock at Meribah (Exod 17:1–7; Num 20:1–13).[2] Events narrated in the books of Samuel and Kings are retold from a different standpoint in 1–2 Chronicles. The canonical gospels tell the story of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus four separate times. Even in the final book of the Christian canon, Revelation, the reader reencounters a series of apocalyptic signs from the Book of Daniel reprised in light of new historical and theological perspectives.

Upon reading the narrative of Jesus' encounter with a woman of Samaria at Jacob's well (John 4:1–42), the reader experiences a similar déjà vu. The basic story line conjures up other encounters at wells between Rebecca and Abraham's servant (Genesis 24), Rachel and Jacob (Genesis 29), and Zipporah and her sisters with Moses (Exodus 2). The outcome of these episodes, however, is not the same. The three Torah passages lead to a betrothal, but the Gospel pericope concludes with an acclamation of faith. What, then, is the relationship between them? Does the latter presuppose the reader's knowledge of the former? If so, then what sort of interpretation of the pentateuchal well encounters is presupposed, and what significance does this have for the exegesis of the Johannine Samaria narrative?

There is no shortage of scholarly studies addressing these or similar questions. Their positions run the gamut, with some treating the Gospel pericope as essentially identical to its counterparts from the Pentateuch, and others seeing no connection at all. The majority fall between those two extremes, but among

---

[1] For more on doublets and recurring patterns in the Bible, see Joel Rosenberg, "Bible: Biblical Narrative," in *Back to the Sources: Reading the Classic Jewish Texts*, ed. Barry W. Holtz (New York: Summit, 1984), 31–81, here 41–44; and Jacob Licht, *Storytelling in the Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1978), 51–95.

[2] For more on these and other examples of doublets and reprises from the Pentateuch, see Jean Louis Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, trans. Pascal Dominique (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 53–75.

them there is little consensus on how to define the textual relationship. Histor-
ical-critical approaches look to the world behind the text and/or its composition
history for answers, but opinions vary on which texts to include in the discus-
sion and how to conceive their role in the Johannine Samaria narrative's for-
mulation. Literary studies rely heavily on proposals regarding recurring narra-
tive patterns in ancient literature, often focusing on the betrothal motif. They
envision the link between these passages in terms of literary tropes such as
allegory, parody, and allusion, yielding interesting but diverse conclusions.
Approaches which combine historical and literary (or more properly, dia-
chronic and synchronic) perspectives provide some of the most compelling in-
sights, but even they fall short of answering the fundamental questions posed
above.[3] The result is that interpreters might consider this a closed issue, having
embraced one of the various positions or resigned themselves to the present
stalemate in the discussion.

The present study, however, seeks to move this discussion past its present
impasse by proposing a new approach. The posture taken is deliberately induc-
tive, letting the verifiable evidence in the text be the starting point. Rather than
engaging a wide array of biblical and extrabiblical sources, the focus is limited
to just four texts (Gen 24:1–67; 29:1–14; Exod 2:15–22; John 4:1–42) linked
by narrative structure and by the Torah's familiarity and normativity for NT
writers. The fundamental premise is that these four "well encounters" interre-
late in several distinct ways: a) all four represent variations on a narrative pat-
tern also found in Homer and Euripides; b) the Johannine pericope imitates but
also modifies the three pentateuchal episodes; and c) it contains literary ele-
ments from each of them. This "three-dimensional" relationship raises inter-
esting questions about what sort of literary correspondence can be verified and
how it might have historically come about. Since this type of enquiry includes
both synchronic and diachronic concerns, it can incorporate the disparate con-
tributions of previous scholarship, but it also calls attention to certain ongoing
lacunae to be addressed.

The first of these lacunae is the lack of a comprehensive critical assessment
of literary parallels between John 4:1–42 and its OT counterparts.[4] This reap-
praisal of the topic therefore includes a comparative analysis which uncovers

---

[3] On diachronic methods of biblical exegesis, which focus on the text's origin and devel-
opment, and synchronic methods, which consider the text in its final, canonical form, see
Michael J. Gorman, *Elements of Biblical Exegesis: A Basic Guide for Students and
Ministers*, Revised and expanded ed. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2009), 13–17.

