RHETORIC OF THE WORD. AN INTERACTIONAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE LORD'S PRAYER OF JOHN 17 AND ITS COMMUNICATIVE IMPLICATIONS
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ABSTRACT
This investigation focuses upon the discourse organisation and rhetorical dynamics of Christ's intercessory/inspirational prayer found in John 17. It is based upon the results of three integrated types of discourse analysis: lexical, syntactic-semantic, and architectonic, which pertain to the text's paradigmatic, syntagmatic, and poetic structures respectively. Aspects of 'speech-act theory' are used as a means of further exploring the communicative dimensions of this discourse, namely, its main interactional moves as these relate to points of thematic significance. The elucidation of this structural complex forms the basis for a more tentative description of the past and present persuasive power of Christ's address to his heavenly Father. Of special importance is the operation of a literary technique termed 're-familiarisation' which serves to effect the prayer's principal interpersonal function of physical, psychological, and spiritual reinforcement.

1 ON 'RHETORIC' AND ITS APPLICATION TO JOHANNINNE LITERATURE

1.1 'Rhetoric' is one of those commonly used technical terms that suffers considerably from overdefinition and hence a corresponding amount of ambiguity in usage. In ordinary speech it tends to have a rather negative connotation, that is 'artificial eloquence' according to Webster (Guralnik 1976:1220). In literary circles, however, the term is highly regarded and has become increasingly popular, but unfortunately no more clearly defined. One difficulty relates to the fact that it may be used in a wider or a narrower sense, the scope of its application ranging from effective communication in general to that intended specifically to convince the listener/hearer, where the discourse is designed 'to shape response and manipulate attitude' (Sternberg 1987:482).

Another citation from Webster will serve as the basis for the definition of rhetoric as used in this essay: 'the art or science of using words effectively in
speaking or writing' (cf Plett 1985:59). The study of rhetoric may therefore be specified as that branch of stylistics which analyses (describes and evaluates) successful discourse of any sort. It seeks to determine the principal literary or linguistic features involving various patterns of choice and composition which are utilised by a verbal artist in order to communicate his message, no matter what the medium, efficaciously, that is, with the appropriate emphasis, wholeness, coherence, interest, and attractiveness (cf de Waard and Nida 1986:78). Accordingly, we will be focusing upon both the linguistic as well as the closely related pragmatic aspects of the definition above, that is 'using words...effectively.'

1.2 For all of the scholarly interest in biblical rhetoric (for a general survey, see the essays in Warner 1990; Jackson and Kessler 1974; Clines et al 1982), relatively few studies focus their attention on the Johannine literature. Those which do rarely deal with the formal linguistic aspect of the subject, especially the syntactic features of the text (for a brief exception, see Nida, Louw, et al 1983:112-116). Most commentaries, for example, including some of the more recent ones, do not even mention grammar in this regard (e.g Tenney 1981; Bruce 1983; Michaels 1984; Beasley-Murray 1987). Perhaps this is because the verbal construction of John's gospel is considered to be too 'simple' (Plummer 1894) or 'uniform' (Turner 1976:64) to warrant learned comment. Such writing, so the argument goes, is the obvious product of stylistic pressure from either the Semitic languages [Hebrew, Aramaic] and/or Koine Greek, with regard to features such as: subject prolepsis, casus pedens, asyndeton, parataxis, the historical present, redundant pronouns, and an 'excessive' use of hina (Hendriksen 1954:45,64; Turner 1976:ch 5). The latter regards John's language to be 'characteristic of Jewish Greek' but 'pointlessly varied in syntax and vocabulary' (Turner 1976:78). Such notions are corrected in Louw (1986). In another well-known grammar, the depreciatory observation is made that 'the absence of rhetorical art in the Johannine discourses is quite clear' (Blass-Debrunner 1976:par 492).

1.3 The literary-critical analysis by Culpepper (1983) was the first to apply a comprehensive rhetorically oriented methodology to the complete gospel of John. In treating it 'as a narrative text', his aim was to reveal more precisely 'what it is, and how it works, [that is] how the narrative components of the Gospel interact with each other and involve the reader' to aid him in shaping the 'production of its message' (1983:5-6,8). Culpepper's principal interest, however, remains with the style and content of the discourse, focusing in particular upon its 'literary design' (1983:11). The main concern that one has about such 'new critical' efforts to shed light on biblical literature is the extent to
which analytical categories and processes pertaining to the poetics of the novel as a fictional art form apply to the historically based truth claims of the Gospels and other narrative compositions in Scripture. A related problem has to do with the restrictive nature of one’s underlying theory and consequent methodology. As Carson observes in his critique of Culpepper:

Some of his judgments spring from his adoption of fiction poetics as a Procrustean bed in which every scrap of evidence must be forced to lie (1989:62).

One could express similar reservations about most contemporary investigations of biblical rhetoric: they tend to be overly bound to their respective theoretical assumptions and associated procedures. There is thus an over-emphasis either upon minute distinctions found within the text (e.g. Sternberg 1987; Watson 1988) or upon specific psychological effects allegedly stimulated by the text within receptors, whether real or ‘implied’ (e.g. Staley 1988; Petersen 1984). In addition, most rhetorical studies do not pay adequate attention to the macrostructural linguistic — as opposed to literary — features of the discourse and their probable influence upon the act of literary communication.

1.4 The same situation applies more or less to the scholarly literature on chapter 17 in particular. There are very few (if any) studies which discuss the linguistic aspects of the text in detail, and those analyses which do treat the actual verbal component of the prayer normally deal with it merely in terms of general thematic patterns or selected literary features. Two significant exceptions may be noted: [a] Malatesta (1971) has produced a meticulous exposition of the linguistic attributes of the text, calling attention to a number of its poetic qualities including lineation, chiasmus, and a balanced lexical and syllabic structure; [b] Schnackenburg (1973) draws attention to the formal reductionism and idealisation that is often inherent in such neat, schematic proposals and seeks to remedy this in his own arrangement of the discourse (which is followed more recently by Beasley-Murray 1987:295-296). The structural descriptions advanced by these two studies, these are [a] verses 1-5,6,8,9,19,20-24,25-26; and [b] verses 1-5,6-11a,11b-16,17-19,20-23,24-26, are both compatible with my own composite analysis presented below, but only at a single level in the organisational hierarchy for each of their proposed sub-divisions.

1.5 Newman and Nida (1980:1) summarise what for the casual observer is one of the most prominent features of John’s ‘symphonically’ organised style, namely, its subtle interlocking of recurrent motifs and other thematic elements:

A theme is introduced and then followed by a second or third theme, and so on; and
these themes are interwoven into various patterns. A theme may even be dropped momentarily, only to reappear later in combination with other themes....But throughout the gospel the person and work of Jesus Christ bring all these diverse themes into a closely-knit unity, and in this way the author achieves his purpose.

This texture is not the product of just a random placement of topical units. Rather, these segments are often significantly ordered syntactically and/or phonologically to form multiple lexical-thematic patterns that criss-cross a particular passage. Indeed, in a number of Johannine pericopes the textual organisation is so intricately woven that it resembles arrangements which are typical of poetry. Several commentators have in fact drawn attention to the poetic, or 'hymnic', quality of the Gospel's 'prologue' (1:1-18; e.g. Sanders 1971:29-57; Beasley-Murray 1987:3-4). Hansford has further suggested that the entire first epistle of John is a poem involving a recycling triad of hortatory elements, these are problem, command, and motivation (1990:1).

