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Part 1

• Introduction and Background

  – A plural form of paradox (παράδοξα) in Luke 5:26, for the word and deed of Jesus.
  – "paradox" (παράδοξος): "contrary to opinion or exceeding expectation," "unexpected," "strange," "wonderful," or "remarkable" in Classic Greek, Koine Greek of the Bible, Patristic Greek, and consistently used till 19c.

BADG

\[\text{παράδοξος, ων} (\text{παρά, δόξα; X., Pla.} ; \text{ins, pap, LXX; JosAs 28:1 cod. A π. θαύμα [Bat.]; ApoSed 11:1 p. 134, 10 Ja.; EpArist 175; Philo; Jos., C. Ap. 1, 53 al; Just.; loanw. in rabb.) contrary to opinion or exceeding expectation, strange, wonderful, remarkable. κατάστασις τῆς πολιτείας Dg 5:4. σημείων 1 Cl 25:1. Subst. in pl. παράδοξα wonderful things (Lucian, Somn. 14; Aelian, VH 13, 33; Celsus 1, 6; Philo, Mos. 1, 212; Jos., Bell. 4, 238) \text{Lk 5:26; GJs 19:2; 20:3.—OWeinreich, Antike Heilungswunder 1909, 198f.—DELG s.v. δοκάω. M-M. TW.}

Moulton

παράδοξος,

“unexpected” (as in Lk 5:24, cf. Aristeas 175) readily passes into the meaning “wonderful,” “admirable.” In this latter sense it was applied to one who was victor in both πάλη and πένταθλον (see Meyer on P. Hamb I. 219), and occurs as an athletic title in P. Lond 1178bd (A.D. 194) (= III. p. 217) πύκτου ἀλείπτου παράδοξου, and 56 παλαίστου παράδοξου, also P. Oxy XIV. 1759 (i i /A.D.) where Demetrius wishes Theon, an athlete, νικάν πάντοτε, and concludes with the greeting 10 ἔρρωσό μοι, παράδοξε. The word is used as a proper name in BGU II. 362xiv. 10 (A.D. 215), and probably P. Oxy IX. 12054 (A.D. 291).

For the adv. cf. OGS 38310 (mid. i /B.C.) κλείνοντος μεγάλους παραδόξους διέφυγον.

Circular Rhetoric and Paradox: Background

• **Russell’s Discovery - Paradox** (1910 & logical atomism)
  A barber is “one who shaves all those, and those only, who do not shave themselves." (Barber’s Paradox)
  Does the barber shave himself? Yes? or No?
  (Russell 1918 Lecture: *The Philosophy of Logical Atomism*)

• **The Liar Paradox** (Titus 1:12). cf. Romans 3:4, Psalm 116:11
  Even one of their own prophet has said, “Cretans are always liars.”
  “Κρήτες, ἀεὶ ψευδεῖς, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί”
  [by Epimenides (circa 600BC), identified by **Clement of Alexandria**]
Two Traditional Approaches

• Logical Atomism 1 (Russell, followed by Tarski)
  – Philosophy is to provide a sound epistemological foundation
  – Classical Logic: to avoid circularity (paradox), to treat circular logic as invalid, and to have a hierarchy of language (in linear order) to prevent the circularity (to eliminate the vary cause of a paradox).

• Logical Atomism 2 (Wittgenstein who is a student of Russell)
  – Same conclusion but with very “radical view” on language
  – Philosophy is to point out linguistic mistake:
    - metaphysics and ethics were literally nonsensical
  • Language incapable of communicating any (objective) truth
  • Deconstructionism (Postmodernism) by Derrida: to treat the languages as incapable and helpless. (“Is Zombie alive or dead?”)
  • Reconstruct one’s own personal & subjective meaning of the text (for there is no such a thing as objective “truth” expressed in a text).
  • The rise of Post-Liberal (Narrative) Theology
A Breakthrough by Kripke (1975) and Emerging new development with Circular Logic

Kripke (1975): “Outline of a Theory of Truth”, and “Kripke-Kleene 3-valued Semantics for Logic Programs” by Fitting (1985), and various computational approaches, applications & implementations, including:


Two Familiar Examples outside of the Bible

• “Cogito ergo sum” by Descartes, René
  “I think, therefore I am.” in Specimina Philosophiae (1644)
  This proposition became a fundamental element of Western Philosophy,
  as it was perceived to form a foundation for all knowledge. (Wiki)