[4] This study will use the term "Old Testament" when referring to Israel's sacred writings
in Hebrew and Greek from the point of view of the present day, and "Scripture" when ad-
dressing the perspective of the period prior to the differentiation between old and new. See
Dennis L. Stamps, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament as a Rhetorical
Device: A Methodological Proposal," in *Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament*,
ed. Stanley E. Porter (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 9–37, here 10–11.

numerous parallels in vocabulary, setting, plot, and characters. Literary features in John 4:1–42 seem to consciously interact with a pattern established by the three Torah texts, in some cases suggesting similarity and in others surprising the reader with a striking opposite. In the Gospel pericope, one also finds several elements which play a key role but are not from the OT scenes at all. A familiar pattern has been adopted, but it has also been adapted, placing it in dialogue with the Gospel's overall literary and theological priorities. It has been argued that one of the aims of the Johannine account of Jesus in Samaria is to surprise the reader, overturning preconceptions about a number of matters including race, culture, gender, worship, and mission.[5] It also seems to challenge the reader's presumptions about what is supposed to happen when a man and a woman meet at a well.[6]

A second critical lacuna in previous scholarship is that discussions of the Johannine Samaria narrative's prehistory and formulation give little attention to the role of postresurrection reflection by believers. The Fourth Gospel contains several candid references to a process of remembering and reflecting which took place subsequent to the events narrated (John 2:17, 22; 12:16). These verses reveal that believers came to understand Jesus' words and actions in light of Scripture, implying the reverse to be the case as well. The present approach takes these clues from the Gospel itself as a window into the milieu and process out of which 4:1–42 emerged, suggesting that what its formulators understood and believed about Jesus has become inseparably intertwined in the pericope with the reflection that it stimulated on the well encounters in Genesis 24 and 29 and Exodus 2.[7] Seen in this way, the relationship between the Johannine pericope and its scriptural background is reciprocal, or to borrow a phrase from John 4:37, "One sows, and another reaps."[8]

---

[5] For more on this aspect of John 4:1–42 with bibliography, see Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 1:585, 591–601. For additional perspectives, see Eric John Wyckoff, "Jesus in Samaria (John 4:4–42): A Model for Cross-Cultural Ministry," *BTB* 35 (2005); Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 98–105; Francis J. Moloney, *Belief in the Word: Reading John 1–4* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 138–39; and Teresa Okure, *The Johannine Approach to Mission: A Contextual Study of John 4:1–42*, WUNT II 31 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1988), 127–31.

[6] On the correlation between the Fourth Gospel's challenge of reader's preconceptions and its bending of literary conventions, see Jo-Ann A. Brant, "John Among the Ancient Novels," in *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic*, ed. Kasper Bro Larsen, Studia Aarhusiana Neotestamentica 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015), 157–68, here 161.

[7] Throughout this study, the term "formulators" and "writer" are used as a convenient way of referring to the person or persons responsible for composing the Gospel of John in its present form. This is neither a denial nor a defense of hypothetical distinctions between a Beloved Disciple, an evangelist, previous sources, and subsequent redactors.

[8] All English translations of the biblical text are the present author's own. On the textual witnesses being cited, see section 1.1.3 below.

The contours of this postresurrection reflection can be traced through a re-curring series of ten literary motifs reprised in all four episodes.[9] In the penta-teuchal well encounters, these motifs all carry a literal meaning, but the Gospel pericope reconfigures each one of them in some way. Two are accentuated (so-cioethnic barriers, worship); three emerge as metaphors (water, food, work); four retain their literal meaning but take on additional connotations (journey, recognition, announcement, welcome); and one is left ambiguous, entrusting interpretation to the individual reader (matrimony and progeny). As the enquiry to follow will illustrate, these motifs and their Johannine rereading can provide a key for interpreting this complex textual relationship.

This study's aim, therefore, is to propose an explanation for the relationship between the Johannine Samaria narrative and the pentateuchal well encounters which can offer conclusions for the exegesis of the Gospel pericope and clues to the underlying interpretation of the OT passages. The first chapter, entitled "Shaping an Approach," outlines preliminary concerns: text selection, a review of literature, and method. The second and third chapters provide this study's analytical component by addressing the lacunae identified above. "Identifying Literary Parallels" analyzes the similarities and differences in vocabulary, set-ting, plot, and characters among the four selected texts. "Looking behind the Text" investigates clues in the Gospel of John and elsewhere in the NT about the postresurrection reflection process behind John 4:1–42. The results of this twofold synchronic/diachronic analysis are then synthesized in the fourth chap-ter, "Reading the Rereading," which interprets the four texts in relation to one another according to the ten recurring literary motifs they share. A fifth and final chapter, "Conclusions," concretizes the judgments of a more global nature which can be drawn from the study as a whole.