If these proposals are true, then it is highly likely that the Lord's prayer of chapter 17 would fall into a similar literary category. The Jerusalem Bible, for one, does set the entire passage out as poetry. Certainly, it would be an appropriate place for such poetically heightened formal features to appear, for this pericope dramatically, albeit prayerfully, reviews many of the major themes of the Gospel at a climactic, pivotal point in the composition. Thus it clearly reflects those theological elements which occur earlier, especially in chapters 13:31-16:33, the so-called 'farewell discourses' of Christ, as well as those found afterwards in the passion and resurrection narratives.

1.6 In his study of John 17, Malatesta comes to the conclusion on the basis of grammatical, positional (i.e. parallelism), and phonological criteria that the chapter as a whole is an instance of Greek poetry with a decided Semitic influence. He posits an overall structure which displays a 'free rhythm', that is:

Its stresses and its divisions into lines and strophes are determined mainly by the thought content...Very often the various members of a sentence are of similar length, that is they have the same or practically the same number of words or syllables (1971:193).

Malatesta admits that because these diagnostic features 'overlap in each part of the chapter', it is possible to propose and defend other arrangements of this discourse (1971:194). But he prefers his own tightly symmetrical division into formal units on accounted of its alleged correspondence with the poem's principal themes, these are glorification, revelation, knowledge, departure, commission, opposition, holiness, truth, mediation, and unity. In view of the reiterative nature
of the Johannine writings of course, it is possible to posit a harmonious convergence of form and content for just about any kind of unit that is demarcated. Two other problems with Malatesta's ingenious, but rather incredible, scheme are: (a) its overly formalistic bias, where the data, it seems, are frequently skewed in order to fit the analyst's predetermined and predominant chiastic framework; and related to this, (b) the oftentimes non-functional nature of the results, where highly detailed linguistic patterns are proposed which clearly fall beyond most receptors' threshold of perceptive awareness (even granting the fact that the original receivers were more esthetically cognisant of such a highly patterned style than those today might be).

2 JOHN 17 FROM A 'SPEECH-ACT' PERSPECTIVE OF LITERARY COMMUNICATION

2.1 Basing their work upon pioneering studies by Austin, Searle, and Grice (e.g. 1962; 1969; 1975 respectively), speech-act theorists apply a functional approach to the analysis of literary texts, with an emphasis on 'what literature does, and not what it means' (White 1988:2). They seek to examine texts as 'utterances':

not only in terms of their surface grammatical properties but also in terms of the context in which they are made, the intentions, attitudes and expectation of the participants, the relationships between participants and the generally unspoken rules and conventions that are understood to be in play when an utterance is made and received (Pratt 1977:86).

Employing such interactional notions as utterance performatives, locution-illocution-perlocutions, indirect speech acts, implicature, shared knowledge and beliefs, appropriateness conditions, the 'cooperative principle' (conversational maxims), politeness phenomena, and rule-breaking ('flouting'), investigators reveal how a source (author) relates to a receptor group (readers) by means of a verbal discourse which has been formulated within a particular non-verbal, situational context (for a survey, see White 1988; Botha 1989:ch III; an initial application to Johannine discourse is found in Wendland 1985:ch 4 and a much fuller treatment in Botha 1989:ch IV). In order to learn the rules that govern authorial 'intentionality', it is necessary to pay special attention to the role of 'inferential reasoning' in discourse and to the various linguistic means whereby it may be manifested, such as: types of predication, mode of reference, attribution, indirect speech, allusion, metaphor, modality, and deixis (Patte 1988:99).

The following is not a complete speech-act analysis of John 17. That is a subject which would require a careful study on its own. We can only touch upon some of the main topics that such an exposition might include and outline a
number of the general features which would need to be developed in more detail, especially as they concern the specifically rhetorical aspects of the discourse.

2.2 John 17 presents a rather clearly defined 'communication event' in that it delineates a speaker (Jesus), an addressee (his heavenly Father), a group of witnesses who hear what is said (Christ's disciples), a setting (an evening meal shortly before the Passover, cf 13:1-2), and a message — in this case an overtly demarcated verbal text (i.e. by the corresponding 'inclusive' marginal comments in 17:1 and 18:1). There is a certain controversy over the exact time of the meal referred to, that is whether it was the actual Passover meal or not, but that issue does not really affect this particular text per se since it does not include any special paschal imagery or allusions (though the words and events recorded in ch 13 evidently do; cf Suggit 1985).

2.3 In order to specify the nature of this crucial communication event somewhat more fully, it is helpful to consider it within the framework of 'speech act exegesis', which holds that 'a biblical, that is religious, text should be viewed as a religious act' (Patte 1988: 92). In other words, the discourse itself both constitutes and is constituted by a series of individual or composite 'speech acts', each having, in addition to its denotative and connotative content, a distinct locutionary form, illocutionary intent, and perlocutionary effect. Patte goes on to add the qualification that 'religious discourses are peculiar speech acts which cannot be assimilated to other kinds of speech acts' (1988:100). However one decides to describe this special or 'peculiar' quality of biblical literature (e.g. qualified by the term 'inspiration' and related notions), the adoption of such a position undeniably affects one's interpretation of the content of these texts and also their communicative function, as will become apparent below.

But there is another rather serious complication that first needs to be considered, namely, one that concerns the important issue of perspective: from whose point of view should one evaluate the function of a Scripture text such as John — from that of the narrative participants (as outlined above), from that of the [implied] author and his [implied] readers, or from that of receptors today? Fortunately, most reader-response critics agree that it is not really possible to distinguish an additional (third level of) literary viewpoint in John's Gospel, namely, that of the 'narrator/narratees' (e.g. Culpepper 1983:16, Botha 1989:91, which leads one to question whether this is in fact a useful/functional distinction in biblical criticism). But there is a related problem that arises in this connection: who is the real/implied 'author' of this work — if not 'John', the historical disciple of Christ, then who? If not the former, then it is likely that the rhetorical purpose of individual pericopes if not the composition as a whole might well differ in certain significant respects. However, since I have not found convincing
evidence to the contrary, I will assume the traditional ‘John’ to be the ‘author’ of the Gospel which bears his name, and the discourse will be analysed on the most overt, ‘participant’ level of interpersonal interaction.

2.4 Such a perspective makes it easier to postulate an overarching ‘macro-illoeution’ for the Gospel as a whole. The rhetorical (and evangelistic!) purpose of John’s gospel is clearly enunciated in 20:31, namely, to influence — by means of the text — the implied readers to ‘believe’ what has been written about ‘Jesus the Christ’ so that they might ‘have life’. Since the divine authority of the Lord Christ himself stands behind this expressed intention on the part of the writer (e.g. Jn 11:25-26), its illocutionary force is augmented from that of an assertion having the desire to persuade to that of a performative act with the promise to fulfill. The corresponding perlocutionary effect is not merely one of ‘assurance’ with respect to a certain fact, but immediate ‘appropriation’ of that which has been promised — eternal salvation.

