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ABSTRACT

The aim of this essay is to present an analysis of the surface structure of John 17:1-26 by means of a discourse analysis, a methodological approach that comprises an analysis of the semantic content of language segments into its constituent units in order to restate the argument in terms of its taxonomic hierarchy. Following an overview of various proposals regarding the structure of John 17:1-26, a discourse analysis of this chapter is presented. It is divided into cola; structure markers are indicated; the semantic relations are discussed and the flow of the argument is outlined.

1 INTRODUCTION

The aim of this essay is to present an analysis of the surface structure of John 17:1-26 by means of a methodological approach which has become known in South Africa as ‘discourse analysis’. As such, discourse analysis, with J P Louw as its chief exponent, is a methodological approach that comprises an analysis of the semantic content of language segments into its constituent units in order to restate the argument in terms of its taxonomic hierarchy. By highlighting these features of a discourse, the basic development of the train of thought in the discourse can be stated (Louw 1979:4). In the application of this method to John 17:1-26, the following steps will be followed:

1. The text will be divided into syntactical units called cola. A colon is defined by Louw (1979:24) as a ‘stretch of language having a matrix which consists of a nominal and a verbal element along with additions linked to these two elements of the matrix, or additions which are in turn linked to other additions.’ Put simply, a colon can be defined as $S = N + V$, that is, a nominal element (subject) and a verbal element (predicate or the so-called ‘main’ verb), each having the possibility of being extended. A colon may also be broken down into smaller elements (indicated as 1a, 1b, 1c, etc) if it is deemed necessary for the discussion of the relationships within the colon.

1 For more information on South African Discourse Analysis, see Snyman (1978:200-10; 1991:83-99); Combrink (1979); Du Toit (1981:3-14); Riekert (1982:1-22; 1986:30-38); Botha (1990:170-91) and the following editions of Neotestamentica: 8 (1974); 11 (1977); 13 (1979) and 16 (1982).
2 So-called *structure markers* will be indicated in the text. These can be divided into two groups: The first group of structure markers consists of lexical elements that belong to the same semantic domain. The second group of structure markers consists of the words within the text that serve as indicators of transition in the discourse, for example a change in person or an alteration in the mood of the verb (Snyman 1991:90). The structure markers will be indicated in the text (for example by means of different ways of underlining) in order to help one get a clear picture of the occurrence of the various markers.

3 The semantic relationships between the cola will be discussed. For this purpose lines will be drawn on the left-hand side of the text, indicating the way in which each colon or part of a colon is related semantically to other cola/parts of the colon. In order to describe the various semantic relationships precisely, the systematic description developed by E A Nida (1975:50-65; 1983:99-109) will be used. Although this system was developed to describe the semantic relationships between nuclear structures (which are usually much shorter than cola), the same type of relationship applies to all structural levels, for example the relationship between clauses, sentences, paragraphs, sections, and even chapters (Nida 1983:104).

## 1 Coordinate

### A Additive:

1. Equivalent: John is stupid; he is dumb.
2. Different:
   - Consequential: John stopped reading and looked up (an 'unfolding' structure).
   - Nonconsequential: John was reading and Mary was sewing.

### B Dyadic:

1. Alternative: John will do it, or die in the attempt.
2. Contrastive: He came, but did not stay.
3. Comparative: She is more intelligent than Jane.
4. Reciprocal: I belong to you and you belong to me. ²

## 2 Subordinate

### A Qualificational:

1. Substance:
   - Content: He said he would go.
   - Generic-specific: John travels a lot; each year he goes to the

² Note that this type of relationship had to be added to Nida's list. This was necessary since such a relationship occurs in the Gospel of John. See for example John 14:10a.
Orient.

2 Character:
   a Characterisation: Working for John is terrible.
   b Manner: He came to town riding on a horse.
   c Setting:
      (1) Time: When he came, we left.
      (2) Place: Being in the house, he noticed a strange noise.
      (3) Circumstance: As Jim turned, Alice disappeared.

B Logical:
   1 Cause-effect: John's leaving made Mary despondent.
   2 Reason-result: Because John left, he did not see Mary.
   3 Means-result: By coming, John saw Mary.
   4 Means-purpose: John came in order to see Mary.
   5 Condition-result: If John comes, he will see Mary.
   6 Basis-inference: Since John came, he must have seen Mary.
   7 Concession-result: Though John came, he did not see Mary.