• “Scripturae ex Scripturae explicanda est.”
  – Augustine: When we wish to examine passages made obscure by
    metaphorical expressions, the result should be something which is beyond
    dispute or which, if not beyond dispute, can be settled by finding and
    deploying corroboratory evidence from within scripture itself”
    (On Christian Doctrine III.86-86, p. 87).
  – Luther: In this manner Scripture is its own light. It is a fine thing when
    Scripture explains itself. (Franz August Otto Pieper, Church Dogmatics, vol.
    3:362)
Part 2

- Survey - Selected Examples in the Bible
  Circular Rhetoric and Paradox

  1. Exodus 3:14
  2. John 14:10, 11
  3. Titus 1:12
  4. Matthew 22:15-46
Example 1. Exodus 3:14 “I am who I am”

"I am who I am (אֶֽהְיֶ֑ה אֲשֶׁר אֶֽהְיֶ֖ה)" in Exodus 3:14.

idem per idem (OT) – S. R. Driver (1911); Lundbom (1978).
1 Cor 15:10 By the grace of God I am who I am. χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμι ὁ εἰμι
Example 2 - John 14:10, 11
“I am in the Father and the Father in me”

Perichoresis (περιχώρησις) and oneness by Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa; Trinitarian concept & term by Athansius, and Cappadosian Fathers: coindwelling, coinherence, circumincession, cycle, periphero, anacyclosis, etc.
Example 2 - John 14:10, 11
“I am in the Father and the Father in me”

- John 10:30 & 10:38: oneness & mutual indwelling relationship
- “Christ in” me who is “in Christ” (cf. Romans 8:10)
  - Bousset (1913) provides an insightful note and the semantic difference between Paul's Christ-mysticism (vs the Hellenistic religion with similar rhetoric, but pantheistic implication).
  - The lexical pattern ("X in the Christ" or "the Christ in X") does not grant a pantheistic or panentheistic implication (to say that "X is the Christ" or "the Christ is X") whether the expression is provided reciprocally or not.
Example 3 – Titus 1:12. The Liar Paradox
“All the Cretans are liars!”

Figure 3. The Liar’s Paradox in Titus 1:12

Romans 3:4; Psalm 116:11 - “All men are liars!”


Self-Reference (Self-Testimony) with Negation

Bertrand Russell
Example 3 – Titus 1:12. The Liar Paradox
“All the Cretans are liars!”

- Self-Reference (Self-Testimony) with Negation
- Many paradoxes in the Bible use self-negation.
- Romans 3:4 & Psalm 116:11 - “All men are liars.”
  - A similar rhetoric and exegesis should be applied to all the
    prophetic assertions that all men are sinners.
    - Psalm 14:1–3; Romans 3:10–18; Ephesians 2:3
- A few more difficult examples (with self-negation) worthy of mention
  are the paradoxes of (1) self-denial discipleship (Mark 8:34), (2)
  saving by losing one's life (Mark 8:35), and (3) servant-leadership
  (Mark 9:35).
Example 3 – Titus 1:12. The Liar Paradox
“All the Cretans are liars!”

  - One critical note is that most discussions on the Liar paradox or Titus 1:12 are primarily based on monotonic classical logic (propositional or first-order logic [predicate logic] rather than a higher-order logic [more power logic, cf., a second-order logic]).
  - A development in has occurred to handle what is exceptional or abnormal (of nonmonotonic logic with what is default).
Example 3 – Titus 1:12. The Liar Paradox
“All the Cretans are liars!”


• For example, a chosen prophet—whether or not he is a liar—may speak a true prophecy given by God as is clearly stated for the case of Caiaphas in John 11:49–52.

• Many biblical prophecies and miracles are truly an exceptional phenomenon, which cannot be explained by common sense, reasoning, or experience of a finite man, and are not possible without an intervention of the supernatural and almighty God.
Example 3 – Titus 1:12. The Liar Paradox
“All the Cretans are liars!”


• Another point to note is that a liar does not need to tell lies all the time. That is, a liar may tell a lie mixed with some true statements with respect to all the statements in a unit of his or her discourse, possibly to gain some credibility.

• Moreover, an act of cheating or being unfaithful to one's oath or promise is also an act of a lie. In this case, a liar simply does not keep his own word or promise in action.
Example 3 – Titus 1:12. The Liar Paradox
“All the Cretans are liars!”