When, on the other hand, the implied author of a biblical text is viewed as not possessing any special divine insight and is thus subject to the normal human errors and misconceptions, the ‘force’ of the narrative, argument, exhortation, admonition, or prophecy may be considerably weakened, both on the level of the individual speech act and also that of the entire discourse. The particular moral and ethical as well as rhetorical implications pertaining to the impact, appeal, or authority of the Scriptures for readers today depends in large measure on the veracity and validity of their message in the original event. Take, for example, Christ’s surprising prediction in 17:20ff that many others were going to come to faith through the teaching of the disciples (and their disciples in turn). This statement carries much greater weight if it actually was a promise by our Lord which was subsequently fulfilled, rather than a being merely a post-facto reading-back into the text a current observation on the part of some later ‘author’ (or redactor) belonging to the ‘Johannine community’. Similarly, how reassuring or comforting can Christ’s petition for a future reunion with all of his disciples (17:24) really be if it was not he who uttered these words (their essence at least)?

2.5 Thus a different speech-act description of this Gospel could readily be set forth on the basis of either a different theological stance with regard to the Scriptures, a different level of textual engagement (i.e. that of ‘performance’ or ‘contemporary’ relevance), or an alternative historical reconstruction of the total communicative setting of John (Vorster 1984:110). The preceding was obviously only a bare sketch of some of the factors that would need to be taken into consideration. The same thing is true of course when the focus of attention is narrowed to chapter 17, where some, for example, identify the original setting of this composition ‘with celebrations of the Lord’s Supper in the early churches’ (Beasley-
Murray 1987:294; cf Ukpong 1989:50. It is not possible here to enter the scholarly debate over the relevant issues at stake. Instead, a more conservative position has been assumed (cf Agourides 1968:144), one which accepts the text of John 17 as being a substantially accurate record of the essence of the final words of Christ to his disciples at their evening meal together (cf 18:1) — that is, a selective reworking or recomposition, perhaps, of the original Aramaic, but not some fictive creation by an unknown ‘implied author’ (contra Petersen 1984:45).

The harmonious and intricate welding of form, content, and function (analysed below) within the textual context as given and the situational setting as described would seem to argue for viewing the discourse as constituting a historically reliable and complete artistic, rhetorical, and theological whole.

2.6 This chapter occurs as the climax of Christ’s pre-paschal ministry at the final meal with his disciples. It is a verbal actualisation of the motivation attributed to Christ at the very beginning of the section in 13:1-2. Furthermore, it is a general development in parallel of the three main themes which are introduced in 13:31-35 at the onset of John’s farewell discourses, that is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse Range</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:31-32</td>
<td>GLORY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:33</td>
<td>DEPARTURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:34-35</td>
<td>LOVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;17:1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;17:6-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;17:20-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, in view of his immanent departure into glory, Christ’s prayer is an intimate expression of the deep affection which he had for all those who were ‘his own...in the world’. And in relation to the overall structure of this Gospel, it represents a crucially-placed summary of his notion of ‘discipleship’ — as exemplified ultimately in his own sacrificial mission to save humanity, a ‘glorious’ endeavor that he was just about to undertake (18:1ff).

2.7 There is, in addition, some strong intertextual resonance from the Old Testament and Jewish intertestamental literature which highlights the pericope’s positioning in the Gospel at this point. Such a concluding prayer is a familiar feature of the final ‘testamental’ discourse given by a great leader to his followers just before his death, for example Jacob (Gn 49), Moses (Dt 32-33), Joshua (Jos 23-24), Ezra (4 Ez 8:19-36), Baruch (2 Bar 48) (cf Paul at Miletus [Ac 20:17-38]). This would be especially appropriate given the prominent paschal character of the extratextual setting of the discourse as recorded. The Passover celebration itself closes with doxological psalms (the Hallel) and liturgical hymns in praise of God’s mighty acts of protection and deliverance on behalf of his people (Agourides 1968:144). These were typically retrospective and commemorative in nature. John 17, on the other hand, opens a new perspective by presenting a text
which is also decidedly anticipatory and predictive.

2.8 A major preliminary question that confronts the analyst of this chapter is the nature of the discourse as a whole: should it really be considered a ‘prayer’ as the initial quote margin would suggest by recording the gesture of Christ’s ‘raising his eyes to heaven’ (17:1, cf. 11:41, Mk 7:34) — or would some other illocutionary type be more suitable as a generic description? The roots of this issue go deep into Church history, for early theologians debated the same point. Theodore of Mopsuestia, for example, regarded this as a ‘prophetic’ text, while John Chrysostom saw it more as a hortatory monologue (Haenchen 1984:156; cf. Käsemann 1968). However, the formulaic introduction, as noted above, as well as the situational setting and indeed the very style of the text would strongly indicate that it is a prayer — nevertheless one which realises a number of important and interrelated communicative functions that interact during the course of its utterance.

The presence on the scene of Jesus’ associates, that is, as ‘secondary’ addressees, would certainly inject a prominent didactic element into the proceedings, as in the case of so-called ‘Lord’s [better: disciples’] prayer’ of Mt 6:9-13/Lk 11:1-4. Such an interpretation is supported by prayers of a similar nature found in the Gospels, for example Jn 12:27-28, Lk 10:21-22. This viewpoint is further corroborated by the exegetical tradition of the early Church (Agourides 1968:137). Thus Christ reviews the principal themes of his gospel message for the benefit of his faithful few just before he was about to be violently taken from them in order to bring the Father’s plan to its completion on the cross. But why cast such instruction in the form of a prayer then, and a poetic one at that? More had to be involved than mere tradition (i.e. the farewell of a master) or customary ritual (i.e. praying at the conclusion of the Paschal meal). Perhaps the teaching could be more dramatically and memorably impressed upon their minds through the use of this genre (Ukpong 1989:53). It is evident that the practice of utilising prayer as a medium of instruction was familiar in Bible times (Morrison 1965:59-60). In any case, its climactic nature — whether in relation to the narrative plot as a whole or this particular discourse sequence — undoubtedly had an effect on its mode of composition.

2.9 Didactic discourse is obviously very diverse in nature, and thus it is not surprising to find a variety of more specific illocutionary functions manifested as the prayer unfolds. First of all, accepting the position that we are dealing with an actual prayer of Jesus, one addressed to his heavenly Father (the primary receptor), we observe that he opens with a forceful laudatory appeal that God be glorified through his Son (1-5). This extended supplication is then followed by a complex bundle of intercessory illocutions which is carried through to the end of the discourse. The individual components may be designated in various ways
depending on one's perspective (i.e., who is being addressed, whether directly or indirectly) and the degree of specificity desired, e.g., invocation (1, 5, 11, 21, 24, 25), commendation (6-8), mediation (9), revelation [repeated] (11), confirmation (11-12a), explanation (12b), encouragement (13), commission (18-19), promise (24, 26), dedication (19), and petition. These motivations may well be intended to achieve or inspire a complex of perlocutionary effects, for example, fidelity (13), assurance (15), commitment (17, 19), unity (22-23), perception (21, 23), knowledge (25), confidence (24), and love (26). The iterative and carefully patterned nature of these interrelated elements of the speech event are visually displayed in the several discourse analyses to be found in the appendices.

As might be expected, most of the illocutions are connotatively positive in tone. But there are several distinctly negative notions that emerge, at least by implication and always with reference to the 'world' and its master, the 'Evil One,' for example, segregation (6, 9), warning (11, 14), reproof (25). Such sharply contrastive elements are typical of the Johannine corpus and serve, among other things, to highlight the desired — but difficult — model of discipleship that Christ is setting forth.