---

[9] Literary terms such as "motif" and "theme" are routinely used in a variety of fashions. The present study elects to follow the definitions given in M. H. Abrams and Geoffrey Galt Harpham, "Motif and theme," *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, 10th ed. (Boston: Wadsworth, 2012), 229. "Motif" is used to refer to "a conspicuous element, such as a type of event, device, reference, or formula, which occurs frequently in works of literature." "Theme," instead, denotes "a general concept or doctrine, whether implicit or asserted, which an im-aginative work is designed to involve and make persuasive to the reader." According to these definitions, the motifs present in John 4:1–42 would include conspicuous elements such as water and food or events such as the journey or the offer of hospitality. On the other hand, general concepts or doctrines such as missionary concerns or faith responses to Jesus could be proposed as themes.

Chapter 1

Shaping an Approach

Examining one literary work's possible use of another is never simple, even when they share features such as language, genre, and origin. The task is further complicated if the works are dissimilar. For instance, one must negotiate the differences between a Shakespearean tragedy and a Broadway musical and between Elizabethan England, Renaissance Verona, and 1950s-era New York City in order to compare *West Side Story* with the play that inspired it, *Romeo and Juliet*.[1] Tracing the parallels between Homer's *Odyssey* and its modern adaptation in James Joyce's *Ulysses* becomes even more challenging, because it involves determining whether or not Joyce read Greek, and if not, which translation he may have used.[2] Still greater effort is necessary to analyze Virgil's incorporation of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad* into the *Aeneid*, as it involves multiple ancient texts in different languages composed centuries apart, each of which has been preserved with numerous textual variations.[3] The study of the NT use of the OT approximates this last example, but with the added complication that the language and textual form of the Scripture used by NT writers remain the subject of debate.[4]

Hence, defining the relationship between the Johannine Samaria narrative and the pentateuchal well encounters is a complex endeavor which demands a complex approach. The following chapter therefore proposes a set of parameters and procedures tailored to this task. The first step is selecting the texts to be included in the discussion and explaining the criteria for selection. Next, the

---

[1] For a brief but comprehensive comparison of the two works, see Norris Houghton, ed., *Romeo and Juliet and West Side Story* (New York: Random House, 1965), 7–14.

[2] On this question, see Keri Elizabeth Ames, "Joyce's Aesthetic of the Double Negative and His Encounters with Homer's *Odyssey*," in *Beckett, Joyce and the Art of the Negative*, ed. Colleen Jaurretche (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2005), 15–48. Her conclusion is that Joyce read the text in English, using several different translations.

[3] The debate on how to define the literary relationship among the *Odyssey*, the *Iliad*, and the *Aeneid* stretches back to antiquity; see Georg Nicolaus Knauer, "Vergil's *Aeneid* and Homer," *GRBS* 5 (1964): 61–84.

[4] For more on addressing the challenges of this type of research, see Erkki Koskenniemi and Pekka Lindqvist, "Rewritten Bible, Rewritten Stories: Methodological Aspects," in *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland, August 24–26, 2006*, ed. Antti Laato and Jacques van Ruiten, SRB 1 (Turku/Winona Lake: Åbo Akademi University/Eisenbrauns, 2008), 11–39, here 23–27.

panorama of previous solutions is surveyed by appraising different scholars' contributions and the methods they employ. The final section delineates the methodological stance called for by the present state of the question and by this study's objective.

1.1 Selecting the Texts

The study of the NT use of the OT has become a growth area in biblical research, generating a large number of dissertations and monographs in recent years.[5] Many of these have undertaken the task of examining a given text's points of contact with a wide variety of biblical and extrabiblical sources. Like many NT passages, the Johannine Samaria narrative exhibits similarities in vocabulary and subject matter with numerous previous, contemporaneous, and subsequent writings. The following table lists the possible points of contact for John 4:1–42 identified in readily accesible reference works:[6]

---

[5] At the time of writing (2020), recently published monographs addressing the NT use of the OT include the following: Aaron W. White, *The Prophets Agree: The Function of the Book of the Twelve Prophets in Acts*, BIS 184 (Leiden: Brill, 2020); Ianire Angulo Ordorika, *"¿No habéis leído esta Escritura?" (Mc 12,10): El trasfondo veterotestamentario como clave hermenéutica de Mc 12,1–12*, AnBib 226 (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2019); Davide Arcangeli, *Tipologia e compimento delle Scritture nel Vangelo di Giovanni: Analisi di alcuni racconti del Quarto Vangelo*, Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 66 (Bologna: Dehoniane, 2019); Eduard Käfer, *Die Rezeption der Sinaitradition im Evangelium nach Johannes*, WUNT II 502 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019); Zsolt Barta, *Symphony of Scriptures: An Intertextual Study of Acts 10:1–15:35*, Glossa House Dissertation Series 7 (Wilmore: Glossa House, 2018); William G. Fowler and Michael Strickland, *The Influence of Ezekiel in the Fourth Gospel: Intertextuality and Interpretation*, BIS 167 (Leiden: Brill, 2018); Katja Kujanpää, *The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans: Paul's Argumenta-tion by Quotations*, BIS 172 (Leiden: Brill, 2018); and Gregory R. Lanier, *Old Testament Conceptual Metaphors and the Christology of Luke's Gospel*, LNTS 591 (London: T&T Clark, 2018).