Before concluding this short introduction, two observations should be made:

Firstly, it is important to note that discourse analysis is not intended to be an approach that excludes other exegetical strategies. As Louw (1979:2) himself remarked, discourse analysis should not be seen as an attempt at a complete exegesis of the text, as it merely constitutes an 'opening up' of the text to the extent that a linguistic analysis can expound semantic content. As such it represents only one perspective of a text.

Secondly, F E Deist (1978:260-62) has warned scholars who practise discourse analysis against the tendency to view the results of discourse analysis as the structure of the text—in other words, to equate structure with text. He is correct in stressing this point. Like all acts of interpretation, a discourse analysis is a subjective endeavour. To present one's own analysis of a text as the structure, or even as the only possible interpretation of the structure of the text, constitutes a denial of one's own subjectivity. One should rather present one's own analysis as one possible approach to the question of how the structure of the text may be described. The discourse analysis of John 17:1-26 discussed in this essay is thus presented as the result of a subjective process of interpretation. The arguments on which this analysis is based, are also explicated in order to facilitate further critical discussion by other scholars.
2 AN OVERVIEW OF SOME PROPOSALS REGARDING THE STRUCTURE OF JOHN 17:1-26

Before a discourse analysis of John 17:1-26 is presented, some of the proposals regarding the structure of John 17:1-26 will be discussed. In spite of numerous efforts to analyse the structure of the Farewell Prayer, no agreement has been reached amongst scholars on this matter. A survey of a few opinions regarding the structure of this chapter will demonstrate this confusion. The following divisions of this chapter have been suggested:

(1-8) (9-19) (20-26)
This division is proposed, amongst others, by Brown (1984:748-51), Moloney (1982:79-80) and Gnilka (1983:127-32), and is usually based upon the three indications of the person(s) for whom Jesus is praying: Himself (his own glorification), the disciples, and the later believers. A slight variation of this division [(1-5) (6-19) (20-26)] is used by Quinn (1969:90-97).

(1-5) (6-8) (9-19) (20-26)
This so-called fourfold division is a slight modification of the one mentioned above. Verses 6-8 are regarded as a separate unit describing Jesus' work amongst the disciples. This division is proposed by Dodd (1955:417).

(1-5) (6-19) (20-23) (24-26)
This division is used by Wikenhauser (1961:301-11) and Lindars (1982:515-33). Barrett (1978:499) proposes a division which differs only slightly from this in that the last two sections are divided as verses 20-24 and 25-26. Basically this approach differs from the division proposed by Brown in two ways: Verses 6-8 are regarded as a part of the second section, and verses 24-26 are considered to be a separate unit, consisting of a final appeal to the disciples.

(1-3) (4-8) (9-19) (20-23) (24-26)
Boyle (1975:219-20) describes verses 1-3 and 24-26 respectively as introduction to, and conclusion of the chapter. The remainder is divided according to the following principles: Jesus' own work (vv4-8), the prayer for the disciples (vv9-19) and the prayer for the later believers (vv20-23).

[(1-5)] [(6-8) (9-19) (20-23) (24-26)]
Bultmann (1978:371-400) divides the chapter into two sections: Verses 1-5 consist of Jesus' petition for his own glorification and verses 6-26 are used for the intercession on behalf of the community. The second subsection is divided into four sections, dealing with the following aspects with regard to the commu-
nity: Founding (vv6-8), preservation and sanctification (vv9-19), unity (vv20-23) and perfecting (vv24-26).

[[1b-5]] [(6-11a) (11b-19) (20-23)] [(24-26)]
Schnackenburg (1973:67-78) analyses John 17 by using a 'structuralist' approach. His division is based upon a detailed analysis of formal elements such as the repetition of keywords, sentences and small units. Schnackenburg's division is adopted by Beasley-Murray (1987: 293-96) and Thüising (1978:314). In the case of Thüising, one minor modification is made: Verses 24 and 25-26 are regarded as separate units.

[(1b-2)] [(4-5) (6-13) (14-19) (22-26)]
Becker (1969:57-83; also see 1981:507-17) uses Gattungselementen as his point of departure. Four Gattungselementen are distinguished: Account statements (vv4, 6-8, 14, 22-23), introduction to a petition (vv9-11a, 15-6), petition (vv1b, 5, 11b, 17, 24), and motivation for a petition (vv2, 12a, 13, 18-9, 25-26). Becker describes the structure of John 17 in terms of five series of Gattungselementen, each having its own dominant keyword(s).