2.10 The underlying opposition noted above is accentuated by the influence of a heightened inter- and intra-textuality made possible through the shift in medium that took place as the original transient oral event was visually 'fixed' — first partially by chirography, and then typographically for good (Ong 1982:132-133). Despite the numerous undesirable effects of such a 'technologising of the Word' as Ong (1982) calls it, this unavoidable development also has a number of beneficial consequences, including some of considerable rhetorical significance. For one, the medium-induced process of objectification has permanently altered the scope of Christ's prayer. Its reference and application have been extended from the 'secondary' level of receivership, that is, the Eleven, to a 'tertiary' and potentially universal level, namely, all his future 'disciples'. But its nature and purpose have also been significantly affected. In other words, due to increased sociocultural and historical 'distance', the didactic element has tended to become more prominent, whether for better or for worse, and its theological function, too, has been magnified as well as diversified, that is to cater for its new world-wide and timeless receptor constituency.

For this same reason, the communicative intent of the discourse at any point cannot be either described or evaluated solely in terms of the individual illocutionary components. Nor can an exposition of the reception process be reasonably confined and idealised to an initial, a strictly linear, and an unbroken operation (cf Berg 1989:188-190). It is rather the composite whole, processed in whatever way is normal and/or natural for a given receptor, which conveys the [presumably] desired perlocutionary effect, not only for the first hearers, but also
for all those who now receive its words, through inscripturation and publication/broadcasting via various media.

The preceding distinctions are vitally important: most literary theorists maintain the essential integrity of speech events. In other words, they recognise the difference between initial and subsequent acts and settings of communication with regard to both illocution and perlocution, for example, between the original situation of Scripture composition and reception and its subsequent transmission, whether in the original or via translation. Some controversy may arise, however, with regard to the importance which is attached to the respective speech-events or the significance that is attributed to specific literary-rhetorical features which depend for their effect(iveness) on an initial and sustained encounter with the text, for example ‘reader entrapment’ (Botha 1990).

2.11 The remainder of this essay will be devoted to a description (and communicative application) of the intricate textual framework of Christ’s prayer and how this relates to what is perceived to be the primary illocutionary motive of its original ‘meaning’, namely, to effect physical, psychological, and spiritual reinforcement. In his humanity, Jesus needed to fortify himself, first of all, for the tremendous physical suffering and mental anguish that lay ahead. He thus turned to his accustomed way to accomplish this — to intense prayer to his heavenly Father (this account may be John’s version of Christ’s prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane as recorded in the synoptic Gospels, i.e Mt 26:36-46, Mk 14:32-42, Lk 22:39-46). But he was also praying aloud in the disciples’ hearing to strengthen them to face the trials which lay just ahead (11), to confirm them in his teaching for the ministry (8) that he was consecrating unto to carry on in his name (17), to encourage them with regard to the success of their message (20), to reassure them of his continued protection (15), instruction (26), and loving presence [together with the Father] (22-3,26), and in all things to sustain them with the joyous hope of future glory (13,24). The particular ‘significance’ (Hirsch 1976:3) of this prayer for disciples on the contemporary level of communication is that they can apply this same reinforcement, in all of its diverse facets, also to themselves in their lives as believers in Christ (20).

In current sociological terms, we might sum up this notion of ‘reinforcement’ as it relates to John’s central theme also in terms of power and solidarity. Knowledge is power, and from a diagnostic perspective to ‘know’ (γινώσκειν, i.e understand, believe, and commit oneself to) the secret of ‘eternal life’ puts all disciples of ‘Christ, the Son of God’ in an incomparably advantaged position vis a vis ‘the world’ (Jn 17:9,16,23,25, cf 20:31). On the other hand, this same knowledge acts as a powerful bonding force to unite all true believers, not only with one another, but also with their almighty Lord, and indeed, with the heavenly Father himself (Jn 17:21).
3 JOHN 17 AS A SYSTEM OF COMPLEMENTARY TEXTUAL STRUCTURES

3.1 Any viable 'system', whether animate or inanimate in nature, is composed of an arrangement of interrelated elements which interact according to a set of rules to form a unified whole having a distinct function or group of functions within its designated context of operation. A verbal composition, then, is a multi-system designed for communication. It consists of at least three complementary and interlocking co-systems: phonological, lexical, and grammatical (supplemented in the case of an oral presentation by non-verbal systems such as the gestural or proxemic).

The overall form of each system may be described in terms of a 'structure', consisting of discrete units and relationships on several levels of hierarchical organisation, which interacts with the other structures to comprise a meaningful 'discourse'. 'Meaning', in turn, is both directed, that is determined by the perspective of the author, and diverse, being made up of referential (conceptual, denotative) 'content', pragmatic (illocutionary) 'intent', and such associative (connotative) aspects as feeling, tone, mood, attitude, and value. The 'rhetorical' sub-structure of a text, then, is a composite and a derived entity, including all those features from the three primary structures which are specifically selected and arranged in response to contextual constraints or potentialities order to inject the essential qualities of impact and appeal into the whole. Its purpose is to facilitate the primary communicative objectives of the total discourse in its original setting, that is to 'persuade' (in the broadest sense) receptors of the reliability, validity, and credibility of what is being said and why.

In many respects, the multi-system of verbal discourse is analogous to that of a living organism. The operation of a human body, for example, cannot be understood without reference to the function of each of its essential organs and their various interdependencies in relation to the body's internal and external environment. This can of course be carefully investigated and described, and yet the performance and significance of the whole as a living being is still greater than the sum of its constituent parts. Cut out one of these vital organ systems, and the body ceases to operate properly if at all. The same applies to verbal discourse. One cannot hope to understand and evaluate its rhetorical function, let alone its operation as a complete communication event, by examining only one or two of its essential co-systems. They all must be studied in context in order to give one a more accurate idea of what is going on during message transmission. Each system may be analysed separately, but at some point in the description the results obtained will have to be viewed in relation to one another, both structurally and functionally.

A several-staged discourse analysis of the text of John 17 was carried out as
part of the initial preparation for this study. The findings are displayed in two appendices: [A] the ‘paradigmatic-topical structure’, which deals essentially with the lexical organisation of the text; [B1] the ‘syntagmatic-propositional structure’, which relates primarily to both its syntactic and semantic framework; and [B2] the ‘poetic-architectonic structure’, which concerns the text’s larger patterns of thematic arrangement. A summary of the results of these different but related analyses is given immediately below. Their rhetorical significance is then discussed in section 4.

3.2 The paradigmatic-topical structure
Appendix A represents a rather crude, two-dimensional attempt to ‘spatialise’ the text of John 17 according to 14 key ‘topics’. Some of these refer to simple notions, like ‘life’ [c] or ‘word’ [f], while others designate more complex ideas, such as ‘faith/believe/know’ [h] or ‘unity, possession, oneness’ [j]. Topic [a] is somewhat different in that it includes all ‘marginal’ expressions, that is, vocatives, verbs of petition, and references to the beneficiaries of the prayer. The various topics were selected inductively, simply on the basis of their perceived prominence after several readings of this pericope as well as the Gospel as a whole. They are indicated from left to right by individual small letters, that is [a] to [n], along the top of the page. A listing of these topics is given in the ‘key’ at the end of the display. The figure in parentheses after each topic indicates its number of occurrences in the text.