[6] In addition to the resources cited in the following table, see also Wilhelm Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo: Die alttestamentlichen Parallelen des Neuen Testaments im Wortlaut der Urtexte und der Septuaginta*, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1899), 1:114–15; Kurt Aland, ed., *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum: Greek-English Edition*, 12th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2001), 44–46. For talmudic and midrashic passages which treat related topics, see Str-B, 2:431–41.

John 4	NA²⁸ (2012)[7]	Köstenberger (2007)[8]	Evans (2005)[9]
v. 2	1 Cor 1:17		Josephus, *Ant.* 20.118 Josephus, *Vita* 52.269
v. 3	Mark 1:14		
v. 4	Luke 9:52		
vv. 4–15			Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 1.12.28
v. 5	Gen 48:22 Josh 24:32	Gen 33:19; 48:22 Exod 13:9 Josh 24:32	
v. 9	2 Kgs 17:24–41 Ezra 4:1–3 Sir 50:25ff		
v. 10	Jer 2:13 Zech 14:8 Rev 21:6	Num 20:8–11; 21:16–18	*Memar Marqah* 2:1–2; 6:3
v. 12	Luke 11:31		
vv. 12–13			Tg. Neof. Gen 28:10 Frg Tg. Gen 28:10
v. 14	Isa 58:11	Isa 12:3 Jer 2:13	*1 Enoch* 42:1–3 *Memar Marqah* 2:1–2; 6:3 1QS 4:7 CD 19:33–34
v. 19	Luke 7:39		SP Exod 20:21b *Memar Marqah* 2:1–2; 6:3
v. 20	Deut 11:29; 12:5; 27:12 Ps 122	Deut 11:29; 12:5–14; 27:12 Josh 8:33 Ps 122:1–5	
v. 21	1 Kgs 8:27 Isa 66:1		
v. 22	Isa 2:3 Acts 17:23	Isa 2:3	
vv. 22–24			Corp. herm. 5.10
v. 23	Rom 12:1 2 Cor 6:2 Eph 2:18		

---

[7] The citations listed appear in the NA²⁸ margin notes for John 4:1-42.

[8] Andreas J. Köstenberger, "John," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 415–512, here 420.

[9] Craig A. Evans, *Ancient Texts for New Testament Studies: A Guide to the Background Literature* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 370.

John 4	*NA²⁸ (2012)*	*Köstenberger (2007)*	*Evans (2005)*
v. 24	2 Cor 3:17		Epictetus, *Diatr.*, 2.8.1 Stobaeus, *Ecl.*, 1.29, 38
v. 25			SP Exod 20:21b *Memar Marqah* 3:6; 4:12
v. 33	Mark 8:16		
v. 34	Heb 10:9ff		Corp. herm. 13.19
v. 35	Joel 4:13 Luke 10:2 Rev 14:15		
v. 36	Isa 9:2	Amos 9:13	1QS 4:7
v. 37	Mic 6:15 Job 31:8	Mic 6:15	
v. 42	Luke 2:11 1 John 4:14		*Memar Marqah* 4:12

These possible similarities identified by scholars are both numerous and diverse, obliging enquiries such as the present one to limit their scope. Rather than selecting from among the diverse biblical and extrabiblical texts identified above, however, the present study opts to compare John 4:1–42 exclusively with the three texts notably absent from the table. These are the passages from Genesis 24 and 29 and Exodus 2 that narrate similar encounters between a man and a woman at a well.

1.1.1 Rationale

There are two specific reasons for this study's choice to compare John 4:1–42 exclusively with the encounters at wells narrated in Genesis 24 and 29 and Exodus 2, and not with other biblical or extrabiblical texts which exhibit some type of similarity. The first is the narrative structure that these three OT passages share with the Johannine Samaritan narrative. The second reason is the privileged place that these narratives held in the literary and theological milieu out of which the Gospel emerged, by virtue of their belonging to the Torah.