- One famous and classic example and the judgment upon the religious hypocrites is found in the seven woe passages by Jesus in Matthew 23:13–32.

- Further, in Romans 3:4, Paul made an even stronger assertion saying that all human beings are liars (cf. Psalm 116:11). This assertion includes Paul himself as he is the person writing this very statement, and this assertion is a divine revelation.
Example 4 – Matthew 22:15-46
Three Paradoxes in circular rhetoric

(1) Matthew 22:15-22
   To Pay Tax to Caesar or not
(2) Matthew 22:23-33
   Marriage vs Resurrection
(3) Matthew 22:41-46
   David called Christ, “My Lord” in Psalm 110:1
Example 4 (1) Matthew 22:15-22


Options 1&2. “Yes for Yes” and “No for No” (Matthew 5:37)

2-valued logic (e.g., classical logic)
- The Son of God, Christ (King of Kings) to the people of God, expected to say: No! Your King is God (not Caesar). This answer is against Herodians saying “We are the servants of Caesar.”
- A man of a colony under the Roman imperial rule, expected to say: Yes! And this answer is against Pharisees to reject Jesus as Christ and the King of Kings.
- Political, Religious, Legal, and Logical dilemma (deadlock, suicidal)
Example 4 (1) Matthew 22:15-22
To Pay Tax to Caesar or not?

Options 1&2. “Yes for Yes” and “No for No” (Matthew 5:37) and

3-valued logic

To reply: I do not know. No comment. I cannot answer. I will not answer. That’s nonsense. I have a right to remain in silence. I am not going to play this stupid game. I will not say anything against my interest or in my own behalf.

23 Jesus entered the temple courts, and, while he was teaching, the chief priests and the elders of the people came to him. "By what authority are you doing these things?" they asked. "And who gave you this authority?" 24 Jesus replied, "I will also ask you one question. If you answer me, I will tell you by what authority I am doing these things. 25 John's baptism-- where did it come from? Was it from heaven, or of human origin?" They discussed it among themselves and said, "If we say, 'From heaven,' he will ask, 'Then why didn't you believe him?' 26 But if we say, 'Of human origin'-- we are afraid of the people, for they all hold that John was a prophet." 27 So they answered Jesus, "We don't know." Then he said, "Neither will I tell you by what authority I am doing these things."
Example 4 (1) Matthew 22:15-22
To Pay Tax to Caesar or not?

(1) Matthew 22:15-22. To Pay Tax to Caesar or not?
ἀπόδοτε οὖν τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι
καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.

4-valued logic (Belnap’s relevance logic) – both “Yes” and “No”
1. The Solution is Circular. (What is God’s to God).
   cf. “A if A” and “B if B” (or “not A if not A”)
2. The Solution is Modal: a model-set of two contradicting models.
   "possible world semantics": a model-set of two solutions/models
   (1) the first model (belief) (“Give Caesar’s to Caesar”) is true
   (2) the second model (belief) (“Give God’s to God”) is true
Example 4 (1) Matthew 22:15-22
Pay Tax to Caesar or Not

"Possible World Semantics" and 4-valued Logic
a model-set of two solutions/models
(1) the first model ("giving Caesar’s to Caesar") is true
(2) the second model ("giving God’s to God") is true

• A deeper analysis may reveal that this is not just a problem of "either-or" but it could be a problem of "both-and" if one consider the biblical mandate (e.g., Romans 13:6-7).

• Similar examples in the Bible – A Model Set of "P and not P"
A Note on Modal Logic (and Contemporary Bias) Outside of the Bible

• Modal Logic and its Tradition (outside of the Bible) goes back
  – at least two millennia with Greeks (by Aristotle) and
  – a millennium for Ontological proof of the existence of God
    (One and Only one God) back to Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Leibniz, Descartes, Pascal, Kant, and finally by Kurt Gödel (as his proof is proven to be flawless!).
    (cf. Romans 1:18-23)

• Scholarly tradition (bias) against Modal Logic could be traced back to Kant (1781), and the omission of modality by Frege (1879) in his pioneering groundwork of modern logic for propositional logic and higher-order logic.
Example 4: (2) Paradox in Matthew 22:23-33

Resurrection (with Marriage Law)
The Law of this age versus the Law of the age to come
(Paradox in Circular Rhetoric/Logic)

Figure 2.4  One’s Marital Status (of being married or widowed) and Life-Status (of being alive or dead)
Example 4: (2) Paradox in Matthew 22:23-33