Notice that on the display chart a phrase or clause which has been interpreted as primarily manifesting a given topic (marked by italicisation) is indented to the right to a point which corresponds to the upper letter designating that topic. The second utterance of verse one, for example, is recessed to the vertical dashed line under letter [g], which signifies the notion of ‘separation’ in both a spatial (e.g., ‘come/go’) and a theological sense (e.g., ‘sanctify!’). The last two word-groups, however, deal with the concept of ‘glory’ (or ‘glorify’), and hence are aligned under [b]. Most such units are relatively straightforward in their classification, but there are several that might be categorised differently. In other words, there are instances of mixing, overlapping, and ambiguity.

The results give one a rough idea of both the density and the distribution of the different topics. This, in turn, provides an indication of the major theme(s) of the prayer as it develops, based on the assumption that the most frequently appearing topics, whether interpreted in a literal sense or figuratively, have a definite bearing on the principal message that the speaker/author wanted to get across to his hearers/readers. Thus Christ begins with a strong emphasis upon the related concepts of ‘glory’ [b] and ‘giving’ [d] (vv1-5). The latter notion continues to be prominent in the second principal segment (6-9). The three topics of ‘unity’ [j], ‘separation’ [g], and ‘preservation’ [i] then intermingle (10-13) until the second
comes to predominate (14-19) in conjunction with the antithetical notion of ‘world’ [k]. The final portion of the prayer (20-26) is the most diverse topically, with ‘glory’ being reintroduced along with an emphasis upon ‘knowledge’ [h] and ‘love’ [m]. But ‘unity’ again prevails as it does throughout the text.

To summarise: Christ prays that the ‘fellowship’ which exists between the heavenly Father and himself might be manifested among all those ‘believers’ who have been ‘given’ to him and whom he has, in turn, ‘commissioned’ to carry on his ministry. A demonstration of oneness is especially important in view of his upcoming ‘separation’ from them. This generally positive theme is highlighted by a secondary, but related, contrastive thought which features a fundamental paradox — namely, the need for Christ’s disciples to be ‘preserved’ and ‘set apart’ morally and spiritually from the hostile ‘world’-environment in which they are to manifest the ‘unity’, ‘knowledge’, and ‘love’ of their Lord while carrying out their ministry to that same world.

3.3 The syntagmatic-propositional structure
Appendix B1 is designed primarily to show the binary, hierarchically-arranged syntactic relationships which link the various propositional units (and clusters) as they appear sequentially in the text of John 17. The development of the prayer’s rhetorical ‘argument’ may be traced by noting the relationships between the larger segments (propositional clusters) of the discourse. Thus the ‘grounds’, as it were, of the entire prayer is found in the initial proposition [1.1], namely, that ‘the hour had come’ for Jesus to bring his saving mission to a climax in the crucifixion event (cf 12:23,27; 13:1; 16:32). It was this ultimate fact which motivated the several petitions which he addressed to the Father on his own behalf and for the benefit of his disciples.

The first ‘petition’ concerns Christ himself as he requests that he might now be glorified since he had completed the work which his Father gave him to do. This includes his past ministry as well as his impending passion (i.e. the aorist τελειώσας in 4.2 has a double temporal reference). It is motivated (‘purpose’ [c]) by a desire that the Father also receive glory through these events. The various ideas associated with this initial request, which is reiterated for emphasis in [5.1] (i.e. an inclusio), span the first major discourse segment or propositional cluster [1.2-5.4]. Rhetorically as well as theologically, it is significant that Christ begins with his most important petition, namely, the one which deals with his ‘glorious’ relationship with the heavenly Father and which in turn is effected by his mission to save mankind [2.2-3] by making known to them ‘the only true God’ and his ‘apostle’ Jesus Christ [3.1-5]. This constitutes the ‘base’ in relation to which the other requests may be viewed as successive stages of ‘amplification’ [t’].

The second petition, an appeal on behalf of the disciples for preservation through unity, is not actually expressed until the very end of the second major
discourse unit [11.4-7], which encompasses verses six through eleven. The preceding material builds up to this peak by outlining the reasons on which it is based, namely, the disciples' fidelity and faith [6.1-8.7] coupled with Christ's departure from them [9.1-11.3]. The essence of this request is repeated in the third discourse segment (vv12-16), but with a somewhat different emphasis. Here Christ asks that his disciples be preserved (or 'kept' τηρήσωσι) from the 'Evil One' [15.4], who is the Master of the evil 'world' that opposes [14.2] and rejects them [16.1-2]. This third petition again comes near the end of a larger propositional cluster [12.1-16.2]. It is then dramatically juxtaposed with the fourth petition, which leads off the short concluding unit [17.1-19.2] of the second principal portion of the prayer, that is verses 6-19. Christ prays that his disciples be 'sanctified' in by the 'truth' of his 'word' [17.1-2] so that they might be prepared to carry on his ministry in the 'world' [18.1-2]. Thus our Lord's supplication was significantly two-pronged: it had an immediate in-group, consolatory relevance, but it also presented a bold challenge for his followers to take the offensive with his word of truth in a hostile world.

The third and final section of the prayer, that is verses 20-26, is clearly divided into two major segments, each of which is centered upon another petition: The first opens by expanding the scope of the entreaty to all believers [20.1-3]. It is another strong appeal for unity [e.g. 21.1, 22.3, 23.3]. However, this is not a static, introverted notion, but rather one which forms the foundation for the Church's evangelistic ministry into the 'world' [21.4-6 and 23.4-6 which parallel each other at the close of their respective sub-sections]. In this sense, then, the pronoun αὐτῶν, 'them', in 23.6 may well be an instance of 'semantic density' (Wendland 1990) by referring not only to the current 'believers' but also to those in the 'world' whom they will be winning for Christ.

The last segment of the prayer appropriately adds an eschatological dimension to the text in Christ's request that the elect might ultimately join him in 'glory' [24.1-5]. There is, however, also an immediate practical application of this future oriented desire through an important extension of communicative roles. Thus, even as Jesus made the heavenly Father 'known' in his saving mission to bring 'eternal life' to all people [3], so also Jesus would continue to do so through the message of his 'sent' disciples [18, 25.3-26.2]. And there is in this connection a subtle reversal that occurs right at the end: The 'glory' of Christ which believers will one day enjoy 'with him' is to be experienced even now in the 'love' which should characterise their temporal relationship with one another [26.3-4, cf 23.5-6] while he is 'with them' [26.5]. Indeed, this is a 'glory' that is as much worth working for as it is worth waiting for!

3.4 The paradigmatic structure of the text, arranged according to 'topic' in appendix A, is viewed from a somewhat different perspective in appendix B2.
namely, with respect to its architectonic or positional relationships, as indicated by means of dashed lines along the right side of the chart. These parallels reveal much more than a rambling style or even emphatic repetition; rather, they manifest the significant placement of topics within the discourse, especially as boundary indicators for sections (propositional clusters) of all sizes. Major correspondences are distinguished by the related sequences of capital letters, that is, in contrast to the individual small letters which mark propositional relationships on the left.