1.1.1.1 Narrative structure

Genesis 24 and 29 and Exodus 2 contain episodes which, for the sake of convenience, can be referred to as "well encounters."[10] These episodes recount a journey by a male character to a land depicted as foreign, where he meets a female character at a well, after which she reports this meeting to others who

---

[10] The similar designation *Begegnung am Brunnen* or "encounter at the well" for the recurring narrative pattern discernible in these texts is proposed in Susanne Gillmayr-Bucher, "Begegnungen am Brunnen," *BN* 75 (1994): 48–66.

welcome him. Despite the variations between them and the details which are unique to each, all three share this basic narrative structure. The very same narrative structure is also evident in John 4:1–42, creating a demonstrable literary link uniting these four texts.[11]

There are no other passages in the OT which reproduce the complete narrative structure of a well encounter as described above. The book of Genesis narrates Hagar's encounters with an angel at a spring (16:7–14) and with the Lord at a miraculous well (21:17–21), but neither of her counterparts are human, and there is no report or welcome afterwards. Ruth and Boaz discuss drawing water and sharing the harvest in their first meeting (Ruth 2:7–9), which Ruth then recounts to Naomi (vv. 18–22). However, it is the female characters who journey, and there is no well or spring. In 1 Sam 9:11–13, Saul and his servant arrive in Ramah in search of Samuel and are greeted by maidens drawing water. In this passage, instead of reporting the encounter to anyone, the maidens simply explain where Samuel can be found and send the future king on his way. In 1 Kgs 17:10–24, Elijah encounters a widow at Zarephath whom he asks for a drink before miraculously multiplying her food provisions and resuscitating her son. This episode, however, includes no water source, and there is no subsequent report of the protagonist's arrival. Various OT texts develop imagery also featured in John 4:1–42, such as "living water" (מים־חיים/ὕδωρ ζῶν, e.g., Gen 21:19; 26:19; Jer 2:13; 17:13; Zech 14:8; Song 4:15), or a well (e.g., Num 21:16–18; Ps 35/36:10; Prov 10:11; 13:14; 14:27; 16:22; 18:4), or flowing water (e.g., Isa 58:11; Ezek 47:1–12).[12] These passages, however, lack altogether the narrative structure of a well encounter.

The narrative structure shared by the pentateuchal well encounters and John 4:1–42 is a synchronic matter, but behind it lies a diachronic explanation. In the ancient world, imitating previous works was an encouraged practice, referred to as μίμησις in Greek and *imitatio* in Latin.[13] The first-century Roman rhetorician Quintilian, for example, describes in *Institutio Oratoria* how students of rhetoric and letters ought to begin from examples of good writing and

---

[11] For a preliminary overview of the correspondence among these passages, see, *inter alia*, Hartwig Thyen, *Das Johannesevangelium*, 2nd ed., HNT 6 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 241–43; and Keener, *The Gospel of John*, 1:586.

[12] For more on these and other texts which develop water imagery, see section 4.2.4.2 below.

[13] Gian Biagio Conte and Glenn W. Most, "*Imitatio*," in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, ed. Simon Hornblower, Antony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 727–28.

imitate them, with Homer representing the finest model for imitation.[14] Literary conventions and recurring patterns in plot, characters, and setting, often referred to as "topoi" (τόποι), were simply part of the art of storytelling.[15]

The Bible is no exception to this practice, as the narrative books of the OT are full of recurring patterns.[16] One of the best-known discussions of this dynamic is by Robert Alter in *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, where he explicitly addresses the narrative structure shared by Genesis 24 and 29 and Exodus 2.[17] Unsatisfied by historical-critical explanations based on reconstructions of multiple sources, Alter was nevertheless struck by a synoptic presentation of the similarities among these three passages in Robert Culley's *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Narrative*.[18] Unlike Culley, however, Alter proposes that the parallel in narrative structure is best explained as a literary convention or topos consciously employed by the biblical writers. Borrowing a concept from modern studies of Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, he refers to this convention as a "type scene."[19] In the Bible as in the Greek epics, type scenes occur at crucial

---

[14] Quintilian, *Inst*. 10.1.1–10.2.28. For more on this literary practice, see Brad McAdon, *Rhetorical Mimesis and the Mitigation of Early Christian Conflicts: Examining the Influence that Greco-Roman Mimesis May Have in the Composition of Matthew, Luke, and Acts* (Eugene: Pickwick, 2018), 17–35; Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Gospels and Homer: Imitations of Greek Epic in Mark and Luke-Acts* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 3–5; and Nita Krevans and Alexander Sens, "Language and Literature," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*, ed. Glenn R. Bugh, Cambridge Companions to the Ancient World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 186–207, here 189–92.