(1b-5) (6-8) (9-19) (20-24) (25-26)
In his analysis of John 17 Malatesta (1971:190-214) takes into account the 'strophic nature' of the chapter, the literary techniques (for example chiasmus, symmetry and inclusions), as well as literary forms (for example petitions). According to Malatesta, each one of the five sections, as well as the chapter as a whole, displays a concentric structure.

This division is also proposed by Menken (1985:229-60) who is of the opinion that the author of the Fourth Gospel counted numbers of syllables and words in the composition of John 17. These five sections are related in the following way:

\[
\begin{align*}
A & \ 17:1b-5 & A^1 & 17:20-24 \\
C & 17:9-19 & & \\
B & 17:6-8 & B^1 & 17:25-26 \\
\end{align*}
\]

According to Menken (1985:247), this structure is underscored by the number of words and syllables used in each one of these elements.

(1-5) (6-11) (12-19) (20-23) (24-26)
According to Simoens (1981:174-99), John 17 consists of five elements which are arranged in the chiastic pattern A B C B^1 A^1. The elements A, C and A^1 display a concentric structure whereas the remaining two elements B and B^1
display a concentric parallelism.

A close scrutiny of these proposals reveals serious shortcomings in most of them. The reason for this situation is to be found in the fact that most of the analyses discussed above seem to have been done intuitively, or at least without serious consideration being given to the methodological basis of the analysis. For example, Brown's division is not acceptable, as the chosen principle is not used consistently (see vv 20-24). The same may be said of the ‘fourfold’ division. Boyle's proposal contains an unnatural break between verses 3 and 4. In Bultmann's analysis the third section (vv 9-19) should be subdivided further. In the case of Malatesta, Menken and Simoens, the 'neat' structures discovered seem strained—especially in the case of Menken whose basic hypothesis that the author of the Fourth Gospel counted syllables and words is unacceptable. On the other hand, the divisions by Becker and Schnackenburg seem to be well-founded.

The difference between the analysis presented in this essay and most of the analyses discussed above, is that the methodological basis on which this analysis is based, is clearly indicated. In this way, it is possible to explain why the structure of John 17:1-26 is described in a certain way. Furthermore, I hope that this will stimulate further discussion amongst scholars in two ways: Firstly, that the structure proposed in this essay will be critically discussed by other scholars and either accepted or rejected. Secondly, that this will facilitate the discussion of the methodological basis/principles on which the presentation of the structure of pericopes rests:

Based on the application of the methodological principles discussed above, I propose the following division of the prayer:

Vv 1b-5: Introduction to the prayer  
Vv 6-24: Body of the prayer  
Vv 25-26: Conclusion

This will now be discussed in more detail.

3 DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF JOHN 17:1-26

3.1 Vv 1b-5: Introduction to the prayer
The most important reason for the demarcation of these five verses as a separate unit is to be found in the fact that a shift in focus occurs in verse 6. Whereas the first five verses are dominated by Jesus' petition for his own glorification, from verse 6 onwards the focus shifts from Jesus to the disciples. This subsection is thematically integrated by means of the important concept 'glorification' as indicated by the dominant appearance of the structure marker δοξαζω (see
This subsection consists of five syntactical units. With the exception of colon 3, the important concept δοξάζω dominates all of them. The semantic relationships are as follows: In colon 1 Jesus refers to the coming of his hour. This functions semantically as the setting (time and circumstance) for everything which is to follow, that is, the immediate context (cola 2a-d), as well as the prayer as a whole. This relationship may also be interpreted as reason-result (as a result of the fact that the hour has come, Jesus requests a number of things from the Father), but no clear indication to this effect occurs in the text. Jesus' request for glorification is set out in cola 2a-b. Although the particle ἵνα is used in 2b (suggesting purpose), it seems better to describe the semantic relationship between the first two sections of colon 2 as dyadic reciprocal, since mutual glorification is the issue here. (Compare cola 4-5 in this regard.) To this colon 2c-d is added. The particle καθώς (used at the beginning of 2c) refers to δοξάζω in 2a. The semantic relationship between 2c and the imperative in 2a seems to be twofold (as is also the case in other examples where καθώς is used. Cf, for example, 13:34; 17:18,21). On the one hand, the semantic relationship is comparative: The Father is requested to glorify the Son in the same way as He granted ἑξουσία to the Son. On the other hand, the semantic relationship is reason-result (see Blass et al 1979:par53). Since the Father has already granted the Son authority over all human beings, He should also glorify the Son. The semantic relationship between colon 2c and 2d is means-purpose, since colon 2d expresses the purpose for which the Son received authority from the Father, namely to provide eternal life.