Notice, for example, the topical parallels that create a cohesive strand which unites the section covering verses six through eight, that is C-D-E;C'-D'-E', or a more general pattern which spans the entire middle section (vv6-19), that is background: X (6-8)/X'(12-14), reason: Y (9-11.3)/Y'(15-16), and request: Z (11.4-6)/Z'(17-19). Then there are the obvious similarities which foreground points of structural and rhetorical emphasis: the respective beginnings of sections (i.e. 'anaphora', e.g. explicit references to Christ's 'requesting' the Father [9.1,15.1,20.1]); the endings of sections (i.e. 'epiphora', e.g. the disciples and Christ not being 'of the world' [14.3-4,16.1-2]); an envelope construction (i.e. 'inclusio', e.g. the appeal to a revelation of 'glory'[1.2-3,24.5-6]); or a hinge construction (i.e. 'anadiplosis', e.g. Christ's 'keeping those given to him in his name'[11.4-5,12.2-3]). The conclusion of the prayer is highlighted to an even greater degree by a special concentration of such parallels, that is, there is a convergence of the terminal members of several distinct series, these are P", N"", O", O"", M", I", K"", L" within vv24-26.

There are, in addition, several important 'ring' (A-B-A') constructions which serve both to define the boundaries of (sub) sections within the discourse and to highlight different aspects of the major themes being conveyed. We find a larger such ring structure in each of the prayer's three principal divisions as follows:

I A'(1-2): petition for 'glory' and its goal ('life')
   B (3): the goal defined in terms of 'knowledge'
   A' (4-5): the goal accomplished, the petition repeated

II A (11d-g): general petition for protection
   B (12-14): reason for this petition: Christ who had been 'keeping/guarding' them (12) is now going to the Father (13-14)
   A' (15-16): specific appeal for protection from the 'Evil One'

III A (21): petition for unity among believers so that 'the world might believe' that God sent his Son
   B (22a-c): Jesus has 'glorified' them
A' (22d-23): petition for unity among believers so that 'the world might know' that God sent his Son.

There are other somewhat smaller, but very tightly constructed, ring patterns which fill out structural and thematic gaps in these larger sections. For example, one at the close of the middle section serves to emphasise the nature and purpose of the fourth of the prayer's principal petitions:

A (17): a plea that Christ's disciples be 'consecrated in truth' for their mission
B (18): their mission is based on Christ's ministry 'unto the world
A' (19): Christ 'consecrates himself' so that his disciples may be 'consecrated in truth' for their mission.

Similarly, the prayer as a whole concludes with a tripartite focus upon unity, love (i.e., A [24]/A' [26.3-5]) which results from divine 'knowledge/making known' (i.e., B [25-26.2]).

We thus observe an intricate interweaving of topics simultaneously being unfolded as the discourse develops sequentially and also being folded back into the prayer as the many reiterations and rewordings reflect upon one another in synchronic fashion. The different key concepts thus gain in complexity and theological significance by virtue of the varied semantic contexts and mutually-reinforcing structural positions in which they appear.

The word 'glory/glorify', for example, is introduced as having a reciprocal implication already at the beginning of the prayer when Christ asks that he be glorified for the sake of his Father [1.2-3]. This notion is reinforced and expanded at the close of the first section as Jesus stresses the fact that such 'glory' has been his unalienable attribute together with the Father from eternity [5.1-4]. In between these occurrences, the abstract concept is made concrete by being integrally associated with the mission of revelation and salvation that Christ came to earth to perform [esp. 4.1-4]. The active and passive/stative aspects of this crucial topic, these are 'glorify' and 'glory', are further extended to Christ's (by implication also the Father's) relationship with his disciples in [10.3] and, in keeping with the ever widening scope of the prayer, to all believers in [22.1-2] and its parallel in [24.5-6, i.e., an inclusio]. In the process, this central idea is related also to other key terms in the discourse, such as 'knowledge' [3,23.4-6], 'giving' [9.4-10.2,11.5], 'separation' [11.1-3], 'preservation' [11.4], 'unity' [11.5-6,22.3-23.3,24.3-4], 'commission' [21.5-6], and 'love' [24.6-7].

'Glory-ify' as used in chapter 17 forms additional intratextual links with its other occurrences in the Gospel, notably at the core of the prologue where all of the important themes are introduced (1:14), in the conclusion to the account of
Christ's first 'sign' (2:11), in the final event of his public ministry as recorded by John (12:23,28), and in the very introduction to the farewell discourses (13:31-32). A final occurrence once more connects the active and relational force of 'glory' with that of ministry as reference is made to the manner in which Peter would eventually 'glorify' his Lord in death (21:19), apparently, as the tradition goes, also by means of crucifixion!

The preceding is merely an illustration of the extensive verbal rhetoric of John's gospel. The result of such a skillful manipulation and arrangement of key concepts is the formation of an elaborate semantic network which transverses the discourse from beginning to end, diachronically as well as synchronically. A convergence of topics, such as we have in the final three verses of Christ's prayer, produces a rhetorical peak that emphasises both its overall theme and functional intent. Thus form is welded to meaning as rhythmic diction and a harmonious arrangement of utterances effect a congruous linguistic framework which reinforces the speaker's content, attitude, and purpose. It is, in short, an appeal to unity in order to unify followers of all ages with one another even as with their glorious Lord.

4 LOGIC OF THE LOGOTACTIC WORD: PARACLETIC RHETORIC IN JOHN 17

The reason why John 17 was composed in poetic form, if not actually a 'poem', is rather easy to discern. It is yet another instance of a tendency which is exemplified in the Bible literally from beginning to end. Discourse of a particularly important nature — with respect to structure, content, purpose, or emotion — and typically represented as being uttered directly by God, or one of his chosen spokesmen, is generally marked in some obvious way, using a variable range of the poetic devices available in ancient Hebrew and Greek (especially the former, a stylistic preference which carries over into the NT). Such formal embellishment is not gratuitous, but it is always motivated by a number of rhetorical functions, notably, the creation of impact and appeal. As was noted earlier, this is a prominent feature of specifically Johannine composition, many passages of which manifest most of the same features found illustrated in Jn.17, if not always in the same concentration.

4.1 There is thus a pronounced 'logotactic' quality about John's writings, that is, a special focus upon the very words spoken by the one who was called the WORD. Every lexical item counts, and in more ways than one — not only with regard to its individual selection, but also concerning its placement within the text in conjunction with other words as well as its potential significance on several convergent semantic planes, both syntagmatic and paradigmatic, literal and figurative. The farewell 'prayer' of Christ to the Father in the presence of his disciples (and ultimately, all believers) is a natural place for such heightened
discourse to occur, and the text's style itself contributes a great deal to the effect that the words have on listeners in particular, for it was certainly meant to be uttered aloud.

It is somewhat paradoxical then to observe that the 'heightening' to be found in this discourse is rather different from what one might expect, based on other rhetorically-constructed NT texts, such as Mt 5-7, Lk 14-16, 1 Co 9, Hb 9, or 2 Pt 2. Most poetry depends in large measure upon the principle termed 'defamiliarisation' [ostraneniye 'making strange'] by the Russian Formalist critics, that is, language which diverges in some recognisable way from what is normal or expected, thus giving it a special impact and esthetic impression:

The technique of art is to make objects 'unfamiliar', to make the forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged (Shklovsky 1965:12).