Resurrection (with Marriage Law)
The Law of this age versus the Law of the age to come

Note: Lived and then dead, and then to live again (being resurrected) is not circular but linear. This is a common mistake or misunderstanding.
Example 4: (2) Paradox in Matthew 22:23-33
Monotonic vs. Nonmonotonic Reasoning

• Circular, Modal, and Nonmonotonic Reasoning used as one of the most common motifs, methods, and themes used in the Bible
  – seemingly contradictory to monotonic reasoning and principles.
  – cf. Ecclesiastes 3:1-10, 7:14

• Ecclesiastes 7:14
  When times are good, be happy; but when times are bad, consider: God has made the one (good times) as well as the other (bad times). Therefore, a man cannot discover anything about his future.

• Consider Job 1-2 or Matthew 5:10-12.
  Paradox of being Cursed to be Blessed? That is, if the righteous are blessed and the evil are cursed, then how can a righteous man be cursed and persecuted in this world, to be blessed?
Example 4. (3) Paradox in Matthew 22:41-46

- Christ - Whose son is he? Son of David.
  - Paradox of Lord-Servant (Father-Son) Relationship
  - What is Human vs Divine relationships in crash!
    “already” (divine) and “not yet” (humanly) in tension

The paradox in Matthew 22:41-46 extends the number of the constituents in a cycle.

Figure 2.5 Lord-Servant relationship from David to Christ (who is a son of David) in Matthew 22:41–46
A New Look at Matthew 22:15-46

• 4 Questions (& Answers) in Form-critical classification

• Midrash in Yelammedenu Midrash (Question-Answer)
  • J. W. Bowker, ‘Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form’

• All dealing with non-conventional, non-classical logic
  – generating paradox, confusion, conflict, contradiction, dilemma
  – defying conventional logic or contemporary common-sense
  – dealing with circular, modal, or nonmonotonic logic, and in 4-valued logic

• All very difficult problems in Sitz Im Leben
  – at least “very easy” to verify once a solution is given
  – A problem of verification (cf. Luke 5:23; Daniel 2)
A New Look at Matthew 22:15-46

• All dealing with Biblical Law & Legal Reasoning
  • thus the problems of Biblical Legal Reasoning (Halakoth)

• Two Laws in Conflict
  – Matthew 22:15-22. Tax Law
    • the law of God vs the law of Caesar (this World)
    • Who is my Master (Matthew 6:24)? Whose servant am I?
  – Matthew 22:23-33. Marriage (Family) Law
    • the law of Marriage (Mosaic Law) in this age vs. in the age to come
    • the old law to be perished (time-expired) vs. the new law in resurrection
    • Old Law vs. New Law (over the old law)
  – Matthew 22:34-40. Linear Order in the Laws (legal precedence)
    • Hierarchy of the Laws, legal authority, highest law, legal precedence and superseding law, to avoid circular paradox but provide a linear order
  – Matthew 22:41-46. Law of Inheritance (for Title of Lordship)
    • the law governing the Son of God in flesh vs. divine (Psalm 110:1)
Example 5. “Already” and “Not Yet” in Tension
Classical Examples in Contemporary NT Studies

Two-Stage Coming of the Kingdom of God
“Already” and “Not Yet” in Tension (Luke 17:20-30)
Salvation History (Heilsgeschichte) by Oscar Cullmann

Figure 7. Two-stage coming of the Kingdom of God “already” and “Not Yet” in circular rhetoric
Example 5. “Already” and “Not Yet” in Tension
The Testimony of John the Baptist (John 1:15, 30)

- The similar circular rhetoric of “already” & “not yet” in the testimony of John the Baptist (John 1:15,30)
- The passage is composed of three simple and distinctive prepositional phrases, in either temporal or spatial (in rank or order) meaning, to generate an interesting enigma and paradox in exegesis.