[15] In Classical, Hellenistic, and Medieval rhetoric, the term "topos" denotes a commonplace literary formulation, referring to recurring conventions or patterns; see Abrams and Harpham, "Motif and theme," *Glossary*, 229; and William Harmon, "Topos," *A Handbook to Literature*, 12th ed. (Boston: Longman, 2012), 478–79. For more on this phenomenon in Classical Greek literature, see Richmond Lattimore, *Story Patterns in Greek Tragedy* (London: Athlone, 1964), 18–55. On this phenomenon in the Bible, see Rosenberg, "Bible: Biblical Narrative," 31–81; and Licht, *Storytelling in the Bible*, 62–64.

[16] See the Introduction above, and Martin C. Albl, *"And Scripture Cannot Be Broken": The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 96 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 82–83.

[17] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 47–62, 88–113; for another classic discussion of this dynamic, see Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 365–440.

[18] Robert C. Culley, *Studies in the Structure of Hebrew Narrative*, SemeiaSup 3 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 41–43; Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 50. Culley's historical-critical proposal takes the parallels among these three episodes as evidence of an oral tradition adapted to different contexts.

[19] Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 50–52; the author bases himself on Walter Arend, *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1933). Other recurring biblical type scenes include the annunciation of a hero's birth to a barren mother, the epiphany in a field, the initiatory trial, the discovery of a well or other sustenance in the desert, and the testament of a dying hero. For more on biblical type scenes, with bibliography, see Jean Louis Ska,

junctures in the protagonists' lives. In each case, the plot unfolds under partic-
ular circumstances and according to a fixed order which the reader is aware of,
so that any variations (or the omission of the scene altogether) are important to
the meaning.

The use of this technique by Homer himself has been meticulously analyzed
by scholars.[20] In fact, the *Odyssey* contains no less than four episodes in which
male characters are met by women procuring water who guide them to the ones
they are seeking.[21] In the first, the shipwrecked Odysseus meets a maiden
washing clothes by a river, who turns out to be Princess Nausicaa, the daughter
of King Alcinous, and she directs him to her father's palace. Shortly thereafter,
Odysseus is led to the palace by the goddess Athena, who appears as a maiden
carrying a pitcher. Later, Odysseus' men come upon a girl drawing water; un-
beknownst to them, she is the daughter of King Antiphates, and she leads them
into a trap at her father's palace. Finally, a marauding band of Phoenicians
come upon a servant girl from King Ktesios' palace washing clothes on the
shore. They beguile her into revealing the location of the palace, which they
break into and loot, kidnapping the king's son.

A similar narrative pattern also appears at key junctures in the Homeric
Hymn to Demeter and in Euripides' drama *Electra*.[22] In the *Hymn to Demeter*,
the eponymous goddess of agriculture sits down by a well tired and dejected,
disguised as old woman. The daughters of King Keleos of Eleusis come to draw
water and then return home. Their mother sends them back to the well to offer
hospitality; Demeter accepts and eventually reveals herself. In *Electra*, the
characters Orestes and Pylades wait near a spring in order to ask someone's
help in finding Orestes' sister Electra, when Electra herself arrives carrying a
jar of water. She does not recognize her brother, who conceals his true identity
until later. Her husband arrives, and they generously offer the two men hospi-
tality in their humble home.

Thus, a narrative pattern similar to that of the three pentateuchal well en-
counters and John 4:1–42 is to be found in several well-known literary works

---

Our Fathers Have Told Us: Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives, 2nd ed.,
SubBi 13 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2000), 36–38; Rosenberg, "Bible: Biblical
Narrative," 49–51; and James G. Williams, "The Beautiful and the Barren: Conventions in
Biblical Type-Scenes," *JSOT* 17 (1980): 107–19.

[20] For a summary of scholarship on Homeric type scenes, see Mark W. Edwards, "Homer
and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene," *Oral Tradition* 7 (1992): 284–330, here 285–98.

[21] Homer, *Od.* 6.110–331; 7.14–82; 10.103–132; 15:415–484. See Kasper Bro Larsen,
Recognizing the Stranger: Recognition Scenes in the Gospel of John, BIS 93 (Leiden: Brill,
2008), 127–28; and Steve Reece, *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics
of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*, Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity (Ann Arbor:
University of Michigan Press, 1993), 12–13.

[22] *Demeter* 98–304; Euripides, *El.* 55–431. See also Larsen, *Recognizing the Stranger*,
128–29.

which predate the NT and a good part of the OT.[23] This pattern alone, however, does not justify the selection of texts for the present study.