This is just the opposite of what we see in John 17 however. The style differs, in fact, from some of Christ's other (Johannine) discourses in its transparency and directness, with none of the 'ambiguity' that occurs elsewhere 'to focus attention and to urge interpretive effort' (Kotze 1985:57). Thus the grammar and vocabulary is unusually simple and straightforward. There is a virtual absence of novelty with respect to either syntax or sense. The classical lexical figures of speech, including poetic images, are almost non-existent. There are no rhetorical questions, exclamations, radical ellipses, hyperboles, ironic/sarcastic utterances, OT quotations, or direct citations. The overall effect of this text in terms of clarity, impact, and appeal is almost entirely a product of the selection of a basic set of key topics and their arrangement in a diversity of recursive and overlapping patterns that not only facilitate one's apprehension of the sense of the whole, but also enhance one's perception of its euphonious, rhythmic, and balanced qualities of sound:

4.2 And yet, the style of John 17, however plain and unadorned in a literary sense, would appear to be eminently appropriate, not only to the genre of personal prayer, but also to the function which it was designed to carry out and the essential message that it was, and is, intended to communicate. In his role as the original 'Paraclete' (cf Jn 14:16; 1 Jn 2:1), Jesus addresses a distinctive 'paracletic' discourse to his Father on behalf of his followers. Thus, after attending to his own personal needs (vv1-5), he devotes the rest of his prayer to supplication with regard to the immediate and long-term needs of his disciples, and indeed, all believers. He stands as their companion, teacher, mediator, and advocate before his heavenly Father and intercedes for them even as he commissions, counsels and encourages them for their upcoming ministry to the world by recall-
ing the central aspects of his gospel message. In the process he draws attention to the indissoluble bonds which link himself, the Father, and all believers in a triangle of loving concern (e.g. 26.4-6), a relationship which is foregrounded verbally throughout the discourse by the many interwoven parallel and chiastic constructions.

Instead of defamiliarisation, then, the text of this chapter might be more accurately characterised as manifesting the technique of ‘re-familiarisation’ — a many-tiered reiteration of sound, sense, and syntax the rhetorical purpose of which is to consolidate as well as to motivate them with what they already (should) know. There are no dramatic peaks or troughs and nothing really new here as far as content is concerned, just a basic review of what Jesus had been telling his disciples during his entire ministry (from John’s unique point of view). The key topics (life, glory, truth, faith, love, etc., cf Apx A) and the themes which they embody appear in many other pericopes of this Gospel. This ‘Lord’s prayer’ thus represents a fundamental summary of Christ’s theology at an especially critical juncture in the carrying out of his Father’s plan.

The remarkable fact, from a literary as well as a pastoral perspective, is that such repetition is so artfully and affectively articulated. The rhetorical effect of the Word at work is cumulative. Listeners are immediately attracted by the simplicity of style, the familiarity of content, the rhythmic flow, and the depth of feeling conveyed (both explicitly and implicitly throughout). And as they are carried along by its fluid forward progression, they are subtly but inevitably drawn into the internal narrated event of communication. Thus, by the time the message is actually applied to them (v20ff), they are already apprehending the words of this prayer as if they were original auditors on the scene — listening reverently as disciples to their Master, the living Word.
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APPENDICES: DIMENSIONS OF THE DISCOURSE STRUCTURE OF JOHN 17

APPENDIX A.: PARADIGMATIC-TOPOCAL STRUCTURE
(in literal English translation. Hyphen = same Greek word)

KEY: Major Topics in John 17

g = separation: ‘sanctify’ [14]  h = ‘faith/believe/know’ [12]
k = ‘world’ [18]  l = ‘truth’ [5]

[approximate number of individual occurrences of the topics in Jn 17]
Father, it has come the hour: glory of you the Son, that the Son he-might-glory you, as you gave to him authority-over all flesh that everything which you have given to him he-might-give to them life eternal.

Now this it is, eternal life, that they-might-know you, the only true God, and the one whom you sent, Jesus Christ.

I you glorified on the earth, the work having finished which you have given to me that I do.

And now glorify me you, O Father, alongside yourself with the glory which I was having before the world was along with yourself.

I manifested of you the name to the men whom you gave to me out of the world yours they were and to me them you gave, and the Word your (Ut they have kept.) Now they have known that all things as much as you have given to me from you they are.

Because the words which you gave to me I have given to them, and they they have received them, and they know truly that from you I came forth and they believed that you me you did send.

I concerning them I make request, not do I make request, but concerning (those) whom you have given to me because yours they are, and my (things) all yours they are, and your (things) mine, and I have been glorified in them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>j</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>l</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 | And not any longer I am in the world, and they in . . . they are, and I to you I am coming. Holy Father, keep them in the name of you which you have given to me that they may be one as we. When I was with them, I kept them in the name of you which you have given to me, and I guarded, and not one of them he perished, except the son of [the] perdition that the Scripture it might be fulfilled. | 12 | 13 | But now to you I am coming, and these things I am speaking in the world that they might have the joy my [having been] fulfilled in themselves. I have given to them the Word of you, and the world hated them because not they are [out] of the world, as I not I am [out] of the world. Not do I request that you should take them out of the world, but that you should keep them [out] from the Evil One. [Out] of ... not they are. [Out of ... not they are. as I not I am [out of the world. Sanctify them the Word the yours in the truth, truth it is. As me you sent I also I sent them into the world. And on behalf of them I I sanctify myself that they may be also they sanctified in truth. Now not concerning these do I make request only, but also concerning (those) the ones believing . . . in me through their word.
O Father,

that all one they-might-be,

as you...(are) in me

and-I (am) in you,

that also they in us they-be,

in-order-that the world

it-might-believe

that you me you-did-send.

And-I the glory

which you-have-given to me

I-have-given to them

that they-might-be one

as we (are) one,

in them

and you in me,

that they-be completed in one,

that it-might-know

the world

that you me you-send,

and you-loved them

as me you-loved.

Father,...I-wish

what you-have-given to me,

that where I-I-am

those also they-be with me,

that they-might-behold the glory

my

which you-have-given to me

since you-loved me

before (the) foundation

of-(the) world.

Father righteous,

indeed the world

you not it-knew,

but I you I-knew,

also these they-knew

that you me you-sent.

Indeed I-made-known the name of you

and I-will-make-known (it)

that the love

(with) which you-

-loved me in them

it-might-be

and-I in them.
Below is an outline of the text of John 17 according to its significant syntactic clause-level units, namely, those which correspond to complete semantic propositions. They are designated by the sequence of (verse) numbers and (clause-unit) decimals along the right side of the diagram. Levels of indentation on the left give an approximate picture of the degrees of syntactic dependency of the various units in their order of occurrence. The hierarchical, syntagmatic network of inter-clausal connections is shown by the solid lines along the left margin. Here the series of letters denotes the various semantic relationships that link pairs of propositions on the different strata of the hierarchy. These are identified at the end of the display. The initial relation listed there applies to the proposition that occurs first in the text as spatialised below. Noteworthy paradigmatic correspondences and parallels are indicated by means of the broken lines and capital letters on the right side of the page, that is the 'architectonic poetic' structure. In addition, an attempt has been made to mark points of special literary highlighting or foregrounding (i.e., primarily by means of repetition and patterning): syntactic focus by italics and lexical emphasis by CAPITAL LETTERS. There may of course be individual cases of overlapping, indeterminacy, and disagreement, but it is likely that these variations do not substantially affect the interpretation of the discourse structure in its broad outline or with regard to the rhetorical function of its larger constituent segments.
Father, it has come the hour:

1.1 GLORIFY! YOUR the Son ———— A

1.2 that the Son he might GLORIFY YOU ———— B

1.3 inasmuch as you gave to him authority over all flesh ———— D

1.4 that he might give to them life eternal. ———— E

1.5 EVERYTHING which you have given to him ———— F

2.1 This then it is [the] ETERNAL LIFE ———— H

2.2 that they might know you ———— I

2.3 (you are) the only true God ———— K

2.4 and the one whom you sent, ———— N

2.5 (he is) JESUS CHRIST. ———— P

3.1 You GLORIFIED on the earth, ———— N

3.2 the work having completed ———— B

3.3 which you have given to me ———— D

3.4 that I should do. ———— F

4.1 I manifested your the name to the men ———— M

4.2 whom you GAVE to me out of the world. ———— N

4.3 YOURS they were

4.4 and to me them you GAVE ———— D

4.5 and the word your they have kept. ———— D

5.1 And now GLORIFY! me you, Father, alongside yourself — N

5.2 with the GLORY ———— B

5.3 which I was having... WITH YOU /before the world was. / ———— P

6.1 I manifested your the name to the men ———— M

6.2 whom you GAVE to me out of the world. ———— N

6.3 YOURS they were

6.4 and to me them you GAVE ———— D

6.5 and the word your they have kept. ———— D

7.1 Now they have known ———— N

7.2 that all things... from you they are. ———— N

7.3 as much as you HAVE GIVEN to me ———— D

7.4 Because the worlds I HAVE GIVEN to them, /which you GAVE to me / ———— P

7.5 and they have received them, ———— N

7.6 and they know truly ———— B

7.7 and they believed ———— P

7.8 that from you I came forth ———— E

7.9 and they believed ———— E

7.10 that you me you did send. ———— K

8.1 concerning them I make request; ———— N

8.2 not concerning the worlds do I make request ———— P

8.3 but (I make request) CONCERNING (THOSE) whom you have given to me ———— F

8.4 because yours they are, ———— E

8.5 and MY (THINGS) ALL YOURS they are, ———— P

8.6 and YOUR (THINGS) MINE (they are), ———— K

8.7 and I have been glorified in them. ———— N

8.8 And not any longer I am in the world, ———— N

8.9 and they IN THE WORLD they are ———— P

8.10 and to you I am coming ———— G

9.1 and so on ———— F

9.2 and what you have ———— G

9.3 and ALL I have ———— P

9.4 and ALL (I GAVE) to them ———— K

9.5 and I have been glorified in them. ———— N

10.1 and not any longer I am in the world, ———— N

10.2 and they IN THE WORLD they are ———— P

10.3 and to you I am coming ———— G

Reproduced by Sabinet Gateway under licence granted by the Publisher (dated 2010).
Holy Father, keep them in the name of-you, which you-have-given to-me, that they-may-be one as we (are).

When I-was with them, I-kept them IN THE NAME OF-YOU which you-have-given to-me, and I-guarded (them), and not-one of them he-perished, except the son OF-[the]-PERDITION that the Scripture it-might-be-fulfilled.

But now TO YOULL-AM-COMING, and these-things I-am-speaking in the world that they-might-have the joy my [having-been]-fulfilled in themselves.

I-have-given to-them the word of-you, and the world-it-hated them because not they are OF THE WORLD, as /not I-am of the world.

Not do-I-request that you-should-take them out-of the world, but (I-request)

that you-should-keep them from the Evil-One.

OF THE WORLD not they-are, as /not I-am of the world.

Sanctify! them in the truth; the word the yours TRUTH-it-is.

As me you-sent into the world, I-also I-SENT them into the world.

And on-behalf-of them I I-sanctify myself that they-may-be also they SANCTIFIED-ONES IN TRUTH.
Now not concerning these do I make request only, but also concerning those believing in me through the word of them that ALL ONE they might be, as YOU, Father, (are) IN ME, and I (am) IN YOU, that also THEY IN US they might be, that the world it might believe that YOU me you did send.

And I the glory I have given to them /which you have given to me/ that they might be one, as we (are) ONE, in them, and you in me, that they might be completed in ONE that it might know the world that YOU me you sent, and you loved them as me you loved.

Father, I wish /that which you have given to me/ that... THOSE ALSO they might be with me /where I am/ that they might behold the glory my which you have given to me since you loved me before (the) foundation of (the) world.

Righteous FATHER, indeed the world you not it knew, but I you I knew, also these they knew that you me you sent. Indeed, I made known the name of you, and I will make known (it) that the love in them it might be /with which you loved me/ and I (might be) in them.

Semantic Relationships Linking Propositional-Syntactic Units

| a | grounds-petition | n | result-means |
| b | base-amplification | o | grounds-petition |
| c | means-purpose | p | base-time |
| d | petition-grounds | q | concept-description |
| e | base-apposition | r | base-manner |
| f | means-purpose | s | base-addition |
| g | base-comment | t | concept-description |
| h | base-apposition | u | concept-description |
| i | base-apposition | v | base-addition |
| j  | base-addition          | w  | means-result         |
| k  | concept-definition    | x  | orienter-content     |
| l  | means-purpose         | y  | concept-description  |
| m  | concept-description   | z  | base-amplification   |
| a' | concept-description   | n' | base-contrast        |
| b' | base-addition         | o' | base-addition        |
| c' | orienter-content      | p' | grounds-petition     |
| d' | orienter-content      | q' | concept-attribute    |
| e' | base-amplification    | r' | base-comparison      |
| f' | base-addition         | s' | means-purpose        |
| g' | base-amplification    | t' | base-amplification   |
| h' | contrast-base         | u' | time-base            |
| i' | concept-description   | v' | concept-description  |
| j' | result-reason(s)      | w' | base-amplification   |
| k' | base-comment          | x' | means-result         |
| l' | base-amplification    | y' | base-contrast        |
| m' | base-addition         | z' | means-result         |
| a'' | base-contrast         | n'' | concept-description |
| b'' | base-addition         | o'' | base-comparison     |
| c'' | means-purpose         | p'' | concept-description |
| d'' | concept-description   | q'' | petition-grounds     |
| e'' | base-addition         | r'' | comparison-base     |
| f'' | reason-result         | s'' | base-addition        |
| g'' | result-reason         | t'' | means-purpose        |
| h'' | base-comparison       | u'' | base-amplification   |
| i'' | base-addition         | v'' | result-means        |
| j'' | grounds-petition      | w'' | orienter-content     |
| k'' | orienter-content      | x'' | base-comparison      |
| l'' | contrast-base         | y'' | base-amplification   |
| m'' | orienter-content      | z'' | base-amplification   |
| a. | means-purpose         | n. | orienter-content     |
| b. | orienter-content      | o. | apposition-concept   |
| c. | base-amplification    | p. | base-location        |
| d. | concept-description   | q. | means-result         |
| e. | means-purpose         | r. | concept-description  |
| f. | base-comparison       | s. | result-reason        |
| g. | concept-explanation   | t. | base-time            |
| h. | base-amplification    | u. | contrast-base        |
| i. | base-amplification    | v. | base-amplification   |
| j. | means-purpose         | w. | orienter-content     |
| k. | orienter-content      | x. | base-amplification   |
| l. | base-addition         | y. | base-addition        |
| m. | base-comparison       | z. | petition-grounds     |

\[a: \text{means-purpose} \quad b: \text{concept-description} \quad c: \text{base-amplification}\]