Colon 3a-b (linked internally by means of a qualificational substance-content relationship) forms a parenthesis, expounding the concept η αἰωνίος ζωή; mentioned in colon 2d. In colon 4a the structure marker δοξάζω is picked up once again. Colon 4a is linked to colon 4b by means of a qualificational character-manner relationship, since colon 4b describes the way in which Jesus glorified the Father, that is, by completing the work the Father entrusted to him. In the last colon of this subsection (colon 5) Jesus' petition for glorification is repeated. The semantic relationship between the two parts of this colon is qualificational (character-manner). Colon 5a-b is linked to colon 4a-b by means of a reason-result relationship, since the request for glorification is based on the fact that Jesus has completed the work that the Father gave him.

To summarise: This subsection forms the introduction to the prayer in John 17:1-26. As such it comprises Jesus' petition for his own glorification—a theme that semantically integrates the whole subsection. The following relevant aspects in this regard are mentioned: that the hour of glorification has come (colon 1); the mutual nature of glorification: Father-Son, Son-Father (colon 2), the benefits of glorification for the believers (colon 2c-d); the grounds on which the
petition are based (colon 4); and the manner of glorification (colon 2c; 5b).

3.2 Vv 16-24: Body of the prayer
In this subsection six different units can be distinguished, namely

* cola 6-10 (vv 6-8);
* cola 11-15 (vv 9-11a);
* cola 16-25 (vv 11b-16);
* cola 26-29 (vv 17-19);
* colon 30 (vv 20-21), and
* cola 31-32 (vv 22-24).

This demarcation is based on the following arguments:

* The first unit (vv 6-8/cola 6-10) is demarcated as a separate unit, because the focus has shifted from the request for Jesus' glorification (see vv1-5) to the disciples. The primary concern of this unit is Jesus' task with regard to the disciples and their positive reaction towards him (see the structure markers). His task is described in two ways: ἔφανερωσά τὸ ὄνομα and τὰ ρήματα δέδωκα. Their positive response is described as τὸν λόγον τετήρηκαν, ἔγωγαν, ἔλαβον and ἐπιστευσαν. Within the prayer as a whole this unit serves as the introduction to the petitions in verses 11b-24. The theme of this unit can be summarised as follows: *Jesus' task with regard to the disciples completed.*

* Verses 9-11a/Cola 11-15 are demarcated as a separate unit, as two new aspects are introduced. On the one hand, the people for whom Jesus are praying, are identified and, on the other hand, two reasons for the prayer are given: Firstly, Jesus prays for the disciples because they belong to the Father. Secondly, he prays for them because he is going away.

* Verses 11b-16/Cola 16-25 are demarcated as the third unit since it contains the first petition. This unit is dominated by Jesus' request for the preservation of the disciples (note the structure markers). The inclusion between cola 16 and 24 underscores this demarcation.

* Verses 17-19/Cola 26-29 are demarcated as a separate unit, because a new petition is introduced. Whereas the petition in the previous unit concerns the preservation of the disciples, the petition in this unit concerns something different, namely the sanctification of the disciples.

* Verses 20-21/Colon 30 are demarcated as a separate unit, since a twofold
change can be perceived in relation to the previous unit. Firstly, a new petition is introduced: Jesus prays for unity. Secondly, the persons for whom Jesus is praying, have changed, since the focus has shifted from the disciples to the future believers.

* Verses 22-23/Cola 31-32 pose a problem, as they fit in well with either the previous or the next verse(s). On the one hand it might be argued that they should be grouped with the next verse, since the important structure marker δόξα, which is mentioned again in verse 24, is re-introduced in verses 22-23, and, furthermore, verses 22-23 concern the disciples and not the future believers—thus implying a shift in focus when compared to the previous unit (cf Becker 1981:526-7). On the other hand, it might be argued that the theme of unity (discussed in the previous unit) also constitutes an important element of these two verses. In the analysis presented here, the first option was chosen. However, as this unit also comprises a petition, namely a petition for the disciples' future glorification, it is included as a part of the body of the prayer, and not as part of the conclusion (next unit) as is often done.