1.1.1.2 Literary and theological milieu

The second reason for selecting the well encounters in Genesis 24 and 29 and Exodus 2 is that they were part of the literary and theological milieu out of which the Fourth Gospel emerged. This is not quite the same as claiming direct literary dependence. Literary dependence can only be judged on the basis of a comparative literary analysis of the texts in question.[24] For the present task of text selection (as a first step toward eventual analysis), it is sufficient to determine the plausibility and likelihood of an influence, direct or indirect, on the process by which the Samaritan pericope took shape. This basically depends on how familiar these texts would have been to the Gospel's formulators, and what sort of status they held among literary works.

There is no reason to doubt that as part of the Torah, the well encounters in Genesis and Exodus would have been familiar to the Fourth Gospel's formulators and its intended readership and held in high regard. Jews accorded the five books of Moses a unique status among religious writings, revering them as sacred and authoritative.[25] For Samaritans, of course, the Pentateuch was (and

---

[23] Scholarly opinions generally date the *Odyssey*'s composition to the eighth or seventh century BCE; see the discussion in Alfred Heubeck, Stephanie West, and John Bryan Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Vol. I: Introduction and Books I–VIII* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 33–35. The *Hymn to Demeter* can be dated to approximately 650–550 BCE; see Helene Foley, ed., *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretive Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 29–30, 79. Euripides' Electra was likely composed in about 420 BCE; see David Grene et al., eds., *Euripides II: Andromache, Hecuba, The Suppliant Women, Electra* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013), 189.

[24] Various sets of criteria have been proposed by scholars expressly for the purpose of determining literary dependence. See, *inter alia*, Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 25–33; Thomas L. Brodie, *The Birthing of the New Testament: The Intertextual Development of the New Testament Writings* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2004), 44–49; Michael B. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ: The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12.1–15.13* (Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2011), 30–34; and MacDonald, *The Gospels and Homer*, 5–7. On the strengths and weaknesses of Hays' criteria, see Gregory K. Beale, *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012), 31–35; and Paul Foster, "Echoes without Resonance: Critiquing Certain Aspects of Recent Scholarly Trends in the Study of the Jewish Scriptures in the New Testament," *JSNT* 38 (2015): 96–111, esp. 98–99. For a comparison and critique of MacDonald's and Brodie's methods, see McAdon, *Rhetorical Mimesis*, 35–40.

[25] Consensus among Jews on which books were sacred and to be included in the Tanak did not come until after the period when the NT was written, but the Torah had already attained its authoritative status prior to this. See Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 2nd ed. (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2006), 167–204, esp. 174–177;

still is) their only Scripture.[26] Accordingly, the Fourth Gospel is replete with pentateuchal motifs, beginning with the allusion to Gen 1:1 in its opening words, ἐν ἀρχῇ.[27] The Johannine Jesus knows the Torah, making reference to texts such as Gen 28:12 (John 1:51) and Num 21:8–9 (John 3:14). Characters in the Gospel ask him if he is greater than Abraham (8:53) and Jacob (4:12). He is judged in comparison to Moses several times (e.g., 1:16–17, 45; 3:14; 5:45–46; 9:28–29), and Mosaic and/or Exodus typology has been identified throughout the Gospel.[28] A noteworthy example is in John 6, where the events of Exodus 16 (and their reprise in Num 11:7–9 and Ps 77/78:24) are used as a point of contrast in Jesus' discourse.[29] On two occasions, the Gospel goes so far as to assert that Moses wrote about Jesus (John 1:45; 5:46).[30] The Gospel of John's use of the Pentateuch is habitual, recurring, and deliberate.

As for the three pentateuchal well encounters themselves, possible echoes can also be identified elsewhere in the Gospel of John. For instance, Genesis 24 emphasizes how Abraham has entrusted everything to his servant (vv. 2, 10) and to his son Isaac (v. 36; see also 25:5), and the Fourth Gospel occasionally

---

and Armin Lange, "The History of the Jewish Canon," in *The Hebrew Bible*, ed. Armin Lange and Emanuel Tov, Textual History of the Bible 1A (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 36–48, esp. 38–39, 41.

[26] On the status of the Torah for ancient and modern Samaritans, see Reinhard Pummer, *The Samaritans: A Profile* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 195–96, 271–72.