(1) ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος
(2) ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν
(3) ὃτι πρῶτος μου ἦν

Figure 8. “A is before B” and “B is before A” (or “A is after B”)
Example 5. “Already” and “Not Yet” in Tension
Melchizedek and the Son of God in Hebrews 7

• Melchizedek and the Son of God

1 Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισέδεκ, βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ἱερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υψίστου, … 3 ἀπάτωρ ἀμήτωρ ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων, ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές. …

Melchizedek is (made) alike the Son of God

15 καὶ περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλον ἔστιν, εἰ κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα Μελχισέδεκ ἀνίσταται ἵερεύς ἔτερος,

15 And it is yet far more evident if, in the likeness of Melchizedek, there arises another priest.
Example 5. “Already” and “Not Yet” in Tension
A Difficult Problem in 1 John 3:9 & 5:18 vs 1:8-10

1. Sin-state of Christian in need of Confession for the forgiveness of God (1 John 1:8-10) versus

2. Sinless-state (impeccable state) of Christian (1 John 3:9, 5:18)
   • How to Harmonize these conflicting passages?
     Or is it even possible?
   • 1 John 3:9 one “born of God” in circular logic

   \[ \text{Πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ,} \]
   \[ \text{ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν,} \]
   \[ \text{ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται.} \]
   • Does sin have a different meaning (aspect) to one “before” and “after” being born of God? What sin can “one born of God” never commit?
   • Sin of not believing in Jesus Christ the Son of God our Propitiation
Part 3

• A New Critical Method in Exegesis and Biblical Studies
A New Critical Method

• Circular Rhetoric and Logic of Paradoxes
  To make sense and do a valid and sound exegesis.
  Otherwise, to treat it meaningless or invalid, or to treat as if it is not there

• There are so many and so predominant in the Bible
  And each case/its presence simply cannot to be ignored or silenced.

• Once understood and applied correctly, it truly makes sense objectively and logically
  Matthew 22:15-46, John 8:12-20 with Exodus 3:14-15

• To construct a coherent, consistent, and a unifying framework in exegesis and its application (and no need of “post-liberal theology or narrative theology”, deconstructionism or “story-telling” [as one may argue that these biblical passages have no valid logic or an objective truth, and thus treat them metaphorically, subjectively, ...]
A Semantic Difference with Circular Logic

• Induction and its Semantics
  – Here we say “infinite” or “eternal” but it has no meaning (nonsense) in
    the frame of Induction or Inductive Logic (in this conventional “finite”
    worldview).

• Coinduction and its Semantics (extending induction)
  Example: The “chicken or egg” problem
  (1) a chicken comes out of an egg, (2) an egg comes out of a chicken,
    and (3) the reproductive cycle between chicken and egg goes on
    forever.
  Inductive Logic: No answer (A Nonsense)
  Coinductive Logic: 4 possible answers (4-valued logic)
    { No answer, Chicken, Egg, both Chicken and Egg }
  e.g., Matthew 22:15-22 – to pay tax to Caesar or not
A New Look at “I AM” sayings in John

- Two Proof Methods in John 8:12–20
- “I am” sayings of Jesus - Self-Testimony as a valid proof method
- Exegetical Parallel between Exodus 3:14–15 and John 8:12–20
- A Unifying Framework for Jesus’ “I am” Sayings
Two Proof Methods in John 8:12-19

John 8:12-19 (NIV)

12 When Jesus spoke again to the people, he said,
   “I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in
darkness, but will have the light of life.”

13 The Pharisees challenged him,
   “Here you are, appearing as your own witness; your testimony is not
valid.”

(1) John 8:12. one of “I am” sayings in John
   ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου

(2) John 8:13. Objection and Accusation by the Pharisees
   It is “Self-witness” (Circular Reasoning).
Two Proof Methods in John 8:12-19

John 8:12-19 (NIV) – Two Testimonies

14 Jesus answered, “Even if I testify on my own behalf, my testimony is valid, for I know where I came from and where I am going.

But you have no idea where I come from or where I am going.

15 You judge by human standards; I pass judgment on no one. 16 But if I do judge, my decisions are right, because I am not alone. I stand with the Father, who sent me.

17 In your own Law it is written that the testimony of two men is valid.

18 I am one who testifies for myself; my other witness is the Father, who sent me.”

1) John 8:12 “I am …” as Self-Testimony – Circular Reasoning
2) John 8:17 Testimony of two men according to the Law – Lawful Reasoning
3) Thus all metaphorical “I am” sayings of Jesus in John are essentially Circular.
Parallel: John 8:12-19 & Exodus 3:14-15

(Exodus 3:14 ASV – Self-Referencing God)
And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel,
I AM hath sent me unto you.

(Exodus 3:15 ASV – God in reference with His 3 most credible witnesses)
And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel,
Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.

Also noted in Matthew 22:23-33: God is God of the living.
Afterword by Solomon

13 Now all has been heard; here is the conclusion of the matter:

   Fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the duty of all mankind.