The semantic relationships within the various units in the body of the prayer will now be discussed in more detail.

In the first unit (cola 6-10/vv6-8), summarised as Jesus' task with regard to the disciples completed, the following pattern (used twice) can be distinguished: 'Reveal-receive' process-result. In cola 6-10b it is used for the first time. In cola 6 the process of revealing is described. This colon is semantically linked to colon 9 by means of a cause-effect relationship: The process of revealing caused a positive response, since it was accepted by the disciples. Cola 7 and 8 (internally linked by means of an additive different consequential relationship) are semantically linked to the phrase τοῖς ἀνθρώποις...κόσμου in colon 6 by means of an additive different consequential relationship. The description of the reveal-receive process (as described in cola 6-9) is followed in colon 10 by a description of the result of this process, namely that the disciples have acquired a knowledge that everything that the Father has given Jesus, originates from the Father. The two sections of colon 10 are linked by means of a qualificational substance-content relationship.

The same pattern is used in colon 10c-10f. In colon 10c and 10d (internally linked by means of a cause-effect relationship; also see the semantic relationship between cola 6 and 9 discussed above) the reveal-receive process is described. This is followed in colon 10e-f by a description of the result of this process, namely that they knew that Jesus came from the Father, and that they believed that the Father had sent Jesus. The semantic relationship between colon 10e and 10f is additive different consequential.

In the second unit (cola 11-15/vv9-11a) the people for whom Jesus are
praying are identified, and the reasons for the prayer are provided. The following pattern can be distinguished in this unit:

| Cola 11-12b  | Identification          |
| Colon 12c-12f | First motivation        |
| Cola 13-15   | Second motivation       |

In cola 11-12b the disciples are identified as those for whom Jesus is praying. The semantic relationship between colon 12a and 12b is dyadic contrastive. To this colon 11 is linked by means of an additive different consequential relationship. In colon 12c-12f the first motivation for the prayer is provided, namely that the disciples belong to the Father and Jesus. Colon 12d and 12e are linked by means of a dyadic reciprocal relationship. To this colon 12c is added by means of an additive different consequential semantic relationship. The semantic relationship between colon 12f and colon 12c-e is also additive different consequential. The second motivation for the prayer (namely that Jesus is going to the Father) is provided in cola 13-15. Cola 13 and 14 are linked by means of a dyadic contrastive relationship. To this colon 15 is added by means of a reason-result semantic relationship (reversed order), as it provides the reason for the state of affairs described in cola 13-14.

The **third unit** (cola 16-25/vv11b-16) is devoted to the first petition, a petition for the preservation of the disciples. This unit is structured in the following way:

Colon 16a-16c: Petition for the preservation of the disciples.
Cola 17a-21b: First motivation: Jesus cannot keep them safe as he is going to the Father.
Cola 22-23: Second motivation: They are not from the world.
Colon 24a-b: Petition for the preservation of the disciples.
Colon 25a-b: Second motivation (continued): They are not from the world.

The semantic relationships within the third unit are as follows: In colon 16a-c where the petition for the preservation of the disciples is set out, colon 16a and 16b are semantically linked by means of a qualificational (character-manner) relationship, as colon 16b describes the way in which the disciples will be protected. To this colon 16c is added by means of a means-purpose relationship.

The first motivation provided for the petition is that Jesus will not be able to continue his task of preservation with regard to them, as he is going to the Father. The semantic relationship between colon 17b and 17c is qualificational (character-manner). The next two cola (18a and 19a) are linked successively to colon 17b-c, both by means of an additive different consequential relationship.
The semantic relationship between cola 17a and 17b-19a is qualificational (setting-time). The statement in colon 19a (that none of the disciples perished) is followed by a short digression regarding Judas, thus linking cola 19a and 19b additive different consequentially. Colon 19c indicates the purpose of this event, thereby constituting a means-purpose relationship. Cola 20-21b are related to cola 17a-19a by means of a dyadic contrastive relationship, as the situation up till then is contrasted with the situation which will be initiated by Jesus' departure. Cola 20 and 21a are linked by means of a reason-result relationship. To this colon 21b is added by means of a means-purpose relationship.