[27] On Gen 1:1 and John 1:1, see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2016), 284. For an overview of Fourth Gospel passages which evoke theological motifs and structural frameworks from the OT, particularly the Pentateuch, see Rekha M. Chennattu, "Scripture," in *How John Works: Storytelling in the Fourth Gospel*, ed. Douglas Estes and Ruth Sheridan, RBS 86 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2016), 171–86, here 171–73. Direct citations of the Pentateuch, on the other hand, are probably only two: John 8:17 (citing Deut 19:15 LXX), and John 19:36 (citing Ps 33/34:21 LXX in combination with either Exod 12:10 or 12:46, or Num 9:12); see Maarten J. J. Menken, *Old Testament Quotations in the Fourth Gospel: Studies in Textual Form*, CBET 15 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1996), 16, 147.

[28] These include, *inter alia*, T. Francis Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, SBT 40 (London: SCM, 1963), esp. 20–105; Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*, NovTSup 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), esp. 286–319; Marie Émile Boismard, *Moses or Jesus: An Essay in Johannine Christology*, trans. Benedict T. Viviano, BETL 84A (Leuven: Peeters, 1993), esp. 1–68, 93–98; Stan Harstine, *Moses as a Character in the Fourth Gospel: A Study of Ancient Reading Techniques*, JSNTSup 229 (London: Sheffield Academic, 2002), esp. 40–75; Andrew C. Brunson, *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John: An Intertextual Study of the New Exodus Pattern in the Theology of John*, WUNT II 158 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), esp. 153–79; and Catrin H. Williams, "Patriarchs and Prophets Remembered: Framing Israel's Past in the Gospel of John," in *Abiding Words: The Use of Scripture in the Gospel of John*, ed. Alicia D. Myers and Bruce G. Schuchard, RBS 81 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 187–212, esp. 192–201.

[29] See, *inter alia*, Paul N. Anderson, *The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*, WUNT II 78 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 202–5.

[30] John 1:45 also mentions "the prophets."

describes Jesus' relationship to the Father in terms of similar dynamics (e.g., John 13:3; 16:15; 17:7). In Gen 29:7, Jacob chides the shepherds that one must work while there is daylight, a theme the Gospel takes up in three different places (John 9:4; 11:9–10; 12:34–36). In Exodus 2:17, the antagonists are wicked shepherds, a motif also found in other OT passages and developed at length in John 10.[31] Though subtle, these similarities support the possibility that these three episodes figured in the scriptural knowledge which the Gospel's formulators brought to the process which engendered John 4:1–42.

In short, the well encounters in Genesis 24 and 29 and Exodus 2 are well-known to modern readers, and they would have been even more so for first-century Jews and Samaritans as well as gentiles who had come to know Scripture through the preaching of Jesus' followers. Regardless of whether these three texts are better explained as independent traditions or as conscious reappropriations of one another, the Fourth Gospel's formulators and its readership still would have been well acquainted with all three. From their perspective, these passages stood on the authority accorded to Scripture, and so did their repeated use as a narrative pattern. Ancient writers and scribes often learned textual sources by heart, and for these writers, Israel's Scripture was their sacred and normative collection of religious writings.[32] As such, it also naturally became for them what Homer was for Greco-Roman rhetoricians: a constant ideological touchstone, a literary model, and the source of their vocabulary of words, images, and modes of expression. It is therefore entirely plausible that the formulators of John 4:1–42 would reprise a narrative structure from the Torah which had already been reprised within the Torah itself.

In contrast, writings such as the passages from classical literature cited above may be similar in narrative structure to John 4:1–42, but they cannot be considered part of the literary and theological milieu behind the Fourth Gospel in the same sense as the well encounters from Genesis and Exodus. Comparisons between secular Greek writings and the Gospel of John go back to Origen's *Contra Celsum*, with several modern studies addressing the Samaritan pericope directly.[33] Nevertheless, the level of familiarity with the works of

---

[31] Genesis 26:18–22 narrates a conflict between Isaac and shepherds of Gerar over wells and water rights. Other OT texts which develop the motif of bad shepherds include Isa 56:11; Jer 2:8; 10:21; 12:10–11; 22:22; 23:1–5; 25:34–36 (32:34–36 LXX); 50:6 (27:6 LXX); and Ezek 34:1–10.

[32] For more on this dynamic, see David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 3–14.

[33] Origen, *Cels*. 2.34 (PG 11:853–56); Celsus accuses the Fourth Gospel of mimicking Euripides' *Bacchae*. A recent study which proposes connections (albeit without the narrative pattern) between the Samaritan pericope (minus vv. 30–39) and *Bacch.* 114–166 is Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Dionysian Gospel: The Fourth Gospel and Euripides* (Mineapolis: Fortress, 2017), xvii, 51–54; on points of contact with a wider variety of Greek literature, see Jo-Ann A. Brant, *Dialogue and Drama: Elements of Greek Tragedy in the Fourth Gospel*