14 For God will bring every deed into judgment, including every hidden thing, whether it is good or evil.

(Ecclesiastes 12:13-14 NIV)
“I AM” sayings in John

• Two Proof Methods in John 8:12–20
• “I am” sayings of Jesus - Self-Testimony as a valid proof method
• Exegetical Parallel between Exodus 3:14–15 and John 8:12–20
Two Proof Methods in John 8:12-19

John 8:12-19 (NIV)

12 When Jesus spoke again to the people, he said,
   “I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in
darkness, but will have the light of life.”

13 The Pharisees challenged him,
   “Here you are, appearing as your own witness; your testimony is not valid.”

(1) John 8:12. one of “I am” sayings in John
   ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου

(2) John 8:13. Objection and Accusation by the Pharisees
   It is “Self-witness” (Circular Reasoning).
Two Proof Methods in John 8:12-19

John 8:12-19 (NIV) – Two Testimonies

14 Jesus answered, “Even if I testify on my own behalf, my testimony is valid, for I know where I came from and where I am going.

But you have no idea where I come from or where I am going.

15 You judge by human standards; I pass judgment on no one. But if I do judge, my decisions are right, because I am not alone. I stand with the Father, who sent me.

17 In your own Law it is written that the testimony of two men is valid.

18 I am one who testifies for myself; my other witness is the Father, who sent me.”

1) John 8:12 “I am …” as Self-Testimony – Circular Reasoning
2) John 8:17 Testimony of two men according to the Law – Lawful Reasoning
3) Thus all metaphorical “I am” sayings of Jesus in John are essentially Circular.
Parallel: John 8:12-19 & Exodus 3:14-15

(Exodus 3:14 ASV – Self-Referencing God)
And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.

(Exodus 3:15 ASV – God in reference with His 3 most credible witnesses)
And God said moreover unto Moses, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel,
Jehovah, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you: this is my name forever, and this is my memorial unto all generations.

Also noted in Matthew 22:23-33: God is God of the living.
A Unifying Interpretive Framework

“I am” sayings of Jesus in John, in self-testimony

(1) John 10:1-18  (with a parable explicitly stated in 10:1-5)
   “I am” the good shepherd, and “I am” the door of sheepfold

(2) John 6:30-34 (Well-known OT manna story - Sitz Im Leben)
   Background Story: Manna from the heaven in the wilderness
   John 6:35, 48, 51 - “I am” the bread of life
   … to eat my flesh and drink my blood (John 6:56) …

(3) Somewhat similar, yet different presentations (OT Sitz Im Leben)
   John 8:12  “I am” the light of the world (John 9 - a man born blind)
   John 11:25  “I am” the resurrection and the life (John 11 - Lazarus)
   John 14:6  “I am” the way and the truth and the life (John 14:1-5)
   John 15:1,5 “I am” the true vine (John 15:1-10 dwell in me, in my love)
A Unifying Interpretive Framework

Summary for 7 Metaphorical Predicated “I am” sayings of Jesus in John

- “I am” as the Interpretive Key, providing
- Partial Interpretation (and Modal solutions)
- Unfolding Story (as the story continues with explanation)
- Blended with Real and Symbolic (Figurative) materials
- With or Without an opening proverbial or parabolaic story
  - well-known OT story or case of Sitz Im Leben, Miracle, etc.
- In Continuous, Progressive, Dynamic narrative-frame.
Many difficult examples in the Bible

• A Few Noteworthy Examples
  – Two-Stage Coming of the Kingdom of God. “Already” and “Not Yet” in Tension (Luke 17:20-30)
  – The Testimony of John the Baptist (John 1:15, 30)
  – A Difficult Problem in 1 John 3:9 & 5:18 vs 1:8-10
  – Hebrews 7:3,15 – Melchizedek
  – John 1:16 χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος
  – Circular Rhetoric and Paradoxes in Romans
  – Examples in Exodus (for example, Exodus 3:14)
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

- This pair-expression ("in Christ" and "Christ in") in Romans
  - provides a comprehensive conception of Paul
  - for the mutual-indwelling relationship of Christ and Christians.
- The pair-expression in Romans is clearly circular
  (at least in lexical level), and comparable to what is noted in John (e.g., John 14:20; 15:5; 17:23, 26).
- Question:
  Is “Christ in” significantly different from “In Christ” in meaning (in Romans, or in Paul, or in NT)?
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

• No Difference?: The phrase ("Christ in" [you/me]) has been treated essentially equivalent or parallel to the phrase ("in Christ") among the majority of the contemporary Pauline scholars.