Cola 22-23c provide the second motivation for the petition, namely the world's hatred towards the disciples. Colon 22 is linked to colon 23a-b by means of a cause-effect relationship: The world hates the disciples, because Jesus has given God's word to them. The hatred of the world is motivated by colon 23b (semantic relationship: reason-result). Colon 23c compares the disciples' situation with that of Jesus, thereby constituting a dyadic comparative relationship between colon 23b and 23c.

In colon 24a-b the petition for preservation is repeated—although with a slightly different emphasis. Colon 24a and 24b are linked by means of a dyadic contrastive relationship. In colon 25a-b the motivation provided in colon 23b-c is continued.

The second petition (a petition for the sanctification of the disciples) is set out in the fourth unit, vvl7-19/cola 26-29. This unit is structured in the following way:

Cola 26a-27 : Petition for sanctification
Colon 28a-b : Purpose of sanctification
Colon 29a-c : Jesus as mediator of sanctification

In cola 26a-27 the petition for sanctification is set out. Colon 26b is linked to colon 26a by means of a qualificational (character-manner) relationship. To this colon 27 is added additive different consequentially, equating ἀλήθεια with ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς.

In colon 28a-b the disciples' task is mentioned. At first glance it may seem as if the semantic relationship between colon 28a and 28b is dyadic comparative, indicating the disciples' task as being analogous to that of Jesus. However, there is more to it. Καθώς also serves to indicate that the disciples' mission is rooted in that of Jesus. Therefore the semantic relationship between colon 28a and 28b should be described as both dyadic comparative and reason-result. When the question as to the function of colon 28a-b within this unit as a whole is considered, it seems as if colon 28a-b is related to cola 26a-27 by a means-purpose relationship: The disciples will be sanctified in order to be sent to the
world. They will have to take over Jesus' assault on the world—his ἐλέγχειν and κρίνειν (see 16:8-11)—a task which can only be undertaken if they remain what they are: sanctified and separated from the world (Bultmann 1978:390-91).

It is important to note the analogy between Jesus' mission and that of the disciples in this regard: In the same way that the Father consecrated the Son and sent him to the world, Jesus is now consecrating the disciples and sending them into the world in order to continue his mission. Thus sanctification and mission are inextricably linked (Ibuki 1972:132; Riedl 1973:12-14).

In colon 29a-c Jesus refers to his own 'sanctification'. This statement should be understood against an Old Testament background—however, not in the sense of the consecration of a person for a special task (for example Jr 1:5; Ex 40:15; Lev 8:30; 2 Chr 5:11), but in the sense of the consecration of sacrificial victims (for example Dt 15:19) (Brown 1984:766-67). The phrase ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν also favours this interpretation. Thus, when Jesus speaks of his self-consecration, he is referring to his self-sacrifice in death. The semantic relationships in colon 29a-c are as follows: Colon 29b and 29c are related by means of a qualificational (character:manner) relationship. To this colon 29a is linked by means of a means-purpose relationship.

The third petition (a petition for unity amongst the future believers) is set out in the fifth unit (colon 30a-i/vv20-21). This unit is structured in the following way:

Colon 30a-d: Petition for unity
Colon 30e-g: The relationship between Jesus and the Father as model and basis for the unity amongst the disciples
Colon 30h-i: Purpose of unity

In colon 30a-c the persons for whom Jesus is praying are identified: not only the disciples, but also the future believers. This is followed by the petition for unity in colon 30d. The semantic relationships are as follows: Colon 30a and 30b are linked by means of a dyadic contrastive relationship. Colon 30c describes the way in which future believers will become πιστεύοντες, thereby constituting a qualificational (character-manner) relationship between colon 30c and 30b. The content of the petition is set out in colon 30d: that they may be one. In colon 30e-g it is made clear that the unity between believers should be modelled after, and based upon the unity between Father and Son. Once again καθὼς serves as an indicator of a dual semantic relationship, namely dyadic comparative, as well as reason-result.

In colon 30h-i the purpose of the unity amongst future believers is set out: that the world may believe, thus constituting a means-purpose relationship between colon 30h-i and the rest of the unit. The semantic relationship between
colon 30h and 30i is qualificational (substance-content).

In the last unit (col. 31a-32d/vv22-24) a petition for glorification is set out. This unit can be divided into two parts. In col. 31a-31i the δόξα already given to the disciples is discussed. This is followed in col. 32a-d by a petition that the disciples should be where Jesus is, in order that they can see his δόξα.