• Bultmann voiced:

"It makes no difference whether Paul speaks of the believers being in Christ or of Christ's being in the believer."

(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

• A handful of scholars have voiced their differences or distinctions between these two phrases.
  

• William B. Barcley, "Christ in You": A Study in Paul's Theology and Ethics (Lanham, MD: University of America, 1999).
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

- The meanings of the "in Christ" phrase are rich and comprehensive, usually presented with six+ major theses
  - being in union with Christ (e.g., Romans 6:5) or
  - being baptized into one body of Christ (e.g., Romans 12:4–5; Galatians 3:27–28; 1 Corinthians 12:12–13; Col 3:10–11)

  (1) Corporate expression of Christians in Christ, (2) the Adam-Christology or Adam-Christ anthropology, (3) Membership in the body (church) of Christ who is the head, (4) Eschatological temple (house, building), (5) typological husband in marriage with his wife (or the virgin), (6) Metaphor of being clothed in Christ, (7) Adoption in Christ, and so on.
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

- Bousset provides an insightful difference between Paul's Christ mysticism and the Hellenistic religion with similar rhetoric, but pantheistic implication. That is,

- The lexical pattern ("X in the Christ" or "the Christ in X" where X is, for example, a Christian or Christians) does not grant a pantheistic or panentheistic implication (to say that "X is the Christ" or "the Christ is X") whether the expression is provided reciprocally or not.
  
  - Wilhelm Bousset, *KYRIOS CHRISTOS: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*, trans. John E. Steely (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013 [1913]), 164–69. Bousset notes the expressions in Hermetic prayers for being completely pantheistic (for example, "Come to me, Hermes, as children come into the body of women. . . . I know you, Hermas, and you know me. I am you and you are I," and "For you are I and I am you. Your name is mine and mine is yours. I am your image.")

- Based on this ground, four points are noted.
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

- First (1), in the framework of Adam-Christ anthropology (Adam-Christology),
  - we note the pair-expression of "in Christ" and "Christ in" in Romans, but always with the phrase "in Adam."
  - There is never a phrase such as "Adam in" or with any human being (except the Christ or Satan, or non-human object such as sin, death, or the Kingdom of God).
  - This observation may hint the difference between "in Christ" and "Christ in" for further study.
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

- Second (2), in the framework of the two-stage coming of the Kingdom of God (Luke 17:17–24),
  - a clear difference and distinction exists between the case of the invisible Kingdom of God within a person ("the Kingdom of God in X")
  - and the case of the visible Kingdom of God on the day of the Son of Man ("X in the Kingdom of God").
  - Clearly, the invisible Kingdom of God is present in all those who witness the power of the Holy Spirit (Matt 12:28; Luke 11:20).
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

• Third (3), Satan (or demonic beings) enters into a man ("Satan in X"), as well as a man is in or under the rule of Satan (Eph 2:1–2; John 8:34, 44).
  – For example, Satan enters into Judah (John 13:27).
  – Judah was already in (under the influence of or being tempted by) Satan, who inserted an evil thought into Judah's heart to betray Jesus (John 13:2).
  – A similar case of an evil spirit being in and later coming out of a slave girl by Paul is noted in Acts 16:16–18.
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

- Finally (4), in the framework of Temple-House anthropology,
  - a man is like a temple or a house in which the Holy Spirit or evil spirit(s) may come and dwell (Rom 8:9, 11; Matt 12:43–45). So does Christ (John 2:19–22).
  - Abundant biblical examples exist of a man possessed by evil spirit(s) dwelling in the man, and evil spirit(s) being cast out of a man (Matt 8:28–34).
  - Further, John notes that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit shall dwell in the believer (John 14:17, 23).
(3) "Christ in You" in Romans 8:10 & "In Christ"

• Based on these four observations, we may conclude safely that a substantial difference and distinction exists between "in Christ" and "Christ in"
  – in this circular rhetoric and expression in the Bible, and is consistently applied to the letters of Paul and so in the framework of Romans.
  – Gal 2:20; 4:19; 2 Cor 13:5; Col 1:27; Eph 3:17
  – as well as in Johannine Literature, and then to New Testament in general.