Colon 31a-31i is structured in the following way:

Colon 31a: The glory already given to the disciples
Colon 31b: Purpose: Unity amongst the disciples
Colon 31c-e: Model and basis for the unity amongst the disciples
Colon 31f: Purpose (repeated): Unity amongst the disciples
Colon 31g: Purpose of the unity amongst the disciples: That the world may believe
Colon 31h-i: Content of the belief that the world should have

In the second part of this unit, colon 32a-d, Jesus prays that the disciples will share his future δόξα. The semantic relationship between colon 32a and 32b is additive different consequential. To this colon 32c is added by means of a means-purpose relationship. The semantic relationship between colon 32d and 32c is reason-result (reversed order).

3.3 Vv 25-26: Conclusion

Verses 25-26 (col. 33-37c) serve as the conclusion to the prayer. This unit can be divided into two parts. In the first part, 33-35b (verse 25), two different ways of reacting to the Father are described. In the second part (col. 36-37c) the issue of the past and future revelation is addressed. In the first part the semantic relationships are as follows: Cola 33 and 34 are linked by means of a dyadic contrastive relationship. In the case of colon 35a and 35b, colon 35b provides the content of ἐγνώσων (colon 35a), thereby constituting a qualificational (substance-content) relationship. The relationship between col. 33-34 and 35a-b is additive (different-consequential). In the second part the issue of revelation is discussed and a promise of future revelation is made. The semantic relationships are as follows: Cola 36 and 37 are linked by means of an additive different consequential relationship. Colon 37b-c (internally linked by means of a dyadic reciprocal relationship) expresses the purpose of the future revelation, thereby constituting a means-purpose semantic relationship between cola 36-37a and 37b-c.
4 CONCLUSION

Based on the discourse analysis presented in this essay, it can thus be said that John 17:1-26 is structured in the following way:

Vv 1-5: Introduction to the prayer
Jesus, having completed his work, prays for his own glorification.

Vv 6-24: Body of the prayer
First unit: Vv 6-8: Jesus’ task completed
* V6 (Cola 6-9): ‘Reveal-receive’ process
* V7 (Colon 10a-b): Result
* V8a (Colon 10c-a): ‘Reveal-receive’ process
* V8b (Colon 10e-f): Result

Second unit: Vv 9-11a: Identification of the persons for whom Jesus is praying
* V9a (Cola 11-12b): Identification
* Vv9b-10 (Cola 12c-12f): First motivation for prayer: The disciples belong to Jesus and the Father
* V11 (Cola 13-15): Second motivation: Jesus is going to the Father.

Third unit: Vv 11b-16: Petition for the preservation of the disciples
* V11b (Colon 16a-16c): Petition for preservation
* Vv12-13 (Cola 17a-21b): First motivation: Jesus cannot keep them safe as he is going to the Father.
* V14 (Cola 22-23c): Second motivation: They are not from the world
* V15 (Colon 24a-b): Petition for the preservation of the disciples
* V16 (Colon 25a-b): Second motivation (continued): They are not from the world.

Fourth unit: Vv 17-19: Petition for the sanctification of the disciples
* V17 (Cola 26a-27): Petition for sanctification
* V18 (Colon 28a-b): Purpose of sanctification
* V19 (Colon 29a-b): Jesus as mediator of sanctification

Fifth unit: Vv 20-21: Petition for unity
* V20-21a (Colon 30a-d): Petition for unity
* V21b-21c (Colon 30e-g): The relationship between Jesus and the Father as model and basis for unity
* V21d (Colon 30h-i): Purpose of unity
Sixth unit: Vv 22-24: Petition for glorification
* Vv22-23 (Colon 31): The glory already given to the disciples
* V24 (Colon 32): Petition for future glorification of the disciples

Vv 25-26: Conclusion to the prayer
* V25 (Cola 33-35b): Two opposite ways of reacting to the Father
* V26 (Colon 36-37): Past and future revelation
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Subsection 1: Introduction: Jesus, having completed his work prays for his own glorification (1-5):

1. Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὄφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἶπεν:
   1a πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὁρα:
      1b ἵνα ὁ υἱὸς δοξήσῃ σέ.
   2a δόξος σου τὸν υἱόν,
      2b ἵνα πάν δεδωκας αὐτῷ δόσῃ αὐτοῖς
   3a ζωὴν αἰώνιον:
      3b ἵνα γινώσκοι
   4a εἰς τὸν ποιήσας εἰπὶ τῆς γῆς
      4b τὸ ἔργον τελείωσας ὁ δεδώκας μοι ἵνα ποιήσω.
   5a καὶ τὸν υἱὸν δοξάσῃ με σύ, πάτερ, παρά σεαυτῷ
      5b τῇ δόξῃ. ἀ εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι
      παρὰ σοι.

Subsection 2: Body of the prayer (6-24)

6. Ἐφανερώσας σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὁ ὁ δεδώκας μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου
   7 σοι ἔδωκαν
   8 καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετήρηκαν.
   9 καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετήρηκαν.
   10a νῦν ἔγνωκας
      10b ὅτι πάντα ὁ δεδώκας μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσίν

Revealing process

Result

Jesus' task completed

Result

Revealing process

Result
9:  
11 Ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ,
12a οὗ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ
12b ἄλλα περὶ ἐν δὲ δεδωκάς μοι,
12c ὅτι σοὶ εἰσίν,
12d καὶ τὰ ἑόμα πάντα σὰ ἔστιν
12e καὶ τὰ σὰ ἑόμα,
12f καὶ δεδώκασαι ἐν αὐτοῖς.

10:  
13 καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,
14 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσίν,
15 καὶ ἐπέρ καὶ σὲ ἔρχομαι.

11:  
16a πάλαι ἄγιον, τήρησον αὐτοὺς
16b ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί σου ἢ δέδωκάς μοι,
16c ἦν ὅσιον ἐν καθέως ἡμεῖς.

12:  
17a ὅτε ἡμῖν μετὰ αὐτῶν
17b ἐγὼ ἔτρησαν αὐτοὺς
17c ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι σου ἢ δέδωκάς μοι,
18 καὶ ἔφυλαξα,
19a καὶ οὐδεῖς έξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο
19b εἰ η ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας,
19c ἦν ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῆ.

13:  
20 νῦν δὲ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι
21a καὶ ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ
21b ἦν ἔκωσιν τὴν χαράν τὴν ἐμῆν
pestlplmphményn ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.

14:  
22 ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου
23a καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐμίσησεν αὐτοὺς,
23b ὅτι οὐκ εἰσίν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου
23c καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.

15:  
24a οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἦν αἱρήσ αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου,
24b ἄλλα ἦν τηρήσεις αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

16:  
25a ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ εἰσίν
25b καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.
17: 
26a ἀγίασον αὐτοὺς
26b ἐν τῇ ἁλθείᾳ.
27 ὁ λόγος ὁ σῶς ἁλθεία ἐστίν.

18: 
28a καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον,
28b καὶ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

19: 
29a καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἐμαυτόν,
29b ἵνα ὄσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι
29c ἐν ἁλθείᾳ.

20: 
30a ὦ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον,
30b ἄλλα καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστεύοντων
30c διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμὲ,

21: 
30d ἵνα πάντες ἐν ὑσίν,
30e καθὼς σὺ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ
30f καὶ ἐν σοί,
30g ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὑσίν,
30h ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ
30i ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας

22: 
31a καὶ τὴν δόξαν ἦν δέδωκάς μοι
31b δέδωκα αὐτοῖς,
31c καθὼς ἥμεις ἐν-
31d ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς
31e καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί.
31f ἵνα δοθῇ τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἐν,
31g ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι
31h σὺ με ἀπέστειλας
31i καὶ ἡγάπησας αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας.

23: 
31j καθὼς ἥμεις ἐν-
31k ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς
31l καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί.
31m ἵνα δοθῇ τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἐν,
31n γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι
31o σὺ με ἀπέστειλας
31p καὶ ἡγάπησες αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας.
Subsection 3: Conclusion

25: πάτερ δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω,
 εγὼ δὲ σε ἔγνων,
 καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν
 ὅτι σὺ με ἀπέστειλας.

26: καὶ ἔγνωρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ δυνάμα σου
 γνωρίσω,
 ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἦν ἡγάπησάς με ἐν αὐτοῖς ἦ
 καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς.